THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

'A NATION NOBLER IN BLOOD AND IN ANTIQUITY': SCOTTISH NATIONAL IDENTITY IN *GESTA ANNALIA I* AND *GESTA ANNALIA II*

Finlay Young

PhD Scottish History

The University of Edinburgh

2018

DECLARATION OF OWN WORK

I confirm that -

a) the thesis has been composed by me;

b) the work is my own;

c) the work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification except as specified.

Finlay Young

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

The origins and development of a sense of Scottish national identity have long been a matter of critical importance for historians of medieval Scotland. Indeed, this was also the case for historians in medieval Scotland itself: this period saw the composition of a number of chronicles that sought to describe the history of Scotland and the Scottish people from their earliest origins until the chroniclers' own time. The dissertation explores ideas of national identity within two medieval Scottish chronicles, known today as *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*.

Taken together, these two chronicles, one written before the Wars of Independence, the other after, can offer valuable insights into the development of the identity of the Scottish kingdom and its people, and the way in which this was affected by the Wars of Independence, providing evidence both of continuity and of contrast. This is of particular interest with respect to their portrayals of the role of the Scottish king and his relationship with the kingdom, given the way in which Robert I and his supporters later apparently attempted to shape the narrative of Scotland's past and the position of its king to their own ends.

The dissertation therefore seeks to investigate how such issues of Scotland's identity are presented in *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*. The first section of the study discusses the construction of these texts. The second then looks at how terms such as 'Scotland' and 'Scot' are understood in the two chronicles, and the relationship between these ideas of the Scottish kingdom and the Scottish people. The third section examines the presentation of the crown, church and language in the chronicles, and the role of these elements in uniting the kingdom and fostering this sense of identity, arguing that the continuity of these ideas between the two texts suggests that many elements of Scotland's national identity were well-established by the later thirteenth century.

CONTENTS

Referencing conventions

William Skene's 1871 edition of John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* remains the standard printed edition not only for Fordun's chronicle, but also the chronicles now generally referred to as *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*. As this thesis will argue, *Gesta Annalia I* also formed part of a longer work, known as *Proto-Fordun*, the remainder of which survives only within Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*.

Skene's edition, however, does not treat *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II* as separate texts, and further complicates the issue by printing part of *Gesta Annalia I* in a separate appendix, under the title *Capitula ad Gesta Annalia Praefixa*.

This thesis will, for ease of reference, nevertheless make use of the chapter numbers given in Skene's edition, which will be cited as follows:

For *Proto-Fordun* chapters within *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*:

- Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* [book & chapter no.]

(It will be made clear where necessary if *Proto-Fordun* is not considered to be the author of a given example from *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*.)

For *Proto-Fordun* chapters printed as *Capitula ad Gesta Annalia Praefixa*:

- Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad Gesta Annalia Praefixa* [chapter no.]

For *Proto-Fordun* chapters printed as *Gesta Annalia*:

- Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* [chapter no.]

For *Gesta Annalia II*:

- Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* [chapter no.]

INTRODUCTION: National Identity

The referendum on Scottish independence has placed the question of Scotland's national identity, and the country's place in the world, at the heart of public debate in Scotland since 2014. Recent events such as the opening ceremony of the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow similarly inspired discussion about Scottish identity. This coincided with occasions such as the 700th anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn, not to mention the rerelease of yet another edition of Mel Gibson's *Braveheart* (conveniently timed to fall on the same day), that have drawn attention to how Scotland's medieval past has helped to shape this identity.[1]

The origins, emergence and development of this sense of Scottish identity have, however, long been a matter of critical importance for historians of medieval Scotland.[2] Indeed, it was arguably a central theme in the work of historians actually living and writing in medieval Scotland: the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries saw the composition of a number of chronicles that sought to describe the history of Scotland and the Scottish people from their earliest origins until the chroniclers' own time. This dissertation will investigate ideas of national identity within two medieval Scottish chronicles, known today as *Proto-Fordun* (of which the chronicle *Gesta Annalia I* forms part) and *Gesta Annalia II*.

I

The question of whether national identities could even exist in the Middle Ages is potentially controversial, at least from the perspective of many modern historians of nations, nationalism and identity, who have suggested that such concepts have little relevance to societies before the industrial and political revolutions of the

---

[1] This heady mix of circumstances was perhaps best encapsulated in the Scottish swimmer Daniel Wallace yelling 'For freedom!' after his victory in the 400m medley in said Commonwealth Games, having watched the film beforehand: http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/commonwealth-games/28501031 [accessed 09/08/2014].

[2] Michael Brown, *The Wars of Scotland 1214-1371* (Edinburgh, 2004), p.354.

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[3] As medieval historians have observed in response, however, it is clear that those who lived in the medieval period frequently identified themselves as belonging to distinctive nations, peoples and kingdoms, understanding this to be a natural division, and, moreover, discussion of how particular groups originated, what linked them together, and what set them apart from one another, is a common theme in medieval writing.[4]

Thus, medieval authors conceived of the world as being populated by different peoples or races, who shared a common descent and even common characteristics and qualities.[5] The particular language, laws and customs associated with such groups distinguished the different peoples from one another.[6] Such groups were not necessarily regarded as forming a distinctive political entity, with no higher external authority: it was possible for a kingdom to contain within it many different peoples, who nevertheless retained their own laws and identity.[7] Increasingly, however, as governments developed, so did the idea that nations and kingdoms naturally coincided, a sense of regnal solidarity, so that a people formed a kingdom and a kingdom consisted of a people.[8] This can be seen in the case of Britain: where kings of England and Scotland once addressed several different races in their

---

[3] R.R. Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6.4 (1994), pp.1-20 at pp.2-4; Dauvit Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain: From the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.280-1; Anthony D. Smith, *The Antiquity of Nations* (Cambridge, 2004), pp.3-17; Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1997), p.251.

[4] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.4-8; Robert Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity,' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31.1 (2001), pp.39-56 at pp.42-50; Susan Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm,' *History* 68 (1983), pp.375-90 at p.375; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.280-281; Dauvit Broun, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth* Centuries (Woodbridge, 1999), pp.7-9; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.253.

[5] Peoples were usually described as sharing descent from a founding figure in biblical or classical times: Broun, *Irish Identity*, p.8; Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium*,' pp.375-6; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.8; Matthew H. Hammond, 'Ethnicity and the Writing of Medieval Scottish history,' *Scottish Historical Review* 85 (2006), pp.1-27 at p.16; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.5-7; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.44-7

[6] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.8-9; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.47; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.256-7.

[7] Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.50-3; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.12-3; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.257.

[8] Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.8-9; Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium*,' pp.389-90; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.10; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.260

charters, by the late twelfth century they no longer did so.[9] Such kingdoms were now apparently seen to consist of a single, unified people.

One of the key ways by which the identity of kingdoms and nations was expressed was in the creation of founding myths and national histories.[10] These stressed the antiquity of the nation or its royal dynasty, emphasising the idea of regnal solidarity and the association of the people with the crown. Such regnal histories were first constructed in England and Wales in the twelfth century, and even earlier in Ireland.[11] In the case of Scotland, however, a nation whose collective noun ('Scoti') had previously been used for the Irish, who did not have a single common language, and whose geographical name did not always refer to the entire kingdom, such narratives do not appear to have emerged until notably later.[12]

*

In late medieval Scotland, then, works such as John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (most likely compiled in the 1380s, and the earliest surviving substantial history of this type), Andrew Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland* (written in the early fifteenth century) and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* (dating from the 1440s) articulated, in increasingly assertive and vociferous terms, a sense of Scotland as an ancient, free and independent kingdom, inhabited by a single, distinctive, unified race of people and ruled by an unbroken line of their own kings.[13] In this they were building on ideas of regnal solidarity that had been expressed in earlier documents, dating from the period of the Wars of Independence, such as the Pleadings of Baldred Bisset in 1301 and the Declaration

---

[9] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' p.16; Alexander Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness in Medieval Scotland,' in Claus Bjorn, Alexander Grant & Keith J. Stringer, *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen, 1994) pp.68-95 at p.79.

[10] R.R. Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6.7 (1997), pp.1-24 at pp.15-6; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.261.

[11] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.40-7.

[12] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.48.

[13] Steve Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland and the Matter of Britain,' in Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.47-72 at p.47; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.74.

of Arbroath in 1320, which emphasised the unity of the people and country under its king, and the antiquity and freedom of the kingdom.[14]

The Wars of Independence have traditionally been regarded as the crucial period in the development of this sense of Scotland's identity, with the kingdom emerging from the long years of resistance to English invasion and oppression as a defiantly independent nation, united by a shared belief in the necessity of that independence and firmly loyal to a crown that upheld it.[15] This sense of common cause, then, drew together and united a kingdom of different languages, of different origins and regional interests.

Indeed, even in the thirteenth century, not everyone within the kingdom of Scotland and subject to the king of Scots was consistently regarded as being Scottish, or even necessarily identified themselves as living within a geographical territory called 'Scotland'. Only in 1216 did the monks of Melrose, compiling their own chronicle, use the word 'Scotland' to refer to an area that included both the Merse in the southeast (a region that includes Melrose itself) and Galloway in the southwest.[16] John of England burned Berwick, Roxburgh, Dunbar and Haddington

---

[14] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.38; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.274; Grant G. Simpson, 'The Declaration of Arbroath revitalised,' *Scottish Historical Review* 56 (1977), pp.11-33 at pp.27-33; Grant G. Simpson, 'The Declaration of Arbroath: What Significance When?' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Declaration of Arbroath: History, Significance, Setting*, (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.108-115 at pp.111-2; Dauvit Broun, 'The Declaration of Arbroath: Pedigree of a Nation?' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Declaration of Arbroath: History, Significance, Setting* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.1-12.

[15] For example Edward J. Cowan, 'Identity, Freedom and the Declaration of Arbroath' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.38-68 at p.38; Bruce Webster, *Medieval Scotland: The Making of an Identity* (London, 1997), p. 86; Roger A. Mason, '"Scotching the Brut": The Early History of Britain', in Jenny Wormald (ed.), *Scotland Revisited* (London, 1991), pp.49-60 at pp.51-4; William Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historic Quest* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.43-4.

[16] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Joseph Stevenson, trans.), printed in *The Church Historians of England*, vol.4 part 1 (London 1856), pp.77-243; reprinted in facsimile in *Medieval Chronicles of Scotland: The Chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood* (Llanerch 1988), pp.7-124 at p.44; Dauvit Broun, 'Defining Scotland and the Scots Before the Wars of Independence,' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.4-17 at pp.4, 13 n. 3. Barrow posits that it was in fact foreign use of the word 'Scotland' to refer to the entire kingdom that encouraged the gradual adoption of this usage by Scots themselves: G.W.S. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306* (Edinburgh, 1981), p.153. This might be compared with foreigners referring to people from the kingdom as 'Scot,' even when they were from areas not yet habitually included in 'Scotland': see Matthew Hammond, 'The Use of the

in 'the southern part of Scotland,' while a vision of the moon was seen in 'the western part of Scotland, which is called Galloway.'[17] *Gesta Annalia I*, on the other hand, describes both Lothian and Moray as lying outside Scotland in an entry for 1214, when William I first 'came back from Moray into Scotland,' and then, 'from Scotland, he went to Lothian.'[18] While the Melrose monks seem to have regarded their abbey as lying within Scotland in 1216, however, they did not unambiguously refer to an inhabitant of the region as Scottish until a notably later entry, in 1265, when a monk, Richard of Roxburgh, is described as a Scot.[19]

This was a period in which Scotland's borders would be formally defined in acts such as the Treaty of York in 1237, which confirmed the southern limits of the kingdom, and the Treaty of Perth in 1266, in which the Norwegian crown gave up its claims to Man and the Hebrides, and was marked by the increasing exertion of royal authority and control throughout the kingdom, trends which have been seen to encourage the identification of the term 'Scotland' with the entire territory of the kingdom.[20] According to the conventional view of Scotland's development, such gradually emerging ideas were then essentially forced to coalesce into a clearly defined sense of Scotland's independence and the distinctiveness of its (now unified) people by the need to resist English invasion and an external threat to Scottish kingship.[21]

Name "Scot" in the Central Middle Ages, part one: "Scot" as a by-name,' in *Journal of Scottish Name Studies* 1 (2007), pp.37-60.

[17] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.44; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.7.

[18] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (p.279) published in *Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (William F. Skene, ed.), (*Historians of Scotland* vol. 1, Edinburgh, 1871); and translated as *John of Fordun's Chronicle of the Scottish Nation* (William F. Skene, ed.; Felix Skene, trans.), (*Historians of Scotland vol. 4*, Edinburgh, 1871): 'de Moravia rediit in Scocia, de Scocia vero profectus in Laudoniam;' Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.4.

[19] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.103; Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.9.

[20] A.A.M. Duncan, 'The Making of Scotland' in Gordon Menzies (ed.), *Who Are The Scots?* (London, 1971), pp.127-38; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.10; Fiona Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion: Scotland, Kingship and National Identity in the Wars of Independence,' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages,* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.18-37 at pp.18-9; Robin Frame, *The Political Development of the British Isles 1100-1400* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1995), pp.10-1; David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066-1284* (London, 2003), pp.11-4.

[21] Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.20.

While still commonplace, this view has, however, faced increasing challenge in recent years as historians have attempted to locate the roots of this sense of Scotland's identity, particularly through trying to discover in the surviving Scottish chronicles of the period the traces of their own older sources. This is particularly crucial given that what little evidence survives from Scotland in this period is largely written by people aware of Robert I's eventual success in securing both Scotland's independence and the continued succession of his own dynasty to the Scottish throne, and coloured by the influence of attempts by Robert and his supporters to convince not only sceptical outsiders but also fellow Scots of the legitimacy of his reign, leading to a particularly selective interpretation of Scotland's history and the relationship of the Scottish king with his subjects.[22] The influence of this Bruce propaganda, and the knowledge that Scotland's independence was eventually secured, has continued to encourage a conflation of the Bruce cause with the Scottish cause, an assumption that they are essentially the same, and that therefore those who opposed this were acting in defiance of their identity as Scots, rather than perhaps acting in accord with a different, but equally valid, understanding of this identity.[23] Trying to overcome this assumption has encouraged investigations on different perspectives of Scottish identity and loyalties during and after the Wars of Independence.[24]

---

[22] Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.32; Alexander Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn: What Was Going On?', *Scottish Historical Review* 86.2 (2007), pp.176-224 at pp.189-90.

[23] A warning made for example by Alasdair Ross, 'Men For All Seasons? The Strathbogie Earls of Atholl & the Wars of Independence, c.1290-1335,' *Northern Scotland 20* (2000), pp.1-30 at p.1; Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.24.

[24] For example, Fiona Watson has attempted to examine the nature of Scottish resistance prior to Bruce's succession in 1306 and the experience of occupation, and partly rehabilitate the reputation of the much-maligned John Baliol: Fiona Watson, *Under the Hammer: Edward I and Scotland: 1286-1306* (East Linton, 1998); Fiona Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' in Edward J. Cowan & Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.29-46; while Alexander Grant has looked at evidence of pro-Comyn sympathies within Scottish chronicles of the period and James Fraser has examined the portrayal of William Wallace in this light: Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.189-224; James E. Fraser, '"A Swan From a Raven": William Wallace, Brucean Propaganda, and *Gesta Annalia II*', in *Scottish Historical Review* 81.1 (2002), pp.1-22. It is notable, however, that while research has been done into the earlier roots of Scottish identity, suggesting continuity across the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (or even earlier), many texts continue to treat the pre- and post-war periods separately, usually using dates such as 1286, 1292 or 1306 as a breaking-off point. As Michael Brown has noted, however, viewing the period across the

The work carried out on the most recent edition of Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon* has also spurred further investigation of the sources of the major Scottish chronicles, and from this work it has become clear that many of the ideas and much of the content of work associated with the late fourteenth century have, in fact, significantly older roots, suggesting a greater degree of continuity between Scotland before and after the Wars of Independence than was previously supposed. This has had particular significance for our understanding of the chronicle known as *Gesta Annalia* ('Yearly Deeds') and its relationship with John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, with which it has traditionally been associated. It has been shown that this chronicle is not, as was traditionally believed, a set of notes prepared by Fordun in anticipation of bringing his chronicle (likely to have been written at some point between 1384 and 1387, but which ends in 1153) up to date to his own times, nor even the work of Fordun at all. Indeed, not only is *Gesta Annalia* a wholly separate work from that of Fordun, but it in fact consists of two different chronicles, both associated with the diocese of Saint Andrews. The first, known as *Gesta Annalia I*, was compiled around 1285, the other, known as *Gesta Annalia II*, was compiled around 1363, though they were later copied together into the same manuscript.[25]

Moreover, as the next chapter discusses, it has also become apparent that the author of *Gesta Annalia I* was also the author of Fordun's major source for *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*. *Gesta Annalia I* itself formed the final part of this source, referred to as *Proto-Fordun*.[26] Consideration of the viewpoint of *Gesta Annalia I* therefore also requires consideration of the traces of this work that are evident within Fordun's *Chronica*.

---

wars as a whole gives a clearer sense of the development of Scotland's identity and allows it to be seen in a wider context, in relation to trends across Britain and Europe: Brown, *The Wars of Scotland*, pp.1-3.

[25] See in particular Dauvit 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), pp.9-30.

[26] See in particular Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.215-63.

Gesta Annalia I and *Gesta Annalia II* have in the past been somewhat undervalued as sources in their own right, a legacy of the belief that they were little more than notes incorporated into the more substantial work of Fordun and, later, Walter Bower, and also of the nineteenth century edition of Fordun's work by William F. Skene, which misrepresented the nature of the texts.[27] *Proto-Fordun* (the term that will be used in this thesis to refer to the entire work, of which *Gesta Annalia I* is part), however, stands as one of the earliest substantial accounts of Scottish history, a narrative of Scotland's kings that pre-dates the Wars of Independence, and contains within it the traces of even older, now lost, works, including perhaps the chronicle of 'Veremundus,' dating from mid-thirteenth century.[28] Although recent scholarship has tended to focus on this aspect of the text, delving into it to find evidence and reconstruct older works, it is valuable also for what it can reveal about Scotland in the late thirteenth century, particularly because it was composed in 1285, shortly before the death of Alexander and prior to the outbreak of the Wars of Independence or the rise of Robert Bruce, events which so often colour later accounts of this period.

Proto-Fordun, then, incorporates and elaborates on texts from earlier in the thirteenth century, suggesting that the author of 1285 saw a great deal of continuity and similarity between the Scotland of his own time and that revealed in his sources. *Gesta Annalia II* likewise appears to have drawn on earlier sources, including in its case a work associated with a lost chronicle of Saint Andrews which was also used by Bower and Andrew Wyntoun, perhaps ending in the 1330s.[29] Again, this suggests that the author of *Gesta Annalia II*, in around 1363, similarly recognised in such works an interpretation of Scotland's recent history that matched his understanding of the kingdom's identity. It is notable also that they soon became associated with one another; evidently the copyist who added *Gesta Annalia II* to *Gesta Annalia I* and an accompanying set of documents relating to

---

[27] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.9-17; and see discussion in the next section.
[28] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.235-70.
[29] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.14-5; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.189.

Scottish independence, with only minimal interpolation to fit the two texts together, felt that the two chronicles provided a cohesive account of Scotland's history. Both of these texts were drawn on by later historians to present their own narratives of Scotland as an ancient, independent country, ruled by an unbroken line of its own kings.

Taken together, the two chronicles, one written before the Wars of Independence, the other after, can offer valuable insights into the development of the identity of the Scottish kingdom and its people, and the way in which this was affected by the Wars of Independence, providing evidence both of continuity and of contrast. This is of particular interest with respect to their portrayals of the role of the Scottish king and his relationship with the kingdom, given the way in which Robert I and his supporters later apparently attempted to shape the narrative of Scotland's past and the position of its king to their own ends.

II

This dissertation therefore seeks to investigate how such issues of Scotland's identity are portrayed in *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*: what these chronicles understood by terms such as 'Scotland' and 'Scottish', and how they used them, how they defined the Scottish people, and the role that institutions such as the crown and church, and elements such as language, played in creating this definition. This will be achieved through a close reading of the two texts, focusing on how they interpret events and present these ideas. It is the intention of this dissertation to show that, far from being collections of often conflicting and contradictory sources, both assembled more or less unthinkingly simply to create a roughly continuous narrative, these two chronicles have rather been carefully and deliberately constructed, their contents thoughtfully selected, in order to articulate a distinct, consistent vision of the Scottish kingdom. These interpretations of Scotland's past are, moreover, not only internally consistent within each text, but are also, in many respects, consistent with one another, demonstrating the continuity and development of ideas of Scottish identity across the thirteenth and fourteenth

centuries, at least as far as two particular clerics associated with the diocese of St Andrews are concerned.

The thesis is therefore divided into three parts. The first of these parts discusses in further depth the composition and context of the two chronicles, and their subsequent transmission and relationship with one another. After this, the second section of the dissertation looks at how terms such as 'Scotland' and 'Scot' are understood in the two chronicles, and the relationship between these ideas of the Scottish kingdom and the Scottish people. The first chapter in this section examines how Scotland is defined and identified; as noted above, it was only during the thirteenth century that 'Scotland' came to habitually describe the entire kingdom ruled by the king of Scots, but *Proto-Fordun* is consistent on which regions are of that king's realm, whether or not they are called 'Scotland.' This sense of the territorial integrity of the kingdom, and the idea that the geographical and political limits of Scotland were essentially the same thing, is very firmly established in *Gesta Annalia II*, despite the challenges of English occupation and government throughout much of the southern part of the kingdom in this period, and the shifting allegiances of many of the inhabitants.

The second chapter in this section builds on this theme to examine who, in the chronicles, is understood to be Scottish, and which factors seem to influence this definition, whether it is a matter of, for example, birth place and shared origins, or political allegiances, or common customs. This is not necessarily something that developed at the same rate as the changing definitions of Scotland; after all, it was possible for the monks of Melrose to live in Scotland in the early thirteenth century but not think of themselves as Scottish until the later part of the century. The chronicles were composed during a period that saw many changes to the make-up of the Scottish population. For example, the twelfth century had seen the arrival (encouraged by the crown) of English, French and Flemish nobles, while the Wars of Independence saw not only the long-standing presence of English armies and administrators, but also forced many nobles to choose between English and Scottish

landholdings and allegiances.[30] In both chronicles, therefore, neither everyone living in Scotland, nor everyone subject to the Scottish crown, is necessarily referred to as a Scot. This applies also to inhabitants with even longer roots in the realm: in *Proto-Fordun*, for example, the inhabitants of Moray occupy a distinctly ambiguous position. Even within *Gesta Annalia II*, certain areas, such as Argyll and Galloway appear to have strong regional identities that mark them out from other Scots. This invites the question of whether Scotland contained more than one race, or whether the Scots were not themselves a single race, and this chapter therefore also examines the kind of terminology used to discuss these identities in the chronicles, and how other nations are viewed.[31]

*

Having established how the chronicles saw the kingdom of Scotland and the Scottish people, the third section of the dissertation examines in greater depth how *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* portray the elements and symbols that created and expressed this sense of Scottish unity and identity. These chapters focus on three particular elements: the crown, the church, and ideas of language and ethnicity. These elements are identified in the chronicles as ways of demonstrating the distinctiveness of the Scottish kingdom. Not only do they serve as markers for identifying and distinguishing the Scots, but they are also used to explain both their past and their present, and as a way of representing and expressing the history, values and character of the Scots. Shared institutions such as the Scottish crown and church also help unite a kingdom through binding the people together within the same system of administration, bureaucracy and worship, in the same way that a common language creates a sense of a shared identity (or, as might be more

---

[30] Michael H. Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*: Scots in Plantagenet Allegiance during the Fourteenth Century,' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.94-115 at p.95; A.A.M. Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1975), pp.133-73.

[31] The distinction (or otherwise) made by medieval authors between terms such as 'gens' and 'natio,' and the problem of translating such terms, is discussed, for example, in Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.4-5; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.42-4; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.77; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.254-56.

appropriate in Scotland's case, in the way that a lack of one might perhaps create a sense of division). These elements helped foster national identities throughout Europe in this period, and in Scotland's case are particularly important, given that it was a kingdom of many languages, and whose crown and church faced many challenges to their independence and autonomy.

The first chapter within this section of the dissertation therefore discusses the chronicles' presentation of the Scottish crown and its relationship to the Scottish people. Kingship is central to ideas of national identity in the medieval period, during which time, as government and royal authority developed, communities once defined as a people or nation by a sense of an ancient common descent or shared language and laws increasingly came to define themselves as a people by their shared belonging to a single kingdom, so that frequently 'kingdoms and peoples came to seem identical.'[32] This shift in how nations were understood was accompanied by the development of royal genealogies and narrative histories detailing the ancient origins of kings (and their subjects) that could legitimise both claims for the existence of such nations and for their sovereignty and express this sense of regnal solidarity.[33] As noted above, such works existed in England and Wales in the twelfth century, and even earlier in Ireland, but Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, from the late fourteenth century, is the earliest extant substantial such narrative history of Scotland.[34] *Proto-Fordun*, however, demonstrates that such a narrative existed around a century before Fordun's *Chronica*, and, like *Gesta Annalia II*, is particularly concerned with the nature of kingship and the importance of the king in forming and expressing a kingdom's identity. Both texts make claims for the antiquity and independence of the Scottish royal line, and the crown has been regarded as a particularly significant factor in fostering a sense of a unified Scottish people, particularly given that other elements, such as a shared language or even a sense of a common homeland, were lacking in Scotland's case.

---

[32] Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, p.260; see also Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.38; Broun, *Irish Identity,* 8-9.

[33] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.37-39; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.261.

[34] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.40-49.

This chapter also examines the related question of the extent to which this concept of Scottish identity and the relationship between king and subjects was influenced by propaganda in favour of the interests of Robert I. *Gesta Annalia II*, for example, appears to emphasise the legitimacy of the Bruce claim to the Scottish throne, and portrays Robert I as a divinely sent saviour of the Scottish people. In a similar vein, the chronicle dismisses the claims of Edward Balliol, in favour of Robert's son, David II, and appears to favour the interests of David over those of his eventual successor, the future Robert II, a perspective influenced by the particular context of *Gesta Annalia II's* composition, at a time when David was negotiating with England over reducing his ransom payments while potentially making a son of Edward III his heir.[35]

The crown, however, was not the only Scottish institution whose independence was seen as essential to the identity of the Scottish kingdom. *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, both likely to have been compiled by clerics associated with the diocese of Saint Andrews, not only portray the church as a body that united the Scots in common worship but also expressly identify its status and independence with that of the kingdom as a whole. *Proto-Fordun* in particular emphasises the piety of Scotland's rulers, and depicts the struggle of the church to maintain its own independence from the archbishops of England, a struggle that has been seen to anticipate the struggle of Scotland's kings to maintain their independence.[36] The clerical attitude of the authors of the two chronicles is evident throughout, in their interest in such pious qualities and emphasis on the need for stability and order within the kingdom, particularly when instability comes at a heavy price for the common people. Scotland is clearly identified as a divinely-favoured, particularly devout kingdom (as is typical of most such national histories in the period). The second chapter in this section therefore examines the chronicles' treatment of the

---

[35] See for example, Stephen Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the "Anonymous Chronicle,"' *Scottish Historical Review* 76 (1997), pp.23-43.

[36] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.102.

church in Scotland, and discusses the role of the church in fostering a sense of national identity.

The third chapter in this section examines another important feature of medieval thinking about races and nations: the idea that the people of a kingdom shared not only allegiance to a particular king, but were also united by common laws and customs (overseen, of course, by the king), by a shared descent, and, particularly, a shared language, which could express the distinctiveness of a nation and shaped its character.[37] In Scotland's case, however, there was no single language shared by the entire kingdom. Moreover, while even in the thirteenth century Gaelic was the dominant language throughout most of the kingdom north of the Forth, by the later fourteenth century, during which *Gesta Annalia II* was compiled, use of Scots (or 'Inglis,' as it was commonly known) was increasingly widespread. The linguistic situation of Scotland is expressed most notably in a passage of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* attributable to *Proto-Fordun*, which compares the habits of the Gaelic-speaking, mountain-dwelling Scots with the (Scots) English-speaking Scots of the coastal plains, explaining that these differences in language explained the differences in their characters: ''the manners and customs of the Scots vary according to the difference of their language.'[38] *Proto-Fordun* explained that although the Scots comprised two different linguistic races, they nevertheless formed a single nation.[39]

References to language and linguistic diversity in Scotland in *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* show that, while neither chronicler necessarily regarded language as central to Scotland's identity, the authors were very much aware of the role language could play in creating a sense of unity among a people or kingdom. It is striking, for example, that in *Gesta Annalia II* the only person quoted speaking in a vernacular language is Edward I, who is frequently shown speaking French when he

---

[37] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.9; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.47-8.

[38] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'Mores autem Scotorum secundum diversitatem linguarum variantur.'

[39] Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.50; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.77.

is behaving badly, as if to distance this king, who mistreated not only the Welsh and Scots but even his own English subjects, from the peoples of Britain. This chapter investigates these attitudes towards language in the chronicles, comparing its role in creating a sense of a unified people with other factors such as the idea of shared laws and customs.

*

In both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, two major themes run throughout the treatment of all of these topics. The first of these is the importance of Scotland (or, more generally, any nation) maintaining its independence and freedom from any external authority; both chronicles emphasise that the Scottish king is subject to no other king with regard to Scotland, that Scotland's laws are her own and no other authority can make them, and that the Scottish church is not subject to the church of any other nation, only to the Papacy itself (and potentially not even that, if the Papacy otherwise seeks to interfere with Scotland's government or the autonomy of its church). Alongside this, both chronicles highlight the need for stability within Scotland, and are fiercely critical of political factionalism and civil war, which always brings suffering to the common people and weakens the kingdom. Instead they emphasise the importance of unity and loyalty, under a worthy king, so that the kingdom can prosper.

By analysing the treatment of these subjects within the two chronicles in this manner, this dissertation aims to further our understanding not only of the texts themselves but also of how the identity of the Scottish kingdom was understood and expressed during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Unlike most surviving Scottish sources, *Proto-Fordun* was not composed with the knowledge of Robert I's rise to the throne or even of the outbreak of war with England. Yet this extended comparison with *Gesta Annalia II* reveals that there nevertheless was a great deal of continuity across this period, and that many elements of Scotland's established identity in the fourteenth century were already familiar in the thirteenth.

CHAPTER ONE: *Proto-Fordun*, *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*

I

The chronicle conventionally referred to by scholars as *Gesta Annalia* ('Yearly Deeds') survives today in five fifteenth-century manuscripts, in each of which it follows after part or all of John of Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (though not every manuscript of Fordun's *Chronica* contains *Gesta Annalia*).[1] *Gesta Annalia* was traditionally understood as being a set of notes or an incomplete draft that Fordun intended to use (alongside the fifteen chapters of an apparently unfinished sixth book) to continue his chronicle from the death of David I in 1153 (where the fifth book of *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* ends) to his own time in the later fourteenth century.[2]

This interpretation is not, at first glance, unreasonable; the content of *Gesta Annalia* from 1153 onwards fits neatly with that of the *Chronica* to provide a continuous narrative history of the Scots from their ancient origins until the later fourteenth century. Indeed, two of the surviving manuscripts (**D** and **I**) arrange the *Gesta Annalia* in this fashion, beginning with the accession of Malcolm IV in 1153

---

[1] These are: **A**: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Codex Helmstadiensis 538; **C**: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.9.9; **D**: Dublin, Trinity College, MS 498; **G**: London, British Library, MS Add. 37223; **I**: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E xi. See Appendix for descriptions.

[2] The *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* appears to have been written between 1384 and 1387: near the end of the fifth book, a genealogy of the ancestors of David I is introduced with the statement that the information was given to the author long before, by 'the Lord Cardinal of Scotland, the noble Doctor Walter of Wardlaw, Bishop of Glasgow.' (Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.50 (p.251); see also Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon* (eds. D.E.R. Watt et al), 9 vols. (Aberdeen & Edinburgh, 1987-98), vol. 3, p.171. Wardlaw became bishop of Glasgow in 1367, a cardinal in 1384, and died in 1387, which, assuming the reference was not a later scribal update and was made while Wardlaw still lived, indicates a date of 1384 to 1387. A description of the islands of Scotland describes certain Stewart castles as 'royal,' (Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.10 (pp.43-4); see also Bower, *Scotichronicon* vol. 1, p.187, which also supports a date after 1371: Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.20, 27-8 n. 85a.

and placing it immediately after the end of Fordun's fifth book (without including any of the unfinished sixth book).[3]

In manuscripts **A**, **C** and **G**, however, *Gesta Annalia* does not begin in 1153, but instead contains material that overlaps chronologically with much of Fordun's fifth book. As, however, Fordun's fifth book follows much the same narrative structure as this material, and indeed often appears to be an expansion of it, this overlap might seem to be further evidence that *Gesta Annalia* represented a set of notes or drafts that Fordun had not finished developing into further books.

Moreover, in interpreting *Gesta Annalia* in this way, Scottish historians were apparently following in the footsteps of Walter Bower, who, in the 1440s, used Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* as the basis for the first five (and part of the sixth) books of his own chronicle. Bower modestly described himself as being merely a continuator of the 'famous historical work… by the venerable orator sir John Fordun,' although he not only significantly expanded the material found in Fordun but also wrote an additional eleven books.[4] In his prologue, Bower suggested that, as well as the five completed books, Fordun had also produced 'a great deal of written material, which had however not yet been arranged everywhere, but by means of which a careful investigator could easily continue the work.'[5] Although Bower did not clearly distinguish between material taken from *Gesta Annalia* and his own work (in contrast to his careful treatment of Fordun's *Chronica*), it is clear that Fordun's *Chronica* and *Gesta Annalia* were already closely associated with one another by Bower's time.[6]

In his prologue to the abbreviated Coupar Angus version of *Scotichronicon*, Bower provided an explanation of Fordun's supposed motives as an historian. After

---

[3] MS **D**, p.264; MS **I**, fo.116; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.3, p. xvi; Dauvit Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.10-1; Broun points out, however, that while in *Gesta Annalia* continues directly from Fordun's *Chronica* in MS **D**, in MS **I** *Gesta Annalia* was a later attachment to the *Chronica* and used a different exemplar.
[4] Bower, 'Prologue and Preface in Corpus MS', in *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.3.
[5] Bower, 'Prologue and Preface in Corpus MS', in *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.3.
[6] Bower used *Gesta Annalia* throughout *Scotichronicon* from Book 8 onwards: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.3 (p. xvi); vol.4 (p. xix); Broun, 'A New Look,' p.12.

Edward I had stolen or destroyed the chronicles and records of Scotland (falsely claiming that he wished to use them to decide who had the best claim to the throne), historians of Scotland sought to reassemble what had been lost. Among their number was 'a certain venerable priest, sir John Fordun, a Scot by nationality,' who, 'on fire with patriotic zeal,' travelled to England and 'other neighbouring provinces,' and visited towns, universities and monasteries across the British Isles to speak to historians and find material for his work, taking notes on his 'double-leaved writing tablets.'[7]

Although the fervour attributed to Fordun might seem to more closely reflect Bower's own vigorous approach to Scottish history, it has long been accepted that *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (and *Gesta Annalia* with it) represented an attempt to (re)construct on a grand scale a single continuous narrative of Scottish history, drawn from a variety of different sources.[8] For Bower, it was intended to replace older, lost histories of Scotland, and, given the lack of any surviving alternatives, Fordun's *Chronica* is indeed the oldest extant such history of Scotland.[9]

The particular idea that *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* and *Gesta Annalia* should be taken together to form this single continuous narrative received further impetus with the late nineteenth-century edition of Fordun prepared by William Skene. This, alongside his nephew Felix Skene's accompanying translation, has remained for most practical purposes the most accessible printed edition of both the *Chronica* and *Gesta Annalia*.

Skene followed Bower in assuming that both the *Chronica* and *Gesta Annalia* were by the same author and were intended to form part of the same work. He therefore chose to arrange his version of the texts as a single continuous work. By doing so, Skene hoped to bring Fordun's work out of the shadow cast by its incorporation into Bower's *Scotichronicon*. Although at that time Fordun was generally regarded as the

---

[7] Bower, 'Introduction in Coupar Angus MS,' in *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, pp.12-7, at pp.13-5.
[8] Steve Boardman, 'Robert II (1371-1390),' in Michael Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in honour of Norman Macdougall* (Edinburgh, 2008), pp.72-108.
[9] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.49.

chief author of the work, and Bower only a continuator, Skene believed that an edition of Fordun, free of Bower's interpolations and additions, was 'essential to the right comprehension of the history of the country.'[10] To Skene's eyes, Bower's later additions lacked authority, or were even 'intentional falsifications of history to suit a purpose,' that deliberately downplayed, for example, 'the more ancient and Celtic element' of royal inaugurations to present them as more akin to English coronations.[11] Bower's effrontery extended even to naming the text: his description of it as *Scotichronicon*, by which it came to be known, did not appear in any surviving manuscripts of Fordun's work.[12]

It was instead Skene who provided the name by which Fordun's chronicle is known today. He declared that 'Fordun appears to have intended to call his work "*Chronica Gentis Scotorum*,"' although this title does not explicitly appear in any manuscripts either.[13] Skene also provided the name by which *Gesta Annalia* is known. An entry listing the English royal descendants of Malcolm III and Margaret ends with the declaration that the chronicle will now 'go back to the Annals': 'ad gesta annualia decurrendum est.'[14] Skene took this as the title of what, as we have seen, he regarded as an unfinished section of Fordun's complete work.[15]

In attempting to bring Fordun's work into the light, however, Skene obscured the true nature of the chronicle and its relationship with *Gesta Annalia*, and his edition has long been regarded as problematic.[16] Following Fordun's apparent intention to create a single continuous narrative from the *Chronica* and *Gesta Annalia*, Skene

---

[10] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, p. xlv. All the major printed editions of *Scotichronicon* in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries attributed the work to Fordun, regardless of which manuscripts were used or how much of Bower's material was included: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9, p.215.

[11] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xliii, xlv.

[12] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, p. xxxi; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.10 n.77-78.

[13] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, p. xxxii. He argued for this title on the basis that the chronicle is described as a 'chronica' within the text, and that some of the manuscripts begin with the phrase 'Incipiunt tituli capitulorum libri primi gentis Scotorum.' He rejected a possible alternative, deriving from the phrase 'De vetustate originis et gestis Scotorum,' which appears in two other manuscripts at the start of the whole work but otherwise refers only to the first book.

[14] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 80 (p.319)

[15] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxv-xxvi.

[16] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9, p.225.

chose to avoid the apparent repetition between the five completed books and *Gesta Annalia* and simply removed those chapters of *Gesta Annalia* that overlapped with Fordun's chronicle (beginning with an account of the royal English ancestors of Saint Margaret and ending with the death of David I in 1153).[17] These chapters were instead included only in an appendix, under the title '*Capitula ad Gesta Annalia Praefixa*.' Indeed, this was not simply for convenience and to keep the narrative straightforward; as far as Skene was concerned, *Gesta Annalia* began in 1153.[18] According to Skene, therefore, Fordun's *Chronica* was followed in the manuscripts either by *Gesta Annalia* alone or by both 'the chapters prefixed to the *Gesta Annalia*' and *Gesta Annalia* together.[19]

This served to misrepresent the nature of *Gesta Annalia*, and ignored the fact that, although several manuscripts contain a break between Fordun's *Chronica* and the 'prefixed' chapters, they have no such gap between these chapters and the *Gesta Annalia* chapters.[20] This arrangement instead suggests that, at the time these manuscripts were written, the prefixed chapters and *Gesta Annalia* were regarded as forming one single, continuous text, and, moreover, that this single text was not simply an incomplete extension to Fordun's *Chronica*, but potentially a separate work altogether.[21]

Not only, however, is *Gesta Annalia* a separate work from the *Chronica*; it has also been convincingly shown that *Gesta Annalia* itself contains two distinct chronicles. The first begins with a history of St Margaret's royal English ancestors and ends in February 1285; the other then begins soon after this, ending in 1363 (and

---

[17] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xlvi-xlvii. He likewise included the chapters of the sixth book only in an appendix, while the accompanying translation failed to include either book six or the 'prefixed' chapters of *Gesta Annalia*. As noted above, this arrangement, in which Fordun's book 5 led directly to *Gesta Annalia* from 1153, appears in manuscripts **D** and **I**, neither of which Skene used as a base text. Skene also included only the titles of the documents found in the dossier, again in an appendix.

[18] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.12.

[19] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xlv.

[20] These are MSS **A** (fo.178), **C** (fo.147v) and **G** (fo.165v); Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.3, pp.xvi-xvii; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.9-15.

[21] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.3, pp.xvi-xvii; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.11-9.

continued, in some manuscripts, somewhat erratically and sporadically to 1385).[22]
In manuscript **C**, which contains all of *Gesta Annalia* to 1385 (including the chapters 'prefixed' to it), there is a break in the text (a blank page) following the chapter in which Alexander III sent an embassy to find a new wife; this is followed, in a new foliation, by the dossier of documents, then another break in the text, and then the rest of *Gesta Annalia* (beginning with Alexander III's marriage to his new wife).[23] Although manuscript **I** does not include the dossier of documents, it also has a large gap in the text at this same point.[24]

In addition to these gaps in the manuscripts, it is also notable that the material in *Gesta Annalia* from Alexander's second marriage in 1285 to 1363 appears to be closely related to a summary chronicle written in the 1380s and found in an Aberdeen Cathedral breviary.[25] The material from 1285 until the inauguration of David II in 1331 is also very similar to that found in Andrew Wyntoun's *Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland* for the same period, suggesting that Wyntoun and *Gesta Annalia* used the same source for this period but not for the earlier section.[26] This source, also used by Bower for *Scotichronicon*, appears to have been a chronicle compiled at Saint Andrews in the 1360s.[27]

These observations have led to the conclusion that *Gesta Annalia* contains what had once been two separate chronicles. This was concealed not only by Skene's layout of the text but by the neat symmetry of one chronicle apparently beginning just

---

[22] See especially Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.13-19.

[23] MS **C**, fos.168v, 35r (in second foliation); Broun, 'A New Look,' p.15. Skene blithely ignored any possible implications of these apparent anomalies. He described MS **C** as containing the 'prefixed' chapters, which interrupted a narrative of Scottish history that was 'then resumed with the coronation of Malcolm IV, and continued to the year 1385,' except where it was again 'broken at the year 1284' by the inclusion of the dossier of documents, which had been 'inserted out of their place,': Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxv, xlv.

[24] MS **I**, fo.142r; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.25, n. 53.

[25] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.18-19, p.26 n.69. This summary chronicle is printed as 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' in Catherine R. Borland, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library* (Edinburgh 1916), appendix iv, pp.329-332.

[26] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.14-15.

[27] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.19. Broun suggests that this source represented a development, around 1363, of an older chronicle written in Saint Andrews from the twelfth century until 1321 or later (noting that *Gesta Annalia II* is less annalistic in structure after 1321). Wyntoun opted for the fuller 'Anonymous Chronicle' as his source from 1331 onwards.

after the other ended. These two chronicles were labelled for convenience *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II* by Dauvit Broun.[28] *Gesta Annalia I* as it survives consists of the forty-one chapters labelled by Skene as 'chapters prefixed to the beginning of *Gesta Annalia,'* followed by the chapters that he numbered as 1 – 66 of the *Gesta Annalia*. This covers the period from the marriage of Malcolm III and Margaret in 1067 (along with an account of Margaret's royal English ancestry) until Alexander III's search for a second wife in 1285. *Gesta Annalia II* then begins with Skene's chapter 67, the marriage of Alexander III to Yolande later that year, running through to David II's marriage to Margaret Logie in 1363.[29]

The realisation that *Gesta Annalia* in fact consists of two chronicles helps to explain both some of the differences in presentation between the two sections (the chapters in *Gesta Annalia I*, for example, tend to be rather longer and have fewer rubrics than those in *Gesta Annalia II*), and also the occasionally contradictory attitudes of the two sections. Both chronicles appear to pre-date Fordun's *Chronica*, and also provide further evidence of other, earlier still, sources, indicating that they (and Fordun) formed part of a relatively large body of Scottish historical works from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[30] Ideas about Scotland's past that had apparently only been articulated in the late fourteenth century (an unusually late date compared to the histories of the other kingdoms of Britain and Ireland, which developed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries) in fact appear to have had a much earlier provenance.[31]

Gesta Annalia I appears to have been composed in early 1285, shortly before the death of Alexander III (which occurs in the first chapter of *Gesta Annalia II*), and

---

[28] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.15; these have become the conventional titles, although the description 'gesta annalia' only occurs in *Gesta Annalia II*.

[29] The occasional entries from 1370 to 1385, which appear in some manuscripts, seem to have been a later addition to the chronicle. Broun has suggested that *Gesta Annalia I & II* and associated texts developed as follows: to *Gesta Annalia I* (written in 1285) was added the dossier of documents, beginning with the Declaration of Arbroath and ending with the Processus of Baldred Bisset. Other documents were added to this at later stages, and eventually *Gesta Annalia II* was added after this. This entire collection was then added to the end of Fordun's *Chronica*: Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.16, 20; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.217.

[30] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.20-1.

[31] Broun, *Irish Identity*, p.73; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.40-7, 215.

before the Wars of Independence, traditionally regarded as the crucial defining period in the development of the national identity of Scotland and the Scottish people. This means that it provides a potentially valuable comparison and contrast with the sense of Scotland's history and identity expressed within *Gesta Annalia II*, written in the 1360s. Such a comparison can offer a glimpse into the extent to which the sense of Scottish identity expressed fully in the years after the Wars (and more tentatively in documents such as the Pleadings of Baldred and the Declaration of Arbroath during them) had been predominantly formed and shaped by the experience of war and political circumstances, or rather reflected an already-established, robust and well-developed tradition.

There are, however, problems with the nature of *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*, their transmission and their relationship with Fordun's *Chronica*, that must be addressed before any such comparison can be attempted. It is not clear, for example, whether the surviving texts represent complete, discrete chronicles, or only parts of them: are the extant start and end points the original start and end points? Within *Gesta Annalia I* there is evidence of additions made after 1285, as well as apparent cross-references to material within *Gesta Annalia II*: to what extent can it be regarded as a 13th century text? Both chronicles also contain apparently contradictory material, inviting the question as to whether they represent the voice of a single author, or are perhaps little more than unedited compilations of disparate sources. The following sections therefore address these questions in greater depth.

II

The last entry in *Gesta Annalia I* describes Alexander III sending an embassy to France, 'to seek out for him a spouse born of noble stock,' an event which took place in February 1285.[32] Elsewhere in the text, a description of the dispute over the succession of the earldom of Menteith, which arose in 1260, stated that 'this dispute is still under discussion;' that is, it had yet to be resolved at the time of

---

[32] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 66 (p.309): 'ad providendum sibi sponsam, de nobili exortam prosapia.'

writing.[33] This dispute was, however, eventually settled in a parliament held at Scone in April 1285. Together, these details would suggest that *Gesta Annalia I* was likely to have been completed at some point between February and April that year.[34]

There are, however, also references within the text to events that took place somewhat later than this date. For example, the chronicle includes a detailed, romantic account of the unusual courtship and marriage of the parents of the future Robert I, who is described as 'King Robert,' who became 'the saviour, champion, and king of the bruised Scottish race, as the course of the history will show forth.'[35] Such a description obviously could not belong to the text in 1285, and possibly refers to the description of later events in *Gesta Annalia II*.[36] While it is possible that the account of the marriage was part of the original text (although it seems somewhat out of character), it displays the same pro-Bruce attitude evident in the description of the future king, suggesting that the entire story has been a later addition.[37]

Similarly, the chronicle's account of the death in 1283 of Alexander, son of Alexander III, also looks ahead to events post-1285: the chronicle retrospectively describes the earlier death of Alexander's younger brother, David, in 1281, calling it

---

[33] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 53 (pp.298-9): 'sic sub discussione haec lis adhuc pendet.'

[34] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.17.

[35] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 60 (pp.304-5): 'rex Robertus'; 'futurum conterendae gentis Scotorum salvatorem, propugnatorem et regem, prout historiae series declarabit.'

[36] Robert I is likewise described as 'a saviour and champion' ('salvatorem et propugnatorem') of the Scots in *Gesta Annalia II*, suggesting that this passage was added to the text at the same time as *Gesta Annalia II*, potentially even by the author of *Gesta Annalia II*: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337).

[37] Broun has suggested that the story, which absolves Robert Bruce of any wrongdoing in the marriage, could be part of a Bruce family legend, and added to the chronicle alongside the lines about Robert I: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.218. In that case, the chronicle would appear to have garbled the story somewhat, as it repeatedly presents Marjory ('Martha' in the text) as the daughter, rather than the widow, of Adam, earl of Carrick, a strange mistake that would not suggest it was written relatively soon after the events. The chapter begins by mentioning the death of Louis IX of France on crusade, alongside several Scottish nobles (including Adam, which introduces the story about his 'daughter'). The inclusion of such events is not wholly untypical of the chronicle, although the chapter would be unusually short if that had been all it consisted of; it is not clear if this introduction was broken off from its original chapter so the story could be inserted, or the entire chapter was added, introduced with some notable information that might plausibly have been included anyway.

'the beginning of Scotland's sorrows to come,' and lamenting the great suffering that would follow.[38] Such a bleak outlook would seem markedly out of place if Alexander III was still alive (and in only a few chapters time about to look for a second wife), suggesting that this lament (although not necessarily the otherwise typical notice of David's death) is a later addition to the chronicle.[39]

The following two chapters also contain references to events after 1285. The chronicle's account of Margaret, Alexander III's daughter, noted that her marriage to the king of Norway produced one daughter, Margaret, who 'likewise passed away when she reached maturity, as will be told below.'[40] Margaret did not die until 1290, and this appears to be a reference to the description of her death in *Gesta Annalia II*.[41] The remainder of the chapter then described how the king of Norway, after the death of his wife, Margaret, sent an embassy to Alexander III asking for his daughter to receive money from lands in Scotland.

A projection even further into the future then occurs in the next chapter, describing Edward I's invasion of Wales in 1281. The chronicle noted that he appropriated church tithes meant for the Holy Land in order to fund his programme of fortifications and castle-building in Wales. The same money would also be used for 'a most grievous war against the Scots, which he waged shortly afterwards,' a war that of course did not take place until 1296.[42] The chapter also states that this record of Edward's conquest of Wales was 'inserted here, lest any foreign race which may read this history should, unchastened by the example of the Welsh,

---

[38] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 63 (pp.306-7): 'Cujus mors initium fuit dolorum Scociae futurorum.'

[39] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.218. The Skene translation confuses the matter further by describing Alexander III throughout the rest of the chapter as 'our lord king,' implying that he was still alive at the time of compilation, although the descriptions of him do not include any such first-person possessive adjectives; rather, he is simply 'the lord king': 'dominum regem,' 'dominus rex,' 'domino regi,' as is the case in Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.38 (vol.5, pp.412-3).

[40] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 64 (pp.307-8): 'Quae cum ad annos maturitatis pervenerat, et ipsa similiter, ut infra dicetur, ab hac luce migravit.'

[41] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.218. Her death is described in an early chapter of *Gesta Annalia II*: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 69 (p.311) – only a few chapters later if *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II* are treated as continuous.

[42] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 65 (pp.308-9): 'bella quoque gravissima, quae paulo postea Scotis intulit.''

unwarily fall under the lordship of the English in a most wretched serfdom.'[43] This statement appears to show that the entire chapter has been interpolated to *Gesta Annalia I*, immediately before its final chapter.[44]

Given these interpolations, it is quite possible that other chapters have also been altered, albeit in less obvious ways.[45] If he was aware of it, however, the interpolator does not appear to have felt it necessary to update the account of the Menteith dispute, and the description of Alexander III's inauguration in 1249 states explicitly that the Stone of Destiny 'is reverently kept' in the monastery at Scone, implying that this was written before Edward I removed the stone in 1296 (or not rewritten after this).[46] This supports the idea that these references to events after April 1285 were ad hoc additions made separately to the rest of the chronicle's composition, and do not indicate that the bulk of the chronicle had been substantially edited and altered during the fourteenth century.

Indeed, it is striking that each of these examples, all of them very near the end of *Gesta Annalia I*, refer to matters of Scotland's regnal status, the royal dynasty and

---

[43] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 65 (pp.308-9): 'Hoc igitur insertum est breviter ubi capitulum, ne qua gens provincialis, dictam perlegens historiam, exemplo Gualencium incastigata decidat sub Anglorum incaute dominio miserrimae servitutis.' Edward's conquest of Wales is recalled as one of his crimes in *Gesta Annalia II*'s notice of his death: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 123 (p.344).

[44] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.218.

[45] Broun follows Watt in proposing that the account of the cleric Gilbert's speech in defence of the Scottish church at the Council of Northampton in 1176 is another possible interpolation: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.218–219; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 4, p.527. This chapter has the same general theme of Scottish independence as some of the other interpolations (although this is not directly applied to the crown here); ends with a snappy tag in hexameter, as with the death of the princes Alexander and David; and uses the phrase 'wretched servitude' ('misera seruitudo'), as with account of Edward I in Wales. It is also separated from the account of the Northampton council in the previous chapter and 'out of place chronologically,' again suggesting that it could be an interpolation. The content separating it from the account of Northampton, however, which forms the end of the previous chapter (an account of the visit to Scotland and Ireland of Vivian, a papal legate), begins 'before the aforesaid council' ('ante praedictum consilium'), which would suggest that this, not Gilbert's speech, is the material that interrupts the chronological narrative, at least as far as the chronicler was concerned; this material also appears in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, unlike the account of Northampton: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266). Gilbert's speech is introduced with the phrase 'now, in that aforesaid council' ('siquidem in eodem consilio'), thereby resuming the narrative after the afterthought of Vivian was inserted. Furthermore, the other potential interpolations appear to have been inserted carefully into appropriate places, whereas if this was added later it seems to have been in an unnecessarily awkward place.

[46] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (p.294): 'Qui lapis in eodem monasterio reverenter... servatur.'

the events of the Wars of Independence. This would suggest that the copyist who inserted these comments was interested in *Gesta Annalia I*'s value as a narrative of Scottish history and an explanation of how the kingdom, and the circumstances of the Wars of Independence, came to be. If they were made at the same time as *Gesta Annalia II* was added to the text (as the apparent cross-references indicate), that would suggest that *Gesta Annalia I* was regarded as being generally compatible with the presentation of Scotland's history and identity found in the dossier of documents and in *Gesta Annalia II*.

*

Gesta Annalia I, then, was not simply a set of notes that Fordun intended to use to complete his *Chronica*, but rather a separate chronicle compiled a century earlier. It is nevertheless closely linked to Fordun's work. As Dauvit Broun has argued, *Gesta Annalia I,* as it survives, represents part of a substantially longer work used by Fordun as his principal source (which he referred to as 'proto-Fordun').[47] This 'proto-Fordun' source in turn preserves an even older history of Scotland, dating to the 1260s.[48] Given these discoveries, any discussion of the ideas and themes underlying *Gesta Annalia I* will therefore need to take into account the presentation of the same issues in Fordun's *Chronica*, at least as far as they can be identified as also belonging to 'proto-Fordun.'

That *Gesta Annalia I* was originally part of a longer work is indicated by a strange detail preserved in the various manuscripts of the chronicle. At the end of the chapter describing the death of Malcolm IV in 1165 is the statement 'Book Five ends; Book Six begins.'[49] This is almost halfway through *Gesta Annalia I*, and there are no other such book divisions within the text of *Gesta Annalia I*. Nor does it correspond with the end of Fordun's fifth book, which concludes with the death of David I in 1153. One manuscript of *Gesta Annalia I* also contains a similar statement

---

[47] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.227.
[48] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.258-261.
[49] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.227; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 6 (p.259).

in the dossier of documents, after the material relating to Baldred Bisset: 'the pleading ends which is called Baldred's: book VII finishes here.'[50] There is no corresponding 'beginning of book eight,' but this evidence would suggest that *Gesta Annalia I* was originally part of a longer work, and that whoever attached the dossier seemingly regarded it as forming an extra book.[51]

The realisation that *Gesta Annalia I,* as it survives, seems to represent the final third of a now otherwise lost chronicle, is particularly significant given the evidence linking the author of *Gesta Annalia I* to passages contained within Fordun's *Chronica*. Fordun clearly used the surviving *Gesta Annalia I* as the main source for his fifth and (incomplete) sixth books.[52] The first four books of Fordun's chronicle, however, also share distinctive elements with *Gesta Annalia I*, particularly in their treatment of Scotland's ancient past and the use of a distinctive Latinate royal genealogy, whose kings are used to give structure to the narrative of Scottish history in Fordun's chronicle. As Broun has convincingly argued, this is not simply because Fordun and the author of *Gesta Annalia I* were both aware of a similar source; rather, Fordun's principal source throughout his chronicle (i.e. *Proto-Fordun*) was the now-lost chronicle of which *Gesta Annalia I* was part.[53]

It is apparent, for example, that the author of *Gesta Annalia I* had supplemented an earlier account of the inauguration of Alexander III with a passage about the Stone of Scone's importance and a Latin version of the Scottish royal genealogy.[54] These additions tie in with other passages in *Gesta Annalia I*, including one about the foundation of Scone by the Picts, with similar language and reference to the ancient kingdom of Alba, confirming the impression that they were written by the author of *Gesta Annalia I*.[55] Similarly, *Gesta Annalia I*'s account of Magnus Bareleg's acquisition of the Hebrides in 1098 follows the genealogy in describing Fergus son

---

[50] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.227.
[51] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.227-8.
[52] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.20.
[53] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.223-9.
[54] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.174-9, 220; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).
[55] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (p.430); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.220.

of Feredach as the first king of Scots on the Scottish mainland.[56] This passage also refers to Eochaid 'Rothai' as the first king of Scots to settle in the islands, 500 years before Fergus arrived on the mainland (although the royal genealogy included with Alexander III's inauguration does not go this far back).[57] This name appears only in the earliest extant witness to the genealogy attached to the account of Alexander III's inauguration, Ralph of Diss's *Imagines Historarium*, again implying that the author of *Gesta Annalia I* had made these particular additions to his source about the inauguration and was concerned to fit them into a coherent whole.[58]

Yet these passages by the author of *Gesta Annalia I* also link the chronicle with Fordun's *Chronica*. The description of Fergus at the inauguration commented that he was believed by some to be the son of Ferchar, rather than the son of Feredach.[59] Fergus son of Ferchar is a figure known only from a legend in which he brought the Stone of Scone to Scotland from Ireland; the earliest extant form of this legend happens to be in Fordun's *Chronica*, where it is attributed to a history or legend of 'St Congal.'[60] The same legend also describes how the similarly little-known Simón Brecc took the Stone to Ireland; he is mentioned as the great-grandfather of Eochaid 'Rothai' in *Gesta Annalia I*.[61] *Gesta Annalia I*'s account of Alexander III's inauguration also states that Éber Scot, the son of Gaedel Glas and Scota, was the final king read out at the ceremony, and describes him as the 'first Scot.'[62] Éber Scot also appears in the Latinate genealogy in Diss, but the idea of him as the 'first Scot' perhaps also derives from a legend in which Éber Scot was the first

---

[56] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.221; Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8).
[57] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8).
[58] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.221.
[59] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).
[60] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.222; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 1.26, 27 (p.23).
[61] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.223; Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8).
[62] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.222.

to settle in Ireland, an uninhabited land divinely ordained for the Scots.[63] This legend also appears in Fordun's *Chronica*.[64]

As such connections demonstrate, it is evident that the author of *Gesta Annalia I* was extremely familiar with the key figures and the structure of early Scottish history presented in Fordun's *Chronica*, even sharing with that work the habit of dividing the history of the Scots into 500-year blocks.[65] It is also evident that Fordun himself was somewhat less familiar with this structure, as can be seen in the fifth book of his *Chronica*, for which *Gesta Annalia I* was the main source. For example, Fordun altered the detail that Scone was where the Picts had 'established the seat of the kingdom of Albania' to say that the Scots and Picts together had established the seat, contradicting the care taken elsewhere to show that Scotland had been shared by two distinct kingdoms, the Picts and the Scots.[66] In including a version of the Latinate genealogy that featured in *Gesta Annalia I's* account of Alexander III's inauguration, Fordun also made some inaccurate cross-references to sections of the royal genealogy elsewhere and, most strikingly, described 'Rothaca' as the first to inhabit the Scottish islands.[67] This contradicted *Gesta Annalia I*'s description of Eochaid 'Rothai' as the first to do so, a description that Fordun himself had copied elsewhere in book 5.[68] It also suggested that, rather than being settled by a great-grandson of Simón Brecc, the islands were settled nine generations before Simón, thereby contradicting the chronology of Scottish history in book 1 of the *Chronica*, in which Simón's ancestors still lived in Spain.[69]

Such errors have led Broun to argue that Fordun was not responsible for the structure of Scottish history presented in his own *Chronica*, and that this structure already existed in his principle source, 'proto-Fordun.'[70] Given that *Gesta Annalia I*

---

[63] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.222-3.
[64] Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.117-8; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.17 (pp.15-6).
[65] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.224.
[66] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.225; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.28 (p.227).
[67] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.225-6; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.50 (p.252).
[68] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.226; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.24 (p.224).
[69] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.226.
[70] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.228.

was one of Fordun's major sources, that it was once part of a much longer work, that it displays a detailed understanding of the structure of Scottish history presented in Fordun's *Chronica*, and that its author seemingly shared with Fordun's source a similar interest in matching figures from origin-legends to names in the royal genealogy, it would seem very likely that the author of *Gesta Annalia I* was also the author of 'proto-Fordun,' and, moreover, that *Gesta Annalia I* was part of this longer work.[71]

This does not entirely explain the structure of *Gesta Annalia I* as it survives today. *Gesta Annalia I* begins with a brief history of the royal English ancestors of Saint Margaret, before becoming a much more developed history of her royal Scottish descendants. As Broun acknowledges, this structure gives the impression that the text forms a complete free-standing work, rather than starting in the middle of a longer chronicle.[72] It has been suggested that this discrete appearance is perhaps because *Gesta Annalia I* was based not on the same source as the rest of 'proto-Fordun,' but rather on a different source that had indeed once been a distinct, free-standing work, about the ancestors and descendants of Saint Margaret.[73] If a distinction of some sort was maintained between this material and the earlier sections of the chronicle, it might have been regarded later as a separate work. That it was seen as a discrete work would also explain why, when it was copied alongside Fordun's *Chronica*, chapters that overlapped closely with his fifth book were still included in some manuscripts.[74]

*

Fordun's own role in compiling the chronicle credited to him seems to have been relatively limited, largely consisting of copying (and perhaps not fully

---

[71] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.228-9.
[72] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.228, 257.
[73] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.228, 257-8.
[74] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.257-8.

comprehending) 'proto-Fordun' as far as 1153.[75] This was supplemented with a version of Aelred's eulogy for David I and a copy of the royal genealogy given to him by Walter Wardlaw, bishop of Glasgow.[76] If Fordun's *Chronica*, up to the point where he is obviously using *Gesta Annalia I* as a source, can be regarded as deriving to a great degree from 'proto-Fordun,' and 'proto-Fordun' and *Gesta Annalia I* are accepted as part of the same work, then it is apparent that any discussion of how national or regnal identity is presented in *Gesta Annalia I* should also give some consideration to how such issues are treated in the relevant sections of Fordun's *Chronica*.

While that potentially allows for a great deal more material to be included in the discussion, there remains a degree of uncertainty as to exactly what formed part of the original source and what Fordun added to it. This issue is further clouded by recent discoveries regarding the sources used by 'proto-Fordun' itself.

 The ancient history of the Scots given in the first book of Fordun's *Chronica* utilises several different, now lost, sources, drawn together by the author of 'proto-Fordun.' These accounts often conflict, and although the compiler of 'proto-Fordun' has generally attempted to fit them into a coherent chronological structure, he does not necessarily attempt to resolve all of these conflicts. Broun has shown that one of these different lost chronicle sources, which he named the 'Éber account,' in fact forms part of another source underlying much of Fordun's second book, a history of the Scots adapted from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* and

---

[75] It is not clear why Fordun's chronicle should have ended in 1153; it could be that he felt Ailred's eulogy for David I provided a fitting end point for his work. If the few chapters of 'book VI' were also intended to be part of his chronicle, however, it could be that he died before this was completed: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.261-2; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.27 n.84.

[76] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.261-2. Fordun's limited role might also explain a curious anecdote about Fordun in the preface to Bower's *Scotichronicon*: Bower recalled overhearing some scholars discuss the merits of Fordun's work. One, who apparently knew Fordun personally, did not rate Fordun highly, for he was 'an undistinguished man, and not a graduate of any of the schools,' but another argued that the learning evident in the chronicle, not his education, was the best proof of Fordun's scholarship. Bower declared that Fordun's work then 'won the approval of all educated men.' Such a controversy perhaps arose because Fordun was not regarded as having written much of the chronicle himself: Bower, 'Prologue and Preface in Corpus MS', in *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9, pp.8-11.

known as the 'Scottish Monmouth.'[77] This work was notable for emphasising the idea that the Scots had always been free, even from their earliest origins, and throughout the first two books of Fordun's *Chronica*, the first account of any given episode is overwhelmingly taken from this source; 'proto-Fordun' in essence derives its narrative thrust from the 'Scottish Monmouth.'[78] This narrative continues in the third and fourth books; indeed, as Broun as shown, some of the key elements of the narrative at this point were simply created by the author of the 'Scottish Monmouth.'[79] 'Proto-Fordun,' therefore, is largely derived from this source until the accession of Malcolm III (i.e. up to the point where *Gesta Annalia I* begins).

Broun has demonstrated that a version of this source was also known to Baldred Bisset, in his pleadings at the papal curia in 1301, and identified it with the lost history by 'Veremundus,' used by Hector Boece for his *History of the Scots* in 1527.[80] According to Boece, this work covered the history of the Scots from their earliest beginnings up to Malcolm III, and the mysterious 'Veremundus' has been identified with Richard Vairement, a *céle Dé* of St Andrews and chancellor to Marie de Coucy, Alexander II's queen, who arrived in Scotland as part of her household.[81] Vairement appears in Scottish sources from 1239 to 1267, and if he was indeed the author of 'Veremundus'(or, the 'Scottish Monmouth'), is likely to have written the chronicle in the 1260s, as is further evidenced by its treatment of Scottish claims to northern England and its attitude towards Moray.[82] This makes it perhaps the earliest extended, continuous narrative of Scottish history from ancient times. That the work should end with Malcolm III fits with the idea that the creation of 'proto-Fordun' involved adding *Gesta Annalia I* to continue the narrative. Moreover, as noted above, *Gesta Annalia I* began with a history of St Margaret's ancestors and her royal Scottish descendants, a version of which existed at Dunfermline in the

---

[77] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.248-50.
[78] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.250.
[79] For example, the figures of Grim and Eugenius who feature in *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.3-5 (pp.89-92), and the treatment of tenth-century Cumbria: Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.255.
[80] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.253-6.
[81] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.257.
[82] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.257-60.

1250s. If Vairement was also aware of such a source (the only particularly substantial history of Scottish kings extant at the time), he perhaps intended his chronicle to supplement it, hence his own work ending with Malcolm III.[83]

Vairement's chronicle, then, is the chief source for large parts of the narrative of 'proto-Fordun,' and seems to have provided several of the central themes of that work: for example, the idea that Scotland, north of the Forth, had contained two distinct kingdoms, the Picts and the Scots, and that the Scots had always been free.[84] The creator of 'proto-Fordun' picked up on these themes and developed Vairement's work, by adding alternative versions of the Scots' ancient origins (particularly in book 1 of Fordun's *Chronica*) and making use of the royal genealogy to give his work a chronological structure, continuing this in the *Gesta Annalia I* section of his work.[85]

The knowledge that 'proto-Fordun' drew extensively on Vairement's chronicle allows for the tantalising possibility that much of 'proto-Fordun's presentation of national identity can be dated to the 1260s, rather than the 1280s. This is, however, complicated by the difficulty in differentiating between Vairement's work and that of 'proto-Fordun,' particularly as there remains a degree of uncertainty as to the extent that the author of 'proto-Fordun' edited his sources (and, of course, the extent to which this was edited by Fordun in turn). We cannot say with absolute confidence, for much of Fordun's *Chronica*, whether we are reading something written by Vairement in the 1260s, by the author of 'proto-Fordun' in the 1280s, or by Fordun in the 1380s, and this issue is unlikely to be fully resolved.

Furthermore, the nature of 'proto-Fordun's creation adds an extra complication to this. As has been noted, Fordun's role in the 1380s seems to have largely consisted of copying out 'proto-Fordun,' making it difficult to ascertain any real sense of his voice as an author but allowing us to get a greater sense for the voice of his sources.

---

[83] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.258.
[84] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.259.
[85] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.260-1.

Broun has described the author of 'proto-Fordun' as a 'synthesist,' bringing together a range of different, at times contradictory, sources, without necessarily resolving those conflicts; this potentially includes extensive recreation of Vairement's work.[86] Is it possible that, as with Fordun, no distinctive authorial voice can necessarily be identified?

It is certainly possible that, within 'proto-Fordun,' hints of other authorial voices can be identified on occasion. It is also clear, however, this was not simply an act of copying, but that the 'synthesist' has attempted to corral those voices within a structure of his own devising, based on the royal genealogy, and has tried to match his different sources together as far as possible to create a coherent work. While he does seem to tolerate a degree of uncertainty over some matters of ancient history in particular, broader themes are treated consistently, including the role of the Picts and Scottish freedom. This extends across the entirety of 'proto-Fordun,' so while some of these ideas might derive from Vairement, they are also evident in *Gesta Annalia I*, and are amplified throughout. Attitudes evident in sections of Fordun that have been attributed to 'proto-Fordun' are likewise evident in *Gesta Annalia I*. The author of 'proto-Fordun' clearly sought to make his sources compatible, and to create a cohesive work that chimed with his own attitudes and articulated his viewpoint. That some of those attitudes derived from his sources and so can be dated to an earlier period adds to our understanding of the ideas, without diminishing the sense of an overall authorial stance that has shaped and given voice to them.

*

As has been observed, if *Gesta Annalia I* was written as part of 'proto-Fordun,' then a discussion of national identity in *Gesta Annalia I* should also take into account the relevant sections of Fordun's *Chronica*. Given the complex questions of authorship and textual transmission and development discussed above (including the problems

---

[86] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.260-1.

created by Skene's edition), it is important to clarify what parts of these texts are under consideration in this thesis, and how they will be referred to.

It has been established that *Gesta Annalia I* consisted of both the forty-one chapters labelled by Skene as 'prefixed to the beginning of *Gesta Annalia,'* and the first 66 chapters that he attributed to *Gesta Annalia*.

Gesta Annalia I is in turn the only part of 'proto-Fordun' that survives independently of Fordun's *Chronica*. It is, however, possible to identify elements within Fordun's *Chronica* that can be attributed to 'proto-Fordun,' and even to Vairement's chronicle, a major source for 'proto-Fordun,' and these sections will be taken into account in the thesis. To avoid confusion, then, the title *Proto-Fordun* will generally be used as the title for discussing the work in its entirety; that is to say, the thesis will examine the presentation of national identity in *Proto-Fordun* (and *Gesta Annalia II*). For ease of reference, however, and to help distinguish between sources, distinction will continue to be made between *Gesta Annalia I* and Fordun's *Chronica* where necessary.

It is difficult to be completely confident about which author was responsible for any given piece of prose within Fordun's *Chronica*; given the relatively short period between the composition of Vairement's work and that of *Proto-Fordun*, a fairly cautious approach will therefore be taken to distinguishing the work of Vairement from that of the author of *Proto-Fordun.* Unless it can securely be shown otherwise, it will be assumed that the ideas permeating the extant narrative date to the 1280s, rather than the 1260s.

This leaves the question, then, of what elements of Fordun's *Chronica* might be considered as belonging to *Proto-Fordun*. While a definitive answer to this question is not possible, some general observations can be made.

It is, for example, apparent that *Gesta Annalia I* was the source for much of Fordun's book 5, from chapter 9 onwards, so, other than the opening chapters (about Malcolm III's return to Scotland to claim the throne), this text does not need

to considered as part of *Proto-Fordun*. Turning to the first book of Fordun's *Chronica*, however, it has been established that the narrative of Scotland's ancient origins given there was the work of Vairement, supplemented and developed by the author of *Proto-Fordun*, who added alternative sources and shaped its structure. Fordun's Book 1 consists almost entirely of either Vairement or *Proto-Fordun's* additions to it; if Fordun made any substantial contributions here, it was perhaps the addition of extended extra passages from authors such as Bede and William of Malmesbury (though those too might already have existed in the chronicle).[87]

The narrative of Scottish kings in Fordun's second book, it has similarly been shown, derives from Vairement's work.[88] Vairement, it has been posited, was also responsible for the emphasis on Scottish freedom found in material adapted from Monmouth, such as the letter sent by the Pictish and Scottish kings to Julius Caesar.[89] There is less evidence of the author of *Proto-Fordun*'s use of alternative accounts in this section, but there is also reason to believe that author to be responsible for, for example, the well-known descriptions of Scotland's landscape and people.[90] This book also contains several long digressions on Roman history; it is not clear whether these were added by Fordun or belonged to an earlier stage of the work. Given that, within *Gesta Annalia I*, the author of *Proto-Fordun* appears to be rather less interested in the wider European and ecclesiastical events that featured frequently in related texts such as the *Chronicle of Melrose* (as discussed further below), it might be speculated that these digressions (and similar ones elsewhere in Fordun's *Chronica*) did not belong to *Proto-Fordun*. Fordun was perhaps responsible for the inclusion of the lists of Scottish islands; it has been

---

[87] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.260-1.

[88] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.248; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.1, pp.xxviii-xxix.

[89] Broun, Scottish Independence, pp.248, 276; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.14-16 (pp.46-9).

[90] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.7-9 (pp.40-2); Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.244-5.

posited that the reference to Stewart castles on Arran and Bute as 'royal' date these chapters to after 1371.[91]

The narrative of Scottish kings derived from Vairement continues in Fordun's third book, including several figures of Vairement's own creation, and extends all through this section.[92] Vairement's work is evident, for example, in the account of Charlemagne's alliance with the Scots.[93] There are also some digressions into Roman and Frankish history, and several chapters consist of extended extracts from the likes of Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth. Again, it is not clear who was responsible for the inclusion of these.

Likewise, much of Fordun's fourth book consists of material that is attributable to Vairement or *Proto-Fordun* (although the distinction is not always clear), including the treatment of the Picts, Moray and Cumbria.[94] While there are also some extended digressions (for example, on classical examples of betrayal and poor kingship), this book is particularly focused on the narrative of Scotland and its kings.

Overall, it is clear that a great deal of material from Fordun's *Chronica* can be taken into consideration in order to examine *Proto-Fordun*'s presentation of Scottish identity. What is striking about much of the material in Fordun's *Chronica* that can potentially be attributed to *Proto-Fordun* (or even earlier, to Vairement) is how closely it echoes the themes and attitudes evident in *Gesta Annalia I*, highlighting the extent to which this material seems to have been compiled from a particular viewpoint.

*

---

[91] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.10 (pp.43-4); see also Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.10 (vol. 1, pp.186-7); Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.20, 27-8 n. 85a.

[92] See, for example, Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.3-5 (pp.89-92); Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.255.

[93] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.48 (pp.133-4); Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.260.

[94] See, for example, Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 4.3-4, 8-14, 21, 24-26, 33, 35, 41, 44 (pp.145-8, 151-7, 163-4, 166-9, 175-6, 177-8, 183-4, 187); Broun, *Irish Identity*, p.72; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.259-261.

While Richard Vairement of St Andrews can be identified with a reasonable degree of confidence as the author of the lost 'Veremundus,' rather less can be said about the author of *Proto-Fordun*, although the final date for its composition of April 1285 seems likely (if not certain).[95] The close relationship with Vairement's text might suggest that the author was also a cleric based somewhere in Fife, or the wider diocese of St Andrews, and this is supported by the use (in the section that survives as *Gesta Annalia I*) of a history of St Margaret's ancestors linked to Dunfermline. Indeed, the chronicle's later association with *Gesta Annalia II*, which is likely to have been written in Fife, potentially also supports this assertion.

There is some internal evidence within the text that further hints at this link, suggesting that the chronicle was indeed composed by someone within the diocese. It would appear, for example, that the author of *Proto-Fordun* was based south of the Mount. The section that survives as *Gesta Annalia I* describes how Malcolm IV, having put down a revolt of the Moravians in the 1160s, then scattered them 'over the rest of Scotland, both beyond the mountains and this side of the mountains.'[96] This phrase would suggest that, from the author's perspective, Moray lay across the mountains, locating the author south of the Mount. A later rebellion in Moray and Caithness is also described as taking place in 'the furthest bounds of Scotland,' emphasising that from the author's perspective these events were not only far from his own base but also on the edge of the kingdom.[97] It is possible that such remarks were simply copied verbatim from the author's source, but that they were retained unchanged suggests that they nevertheless made sense from the perspective of the author (or that of his intended audience).

A similar description of the kingdom occurs in a remark on the close, peaceful relationship between England and Scotland during the reign of Richard I of England: the chronicle records that the English were able to roam freely throughout

---

[95] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.219, 261.
[96] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7): 'ita per ceteras, tam extramontanas Scociae, quam cismontanas, regiones.'
[97] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 42 (pp.289-90): 'in extremis Scociae finibus.'

Scotland, both on 'this side of the hills and beyond them.'[98] Other remarks also imply a location north of the River Forth. For example, in 1222, Alexander II's army is described as being raised 'out of Lothian and Galloway, and other outlying provinces,' indicating perhaps that these regions lay outside of the author's immediate vicinity and, from his perspective, on the edges of the kingdom.[99]

There are also some indications that the author of *Proto-Fordun* identified as a Gaelic speaker. In a passage describing Eochaid Rothai as the first Scot to inhabit the Hebrides, this king is said to have given his name to Rothesay. The author then explains that the island was also known as Bute by its inhabitants, because 'St Brendan built on it a hut, "bothe" in our language – that is, a cell.' [100] 'Bothe' here appears to be the Gaelic word 'both,' which generally means 'hut' but can also mean 'cell.'[101] The assertion of Gaelic as 'our language' indicates that the author of *Proto-Fordun* not only spoke Gaelic but regarded it as the 'native' language of the kingdom.[102] This is supported by his description of Alexander III's inauguration, where the king's genealogy was read out by a 'highland Scot,' in 'the mother tongue,' which is specifically identified as Gaelic here, with the chronicle listing the names first in Gaelic and then in Latin.[103]

---

[98] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 21 (pp.273-4): 'tam cismontanas quam citra partes.'

[99] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 40 (pp.288-9): 'de Laudonia et Galwallia, et aliis provinciis circumadjacentibus.'

[100] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.28 (p.25): 'sanctus Brandanus in ea botham, ydiomate nostro Bothe, id est, cellam, construxit.' The description implies that Bute was regarded as an alternative local name, not that it was the standard term used by a different linguistic group. Bute was in fact so-called long before St Brendan's time, and Rothesay is likely to have been the Norse name for the island: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.29 (vol. 1, pp.68-9, notes 147-8); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.260; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.71, 129-30.

[101] Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.129-30.

[102] Although Broun has pointed out that, despite speaking Gaelic, the author of *Proto-Fordun* seems to have been unaware of historical texts written in Gaelic in Ireland, perhaps because he was not literate enough in Gaelic to be part of this wider high culture: Broun, *Irish Identity*, p.130.

[103] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5): 'Scotus montanus,' 'materna lingua.' Given that the language is referred to in Latin as 'Scotice,' such a translation would further emphasise the ceremony's affirmation of Scotland's ancient roots: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.186-7 n.60. The term 'Scotus montanus' could be used just to indicate that the Scot was a Gaelic speaker (as in *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9), without implying that he was wild or rustic; other depictions suggest that this figure was not only literate but perhaps also wealthy and of high status: John Bannerman, 'The King's Poet and the Inauguration of Alexander III,' *Scottish Historical Review*, 68.2 (1989), pp.120-49 at p.122; A.A.M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and*

There are also occasional examples of place-names in *Proto-Fordun* being identified as Gaelic. For example, in the account of the legendary founding of St Andrews by Regulus, Regulus is said to have founded a cathedral on the site of a grove of pigs, 'called, in the mother tongue, Mucrossis.'[104] 'Mucross' is a compound of the Gaelic words 'muc' (sow, pig) and 'ros' (promontory, wood).[105] It is possible that this comment was the work of Vairement, as he seems to have been responsible for the inclusion of the St Andrews foundation legend, but evidence from other parts of the chronicle attributable to Vairement suggests that he was less familiar with Gaelic, and had a rather more negative attitude towards Gaelic speakers, than the author of *Proto-Fordun*, who is more likely to have added the reference.[106] Similarly, while Vairement was probably responsible for the description of Kenneth's conquest of the Picts, the author of *Proto-Fordun* might be the more likely author of the clarification that Drumalban was the Gaelic name for the mountain range dividing the Pictish and Scottish kingdoms, 'the backbone of Albania.'[107]

Independence (Edinburgh, 2002), p.147; Dauvit Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel* in Scotland before John of Fordun,' in Dauvit Broun & Martin MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), pp.49-82 at p.75.

[104] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.48 (p.77); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.60 (vol.1, pp.314-5): 'quod patria [lingua], Mucrossis dicitur.'

[105] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.48 (p.77); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.60 (vol.1, pp.314-5, 405 n.14).

[106] For example, Vairement describes how Gaedel Glas gave his name to the Gaels, and Scota to the Scots, commenting positively on how all Scots were now known as Scots, and that use of Gaelic was in retreat: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.27 (pp.23-4); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.28 (vol.1, pp.64-8, 146 n.49); Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.72, 129-30; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.259. While the comment is not explicit in identifying Gaelic as the author's own native language, implying instead that it is the language of the local inhabitants (rather than the entire kingdom; the author elsewhere is clear that Scotland has two languages), it indicates that the author was familiar with Gaelic.

[107] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.4 (p.147): 'Dorsum Albaniae, quod Scotice Drumalban dicitur.' It is possible, however, that Fordun might also have added such glosses: in rewriting the *Gesta Annalia I* material, Fordun has changed a reference to the earl of Mernys, 'by name Malpetri,' ('per comitem de Mernis, nomine Mal filium Petri'), to say that Malpetri is, 'in Scottish [i.e. Gaelic], Malpedir, ('nomine Malpei, Scotice Malpedir'). The Gaelic name is 'Mael Peadair.' Bower followed Fordun in including this, although his language was explicitly Inglis, describing the Inglis of Barbour's *Bruce* as 'our mother tongue' ('lingua nostra materna'), and his attitude towards Gaels generally is less complimentary than that found in Fordun / *Proto-Fordun* (or, indeed, in Barbour). Mael Peadair was not named in the Dunfermline material used by the author of *Proto-Fordun*, so it is likely this information was added by him; that Fordun's extra clarification is somewhat redundant could also mean instead that the information was removed by a copyist of *Gesta Annalia I* (whereas Fordun

The author of *Proto-Fordun*'s broader sympathies with Gaelic-speakers are also evident in the well-known passage elucidating on the two peoples of Scotland.[108] Drawing on long-established, conventional contrasts between barbaric and civilised people, it presents those who spoke English and lived on the coasts and plains (the '*gens maritima*') as 'docile and civilised people, trustworthy, patient and courteous, decent in their attire, polite and peaceable, devout in worship, but always ready to resist injuries from their enemies.'[109] By contrast, those who spoke Gaelic and lived in the mountains and islands (the '*gens montana*') were a 'fierce and untameable race, rude and unpleasant, much given to theft, fond of doing nothing, but quick to learn, and cunning, handsome in appearance, but their clothing is unsightly.'[110] This stereotype is tempered by the acknowledgement that, while Gaelic-speakers were also 'hostile not only to the English people and language, but also to their own nation, due to the difference in language,' they were at the same time 'faithful and obedient to their king and kingdom,' and happily law-abiding if they were governed well.[111] As Broun has noted, *Proto-Fordun* even provides an example of such a faithful Gaelic-speaker: Uhtred of Galloway, who in 1174 resisted a revolt against William I led by his brother Gillebrigte, and is described as a 'true Scot' for his loyalty to the crown.[112]

*

---

retained the reading he found in *Proto-Fordun*): Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 26 (p.426); *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.24 (p.223); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.29 (vol.3, pp.84-5, 225 n.20-21).

[108] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.244-5.

[109] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'domestica gens est et culta, fida, patiens et urbana, vestitu siquidem honesta, civilis atque pacifica, circa cultum divinum devota, sed et obviandis hostium injuriis semper prona;' Martin MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity in the Later Middle Ages,' in Dauvit Broun & Martin MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), pp.7-48 at pp.7-15.

[110] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'ferina gens est et indomita, rudis, et immorigerata, raptu capax, otium diligens, ingenio docilis et callida, forma spectabilis, sed amictu deformis... et crudelis.'

[111] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'populo quidem Anglorum et linguae, sed et propriae nationi, propter linguarum diversitatem, infesta.' The idea that they will obey the law if well-led echoes the attitude throughout *Proto-Fordun* that it is the duty of a king to promote peace and justice in his kingdom, and prevent the in-fighting of the nobility.

[112] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'quia verus extiterat Scotus'; Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' pp.76-7; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.244-5.

The author of *Proto-Fordun*, then, seems likely to have been a Gaelic-speaking (or at least Gaelic-aware) cleric from Fife (or the wider diocese of St Andrews) who completed his work in early 1285. His chronicle, up to the accession of Malcolm III, was based in large part on that by Richard Vairement, written some two decades earlier. As noted above, this means that Vairement introduced several of the key ideas evident in *Proto-Fordun*, in particular that Scotland (in the sense of the land north of the Forth) had anciently been shared between two kingdoms (Pictish and Scottish), that Ireland had been the ancient homeland of the Scottish people, and that the Scottish people had always been free.[113]

The author of *Proto-Fordun* certainly seems to have diligently followed much of this material. It is evident, however, that he had not simply copied out Vairement's work unthinkingly, but had engaged with it critically and carefully. The author of *Proto-Fordun* provided additional and alternative accounts of Scotland's origin legends, carefully fitting these into a chronological structure based on a particular Latinate version of the royal genealogy.[114] He certainly seems to have been in broad agreement with much of Vairement's portrayal of Scotland, but has also put his own stamp on this material, amplifying and extending it, for example resolving conflicting accounts about when the Picts and Scots arrived in Scotland in favour of a roughly simultaneous arrival, and portraying Gaels and Gaelic more positively.[115] Many of these ideas are also echoed in the *Gesta Annalia I* section *of Proto-Fordun*, highlighting the author's efforts to create a cohesive text. As Broun has shown, the author of *Proto-Fordun* made a point of altering the account of Alexander III's inauguration found in his sources to highlight the ancient Irish roots of the kingship

---

[113] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.247-60;

[114] As noted above, this genealogy is related to that found in Ralph of Diss' *Imagines Historiarum*: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.178, 220-9, 260; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.63-72, 180-3.

[115] He managed to explain the discrepancies by noting that, for about two centuries, the Picts were led by judges, rather than kings, so the Scottish kingdom might have technically been established first but its people had not necessarily arrived earlier: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.35 (p.30); Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.242.

and the role of the Picts in establishing the ancient kingdom, both themes evident in the material taken from Vairement.[116]

*

Vairement's chronicle only extended as far as the accession of Malcolm III, perhaps because he regarded the existing history of St Margaret's royal English ancestors and royal Scottish descendants, written at Dunfermline in c.1250, as providing suitable coverage of events after this date. This text portrayed Malcolm and Margaret as dynastic founders and showed the Scottish kings as successors to the English royal line.[117] A version of the Dunfermline text, which survives only in a fifteenth-century manuscript, seems to have been a major source for *Proto-Fordun*'s account of events from the reign of Malcolm III to that of David I (covered in that section of *Proto-Fordun* that survives as *Gesta Annalia I*, in particular the chapters that Skene labelled as 'pre-fixed').

The Dunfermline material consists of five different texts: firstly, a version of Turgot's *Life of Margaret,* with extensive additional material derived from Ailred of Rievaulx's *Genealogia Regum Anglorum* that places particular emphasis on Margaret's royal English roots and her marriage to Malcolm III; this is followed by some further historical material, known as the 'Dunfermline Continuation;' a dynastic chronicle of Margaret's ancestors and descendants as far as Alexander II, known as the 'Dunfermline Chronicle;' a collection of Margaret's miracles; and finally Jocelin of Furness' *Life of St Waltheof*.[118] The first three of these items, as Alice Taylor has argued, together represent a compilation made as part of the effort during Alexander III's reign to gain the rights of coronation and unction for Scottish

---

[116] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.174-9, 220; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).

[117] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.217; Bower, *Scotichronicon* vol. 3, pp.xvii-xviii; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.196.

[118] The 'Dunfermline Chronicle' also includes a brief king-list from Alexander III to James III, although this is a much later addition to the material: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 3, pp.xvii-xviii; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.217, 258-9; Robert Bartlett (ed. & trans.), *The Miracles of Saint Aebbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland* (Oxford, 2003), pp.xxxi-xxxiv; Alice Taylor, 'Historical writing in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland: the Dunfermline compilation,' *Historical Research* 83 (2010), pp.228-252 at pp.228-30.

kings, presenting the Scottish royal dynasty as the descendants of a line who had long ago earned that right.[119] The *Gesta Annalia I* section of *Proto-Fordun* draws extensively on this compilation (or a version of the three texts it contained). As with other sources, while the author of *Proto-Fordun* did not necessarily extensively alter or rewrite this material, it was edited and rearranged to fit his intentions, and he included material not found in the Dunfermline compilation.[120]

Gesta Annalia I, for example, follows the Dunfermline material in presenting an account of the ancestors of Margaret, saint and 'most noble queen of Scots,' starting with Adam and describing the achievements of the kings of England from whom she was descended.[121] As with the Dunfermline compilation, *Gesta Annalia I* presented the English royal line as continuing through Margaret and her descendants, rather than with William I of England, who is presented as an intruder in the succession. The English throne was, from this perspective, reunited with the royal dynasty through the marriage of Margaret's daughter Matilda to Henry I.[122] This is a point made more explicitly in the Dunfermline compilation, which includes an account of Edward the Confessor's vision of a green tree, symbolising the separation of the English royal dynasty from their kingdom; this image is then referred to in the compilation's account of the marriage of Matilda to Henry I.[123]

Gesta Annalia I, however, does not include this vision or the subsequent reference, and its treatment of Margaret's English ancestry highlights the different intentions of *Proto-Fordun* and the Dunfermline compilation. The Dunfermline compilation was produced to demonstrate that the kings of Scotland were worthy of receiving unction and coronation, by showing how they had descended from a line of kings who had long before earned that right. That is why, as Taylor argues, the account of

---

[119] Taylor, 'Historical writing,' pp.231-252.

[120] In addition to omitting or supplementing passages from the Dunfermline compilation, examples of rearranging include inserting material from the Dunfermline Chronicle in place of passages from the *Life of St Margaret:* Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 11, 19 (pp.415, 421-2); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.14,15 (vol.3, pp.42-9).

[121] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 1 (p.406): 'nobilissima Scotorum regina.'

[122] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.61-2.

[123] Taylor, 'Historical Writing,' pp.233, 246-7.

Edward the Confessor's vision includes a detailed account of how Alfred the Great journeyed to Rome and was anointed by the pope.[124] As Taylor also points out, this is why the Dunfermline compilation introduced its account of Margaret's ancestors by stating that it would show how the line 'of this holy generation' (the Scottish kings) descended from Adam, reworking Aelred's statement that it would show how the royal line of Henry II descended from Adam.[125]

In *Gesta Annalia I,* however, this introduction has been reworked again, this time to show how 'the line of this holy queen' (i.e. Margaret) descended from Adam.[126] Rather than presenting the Scottish kings as if they solely, or primarily, descend from the old Saxon kings of England, *Proto-Fordun* presents this as only one (undeniably important) part of their ancestry. Their Scottish ancestry, through Malcolm III, has been already been described at length in the preceding material. *Proto-Fordun* is not a plea to be granted unction; it is a history of the Scottish kingdom and its kings that shows their long-standing independence and prestige. The English ancestry is included because it adds to that prestige, as does Margaret's saintliness, but their status was not dependent on it.

The remainder of the text, however, does not display such interest in the history of the English royal line (the Dunfermline compilation, by contrast, recapitulates the English genealogy found in its version of the *Life of St Margaret* in its 'Chronicle' section), nor does it attempt to use this to make any statement about Scottish claims to British sovereignty.[127] *Proto-Fordun* also significantly edits down the account of the Saxon kings; after eleven chapters of English royal history, Margaret's arrival in Scotland is marked by a sudden switch to describing events from a Scottish perspective, focussing on Malcolm's actions and his decision to meet, and subsequently marry, her.

---

[124] Taylor, Historical Writing,' pp.246-7.
[125] Taylor, 'Historical Writing,' p.246.
[126] Taylor, 'Historical Writing,' p.246; Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 1 (pp.406-7: 'lineam hujus sanctae reginae'
[127] Taylor, 'Historical Writing,' p.245.

Margaret is certainly still a key figure in *Proto-Fordun*, but primarily in conjunction with Malcolm III, as joint founders of a new, pious and successful dynasty that is nevertheless rooted in Scotland's ancient past. *Proto-Fordun* jettisons much of the material in the Dunfermline version of the *Life of St Margaret* that concerns Margaret herself, her piety and her activities in Scotland, but does include some examples that also feature Malcolm.[128] In the Dunfermline material, these examples seem intended to present Malcolm as a suitably pious match for Margaret, and show that he was worthy of her English ancestors, but here they have been edited to play up Malcolm's role even further.[129] *Proto-Fordun* even introduces them as 'the virtuous works and almsgiving of that high-minded King Malcolm,' as found in the *Life of St Margaret*, evidence perhaps of his intention to use his source in the context of a narrative of Scottish kings.[130] During Lent and Advent, Malcolm would, 'unless he was prevented by important temporal business,' return to his chamber after the morning prayers, and together with Margaret 'wash the feet of six beggars, and lay out something to comfort their poverty.'[131] The reminder that Malcolm III was pious and charitable, despite his duties as a king, was not made in the Dunfermline material; more strikingly, in the Dunfermline material (and Turgot's original version of the *Life of St Margaret*), it is the queen who is the protagonist: *she* returns to *her* chamber, to be joined by the king, and performs the charitable service.[132]

Similarly, in the Dunfermline *Life*, an account of the king and queen serving food and drink to paupers in the royal court ends by saying that, after this service, the

---

[128] The Dunfermline version of the *Life of Margaret* has been printed (with translation) in Catherine Keene, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2013), pp.135-221.
[129] Keene, *Saint Margaret,* pp.108-12.
[130] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18 (p.420): 'de illius magnifici regis Malcolmi virtutum operibus et eleemosynarum largitione, ut testatur Turgotus in vita sanctae Margaretae reginae.' Cf. Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.18 (pp.216-7); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.23 (vol.3 pp.70-3).
[131] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18 (p.420): 'nisi major secularis occupation impediret,' 'pedes sex pauperam cum regina lavare, et aliquid quo paupertas consolaretur solebat erogare.' Cf. Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.18 (pp.216-7); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.23 (vol.3 pp.70-3).
[132] *Life of Margaret* in Keene, *Saint Margaret,* p.204; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.23 (vol.3 pp.70-3 & notes pp.217-8).

queen would go to church to pray.[133] There is no mention of what Malcolm does. In *Proto-Fordun*, however, it is explained that afterwards Malcolm would 'busy himself anxiously with temporal matters, and affairs of state,' and Margaret go to church, again placing Malcolm at the centre of the story and demonstrating that he was both pious and aware of his duties as a king.[134] While *Proto-Fordun* is generally less interested in providing extended moral lessons than its source material, the importance of properly balancing devotion and duty is stressed throughout the chronicle, for example in its account of Malcolm IV.[135]

The particular perspective of the author of *Proto-Fordun* is also evident in some of the other omissions that he made. His Gaelic-speaking sympathies, for example, are evident in the tactful omission of the *Life of St Margaret*'s description of the 'barbaric Scottish people,' who were ignorant of the proper teachings of the church until Margaret's arrival.[136] He has also omitted some of the Continuation's material emphasising Margaret's devotion to Dunfermline, suggesting that he was not based there.[137] Indeed, while *Proto-Fordun*'s account of the reign of Alexander I (much of which was not taken from the Dunfermline material) does mention the endowments he gave to the Benedictine abbey at Dunfermline, founded by his parents, it also stresses his generosity towards the Augustinian priories of St Andrews and, in particular, Scone.[138] *Proto-Fordun* states that Alexander chose to build the new church at Scone, on the same spot where the ancient kings, from

---

[133] *Life of Margaret* in Keene, *Saint Margaret,* p.205; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.23 (vol.3 pp.70-3 & notes pp.217-8).

[134] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18 (p.420): 'rex pro temporalibus et regni sui negotiis [sese] sollicitus occupar.' Fordun (and Bower) go further in presenting Malcolm as Margaret's match in piety by adding to this that they 'were both equal in works of charity, both remarkable for their godly behaviour': Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 5.18 (pp.216-7); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.23 (vol.3 pp.70-3).

[135] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257).

[136] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 12 (pp.415-6); *Life of Margaret* in Keene, *Saint Margaret,* p.170.

[137] Taylor, 'Historical Writing,' p.235.

[138] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (pp.429-30); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.36 (vol.3, pp.104-7).

Cruithne, first king of the Picts, onwards, had established the seat of Albany.[139] As noted above, this emphasis on the role of the Picts in establishing the ancient kingdom draws attention to *Proto-Fordun*'s particular concern to demonstrate the Scottish crown's ancient roots and the kingdom's ancient unity.[140] An association with St Andrews, rather than Dunfermline, is perhaps also hinted at in the inclusion, not present in the Dunfermline compilation, of a detail about the burial place of Ethelred, the second son of Malcolm and Margaret: the author states only that it is rumoured he was buried at St Andrews.[141]

Moreover, the description of the foundation at Scone also highlights how the author of *Proto-Fordun* sought to fit the material taken from his sources, including that from the Dunfermline compilation, into an underlying structure based on a version of the royal genealogy. This structure is also evident in another addition to the Dunfermline material, as noted above: *Proto-Fordun's* account of Magnus Bareleg's acquisition of the Hebrides in 1098, which described Fergus son of Feredach as the first king of Scots on the Scottish mainland and referred to Eochaid 'Rothai' as the first king of Scots to settle in the islands, 500 years before Fergus arrived on the mainland. [142]

*

In addition to this use of material from the Dunfermline compilation, the *Gesta Annalia I* section of *Proto-Fordun* also shares many correspondences with the *Chronicle of Melrose* as far as the death of Alexander II in 1249, suggesting that the author also used a lost source related to that chronicle.[143] Duncan has argued that

---

[139] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (pp.429-30). The use of 'Albany' rather than 'Scotland' may have been intended to indicate the territory north of the Forth, without invoking the sense of a solely Pictish realm or the contemporary kingdom of Scotland:

[140] Hence the careful use of 'Albany' rather than 'Scotland,' showing that the contemporary kingdom embodied the ancient territory of Scots and Picts: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.220-2; 240-52.

[141] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 26 (p.426); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.29 (vol.3, pp.84-7).

[142] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.221; Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8).

[143] This source might also have included the original account of Alexander III's inauguration, which was expanded by the author of *Proto-Fordun*: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.175-9, 217, 261;

this source was perhaps a chronicle compiled at the abbey of Coupar Angus; it perhaps followed the Chronicle of Holyrood as far as c.1170, then combined a draft form of the Melrose chronicle for 1170-1195 with its own annals up to 1187.[144] The chronicle was then continued using a range of sources until c.1223, with a continuation from 1222-1249 being added in c.1249.[145] This would also explain why *Gesta Annalia I's* account of Malcolm IV's reign seems to have been based on the Holyrood chronicle, rather than on Melrose.[146] The lost source has been specifically identified with Coupar Angus as the abbey there was known to have kept a chronicle at least until 1187, and *Gesta Annalia I*'s coverage of events in the early 1200s (when the work is least closely related to Melrose) shows a more detailed knowledge of events north of the Forth and south of Moray than elsewhere, with a particular interest in the Cistercians.[147] Furthermore, the account of Alexander III's inauguration in 1249, which might also have derived from this source, contains a glowing eulogy for Geoffrey, bishop of Dunkeld, in whose diocese the abbey lay and who had spoken on its behalf in a lawsuit.[148]

Although it is difficult to be completely confident about which differences with the *Chronicle of Melrose* are the work of *Proto-Fordun*, and which are the work of this putative Coupar Angus source, it is clear that the author of *Proto-Fordun* has again shaped his source material to fit within his overall structure and to focus on his particular interests and themes. Most obviously, he has consciously abandoned the

---

A.A.M. Duncan, 'Sources and Uses of the Chronicle of Melrose, 1165-1297,' in Simon Taylor (ed.) *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland 500-1297*: *Essays in honour of Marjorie Ogilivie Anderson on the occasion of her 90th birthday* (Dublin, 2000), pp.145-186 at p.163; A.A.M. Duncan, 'Before Coronation: Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century,' in Richard Welander, David J. Breze & Thomas Owen Clancy (eds.), *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon* (Edinburgh, 2003) pp.139-168.

[144] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.169.

[145] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' pp.169-174.

[146] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.169; Majorie Ogilvie Anderson, (ed., with additional notes by Alan Orr Anderson), *A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood* (Edinburgh, 1938), pp.44-5.

[147] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' pp.168-170.

[148] Geoffrey is said to be 'beloved by both clergy and people, careful in his administration of matters temporal and spiritual, who was loved by all, both great and poor, but was a terror to evil-doers,' ('vir tam clero quam populo in multis gratiosus, in temporalibus et spiritualibus sollicitus, qui omnibus tam magnatibus quam pauperibus amabilem, malefactoribus vero se terribilem exhibebat'). By contrast, the bishop of St Andrews and the abbot of Scone are simply noted as being present: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 47 (p.293); Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.174.

straightforwardly annalistic structure of the Holyrood and Melrose chronicles in order to present events in narrative form, in keeping with the rest of *Proto-Fordun*.[149] This restructuring extends to recording some events out of sequence, where they are still relevant but might otherwise have detracted from the overall narrative; for example, Alexander II's foundation of Balmerino abbey in 1229, and his mother's death and burial there in 1233, are reported in *Proto-Fordun* during its description of Alexander's death in 1249.[150] In the Melrose chronicle, however, these events were all recorded separately in the relevant year.[151]

 As he had done in his treatment of the Dunfermline material, the author of *Proto-Fordun* also omitted a great deal of material that did not fit his particular focus on the kings of Scots. The church appointments and business that make up a great deal of the Melrose chronicle are largely absent in *Proto-Fordun*, except where they fit with his interest in the Scottish crown and the themes of the independence of the Scottish church and kingdom.[152] Indeed, as Duncan points out, the first such appointment noted in this section of *Proto-Fordun* is that of Gilbert, bishop of Caithness, following the murder of his predecessor Adam in 1222.[153] The Melrose chronicle does not actually record the appointment; it does, however, give an extensive report on Adam's death, presenting it as the martyrdom of a saintly and devoted cleric; its interest in the tale is unsurprising, as he was a former abbot of Melrose. It therefore emphasises the righteousness of his cause (by his death, he is said to saved his ecclesiastical subjects from their mistaken beliefs and stood up for the church's right to collect tithes) and comparing his sufferings (culminating in being burned to death) to those of the saints.[154] This presentation of Adam's murder was continued in later entries; the chronicle recorded the death of John, earl of Caithness, in 1231, noting that, fittingly, he suffered the same fate as he had

---

[149] As Duncan has observed, this also has the occasional effect of making it difficult to keep track of when events take place: Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' pp.164-5.

[150] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 46 (pp.292-3).

[151] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), pp.59, 60, 87.

[152] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' pp.163-4.

[153] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.163.

[154] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), pp.57-8.

inflicted on Adam, burnt to death in his home.[155] It also recorded the translation of Adam's bones in 1239, noting many miracles were reported to have occurred there.[156]

Although *Proto-Fordun* includes the same grisly details of Adam's death as Melrose, the author brings in material not found in Melrose (which has nothing on the aftermath of Adam's death) and has a very different interest in the murder.[157] By omitting the overtly religious commentary and focusing instead on the rebellious nature of the people of Caithness and the earl's failure to act to defend Adam and uphold law and order (rather than directly killing Adam, as in Melrose), *Proto-Fordun* uses the affair to highlight Alexander II's effectiveness in bringing justice and maintaining order throughout his kingdom.[158] Alexander is depicted as immediately raising an army and marching all the way from Jedburgh to Caithness, where he inflicts gruesome punishment on those directly responsible for the killing and fines the earl for his failure to act, confiscating some of his lands.[159]

His decisive action is praised in the chronicle, although his later willingness to restore the lands of John, earl of Caithness, in exchange for a cash payment, is rather less well-received, with the chronicle commenting that many 'did not think well of this proceeding, and suspected that our lord the king had been overreached in this matter by evil advisers,' but that John suffered appropriate divine justice later.[160] Even the inclusion of a piece of church business here highlights the

---

[155] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.59.
[156] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.65
[157] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.168.
[158] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 41-42 (pp.289-90).
[159] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 41-42 (pp.289-90).
[160] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 41-42 (pp.289-90). Reid has argued that *Proto-Fordun* is ambivalent about Alexander's entire handling of the affair, given the graphic but neutral detail of the punishment inflicted on the murderers and the criticism of his later treatment of John. *Proto-Fordun* presents John's role rather differently than Melrose does, however, while still noting that his later death, and makes its disapproval of the murderers clear. *Proto-Fordun* also thanks God for the safe return of the king, and notes that the prelates of Scotland and the pope himself commended Alexander for his decisive action; this treatment is very much in keeping with the attitude of the rest of the chronicle, which emphasises the importance of swift royal justice and loyalty. While the author's clerical perspective is perhaps evident in the disapproval of John's treatment, the point of the story is that this treatment did help restore order and emphasis the king's authority in the

different approach taken to this material by the author of *Proto-Fordun*: the chronicle records that Gilbert, archdeacon of Moray, was chosen as the new bishop in the presence of the king and 'the chief men of his army,' implying that the decision was essentially Alexander's and backed by force.[161] The chronicle makes no objection to this, treating it as a part of the king's role to maintain the stability of the kingdom.

The idea that the author of *Proto-Fordun* was consciously selecting and adapting his material to suit his particular perspective is also evident in passages where he has borrowed closely from the Melrose-related material. *Proto-Fordun*'s account of the visit to Scotland of Vivian, the papal legate, in 1176-77, is almost identical to that found in Melrose, with Vivian 'crushing and trampling upon everything he came across, ready to clutch, and not slow to snatch,' as he made his way through Scotland, a phrase which appears in both texts.[162] Indeed, the most notable difference between the two versions is that the author of *Proto-Fordun* has condensed his account of Vivian's arrival in Scotland, his subsequent crossing to Ireland and return to Scotland into the same passage, whereas in Melrose Vivian's arrival in Scotland is recorded in the annal for 1176 and his visit to Ireland under the next year, separated by several other events. The author of *Proto-Fordun* appears to have consciously followed Melrose's negative portrayal of Vivian's legation because it reflected the theme found throughout *Proto-Fordun* that the Scottish church should be independent and free of outside interference from any quarter.

Significantly, in *Proto-Fordun*, the account of Vivian's legation appears in the midst of a much longer account of Henry II's council at Northampton in 1176 that

---

region: Norman H. Reid, '"A great prince, and very greedy of this world's honour." The Historiography of Alexander II,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.49-78 at pp.53-4; Richard Oram, *Alexander II King of Scots, 1214-1249* (Edinburgh, 2012), pp.85, 207.

[161] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 42 (p.289): 'domino rege praesente cum exercitus sui optimatibus.' For Duncan, this treatment 'shows up the profoundly erastian view of the church' presented by the chronicle: Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.163.

[162] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266):'conculcans et comminuens obvia quaeque, expeditus capere nec impeditus rapere;' Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' pp.164, 179; *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.19.

forcefully makes this point. This council, attended by William I and 'all the bishops and prelates of the kingdom of Scotland,' is not mentioned in the *Chronicle of Melrose*.[163] There it was demanded, by 'perverted reasoning passing for good advice,' and threats of banishment, that the Scots 'be subject to the metropolitan bishop.'[164] Yet the Scots, *Proto-Fordun* proudly declares, 'with all their might avoided the threatened danger,' and unanimously rejected the proposal, and instead secured, by the authority of Pope Alexander III, 'the former status of their church', with 'its independence buttressed' and protected by 'privileges.'[165] This is possibly a reference to the papal bull, *Super anxietatibus*, declaring that Henry II had no right to interfere in ecclesiastical matters and that the Scottish bishops were to be subject only to the pope until the matter could be resolved.[166] Indeed, *Proto-Fordun's* account of the council at Northampton concludes, after the digression on Vivian, with an impassioned speech, reportedly delivered by 'a certain Scottish cleric, named Gilbert.'[167] Gilbert was outraged by what the chronicle describes as an attempt by the archbishops of York and Canterbury to 'make the Scottish church subordinate,' aligning the interests of the Scottish church with that of the Scottish kingdom by depicting this as an assault on Scotland's freedom.[168]

Just as the author of *Proto-Fordun* drew on the ecclesiastical material in the Melrose Chronicle to develop the wider themes of his chronicle, altering it to suit his purpose, so he made similar use of Melrose's extensive material about England

---

[163] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'omnes episcope et praelati regni Scotorum.'

[164] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'Quibus hinc sub interminatione exilii praecipitur, illinc suasione perversa sub praetextu consilii innuitur, metropolitano subici episcopo.'

[165] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'Quod vero periculum imminens totis nisibus declinantes, ab eis unanimiter, sub tamen induciarum remedio, praestantiori consilio refutatum est. Quorum subinde industria ecclesiae suae pristina dignitas auctoritate apostolica confirmatur, et libertas ab Alexandro papa privilegiorum munimine roboratur.' The Scots seem to have used the dispute between York and Canterbury about which should be the metropolitan for the Scots as an opportunity to wriggle out of making submission, perhaps with the aid of the archbishop of Canterbury himself: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.112; A.D.M. Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi*: Scoto-papal relations, 1159-1192,' *Innes Review* 46.2 (1995), pp.116-38 at p.119; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, p.99.

[166] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.112; Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi,'* pp.119-20; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.264; Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.164.

[167] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'quidam clericus Scotus, Gilbertus nomine.'

[168] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'Scoticanae subjectionis ecclesiae conatum.'

and beyond, generally drawing on it only where it directly pertained to Scotland.[169] As Duncan has observed, *Proto-Fordun* includes an account of the fall of Jerusalem in 1187 not for its news value so much as to provide the context for Richard I's departure on crusade (described at length in Melrose) and consequent settlement with William I.[170] Indeed, while incorporating many of the same details, *Proto-Fordun* expands on Melrose's account of the succession of Richard I in 1189 and the terms agreed with William, stressing that this confirmed Scotland's independence and freedom (even including a text of the Quitclaim of Canterbury).[171] Similarly, where Melrose provides a detailed account of Richard's troubles abroad, *Proto-Fordun* makes only a brief mention of them, and Richard's return to England is used not to introduce an account of his activities in France but to show the bond between William and Richard, and how willingly William helped the English king.[172]

*

The author of *Proto-Fordun*, then, sought to create an extended history of the kings of Scotland, from their ancient beginnings up to his own time in the 1280s. To do so, he built on the work of Richard Vairement in the 1260s, supplementing Vairement's chronicle with a range of other sources and creating a unified, coherent work structured around the royal genealogy. While it is not always possible to know for certain whether a given piece of text was the work of the author of *Proto-Fordun* himself, or was copied more or less verbatim from another source, it is also clear that the creation of his chronicle involved an extensive and deliberate process of selecting, editing, and combining materials to suit a particular purpose and to illustrate the author's chosen themes. The chronicle therefore provides important evidence of how the Scottish kingdom and its identity was perceived in the late thirteenth century, while also potentially containing tantalising glimpses of the origins of that perception.

---

[169] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.164.
[170] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.164.
[171] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 18-20 (pp.269-73).
[172] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 21 (pp.273-4).

III

Gesta Annalia II, as it survives today, begins with the second marriage of Alexander III in 1285, soon after the point where *Gesta Annalia I* ends, and closes with the second marriage of David II in 1363. In some manuscripts, the chronicle is continued with a further five entries describing events until 1385. These chapters, however, appear to have been added to the existing chronicle at a later stage. In contrast to the rest of the chronicle, which misses out very few years and does not cover multiple years within one chapter, there are long chronological gaps between some of these chapters, and they often record events in different years within a single entry.[173] Moreover, many important events (noted in the summary chronicle that shares a source with *Gesta Annalia II*) are ignored.[174] The first of these additional chapters, for example, begins with a notice of the death of David II in 1370, seven years after his marriage in the previous chapter.[175] This same chapter also records the death of St Bridget in Sweden in 1373, which appears to have simply been inserted at the end of the existing chronicle.[176] The next chapter then describes assaults on Berwick Castle in 1378 and 1384, but the notice of the bishop of Glasgow's appointment as cardinal receives a chapter to itself, which begins 'in the same year.'[177] Even more oddly, the final chapter records the destruction of Lochmaben Castle by William, earl of Douglas, in 1383, but the penultimate chapter

---

[173] These additional chapters are also less consistent in their date-system than the rest of the chronicle, giving years in combinations of numerals and words, with some using holy days and others giving the day of the month with a simple number rather than the Roman system used in the rest of the chronicle.

[174] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.19. For example, these chapters do not record the divorce of David II in 1369, even though *Gesta Annalia II* otherwise ends with his marriage in 1363, nor do they mention the plague of 1380, though two earlier plagues are recorded.

[175] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 186 (p.382)

[176] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 186 (p.382). The notice even ends with 'etc,' confirming the impression that it was a casual note added to an existing work, copied into later manuscripts: 'Anno Domini MCCCLXXIII obiit domina Brigitta de Swecia, etc.'

[177] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 187-188 (pp.382-3): 'Eodem anno.'

describes the arrival of a French army in Scotland and Richard II's invasion in 1385.[178]

It is, moreover, striking that while each event mentioned in the summary chronicle from 1286 to 1363 also appears (often in very similar form) in *Gesta Annalia II*, the only events mentioned in the summary chronicle after this that also appear in *Gesta Annalia II* are the death of David II and succession of Robert II, and the arrival of the French army in 1385.[179] This reinforces the idea that the chapters of *Gesta Annalia II* after 1363 were added piecemeal at different times to an existing chronicle largely composed in or around 1363.[180]

Although these chapters can confidently be regarded as later additions to *Gesta Annalia II*, the chronicle's apparent opening chapters are also problematic. Most obviously, that the chronicle should begin immediately where *Gesta Annalia I* ended suggests that *Gesta Annalia II*, at least in its surviving form, was intended to continue the narrative of *Gesta Annalia I*. This poses the question of whether this was therefore the intended starting point of the chronicle, or whether an existing, longer chronicle was simply copied from that point onwards.

---

[178] Fordun *Gesta Annalia,* 189-190 (p.383). William, earl of Douglas died in 1384, an event not recorded in these chapters (neither in nor out of sequence) but included in the summary chronicle: Broun, 'A New Look,' p.19.

[179] That the summary chronicle is a summary not of *Gesta Annalia II,* but rather of a shared source, is evident in the inclusion of information not found in *Gesta Annalia II*: for example, the summary chronicle names James and Simon Fraser as leaders of the capture of Perth in 1336, but these names are not given in *Gesta Annalia II*. The summary chronicle also includes the death of David II's first wife, Joan, in England, in 1362; her death is not mentioned in *Gesta Annalia II*: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 148, 186-189 (pp.355-6, 382-3); 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' pp.331-2; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.19, 26 n.78.

[180] Although, curiously enough, manuscripts **D** and **I**, which end in 1363 (and do not include the chapters 'prefixed' to *Gesta Annalia I*) include alterations to *Gesta Annalia II* which seem to have been made in 1389 or later: the description of the battle of Poitiers in 1356 contains a much more detailed account of the Scottish presence at the battle, which appears to refer Archibald Douglas as the earl of Douglas, a title he gained in 1389. These manuscripts, however, do not otherwise bring *Gesta Annalia* up to date by including extra chapters, further supporting the idea that the chronicle originally ended in 1363. There is no mention of Archibald achieving this title in the longer manuscripts, where he is recorded as being present at the destruction of Lochmaben Castle in 1383: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 177 (pp.376-7, n.3); Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 3, p. xvii; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.10-2.

It is also apparent that the chronology of the opening chapters of *Gesta Annalia II* is somewhat confused. The opening chapter describes the marriage (1285) and death (1286) of Alexander III, and the narrative is continued in the following chapters through the appointment of guardians, the negotiations for the marriage of Margaret, the Maid of Norway, her death, the dispute between the Balliol and Bruce factions, and the invitation to Edward I to adjudicate on the matter.[181] This is followed by two chapters describing how Edward I came to choose in John Balliol's favour (when, according to the chronicle, Bruce was the rightful choice), and then several chapters describing the descendants of Malcolm III and Margaret, including the descent of the competitors and then of the English kings.[182] Having concluded this account, the chronicle then declares that it will 'return to the annals,' and the chronological narrative appears to be resumed.[183]

The narrative in fact, however, returns to 1286, with the burial of Alexander III and the appointment of the guardians. It then provides a brief recapitulation of the events leading to the appointment of John Balliol, with some slight differences: a chapter on the death of Duncan, earl of Fife, in 1288, is included; the English ambassadors for the marriage negotiations are named; and the chronicle notes that the Jews were expelled from England in 1290.[184] This overlapping sequence ends with Edward I's judgement in favour of John Balliol, and a more straightforward chronological narrative is resumed with John's 1292 inauguration in the next chapter.[185]

It is possible that this overlap reflects different stages in the chronicle's development. For example, the first account of the years after Alexander III's death, and the genealogies accompanying it (possibly written in the 1350s, although in some manuscripts continued into the 1360s and even 1370s), might have reflected an earlier addition to the material in *Gesta Annalia I*, to which the rest of what we

---

[181] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67-70 (pp.309-12).
[182]Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 71-80 (pp.312-19).
[183] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 80 (p.319): 'ad gesta annualia decurrendum est.'
[184] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 81-83 (pp.319-20).
[185] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 84-85 (p.321).

understand as *Gesta Annalia II* was later added as a further continuation. There is, for example, a curious contrast in the treatment of Robert I's daughter Matilda in these two sections. In the Bruce genealogy, the chronicler declares, in what seems a rather hostile tone, 'I pass over Matilda, her sister, in complete silence, for she did nothing worth remembering.'[186] Wyntoun and Bower make similarly dismissive comments about her.[187] Despite this, however, *Gesta Annalia II* (and Bower) also records her death in 1353 as if it were a fairly significant event, noting the place, date, burial, her marriage, her children and their marriages.[188]

After this stage, perhaps, the more explicitly pro-Bruce material in these opening chapters might have been inserted. The close relationship between the summary chronicle and *Gesta Annalia II* for the years 1285-1363, but not obviously before or after, arguably also supports the idea that this first section of the chronicle was written separately.[189]

While plausible, however, such an explanation is not wholly satisfying. It might seem peculiar enough that the initial continuation of *Gesta Annalia I* ended long before reaching the period when its sources were apparently composed; it seems more peculiar still that the narrative should end before the dates of the documents contained in the dossier, which had been attached to *Gesta Annalia I* before any of

---

[186] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia,* 78 (p.318): 'De Matilde sorore sua penitus taceo, quia nihil dignum egit memoria.'

[187] Bower follows *Gesta Annalia II*: *Scotichronicon* 11.13 (vol. 6, pp.36-7); Wyntoun says of Margaret, 'off me ȝhe sal heyr na mare taulde': Andrew Wyntoun, *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun* (ed. F.J. Amours), 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1903-8), vol.5, pp.256-7.

[188] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 169 (p.369); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.7 (vol.7, pp.274-5). This apparent anomaly might suggest that the genealogical material pre-dated the composition of the rest of the chronicle. The later account of her death might have been included because it fit with the royal interests of the chronicle; that the earlier dismissal was retained alongside this would not necessarily indicate any particular judgement by the later chronicler about how notable her activities were.

[189] Notably, the summary chronicle lists the death of Alexander III in 1285 (and that of his son earlier in 1280), followed by the death of Duncan, earl of Fife in 1288; the second section of *Gesta Annalia II* begins similarly, with the death of Alexander III and the appointment of guardians, then the death of Duncan. Curiously, however, the pre-1285 entries in the summary chronicle are largely genealogical in nature: it begins with a long passage about the descendants of Malcolm III and Margaret that appears to be taken from the *Chronicle of Melrose*, then becomes a simple list of the deaths of Scottish kings from David I in 1153 to Alexander III in 1285. The only other events noted in this period are the death of Thomas Becket and the translation of his relics: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 81-82 (pp.319-20); 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' pp.329-30.

Gesta Annalia II was added.[190] As discussed above, it is clear from the evidence of the layout of some of the manuscripts, for example, that *Gesta Annalia II* was regarded as a text distinct from that of *Gesta Annalia I*; there is no similar suggestion that *Gesta Annalia II* was regarded as two separate sections, a *Gesta Annalia II-a* and *II-b*, as it were.[191] Given that these two sections begin with the same events, such a distinction would seem more likely to have been made. Indeed, it is not clear why, if this *Gesta Annalia II-b* was intended to be a direct continuation of the first section, such essentially redundant chapters would be included. This is particularly relevant if *Gesta Annalia II* is to be regarded as having once formed part of a longer chronicle; if it was going to be cut to continue the narrative, why not cut it at the correct place chronologically?

It is notable also that in manuscripts **D** and **I**, in which *Gesta Annalia I* is presented as a direct continuation of Fordun's *Chronica*, without any of Skene's so-called 'Prefixed' chapters, this seemingly unnecessary overlap is nevertheless retained. This suggests again that *Gesta Annalia II* was viewed as a single chronicle even at the stage when it was first copied alongside *Gesta Annalia I*.

As noted above, *Gesta Annalia II*'s structure is closely related to that of Wyntoun's for the period 1285 – c.1331, and to the summary chronicle found in the Aberdeen cathedral breviary; all three appear to have shared a chronicle source written in St Andrews.[192] Bower also made use of this source in *Scotichronicon*, although, unlike Wyntoun or the summary chronicle, he also utilised *Gesta Annalia II* itself. Significantly, although Wyntoun and Bower both include a great deal of material that does not appear in *Gesta Annalia II* for the period after Alexander III's death, they also both follow broadly the same twisting chronology as *Gesta Annalia II*. This would suggest that this structure was already present in the source material used independently by each.

---

[190] For the development of the compilation, see e.g. Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.16, 20; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.217.

[191] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.13-9.

[192] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.13-9.

For example, Wyntoun's narrative of this period, *like Gesta Annalia II*'s, begins with Alexander III's second marriage, followed soon afterwards by his death.[193] As with *Gesta Annalia II*, this is followed by the appointment of guardians to govern Scotland, and the beginning of Edward I of England's attempts to gain power over Scotland by sending ambassadors to negotiate the marriage of the heirs to the two kingdoms, his son, the future Edward II, and Margaret, the Maid of Norway.[194] After Margaret died en-route, Scotland's leaders fell into dispute over the rival claims of Robert Bruce and John Balliol, prompting them to invite Edward I to arbitrate the matter. Wyntoun's version, like that of *Gesta Annalia II*, includes a conversation between Edward I and Anton Bek, the bishop of Durham, in which Edward is persuaded that Balliol would prove the more malleable and submissive candidate, despite having the inferior claim, and an account of Robert Bruce rejecting the crown if it meant submitting the kingdom to Edward's overlordship.[195] As in *Gesta Annalia II*, this episode concludes with the crown being accepted by Balliol and Bruce fleeing, with the aid of the earl of Gloucester.[196]

Having thus taken the narrative up to 1292, Wyntoun at this stage, like *Gesta Annalia II*, provides genealogies to demonstrate the rival claims, and is even more explicit in declaring Bruce the rightful claimant.[197] After this evidence, the narrative then returns to 1288 (without recapitulating the prior events) with the murder of the earl of Fife, followed, as in *Gesta Annalia II*, by the inauguration of John Balliol as king in 1292.[198]

Given that Wyntoun did not use *Gesta Annalia II* as a source, it is clear that this looping narrative structure was present in their shared source material.[199] Moreover, this arrangement is also evident in the apparently more straightforward

---

[193] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.138-145; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia*, 67 (p.309; trans p.304-5).
[194] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.154-61.
[195] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.216-20; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4).
[196] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.222-5; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4).
[197] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.226-57.
[198] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, p.262-7. The earl was killed in 1289 but Wyntoun and Bower share Gesta Annalia II's mistaken 1288: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.11 (vol.6, pp.32-3, 207 n.39).
[199] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.14-5.

narrative of Bower's *Scotichronicon*, which used both this shared source and *Gesta Annalia II* itself. Bower's narrative does not return to 1286 after providing evidence for the Balliol and Bruce claims; rather, he includes some of the additional information provided in *Gesta Annalia II*'s recapitulation of events from 1286 onwards in its correct place chronologically. For example, Bower's account of the appointment of guardians after Alexander III's death in 1286 and the negotiations for the marriage of Margaret, his last descendant, to Edward I's son, is extremely similar to that given in *Gesta Annalia II*.[200] Notably, however, Bower smoothed out *Gesta Annalia II*'s curious chronology by including here (as marginal additions), in its logical place in the narrative, information that in *Gesta Annalia II* only appears in the recapitulation of events: he lists the names and titles of Edward I's ambassadors at the negotiations, and notes that the Jews were expelled from England at this time.[201]

Despite this, the problematic chronology of his sources remains evident in Bower's narrative. Although Bower adjusted the layout of his sources so that the murder of the earl of Fife, which in both *Gesta Annalia II* and Wyntoun is placed after the genealogical evidence for the Bruce and Balliol claims, now appears before this genealogical material, it nevertheless remains out of place chronologically: it appears instead (in the main text) after Robert Bruce's alleged rejection and John Balliol's subsequent acceptance of Edward I's offer of the crown in 1292.[202] This event appears particularly out of place within this chapter as it is dated rather awkwardly: 'in the above-mentioned year when these events were happening, namely on 7 September 1288,' although the chapter otherwise describes events that took place in 1292, and Bower seems to have dated the events of his previous chapter to 1290.[203]

*

---

[200] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.1 (vol.6, pp.2-5); Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 68 (pp.310-1)
[201] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.1 (vol.6, pp.2-5); Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 83 (p.320)
[202] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.11 (vol.6, pp.30-3).
[203] They actually took place in 1291: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.10-11 (vol.6, pp.26-33, 204 n.1, 207 n.38).

The evidence of these related texts indicates, then, that the unusual chronological structure of *Gesta Annalia II*'s account of the events of 1286-1292 was already present in the source that it shared with Wyntoun and Bower, before *Gesta Annalia II* as it survives today was composed. This chronology was, therefore, always part of *Gesta Annalia II*, rather than arising from several stages of additions being made to the material of *Gesta Annalia I.*

What this does not reveal, however, is whether Alexander III's second marriage was always the intended starting part of *Gesta Annalia II*, or whether the chronicle (or its source) in fact began somewhat earlier. As noted above, *Gesta Annalia II*, Bower and Wyntoun all seem to have had access to a similar source for the period of 1285-c.1330. Bower and Wyntoun also seem to have shared a source, originating in St Andrews, for the century or so before this period, and both incorporate the so-called 'Anonymous Chronicle' from around 1330 to the 1390s.[204] It is therefore possible, given this relationship between Wyntoun and Bower, and from 1285 onwards with *Gesta Annalia II* as well, that *Gesta Annalia II* (or rather, its source) had also at some stage started at an earlier point.

The evidence of the summary chronicle, however, might indicate that *Gesta Annalia II*'s source existed in a form beginning in 1285. As has been noted, all bar one of the events between 1285 and 1363 recorded in the summary chronicle also appear in *Gesta Annalia II*, in most cases closely resembling *Gesta Annalia II*'s chapter headings. The summary chronicle prior to 1285, however, consists of a passage resembling an entry in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, listing the various deaths and successions of Malcolm III and Margaret and their descendants, up to the death of Malcolm IV, followed by a list of the deaths of the Scottish kings to Alexander III. If the source it shared with *Gesta Annalia II* resembled the pre-1285 material in Wyntoun and Bower, it would seem rather odd to include such a skimpy version of it, only to then provide a much more detailed summary of the years after this. Indeed, this pre-1285 material is little more than a king-list (with the addition of two

---

[204] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.14-5.

notes about Thomas Becket); in that sense, it is arguably comparable to the layout of *Gesta Annalia II*, but with the genealogical material (here restricted only to kings) used as part of the chronological structure rather than as a digression.

While the issue of *Gesta Annalia II*'s intended starting point cannot be entirely resolved, it is clear that it derives in part from a chronicle that covered at least 1285-1363 and which was also available to Wyntoun and Bower. It is also clear that this material was treated in very different ways by each of these authors, to an extent that would suggest *Gesta Annalia II* is not simply a copy of this material but a version that has been edited, selected and altered to provide a distinctive narrative of Scottish history. Furthermore, while those alterations clearly indicate that the composer of *Gesta Annalia II* hoped to present a very particular interpretation of Scotland's recent history, in favour of national unity under the Bruce dynasty, there is little to suggest that this required substantially rewriting earlier Scottish history; most of the appeals to the past revolve around recreating the stability and prosperity of the kingdom under Alexander III, which is outlined in *Gesta Annalia II*'s opening chapter. This would suggest that, while it remains possible that *Gesta Annalia II* was created as a complement to a work such as *Gesta Annalia I*, it did not itself have an earlier starting point, and it is reasonable therefore to discuss the text as a discrete chronicle of the years 1285-1363.

The different approach taken by *Gesta Annalia II*, compared to Wyntoun and Bower, is perhaps most apparent in the chronicles' respective treatment of the reign of David II. For this period, Wyntoun appears to have deviated from the source shared with *Gesta Annalia II*, instead preferring the 'Anonymous Chronicle.' This chronicle is significantly different from *Gesta Annalia II* in its attitudes and interests. It displays, for example, more awareness of events and noble families in southern and south-western Scotland than *Gesta Annalia II* (which tends to focus on

the region around the St Andrews diocese), and is far more interested in tales of chivalry and adventure.[205]

Perhaps most strikingly, it (and subsequently Wyntoun and Bower) also presents a much more positive portrayal of the future Robert II than *Gesta Annalia II*, which is at best ambivalent and often overtly hostile towards him.[206] Indeed, this hostility is evident even at his first appearance in *Gesta Annalia II*: the Balliol and Bruce genealogical material includes an account of the descendants of Robert I, where it is noted that Robert Stewart 'took as his mistress one of the daughters of Adam Mure, knight,' with whom he had several children out of wedlock.[207] Although the chronicle diplomatically acknowledges that in 1349 he received a dispensation from the church and married her properly, the intention of the passage certainly appears to be to imply that Robert was of less than wholesome character, and his children (by Elizabeth Mure, at least) of less than legitimate status.[208] In his version of the Bruce genealogy, Wyntoun notes only that this Robert would later be king; he makes no comment on his marital arrangements.[209]

Furthermore, this hostility towards Robert Stewart is not particularly apparent in the chronicle that most closely resembles the outline of *Gesta Annalia II* until 1363: the summary chronicle. He is mentioned by name only once in this section of the summary chronicle, when he is credited with the taking of Perth in 1339.[210] This coincides with one of the few occasions in *Gesta Annalia II* where Robert is mentioned without any accompanying criticism (whether implied or explicit); indeed it is presented as the first notable event after his appointment as guardian. It is also notably one of the relatively few occasions where the summary chronicle provides more detail than is found in *Gesta Annalia II*'s chapter rubric, which refers

---

[205] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.26.

[206] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.24-5.

[207] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 77 (p.317): 'Robertus copulavit sibi de facto unam de filiabus Adae More militis, de qua genuit filios et filias extra matrimonium.'

[208] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 77 (p.317).

[209] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, pp.254-5. Bower includes the details about Robert's marriage as a marginal addition, but tones down *Gesta Annalia II* by altering 'sons and daughters out of wedlock' to simply 'offspring' ('proles'): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.13 (vol.6, pp.36-7).

[210] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (pp.363-4); 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' p.331.

only to the siege and capture of the town; it is the main text of the chapter that says that this was carried out by 'Robert and the rest of the magnates of the kingdom,' (the summary chronicle, however, names Robert alone).[211] The summary chronicle, it is worth noting, does not add Robert's name to its entry on the conspiracy against David II in 1362, although he is the only conspirator named in *Gesta Annalia II*.[212]

While the brief entries in the summary chronicle resemble chapter headings, without any detailed narrative or commentary, it is notable that of those chapters in *Gesta Annalia II* that contain the most explicit criticism of the future Robert II, only one is paralleled in the summary chronicle. This is the battle of Neville's Cross (known in both chronicles as the battle of Durham) in 1346; the summary chronicle's text is identical to the chapter heading in *Gesta Annalia II*.[213] *Gesta Annalia II* accuses Stewart and Patrick Dunbar, earl of March, of fleeing from the battlefield, escaping unharmed while the rest of Scotland's leaders were captured (including the king himself) or killed.[214] The accusation of cowardice here (which is presented even more explicitly in several English chronicles) is given a more pragmatic spin by both Wyntoun and Bower, who present their flight as the wisest option after the rout of the rest of the Scottish army.[215] There is nothing in the summary chronicle equivalent to *Gesta Annalia II's* entry about his parliament in 1335, of which *Gesta Annalia II* says 'nothing was done there that is not worthy of mockery,' due to the 'overbearing behaviour' of David, earl of Atholl and his rivalry with the earl of Moray, a situation that Robert did little about as he was 'not then governed by much wisdom.'[216] Likewise, the summary chronicle does not mention

---

[211] 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' p.331: 'capta est villa de Perth per Robertum senescallum'; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (p.363-4): 'de obsession villae de Perth et captione ejusdem,' 'Robertum, et ceteros magnates regni.'

[212] 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' p.331: 'facta est conspiracio contra regem David per quosdam suos.' Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (p.381): 'de quadam conspiratione contra regem David.'

[213] 'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' p.331; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia*, 165 (p.367): 'commissum est bellum de Doram.' ('Duram' in *Gesta Annalia II*.)

[214] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 165 (p.367): 'fugam capientes illaesi abierunt.'

[215] Penman, 'The Scots at the Battle of Neville's Cross,' pp.158, 180; Penman, *David II*, p.134; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.35.

[216] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 152 (pp.358-9): 'propter ejus tyrannidem, nihil aliud actum est nisi derisione dignum'; 'tunc non magna regebatur sapientia.' Bower, however, omits the comment on

his appointment as guardian after Neville's Cross, although *Gesta Annalia II* devotes a chapter to it, observing pointedly that 'how he governed the kingdom entrusted to him, his deeds make known to all time.'[217] The summary then provides few entries on the period of his guardianship, a time which *Gesta Annalia II* portrays as characterised by feuding, grasping magnates frequently putting their own interests above those of Scotland, Robert Stewart chief among them.[218] There is no equivalent, for example, to *Gesta Annalia II*'s account of the willingness of 'the guardian and nobles of Scotland' to greedily accept an offer of French gold (which they kept for themselves, rather than distributing more widely) in exchange for an attack on England that 'did little that is worth remembering' and ultimately resulted in Edward III devastating Lothian in retaliation.[219]

Gesta Annalia II presents a strikingly different account and interpretation of the events of 1331-1363 from that of Wyntoun, who based his version on the 'Anonymous Chronicle.' This account is also somewhat different from that which is evident in the summary chronicle; *Gesta Annalia II*'s editorialising on the factionalism of the Scottish nobles and the failings of Robert Stewart seems to reflect not so much a fuller copying of their shared source so much as a deliberate process of addition and amplification.

*

Gesta Annalia II's criticism of the factionalism and selfishness of Scotland's nobles, at the expense of the wider kingdom and the suffering of ordinary people is a theme that recurs throughout the chronicle, in the material before 1331 as well as afterwards, and in far more explicit terms than in Wyntoun's version of this

---

Robert Stewart's wisdom. *Gesta Annalia II* is highly critical of the earl of Atholl: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 152-154 (pp.358-60); Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.35; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.33 (vol.7, pp.108-9, 270 n.9).

[217] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 166 (p.368): 'quomodo regnum sibi commissum gubernavit, sua gesta temporibus omnibus innotescunt.' Again, Bower omits this.

[218] See Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 166-178 (pp.368-77).

[219] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 171 (pp.370-1): 'custodem et nobiles Scociae'; 'modicum quid dignum memoria perfecerunt'; 'alios mediocres dimiserunt inanes'; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.36.

material.[220] There are, indeed, significant differences between *Gesta Annalia II*'s presentation of the period 1286-1331 and that of Wyntoun, despite their use of a shared source, which further suggest that *Gesta Annalia II* arose from a conscious editorial and authorial process, rather than simply copying out an existing source (or sources).

One of the most striking differences between *Gesta Annalia II* and Wyntoun in their use of this source material is their treatment of and attitude towards the Comyns, particularly John Comyn, lord of Badenoch, killed by Robert I in 1306. While both texts are explicit in favouring the claim to the throne of Robert Bruce over that of John Balliol, Wyntoun includes a long discussion of the investigation undertaken at the University of Paris, finding in favour of Bruce, which similarly appears in Bower's *Scotichronicon* but is not included in *Gesta Annalia II*, perhaps simply because it would present too long a digression from the narrative. Both *Gesta Annalia II* and Wyntoun include the genealogies of the rival candidates, beginning with an account of the kings descended from Malcolm III and Margaret as far as Alexander III, in order, as *Gesta Annalia II* puts it, that Bruce's right 'will be become manifest more easily and clearly.'[221] In *Gesta Annalia II*, the genealogies begin with John Balliol's descent, but in Wyntoun the first genealogy actually discusses the descent of John Comyn, something omitted entirely in *Gesta Annalia II*.[222]

---

[220] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.199. Compare, for example Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 93 (p.326), where, due to factionalism, 'the innocent common people were exposed to the frenzied bites of these wolves, and lay lacerated throughout the length and breadth of the land,' ('innocens plebicola, rapidis luporum morsibus patens, longa per terrarum spatia jacuit lacerata') or *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337), where the Scots are 'lying in a pool of misery, and utterly lacking any hope or help of salvation,' ('in lacu miseriae prostratos, et omni spe salutis et auxilio destitutos,') with the equivalent passages in Wyntoun (*Original Chronicle*, vol.5, pp.292, 354), which have no similar commentary.

[221] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 73 (p.314): 'facilius et clarius liquebunt.' Both *Gesta Annalia II* and Wyntoun state that Edward I was informed that Bruce's claim was stronger: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 71 (pp.312-3); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.216-20.

[222] See Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, pp.232-42; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.27 n.81; Grant, 'Death of John Comyn,' p.200. This placement of Comyn's descent first might make it seem less unusual that, although both sources emphasise the superiority of the Bruce claim, *Gesta Annalia II* had listed John Balliol's descent, seemingly on the basis that he was descended from an older daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon: Wyntoun's arrangement seems to indicate that they are listed in ascending order, from weakest to strongest claim. The Comyn genealogy is also absent from Bower's

This is not the only way in which Wyntoun appears to highlight the possibility of a Comyn claim to the throne, yet such pro-Comyn material is largely absent from *Gesta Annalia II*, in what appears to be a deliberate revision of the contents of their shared source.[223] Some evidence of this material remains in *Gesta Annalia II*, for example in the lengthy account of the battle of Roslin in 1302 (though Wyntoun makes an even grander tale of it), but the chronicle also blames Comyn and his followers for betraying William Wallace at the battle of Falkirk and then driving him to resign the guardianship.[224] This Comyn tradition is also evident in the 'Scottish poem' included in the *Liber Extravagans* material that supplemented Bower's chronicle.[225] Other Comyns receive largely negative portrayals in *Gesta Annalia II*, which frequently portrays John's relatives as ultimately pursuing their own dynastic and familial interests at the expense of Scotland's people. Indeed, his father had already allegedly delivered one Scottish king (his brother-in-law) into English hands.[226] Similarly, while John Comyn, the earl of Buchan, receives some praise for his efforts to weaken Edward by raiding the north of England, he is also sternly criticised for later throwing in his lot with the English against Robert I.[227] Even the apparently positive portrayal of the lord of Badenoch at the battle of Roslin could instead be interpreted as highlighting the necessity of national unity for Scotland to thrive: having established this unity and led the Scots to victory, Comyn then wilfully discarded it in pursuit of his own interests.[228]

Scotichronicon, although it is evident that he, like Wyntoun and *Gesta Annalia II*, was using this shared St Andrews source as well as *Gesta Annalia II*. In the Balliol genealogy, he notes that John Balliol was 'later king of Scotland,' which is noted in *Gesta Annalia II* but not Wyntoun; and that Edward Balliol was victor at the battle of Dupplin, which appears in Wyntoun but is omitted in *Gesta Annalia II*: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.13 (vol.6, pp.34-5); Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 75 (p.316); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.244-5; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.200.

[223] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.199-203.

[224] Paradoxically, *Gesta Annalia II* is somewhat cooler than Wyntoun in its praise of William Wallace (and records fewer of his various adventures and triumphs) but fiercer in its condemnation of his enemies: Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.190-7; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia*, 101-102, 107-108 (pp.330-1, 333-5); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.314-20, 332-44.

[225] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.202-7; *Liber Extravagans*, in Bower, *Scotichronicon* vol.9, pp.54-127 at pp.76-83.

[226] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 95 (pp.326-7).

[227] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 97,122, 125 (pp.327-8, 343-4, 345).

[228] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.191-7.

This difference in attitude is most evident in the chronicles' coverage of the death of John Comyn. The build-up to this event, in both chronicles, begins with Robert I and Comyn discussing an offer whereby one will support the other's bid for the crown in exchange for receiving possession of his lands.[229] In *Gesta Annalia II*, it is Robert I who makes this proposal; in Wyntoun, however, it is Comyn who suggests it.[230] Bower records both versions; given that he used both *Gesta Annalia II* itself as well as the source shared with Wyntoun, this would suggest that Wyntoun's version is that of the original source, and that *Gesta Annalia II* consciously changed this.[231] This alteration has the effect of presenting Robert I as particularly magnanimous and humble: he was putting the interests of the Scottish kingdom and its people above his own, choosing unity for the kingdom despite being well aware that his was the rightful claim.[232] In then betraying this agreement to Edward I, John Comyn, by contrast, is presented as doing the opposite, to the extent of breaking a sacred oath intended to end the internal divisions causing so much suffering to the Scots and deliver 'the Scottish nation from the house of slavery and shameful subjection.'[233]

This treatment of the rivalry between Comyn and Bruce is, it has been suggested, intended to justify Comyn's murder before the altar in Dumfries; Comyn is, in that respect, a kind of sacrifice necessary to heal Scotland's factionalism and discord.[234] Indeed, the chronicle even carefully avoids stating whether or not Robert I carried out the act himself.[235] This sequence of chapters is notable for repeatedly describing God's role in guiding and protecting Robert, explicitly stating he was sent

---

[229] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113 (pp.337-8); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.356-62. This is the closest *Gesta Annalia II* comes to acknowledging the possibility that John Comyn might have had a claim to the crown.

[230] Wyntoun is following Barbour, rather than the St Andrews source directly, but Barbour seems to have also been making use of this source here: Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.199; Barbour, *The Bruce*, book 1, pp.69-71.

[231] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.5 (vol.6, pp.302-5); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.193-9.

[232] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113 (pp.337-8); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.193-4.

[233] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112, 113 (p.337-8): 'de domo servitutis, et indignae subjectionis materia, fieret deliberatio Scoticae nationis.'

[234] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.194-7.

[235] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 117 (p.340); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.195-7.

by God, in His mercy, as a champion to save the Scots.[236] Robert is also 'inspired by God' ('Deo inspirante') in deflecting the accusations levelled against him by John Comyn to Edward I, and it is with God's guidance and grace that Robert managed to escape safely home before Edward I could have him killed.[237] This divine interpretation of events highlights the recurring theme of *Gesta Annalia II*, in the sections both before and after 1331: the dangers of factionalism, discord and disunity, and the suffering it brings upon the ordinary people of Scotland. It also stands in notable contrast to the version of the killing of Comyn in Wyntoun. Wyntoun copies Barbour's rather more brutal and secular account of the murder, in which Robert I sets out with vengeance in mind and quickly stabs Comyn himself; Wyntoun also includes Barbour's criticism of Robert, stating that he did wrong by disrespecting sanctuary.[238]

Such differences between *Gesta Annalia II* and other chronicles that shared its sources indicate that *Gesta Annalia II* was not the result of an uncritical copying out of earlier chronicles but of a conscious editorial and authorial process. While some of the source material was likely to have been copied more or less word for word, this would have occurred where the material was regarded as still being relevant or accurate and suited to the chronicler's present purpose. Many sections of the source material were omitted or altered and new work inserted. Certainly, the chronicle as it survives appears to present a single unified narrative with consistent themes and interests: it consistently supports the Bruce cause, identifying the interests of Robert I and David II with those of Scotland, and emphasises the need for unity in order to defend the kingdom and ensure the prosperity and, indeed, spiritual salvation of the people. In that regard, the chronicle is highly critical of the tendency of the nobility to divide into factions or pursue their own interests ahead of Scotland's, and displays sympathy towards the common folk of the kingdom.

---

[236] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.195
[237] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113-117 (pp.337-340); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.195-6.
[238] Rather than presenting it is a divinely-guided moment or as a pre-meditated killing, Bower's version suggests that Robert acted in the heat of the moment and felt remorse, Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.7 (vol.6, pp.310-3); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.366-8; Barbour, *The Bruce*, book 1, pp.78-81; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.198-9.

*

It is clear that, like *Gesta Annalia I*, *Gesta Annalia II* is closely associated with Saint Andrews and its wider diocese, and likewise seems to have been written by an author based north of the Forth. While it is possible that much of this was carried over from the St Andrews source upon which it was largely based, the date of *Gesta Annalia II*'s composition and the attitudes it displays suggest that the Fife-based perspective of the chronicle's source (which, indeed, does not seem to have pre-dated *Gesta Annalia II* by very long) can equally be applied to *Gesta Annalia II* itself.

The text frequently displays a particular interest in people and events within the wider area of the Saint Andrews diocese, and many geographical references within the text further support this idea.[239] For example, of the guardians of Scotland appointed in 1286, three (Duncan, earl of Fife, William Fraser, bishop of Saint Andrews, and John Comyn, earl of Buchan) are described as 'from the northern part, this side of the Forth', while the other three (Robert, bishop of Glasgow, the lord John Comyn, and James the Steward of Scotland) came 'from the southern side of the water of the Forth,' suggesting that the author of the chronicle was based north of the Forth.[240]

The chronicle also states that after the battle of Falkirk in 1298, Edward I sent an army to 'this side of the water of the Forth,' so that it might plunder 'the whole land of Fife, and the whole of the land near the town of Perth.'[241] Before Edward then returned to England, he appointed officers to govern on his behalf 'in the regions beyond the water of the Forth, which were then fully and entirely under his

---

[239] Boardman, 'Robert II,' pp.72-108.
[240] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 68 (pp.310-1): 'ex parte boreali citra Forth,' 'ex parte australi aquae de Forth.' It is notable that Scotland north and south of the Forth are equally represented on this council, even though the land south of the Forth had only fairly recently become consistently regarded as part of 'Scotland' itself, rather than as lands controlled by the Scottish king.
[241] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'citra aquam de Forth,' 'quae totam terram de Fyf, cum omnibus terris prope jacentibus villae de Perth.'

control.'[242] These examples make it explicit that, from the chronicler's perspective, Fife lay on 'this side' of the Forth, and Lothian on the other.

Several descriptions also indicate that, from the author's perspective, reaching the northernmost parts of the kingdom required crossing beyond the mountains. In 1303, Edward I received the submission of 'the northern districts' at Lochindorb; he had reached there after first scouring 'the hills and plains' of Scotland, 'both on this side of the hills and beyond.'[243] Similarly, in 1335, the chronicle says that Andrew Murray came to Dunfermline to be approved as guardian of Scotland, after which he 'went off beyond the hills' to secure the north.[244]

Furthermore, the chronicle often highlights the fate of the leaders and men of Fife and the surrounding region within descriptions of Scottish military activity. It records, for example, that in 1296 the nobles and men of Fife were sent to garrison Berwick, and notes that at the battle of Falkirk in 1298, MacDuff and his soldiers from Fife were cut off from the rest of the Scottish army.[245] The chronicle's account of the battle of Dupplin Moor in 1332 is generally vague on the extent of Scottish casualties, naming the earls of Mar, Moray and Menteith, Robert Bruce and Alexander Fraser, alongside a host of 'other nobles, barons, knights, and worthy men-at-arms, and innumerable men of lower rank,' more of whom died in the crush of bodies than were slain by enemy blows.[246] The chapter ends, however, with a more precise tally for Fife casualties: Duncan earl of Fife, 'under whose banner 360 men-at-arms had been killed, and many others, were captured.'[247] In the following

---

[242] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'ultra aquam de Forth, quae plenarie et integre suo tunc subjacebant imperio.'

[243] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 109 (pp.335-6): 'partes boreales ad pacem cepit,' 'tam montanis quam planis, tam ultra montes quam citra.'

[244] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 154 (pp.359-60): 'proficiscens ultra montes in partibus borealibus diu moratus est.'

[245] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 89, 101 (pp.323-4, 330).

[246] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 146 (pp.354-5): 'aliis nobilibus, baronibus, militibus, armigeris valentibus, et inferiorum status ac gradus innumeris.'

[247] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 146 (pp.354-5): 'capti sunt autem Duncanus comes de Fyff, interfectis suis sub vexillo suo III^{C}LX viris loricatis, et alii multi.' These 'men in armour' appear to simply be the soldiers under his command; Wyntoun and Bower also state that there were 360 casualties under Duncan's command: Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol. 5, pp.420-1; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.23 (vol.

chapter, the chronicle notes that Edward Balliol was 'made king, at Scone, by Duncan, Earl of Fife,' who, having been captured, now fulfilled the traditional coronation role of the earls of Fife, and that the ceremony was also attended by 'the abbots, priors, and communities of Fife and Fothreve, Stratherne, and Gowry,' who had submitted to Balliol.[248] These are the regions around Scone, but it is significant that the chronicle should focus on them: Fife, Fothriff and Gowrie are deaneries of the archdeaconry of Saint Andrews; Strathearn is in the neighbouring diocese of Dunblane.[249]

Gesta Annalia II also records a number of events of local significance to Fife or the wider Saint Andrews diocese, as when Andrew Moray is said to have laid waste to 'the whole land of Gowrie, Angus and Mearns': the deaneries that form the northern part of the diocese.[250] Particular attention is paid to events affecting the church in this region: the chronicle records that when Edward I besieged Stirling Castle in 1304, he ordered 'all the lead from the refectory of Saint Andrews' to be removed for use in his siege engines.[251]

This particular interest in events affecting the diocese of Saint Andrews is also evident in the chronicle's account of Edward III's campaign in 1336. The English king laid waste to 'the whole of Moray,' sparing only the religious buildings of Elgin, and burned Aberdeen.[252] The account then becomes more detailed as Edward returned south, into the diocese of Saint Andrews: it records that he 'fortified the strongholds of Dunnottar, Kinneff, and Lauriston,' before returning to Perth.[253]

7, pp.76-81). A total of 3000 Scottish casualties is given in the next chapter, so this would represent some 12% of Scottish casualties.

[248] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 147 (p.355): 'factus est rex apud Sconam per Duncanum comitem de Fyf,' 'abbatibus, prioribus, et communitate de Fyff et Fithirester, de Stratherne, et de Gowry.'

[249] Peter G.B. McNeill and Hector L. MacQueen (eds.), *Atlas of Scottish History to 1707* (Edinburgh, 1996), pp.348-9.

[250] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 156 (pp.361-2): 'tota terra de Goury, de Angus, et de Mernys'; Boardman, 'Robert II,' pp.72-108; McNeill and MacQueen (eds.), *Atlas of Scottish History*, pp.348-9.

[251] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 111 (pp.336-7): 'totum plumbum refectorii Sancti Andreae deponi mandavit.'

[252] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 155 (pp.360-1): 'totam Moraviam.'

[253] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 155 (pp.360-1): 'firmatis fortaliciis de Dunotyr, et de Kynnef, et de Laurestone.'

These all lay within the deanery of Mearns. Edward III then demanded that six monasteries ('Dunfermline, Saint Andrews, Lindores, Balmerino, Arbroath and Coupar-Angus,') pay for rebuilding the walls and towers of Perth, 'at their own cost and expense,' which caused them 'ruinous loss;' the same passage also notes that the castles of Saint Andrews and Leuchars were rebuilt at this time.[254] Such examples further support the idea that the chronicle originated somewhere within the diocese of Saint Andrews, and most likely within Fife, perhaps even Saint Andrews itself.

It is also notable that the majority of these references to Fife and St Andrews occur within the broader context of the narrative of the Wars of Independence and the Bruce dynasty; there are several references to the deaths or appointments of bishops of St Andrews in Wyntoun, for example, that do not appear in *Gesta Annalia II*, suggesting perhaps that while the chronicle retained the Fife-based perspective of its source, its composer was also intent on focussing on this particular narrative rather than a more broadly ecclesiastical history.[255]

*

Gesta Annalia II's distinctively St Andrews-based perspective (which contrasts with the wider awareness of, and interest in, events across Scotland evident in, for example, the 'Anonymous Chronicle') and its probable composition date of c.1363 also help to indicate a highly plausible context for one of its most striking aspects: the apparent hostility towards Robert Stewart, the future Robert II. As noted above, in this respect the chronicle is markedly different from not only Wyntoun, who used the 'Anonymous Chronicle' for this period, but also from Bower, who used both the

---

[254] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 155 (pp.360-1): 'Dunfermlyn, Sancti Andreae, Londoris, Balmurinach, Abberbrothoc et Cuper in Angus,' 'suis sumptibus et expensis,' 'dicta monasteria vehementer fuerunt depauperata.'

[255] Compare, for example, Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.312, 372-4, 382, with Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 100, 142 (pp.329, 353). *Gesta Annalia II* does include an account of the expulsion of English beneficed clergy from the diocese of St Andrews, an event not noted in Wyntoun, which was followed by a wider expulsion of all English from Scotland. This demonstrates the chronicle's awareness of the diocese, and how this is used to form part of the narrative of the wars, showing it growing from a Fife issue to a nationwide issue: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 91 (p.325); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 p.288.

'Anonymous Chronicle' and *Gesta Annalia II* itself.[256] It has been argued that this perspective can be explained by the political circumstances of the time. Throughout the 1360s, David II was engaged in negotiations over his ongoing ransom payments, seeking to gain concessions to the ransom in exchange for making one of Edward III's sons the heir to the Scottish throne.[257] These proposals faced much opposition in Scotland, not least from Robert Stewart, who was otherwise David's likely heir.[258] *Gesta Annalia II's* emphasis on the need for unity, and its portrayal of Stewart as an inadequate leader, would seem to place the author on David II's side in this dispute. Moreover, this hostility towards Stewart, in support of David II, also reflected the political interests of the clergy of St Andrews, whose bishop during the period, William de Laundels, was closely allied to David II, particularly in a long-running dispute between Stewart and the king for the control of the earldom of Fife.[259]

Indeed, another text from the period that shares both *Gesta Annalia II*'s association with Laundels and its hostility towards Robert Stewart was explicitly produced in reaction to these negotiations. This took the form of a 'quaestio' (a format used in clerical schools that presented the arguments for and against a proposal, and then provided a judgement on which side was stronger), prepared by William de Spyny in response to the English proposal of November 1363, which offered peace and settlement of the ransom in exchange for Edward III or his heir succeeding to the Scottish crown if David II had no heirs.[260] Spyny had been Laundels' clerk before leaving for France in 1351, and possibly resumed their association after his return to Scotland in early 1363.[261] The document seems to have been produced for the benefit of the secretaries and clerks of Scotland's leading clerics and magnates, to

---

[256] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.25.

[257] A.A.M. Duncan (ed.), 'A Question about the Succession, 1364,' in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society XII* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp.1-57 at pp.5-20.

[258] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.15.

[259] Boardman, 'Robert II,' p.95.

[260] An edition of this 'quaestio,' with introduction and translation, has been published in Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.1-57.

[261] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.6, 10.

brief their masters ahead of the Scone parliament in March 1364, providing a hint of the range of contemporary views on the matter.[262]

Spyny's 'quaestio' consisted firstly of a series of arguments in favour of accepting the English proposal. These arguments emphasise the benefits of peace (for example, 'empty towns will be inhabited, ruined ones rebuilt'), and the importance of maintaining the integrity of the kingdom, so that it is not 'fractured nor mutilated in its rights, liberties and customs' and that 'full concord' is achieved.[263] The arguments in favour of accepting the proposals also acknowledges the significance of the independent identity of the Scots, by noting that the Scottish people will not be any less Scottish for having a king from a different nation, as long as he rules well ('so long as he discharges his office in praiseworthy fashion, the concept of nation is not at all required').[264] Spyny highlighted the extensive provisions made to ensure that the Scottish kingdom, church and people remained separate and distinct from England.[265] These provisions were based on those in the Treaty of Birgham in 1290, when, moreover, it was deemed acceptable for Margaret, the Maid of Norway, to marry the heir of Edward I: then, as Spyny noted, the Scots would have been 'very happy if, on the other hand, by a marriage of the first-born son of England with our daughter and heiress, we and they had been one people,' so the current proposal should also be acceptable.[266] Spyny also makes the contention that the Scots would not be able to resist should the English simply try to impose their will by force.[267]

This is then followed by a series of arguments against accepting the proposal. These arguments, which do not directly address the previous arguments in favour of the proposal, include concerns about the legality of such an agreement, and question whether the English could be trusted not to become tyrannical oppressors, citing

---

[262] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' p.11.
[263] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.28-35.
[264] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.28-9.
[265] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.28-35.
[266] Interestingly, a later copyist of the document has questioned whether the circumstances of 1290 and 1363 were really comparable in this way: Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' p.35.
[267] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.30-1.

their previous actions in Scotland and their treatment of the Welsh and Irish.[268] The Welsh church had been forced into subjection to the archbishop of Canterbury, such that Welsh prelates were 'held in such despite in England, that they are open to the contempt and abuse of the whole people,' and the English treated 'the Welsh altogether, and the Irish as far as they can, so inhumanely and so like slaves.'[269] It is also suggested that the proposal was unlikely to lead to peace in the long-term, as the Scots were likely to revolt against English rule: they 'will desire a great revenge, even if we must die.'[270] The arguments against the proposal lay great stress upon the importance of maintaining Scotland's freedom and defending the integrity of the kingship and kingdom, rejecting outright the notion that this would not be compromised by the succession of the English king.[271]

These arguments are followed by Spyny's judgement on the matter, namely that the proposal should be rejected, and his explanation of why. Among some obscure and unlikely suggestions, including the idea that David II put forward the proposal as a way of testing his subjects' bravery, Spyny observed that, despite inferior numbers, the Scots had 'defeated them on divers occasions successively,' and the English had little desire for a war of conquest, so there was little to be feared by rejecting the proposals.[272] Accepting them, on the other hand, would voluntarily abandon Scotland's freedom and the kingship 'for whose status, the people have hitherto put up with much,' and allow Edward III to pursue his real aim of destroying the Scots.[273]

In the final section of the 'quaestio,' Spyny presents a counter-proposal that should be acceptable to both sides (and which was David II's preference): namely, that John of Gaunt, the third son of Edward III, should succeed, rather than Edward

---

[268] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.3, 34-43.
[269] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.36-9.
[270] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.38-43.
[271] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.38-43.
[272] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.4, 46-51.
[273] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.48-53.

himself or his heir.[274] Although the format of the 'quaestio' makes the point less than explicit, Spyny's objection was clearly not to an English succession as such, but rather to the specific proposal made by Edward III; indeed, it is difficult to see how some of Spyny's apparent concerns about the proposal could be entirely resolved by this alternative. This is nevertheless presented as the only option that would bring lasting peace (despite Edward III having already rejected the idea).[275]

Many of the points raised in Spyny's 'quaestio' of 1364 echo the themes of *Gesta Annalia II*. Not only does it share *Gesta Annalia II*'s emphasis on the need to maintain Scotland's freedom and its association of the Bruce cause with Scotland's cause, but it is also similarly ambivalent about Robert Stewart as a potential leader, condemning, in general terms, his governorship in David's absence.[276]

The 'quaestio' is explicit in its support for a younger son of Edward III succeeding David II, should David not have any heirs of his own. While *Gesta Annalia II* does not make any such outright claims, there is substantial evidence within the text to suggest that its author was broadly sympathetic to the idea. It is notable, for example, that *Gesta Annalia II* is often ambivalent, rather than hostile, in its depiction of the English people (as opposed to their kings). The text's hostility towards Robert Stewart might therefore be intended to demonstrate that an English heir was better than the alternative, an idea which is also raised (and eventually proposed) in the 'quaestio.'[277]

This is further supported by the chronicle's inclusion, in its genealogies of the contenders for the throne, of a genealogy of the English royal line, presented, like the Scottish dynasty, as descending from Saint Margaret and Malcolm III.[278] Indeed,

---

[274] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.4-5, 54-7.

[275] As Duncan notes, however, Spyny's explanation of why John would be more acceptable (including the suggestion that John's heir would be part-Scottish) is not very convincing: Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.4-5,54-7.

[276] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.5, 32-3; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.36-8.

[277] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.42-3; Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.28-33

[278] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 80 (p.318-9). *Gesta Annalia II* traces the descent of the competitors from Malcolm III and Margaret, rather than simply from David, earl of Huntingdon, reflecting an

a separate genealogy of the English royal dynasty, prefaced with a description of two kingdoms united under a single ruler, also seems to have become associated with Fordun's chronicle alongside *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*. *Gesta Annalia II*'s clear preference for the stability and prosperity of peace, rather than the widespread destruction and suffering of war (a preference shared by Spyny in the 'quaestio'), is also evident in its expression of a degree of sympathy for the English who were as much oppressed by Edward I as the Scots were. The text is extremely critical of those who are seen to obstruct this aim: not only the likes of Edward III, who ignored letters from the Pope and the kings of Scotland and France (and is likewise very much the scheming villain in Spyny's 'quaestio'), but even otherwise heroic figures such as Andrew Moray, praise for whose efforts on Scotland's behalf was tempered by criticism of the bloodshed and suffering that the common people were forced to endure because of his fighting.[279]

By regarding *Gesta Annalia II* as a single, unified work, moreover, it is possible to see the beginning of the chronicle as arguably presenting a precedent for how such an arrangement could work, albeit in circumstances somewhat different from those after the death of Alexander III. The chronicle records that the guardians of Scotland agreed to a proposed marriage between Alexander III's heir, Margaret (the Maid of Norway), and the future Edward II, but with certain conditions attached that were intended to ensure Scotland's continued independence as well as securing the succession and stability of the realm. These included that, if the marriage failed or left no children, the kingdom would go to the next in line from Alexander III, not an heir of Edward I.[280] By including this account, the chronicle highlights that Scotland, lacking a direct male descendant from its king, had already once agreed to having an heir directly descended from the English king, while still retaining its autonomy and identity as a separate kingdom, a point likewise made by Spyny in the

---

established idea about the start of Scotland's royal dynasty but also allowing the inclusion of this English genealogy.
[279] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 151, 158 (pp.358, 363).
[280] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 69 (p.311).

'quaestio.'[281] Furthermore, the union of the two royal houses through the marriage of David II to Edward III's sister, Joan, in 1328, is said to have been received with 'the unutterablee joy of the people of both kingdoms,' though the chronicler knew that it led to no heirs.[282]

Perhaps most strikingly, the grandfather of Robert I is described in *Gesta Annalia II* as being 'of the noblest stock of all England,' and therefore suitable material for kingship, a claim (though it is made by Antony Bek to Edward I) that the chronicle does not dispute, emphasising indeed that he should have been the king.[283] Who could, therefore, object to an English heir when Robert I himself had such ancestry? It presents this ancestry as no barrier to being Scotland's legitimate king, that it would not require breaking from Scotland's most ancient laws and customs.[284] This attitude might also explain something of the chronicle's relatively ambivalent portrayal of John Balliol (which is to an extent shared with Wyntoun, suggesting that this was not wholly the chronicler's own work, although it clearly suited his purpose).[285] John is elsewhere depicted as alien and foreign, as English rather than Scottish, and, indeed, he appears to have thought of himself as a loyal subject of the English king rather than as ruler of an independent kingdom, which undermined Scotland's autonomy and alienated him from his subjects. Although *Gesta Annalia II* states that he did not have the best claim, however, it is supportive of his efforts on behalf of Scotland and does not deny the legitimacy of his reign.[286] The right to kingship is, in that sense, presented as a matter of having Scotland's interests at heart, and upholding those, as much as it is a matter of having a particular ancestry.

---

[281] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.34-35.

[282] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 142 (p.353): 'cum gaudio ineffabili populi utriusque regni.'

[283] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4): 'Robertus sit de nobiliori prosapia totius Angliae.'

[284] Grant notes that the same is true of John Balliol: 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.205.

[285] Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.34-39.

[286] Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.34-9; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.205-6; G.W.S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (4th edition, Edinburgh, 2005), pp.65-6; Amanda G. Beam, *The Balliol Dynasty 1210-1364* (Edinburgh, 2008), pp.114-5, 162.

Spyny's 'quaestio' similarly suggests that a king's nationality does not matter if he rules well and in the kingdom's interest.[287]

This attitude allows the chronicler to reconcile the otherwise potentially contradictory ideas of open-mindedness towards English succession and insistence upon Scottish autonomy, and explains the presentation of David II's erstwhile rival, Edward Balliol. Edward is treated with far more hostility than his father, John, and the chronicle expressly denies his claim to the throne, highlighting his failure to attract the consistent support necessary to maintain his challenge for the throne. Although he managed to persuade the people of Fife to witness his inauguration, having secured (or, rather, compelled) the support of their earl, he apparently found that the Scottish people refused to accept him as their king, in part, because they did not regard him as a fellow Scot or as being in sympathy with their interests.[288] The chronicle consistently equates the cause of Edward Balliol with that of the English, and depicts Edward Balliol complaining to his patron, Edward III, as his support in Scotland ebbed away, that the Scottish race were 'a nation most false,' for they kept rejecting him and refused to let him rule over them as he wished.[289] This alleged disconnection from his would-be subjects is striking; he then gave up his crown to Edward III, asking the English king to conquer the realm instead.[290] For the author of *Gesta Annalia II*, Edward Balliol's dependence on English support, and his willingness to sacrifice Scotland's autonomy to fulfil his own desires, demonstrated his unsuitability as a king (although the chronicle also notes that Balliol was not even entitled to give up this claim, as his father, John, had already done so long before), without contradicting the chronicle's sympathy with David II's intentions.[291]

---

[287] Duncan, 'A Question about the Succession,' pp.28-9.
[288] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 146, 147 (pp.354-5); Beam, *The Balliol Dynasty*, pp.251-66. On the other hand, Robert I 'may fairly be called a Scotsman, born among Scots': Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, p.35.
[289] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 154, 159, 175 (pp.359-60, 363-4, 373): 'gente Scoticana, natione falsissima'; Beam, *The Balliol Dynasty*, pp.259-60; Brown, 'Scoti Anglicati,' p.96.
[290] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 175 (p.373).
[291] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 175 (p.374).

Gesta Annalia II's attempt to reconcile seemingly contradictory ideas about Scottish independence and a potential English succession is strongly reminiscent of the similar attempt made by Spyny in his 'quaestio.' This highlights that the chronicle was the product of very particular circumstances, and displays the perspective of a very particular group: the St Andrews clerics around William Laundels, who collectively supported David II's position in the ransom and succession negotiations. Indeed, Boardman has tentatively suggested that *Gesta Annalia II* was composed by Thomas Bisset, prior of St Andrews from 1354. Bisset was very close to David II's long-running dispute with the Steward over the earldom of Fife (in which Laundels staunchly supported the king), as he was the nephew of Thomas Bisset of Upsetlington, who in 1363 married (by David II's arrangement) Isabella, heiress to the earldom (and widow of Robert Stewart's son, Walter). More tantalisingly still, by early June 1363 he had been 'forced to resign from office... because of ill-health': around the very same time that *Gesta Annalia II* abruptly ends.[292]

Unlike Spyny's 'quaestio,' however, *Gesta Annalia II*'s support for David II's policy is never articulated explicitly; rather, it is implied through the chronicle's presentation of particular aspects of Scottish kingship. While *Gesta Annalia II*'s perspective is clearly shaped by the particular political context of the text's composition, it is nevertheless striking that its apparent sympathy towards an English heir is expressed within a framework that emphasises the same ideals of Scottish autonomy and independence, and the same vision of the role of its king, as can be found in other Scottish sources of this period such as Barbour's *Bruce*. This framework was not new, however, but had already been articulated long before in sources such as the chronicle with which it has been most closely associated, *Proto-Fordun.*

---

[292] Boardman, 'Robert II,' p.95

CHAPTER TWO: The Scottish Kingdom

I

The chroniclers that compiled *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* were certain that the Scottish kingdom had its roots in ancient times and that its rule over the northern part of the island of Britain had been unbroken for many centuries. Indeed, areas such as Lothian in the south, Strathclyde in the west and Caithness in the north had been incorporated into the kingdom long before those chronicles were compiled. By their time, the extent of the kingdom was, for the most part, firmly established, and broadly recognisable as the territory occupied by modern Scotland today. Indeed, *Proto-Fordun* (possibly building on Vairement, and later followed by Bower via Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*) sought to establish Scotland's place in the world not only by relating its history but by describing its location, its geography and appearance and the limits of its territory. Scotland's identity was not only political but geographical, physical and tangible.

Despite the certainty of these chroniclers, however, it was only during the thirteenth century (the period in which *Proto-Fordun* and its chief source, Vairement, was composed) that the word 'Scotland' (Gaelic 'Alba' or Latin 'Scocia' and 'Scotia') came to be consistently used to mean the full extent of the realm subject to the king of Scots.[1] In some respects, this is not entirely surprising, as many of the claims to parts of the kingdom by rival crowns were only settled in this period. Scotland's southern limits were confirmed by the Treaty of York in 1237, while the claims of the Norwegian crown to Man and the Hebrides were formally ended by the treaty of Perth in 1266 (although Orkney and Shetland would formally owe allegiance to Norway until 1472).

Thus it was only in 1216 that the monks of Melrose, compiling their own chronicle, used the word 'Scotland' to refer to an area that included both the Merse in the

---

[1] Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.6.

southeast (a region that includes Melrose itself) and Galloway in the southwest.[2]

Even then, it does not appear to have been until the later part of the century that

the Melrose chroniclers regarded people from their own area as Scots.[3] As Broun

has pointed out, however, while the Melrose chronicle included Galloway and the

Merse as part of Scotland in 1216, by contrast, *Proto-Fordun* describes both Lothian

and Moray as lying outside Scotland in an entry describing William I's death in

1214.[4] William is recorded having gone into Moray to make peace with the earl of

Caithness and, having done so, 'came back from Moray into Scotland,' and then

'from Scotland, he went to Lothian.'[5] From Lothian, he returned to Scotland, visiting

Stirling, where he died.[6]

Proto-Fordun's description here appears to follow the older idea that 'Scotland' was

a geographical term meaning the area north of the Forth and south of Moray,

implying that such an interpretation was still understood when *Proto-Fordun* was

written in the 1280s. Several other examples of the narrower meaning also survive

in *Proto-Fordun*. For instance, a 'most wretched and widespread persecution of the

English' is said to have taken place in 1174, 'both in Scotland and in Galloway.'[7]

Caithness too is described as being outside of Scotland: in 1196, William I defeated

an uprising there, then 'returned to Scotland.'[8] Lothian is also excluded: in 1215,

Alexander II is recorded as having held a parliament at Edinburgh and a council at

Haddington in 1215, and 'from there the king entered Scotland,' meeting his

mother, the queen, at Forfar.[9]

While the author might have understood this meaning, however, and thus retained

it from his sources, it is unlikely that this was a standard interpretation by the

---

[2] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.44; Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' pp.4, 13 n.3.

[3] *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.103; Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.9.

[4] Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.4.

[5] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (p.279): 'de Moravia rediit in Scocia, de Scocia vero profectus in Laudoniam.'

[6] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (p.279).

[7] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11 (p.264): 'persecutio quoque tunc Anglorum miserrima maximaque, tam in Scocia quam Galwallia.'

[8] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 22 (pp.274-5): 'rex in Scociam remeavit.'

[9] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 33 (p.283): 'inde veniens rex in Scociam.'

1280s. Elsewhere in the chronicle, 'Scotland' is used to refer to a wider area: for example, in the chronicle's account of Malcolm IV's dealings with Moray in the 1160s, Moray appears to be regarded as part of Scotland, a realm which includes land either side of the Mounth.[10] The chronicle also records that in 1220, the prior of Durham and archdeacon of York gave absolution to the Scottish clergy, going 'through Scotland, from Berwick all the way to Arbroath.'[11] Most notably, the description of Scotland in Fordun's *Chronica,* likely written by *Proto-Fordun,* stated that, although Scotland's southern border had originally been the Forth (and at other times the Tyne and even the Humber), it was now the Tweed, while the northern boundary was the Pentland Firth.[12] The author of *Proto-Fordun* clearly understood the more limited geographic meaning of 'Scotland,' and was content to retain his source's use of it, but the wider political definition seems to have been his preference, having become commonplace by the 1280s.[13]

---

[10] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7). Rebel Moravians were removed from Moray by Malcolm IV and relocated 'over the rest of Scotland, both beyond the mountains and this side of the mountains': 'ita per ceteras, tam extramontanas Scociae, quam cismontanas, regiones, eam totam segregando, transtulit.' Moray and Caithness are also described as 'the utmost bounds of Scotland' ('ultimis in finibus Scociae') and 'the furthest bounds of Scotland,' ('in extremis Scociae finibus'): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 24, 42 (pp.276, 289-290).

[11] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'perambulaverunt Scociam a Berwic usque ad Abirbrothoc.' This description seems to have been retained from the source related to the *Chronicle of Melrose*, which also states that the two travelled through Scotland, beginning at Berwick (but omitting Arbroath): *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.52; Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.183.

[12] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.7 (pp.40-1): 'Modo quidem ad amnem Twedem incipit, a finibus Angliae borealibus;' 'in freto Pethtlandiae… terminatur.' The seemingly redundant point that Scotland begins at the northern boundary of England might be intended to imply that, while the land between the Forth and Tweed might not have always been part of Scotland, it was never part of England. John Barbour's *The Bruce*, written c.1375, similarly describes Edward I occupying 'all the land' of Scotland, 'fra Weik anent Orknay to Mullyr Snuk in Gallaway,' while later Robert I possessed all of Scotland, except Berwick, 'fra the Red Swyre to Orknay' (that is, Scotland lay between Redeswire, on the border with England, and Orkney): John Barbour, *The Bruce* (ed. A. A. M. Duncan) (Edinburgh, 1997), book 1, ll. 183-188 (p.55); book 17, l.13, p.617.

[13] *Proto-Fordun*'s preference for a definition of 'Scotland' that corresponded with the extent of the thirteenth-century kingdom is possibly also evident in a description of the ancient kingdom that survives in Fordun's *Chronica.* Fergus son of Erc is said to have ruled a kingdom 'on both sides of the Scottish sea… from Stainmore and Inchgall to the Orkney islands': Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.2 (p.88): 'universas regni regiones cis, citraque vadum Scoticum… de mora lapidea videlicet, et Inchegal ad insulas Orcades.' Broun has observed that this seems to have been an attempt to make sense of a confused source by rewriting it to make Fergus's kingdom match that of *Proto-Fordun*'s time: Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.166-170. That both ideas of Scotland continued to exist even into the 15th century is evident in Bower's version of William's death,

Indeed, where it is clear from the context that 'Scotland' is being used only in a more limited geographical sense, there is no corresponding sense that these other places lay outside the wider kingdom of the king of Scotland. Indeed, the chronicle is explicit in stating that they are part of the wider kingdom: the revolts of Moray and Galloway in the 1170s and 1180s are said to take place in 'the southern and northern parts of the kingdom.'[14] The chronicle states that, in retaliation for Alexander II's attack on Northumberland in 1215, the English king, John, brought an army 'into Lothian, laying waste and burning everything he could get at within the kingdom of Scotland.'[15] 'Kingdom of Scotland' had perhaps been preferred to 'Scotland' by *Proto-Fordun*'s source because John did not go beyond Haddington, halting his advance while still on the south side of the Forth.[16]

That *Proto-Fordun*'s understanding of 'Scotland' was arguably based more on political allegiance than geography is in keeping with the themes of the chronicle, much of which deals with the gradual assertion of royal authority over the wider Scottish kingdom. The author emphasises that outlying regions, such as Galloway, which retained a sense of their own distinct identity, were subject to the Scottish king.[17] Several kings were forced to venture 'into Galloway' to crush revolts.[18] After the capture of William, 'their king,' in 1174, the Galwegians 'treacherously' separated 'themselves from the kingdom of Scotland,' a description that

---

adapted from *Gesta Annalia I*, in which William enters Moray without leaving Scotland, and travels 'through,' rather than 'from,' Scotland to reach Lothian. At the same time, however, he describes Stirling as sitting at the boundary of Scotland and Britain: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, 8.79 (vol.4, pp.472-3).

[14] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 17 (pp.268-9): 'australi plaga regni simul et boreali regnicoli.'

[15] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 34 (pp.283-4): 'Et inde in Laudonia progressus est, devastans et comburens omnia quaecunque intra regnum Scociae potuit attingere.'

[16] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 34 (pp.283-4): 'ultra Hadingtone non processit.'

[17] The balance between this sense of regional and national identity is discussed in Keith J. Stringer, 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland: Alan son of Roland, Lord of Galloway and Constable of Scotland,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown Lordship and Community – Essays presented to G. W. S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.82-113.

[18] See, e.g. Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3, 14, 43 (pp.256, 266, 290-1). The *Chronicle of Melrose*'s account of Malcolm IV's 1160 campaigns in Galloway against 'them' has led some to think Malcolm campaigned in pursuit of the nobles who had opposed him at Perth, although *Gesta Annalia 3* suggests that Malcolm had settled with the nobles before this campaigning again rebels': *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), p.12; Richard Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 2000), p.80.

emphasises that Galloway was part of the kingdom.[19] At other times, however, the chronicle shows that Scottish kings were able to raise armies from the area.[20] William I gifted possession of 'the whole land of Galloway' to Roland for his efforts on behalf of the king and the kingdom, confirming the chronicle's understanding that Galloway was very much part of the Scottish kingdom.[21] Similarly, when Alan, lord of Galloway, did homage to John of England for a grant of lands in Ireland, he did so only with 'his lord the king's will and leave.'[22] Argyll too is presented as wholly part of the Scottish kingdom, despite also having a sense of a separate identity. Although Somerled is described as both 'sub-king' and 'king' of Argyll, his conflict with Malcolm IV in 1153 is called a 'civil war,' and at his death is described as having 'for twelve years been wrongfully in rebellion against King Malcolm, his rightful lord.'[23]

Likewise, Ross is described as part of William I's kingdom in the chronicle's account of his campaigns there in 1179: after the campaign, William 'returned to the southern parts of his kingdom.'[24] A later revolt in the region saw MacWilliam first seize 'from his king the whole of Ross,' then take 'the whole of Moray,' and finally lay waste to 'the greater part of the kingdom,' with the intention of seizing all of it.[25] This is presented by the chronicle as a conflict between the Scottish king and a disloyal subject, who sought the crown for himself (rather than trying to achieve

---

[19] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'post sui captivitatem regis conjuratione facta, se a regno Scociae eodem anno dividentes.'

[20] For example, William I in 1172 and Alexander II in 1222: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 10, 40 (pp.262-3, 288).

[21] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 18 (pp.269-70): 'totam terram Galwalliae.' The relationship of Roland and William I indicates both the increasing involvement of the crown in Galloway, and of Galloway in the kingdom: Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, pp.100-8.

[22] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 27 (p.278): 'de voluntate et licentia domini sui regis.' Indeed, it has been argued that William I might not only have permitted, but actually encouraged, this arrangement: Stringer, 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland,' pp.86-8.

[23] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 1 (pp.254-5): 'regulus Argadiae;' 'civilia bella.' 4 (pp.256-7): 'rex Ergadiae,' 'jam per annos duodecim contra regem Malcolmum, dominum suum, impie repugnans.'

[24] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 16 (p.268): 'ad australes regni sui plagas remeavit.' The implication of this is that going to Ross did not involving leaving the kingdom, only going to the northern parts of it.

[25] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 16 (p.268): 'Macwillelmum, sed vero nomine Donaldum Bane'; 'primum quidem totam Ross importunitate tirannidis suae a rege suo extorscrat, ac deinde totam Moraviam, non parvo tempore detinens, maximam partem regni caedibus et incendiis occupaverat, ad illud totum aspirando.'

independence or autonomy for his region).[26] William was described as leaving Scotland to campaign in Caithness in 1196, but the revolt is nevertheless treated as treachery by a noble who should have been a loyal subject.[27] Indeed, Harald, earl of Orkney, had been 'a good and loyal man' until, goaded by his wife, he rose against 'his lord the king.'[28] That the earldom was clearly subject to the Scottish crown is indicated by the eventual outcome of this revolt. After Harald was captured, following a further campaign in Moray and across the highlands, he made peace with the king, giving his son as a hostage.[29] Before long, however, in response to Harald's 'faithlessness' and breaking of the peace, the son was mutilated and died in captivity.[30] Harald escaped when another army was sent to Caithness, but as William prepared to sail after him to Orkney in 1202, Harald came to Perth to make peace again, and was restored to his earldom on payment of two-thousand pounds of silver to the king.[31]

*

Proto-Fordun is similarly certain that the various islands are part of the Scottish kingdom; indeed, their earliest inhabitants were the first Scots to arrive in Britain, and they were the original part of the kingdom. This is made clear in the account of the settlement of Scotland that survives in Fordun's *Chronica*, which describes

---

[26] Indeed, while the MacWilliams have often been associated with Moray in particular, it is not clear if they were ever in fact based there: Alasdair Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams,' in Seán Duffy, *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, warlords and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200 – 1600* (Dublin, 2007), pp.24-44 at p.32. The chronicle's portrayal of the MacWilliams and the people of Moray is discussed in the next chapter.

[27] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 22 (pp.274-5).

[28] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 22 (pp.274-5): 'usque ad id tempus bono viro et fideli,' 'contra regem dominum suum insurrexerat.'

[29] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 22 (p.274-5). The 'highland' areas given are Sutherland, Caithness and Ross: 'omnes illas montanas partes, scilicet, Suthirlandium, et Catenesiam, et Rossam.' This phrase here appears to be used simply to describe these areas as forming a generally mountainous region, rather than having any particular connotations of identity.

[30] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 22 (pp.274-5): 'propter infidelitatem patris.'

[31] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 24 (p.276).

Eochaid 'Rothai' as the first king of Scots to settle in the then-uninhabited islands, long before the Scots settled on the mainland.[32]

This point is reiterated in *Gesta Annalia I*'s account of the struggles between Edgar, son of Malcolm III and Saint Margaret, his uncle, Donald Bane, and his half-brother Duncan for the throne of Scotland after Malcolm's death. Magnus, the king of Norway, seized the opportunity provided by this discord and 'subdued the Orkneys and the Mevanian islands, of Scotland to his rule.'[33] The implication here is that even Orkney had not been part of Norway's dominion before this, and *Proto-Fordun* asserts that these islands formerly belonged to Scotland 'by ancient right,' a right far more ancient than any claims made by the kings of the British.[34] Not only were the islands part of the territory of Scotland, but its people were Scots; indeed, their ancestors had been the first Scots to arrive in Britain, and the Scots had held the

---

[32] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.28 (p.25).

[33] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (p.427): 'Orchades et Mevanias insulas Scociae regno suo adjecit.' Fordun alters this to the Orkney islands and the Mevanian islands 'both of Scotland and of England' ('Orcades insulas, et Mevanias Scociae et etiam Angliae regno suo subegit'): Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.24 (pp.223-4). The Mevanian islands usually referred to Man and Anglesey, though as Anglesey was never taken to be part of the Scottish kingdom, it could be (mis)used in *Proto-Fordun* to indicate Man and the Hebrides (which is what Skene took it to mean). Alternatively it could be a particularly patriotic description of Man, to emphasise the Scottish claim to it, while excluding Anglesey: Man had returned to Scottish control in 1264, not long before *Proto-Fordun* was composed, and is unambiguously described as a Scottish possession in an entry for 1263 (Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 55 (pp.299-300). Fordun appears to have added this distinction to similarly make a claim for Man as the 'Scottish' Mevanian, in the context of it having fallen out of Scottish control in 1346, or because he also misunderstood the term to mean the Hebrides (the 'Scottish' islands) and Man (the 'English' island). Elsewhere, Fordun describes William II of England taking 'the Orkney Islands, the Mevanians, and whatever other islands lie in the sea,' and then returning to England via Anglesey, but it is not clear if Anglesey is a Mevanian island or an 'other island': Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.26 (p.225)). Curiously, Bower then removes the distinction, stating that Magnus 'Orchades insulas et Mevanias Scocie regno suo subegit,' ('subdued to his rule the Orkney and Mevanian islands of Scotland,'), which had belonged to Scotland 'by ancient right.' It has been suggested that this was because Bower similarly misunderstood the term to indicate Man and the Hebrides: as Man had been in English hands for a century by Bower's time, he was either making a patriotic assertion of Scotland's claim to be the true overlords of the island, or he was taking political realities into account, instead emphasising Scotland's claim to the Hebrides and excluding Man. Given the changes made to the text at each stage, it would appear that the chroniclers were not simply blithely copying their sources verbatim, but it would be strange that all of them, over 150 years, misunderstood the conventional meaning of Mevanian (unless it had a acquired a distinctive usage within Scotland): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.29 (vol. 3, pp.86-7, 226 n.51).

[34] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (p.427): 'Quae antiquo jure, ut quidam volunt, ad regni Britannici, ymmo verius antiquissimo jure ad imperium regni Scoticani pertinere solebant.' Fordun and Bower do not mention the Britons here: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.24 (pp.223-4); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.29 (vol. 3, pp.84-7).

island without interruption since 'the time of Eochaid Rothai, Simón Brecc's great-grandson, who was the first of all the Scots to dwell in the islands,' some five hundred years before Fergus, son of Feredach, was the first Scottish king in Albion.[35]

The identity of the islands as part of the Scottish realm is reasserted during the chronicle's account of the conflict with Hakon IV of Norway in 1263. The chronicle states that Hakon claimed 'that all the islands of Scotland which lie between Ireland and Scotland were his by right of inheritance.'[36] In 1266, however, Hakon's successor, Magnus VI, agreed a settlement with Alexander III, which gave the Scottish king 'all the islands between Scotland and Ireland,' and renounced any claims made on them by Magnus or his predecessors, in exchange for Alexander III's payment of 4000 silver marks within two years, and a further 100 marks annually.[37] The chronicle notes, however, that 'although this agreement had pleased some, to many it was unsatisfactory.'[38] This appears to be because it was regarded as an unnecessary concession: after all, 'the Scots had possessed them [the islands] continually, without interruption,' since Eochaid 'Rothai' had brought them to the islands (except for the brief interlude when the Norwegians had taken advantage of the conflict between the sons of Malcolm III and their uncle for the succession to take the islands under their control).[39]

---

[35] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8): 'Nam a tempore regis Ethdaci Rothay pronepote Symonis Brek, qui primus Scotorum insulas incoluit, hucusque, videlicet, per spatium duorum millium annorum, vel amplius, et antequam rex Scotorum Fergus filius Feredaci solum intravit Albionis per annos pene quingentos, easdem insulas continue Scoti etiam sine aliqua interruptione possidebant.' Eochaid Rothay seems to have originated as a misreading of 'Echdach Buadaig' as 'Echdach Rothai' in the twelfth century, with the association with Rothesay coming later: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.223-9; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.71.
[36] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 55 (pp.299-300): 'Dicebat enim, omnes insulas Scociae, inter Hiberniam et Scociam sitas, jure hereditario suas esse.'
[37] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 57 (pp.301-2): 'omnes insulas, quae sunt inter Scociam et Hiberniam.'
[38] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 57 (pp.301-2): 'Et quamvis haec quibusdam placuerat conventio, pluribus attamen displicuit.'
[39] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 57 (pp.301-2): 'Scoti, nulla interruption praepediti, easdem continuo possiderunt.' Unsurprisingly, Norwegian sources such as the *Saga of Haakon Haakonsson* demonstrate a rather different understanding of who should have ultimate authority in Argyle and the Hebrides: Alan Orr Anderson (ed.), *Early Sources of Scottish History, A.D. 500 to 1286* (2nd edition, Stamford, 1990), vol.2, pp.463-476, 540-557, 605, 608-642.

It is unusual for the chronicle to suggest that the islands actually passed out of Scottish sovereignty, and it does not record when they might have returned to Scottish allegiance. It is striking, however, that the chronicle insists that the islands were not only rightfully part of the Scottish kingdom, but that they had been inhabited by Scots even before there was a Scottish kingdom. The use of the term 'Britain' is also notable: this appears to be a term that is entirely geographical in meaning, referring solely to that island, part of which was to become known as Scotland, and form the bulk of the Scottish kingdom.

*

This understanding of the development of the Scottish kingdom, in which the islands of the west were the first places to be inhabited by the Scots who would found the kingdom, would seem to imply that the term 'Scotland' should always have included the isles, in a way that it did not always include Lothian or Galloway. The Isle of Man, on the other hand, occupies a more ambiguous place within *Proto-Fordun*. It is presented as subject to the Scottish crown, without necessarily being part of Scotland itself. Man is one of the islands taken by Magnus of Norway in the eleventh century, and the chronicle appears to regard it as being a Scottish possession at that time, while in 1263 Man is included among the Scottish islands that were claimed by Hakon: to enforce his claim, Hakon 'took the castles of Bute and Man.'[40]

After Hakon's death, Alexander III met the 'sub-king [of Man]' at Dumfries, who did homage to Alexander for 'his sub-kingdom, to be held forever from him [Alexander].'[41] They agreed that Alexander would provide 'safe shelter for him and his in Scotland,' in case of Norwegian attack, while the king of Man would provide

---

[40] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (p.427); *Gesta Annalia* 55 (pp.299-300): 'Ideoque castella de Bothe et Mann cepit.'
[41] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1): 'Ubi occurrens idem regulus, homo regis Scociae devenit, homagium sibi pro suo regniculo faciens imperpetuum de se tenendo.'

ten war galleys as often as 'his lord, the king of Scotland,' required.[42] The language of this passage suggests that although the Scottish king was overlord of Man, the island itself was not necessarily part of the kingdom of Scotland, and the Manx king, although clearly of lesser status than Alexander, seems to have been of higher status than the Scottish nobles who held their own lands on similar terms.[43] Although the description of Magnus' invasion of the islands in 1098 asserts that Man was among those belonging to Scotland 'by ancient right,' the island is not described elsewhere as being among the islands settled by the Scots in ancient times, and Alexander appears to be providing safety for a vassal rather than protecting the island itself or a population of Scots: he was taking advantage of the power vacuum to secure Man's loyalty, but not actually annexing it to his kingdom.[44] According to the chronicle's interpretation, Man was long subject to the Scots but not inhabited by them.

Within *Proto-Fordun*, however, there nevertheless remained a geographical element to the definition of 'Scotland.' The Tweed remained the southern boundary, even if the Scottish king ruled beyond it.[45] For example, the chronicle describes the Northumbrians swearing fealty to Malcolm III, but also states that they were still 'dwellers in his [William I of England's] borders.'[46] The (enforced) political allegiance of the Northumbrians changed neither their national identity nor

---

[42] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1): 'refugium sibi salvum et suis habuerit in Scocia futuris de cetero temporibus,' 'regi Scociae domino.'

[43] The king of Man is described as 'rex Manniae', then 'regulus', 'regulus Manniae', and the Isle of Man itself as 'regniculo': Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1).

[44] Similarly, Fordun includes Man in the list of the islands between Scotland and Ireland (a chapter titled 'The Islands of Scotia, apart from the Orkneys,' and likely to be Fordun's work), stating that it is subject to the Scottish crown and its prince ('regulus') must provide his lord, the king of Scotland, with ten galleys as needed, along with other services, but he does not explicitly refer to it as part of Scotland: *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.10 (pp.43-4). The arrangement refers to the terms agreed between Alexander III and Magnus in 1264, which did not reflect the reality of Fordun's time (Man having left Scottish hands in 1346), so it is possible the description was from *Proto-Fordun* or another source. Bower leaves this description of Man unchanged, other than having 'Caibonia' instead of 'Eubonia' as the ancient name of Man: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.10 (vol. 1, pp.186-7, 344 n. 5-8).

[45] The boundary between the kingdoms seems to have been fairly fixed and widely even before the Treaty of York in 1237: G.W.S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the eleventh to the fourteenth century* (2nd edition, Edinburgh, 2003), pp.112-29.

[46] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 16, 17 (pp.419-20): 'quidam finium suorum incolae, habitatores, scilicet, Northumbriae.'

the boundaries of the kingdoms. Like Man, they were subject to the king of Scots without being part of his kingdom.

Similarly, the chronicle states that when David I raised an army against Stephen of England, in support of his niece the Empress Matilda in 1137, he subjugated England from 'the river Tees to the river Tweed, and from Rey Cross at Stainmore to the river Esk'; that is, from the border as far south as the Tees and Rey Cross.[47] David's peace agreement with Stephen proposed that his son, Henry, 'should do homage to King Stephen for the earldom of Huntingdon, and freely hold the earldom of Northumberland.'[48] This solution avoided the indignity of the Scottish king himself performing homage, but also makes it clear that the territories were not annexed to the Scottish kingdom. *Proto-Fordun* likewise states that, when knighting the future Henry II (his great-nephew), David received a pledge from him that Henry's heirs would not take back any part of the lands that had 'through this feud with England, passed into the dominion of the king of Scots.'[49] Such terms make it clear that, despite falling into Scottish hands, the territory was not itself part of the Scottish kingdom and not inhabited by people considered to be Scottish.[50]

*

Proto-Fordun primarily uses the term 'Scotland' to refer to the realm of the king of Scotland, interpreting the term politically rather than geographically. It is evident, however, that although this had become the dominant interpretation by the 1280s,

---

[47] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 37 (p.433-4): 'aquilonares Angliae regiones, videlicet, a flumine These usque flumen Twede, et a Rercors de Stanmor usque ad flumen Esk, sibi subjugavit.' See also Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.42 (vol. 3, pp.128-31). It has been argued that David I took Cumberland and Westmorland to be part of his Scottish kingdom but did not regard Northumberland in the same way: Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots,* p.118.

[48] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 37 (p.433-4): 'homagium pro comitatu Huntingdoniae faceret regi Stephano, et comitatum Northumbriae libere possideret.'

[49] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 37 (p.433-4): 'quae in ejusdem regis Scotorum dominium ex Anglia dissensione transissent.'

[50] This distinction was reinforced by David having his eldest grandson, Malcolm, taken around Scotland to be acknowledged as heir to the kingdom, while his younger grandson, William, was taken to Newcastle to receive the subjection of the Northumbrian leaders: Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 39 (p.435-6).

the older geographical meaning of the term was still understood, and *Proto-Fordun* was content to retain the usage of his sources. Where regions such as Lothian and Galloway are referred to as lying outwith Scotland, however, the chronicle also asserts their (theoretical) allegiance to the Scottish crown, placing them firmly within the wider kingdom. Outbreaks of revolts in these areas are consistently portrayed as treachery towards a rightful king of the same nation, showing little interest in how such actions might be perceived within such regions (as legitimate responses to royal encroachment, for example).

At the same time, there is no sense that Scottish-controlled parts of England should be considered parts of the Scottish kingdom, even if culturally and linguistically, as well as politically, the population might be supposed to have much in common with that of southern Scotland (and likewise, areas temporarily lost to a rival crown are not treated as part of that kingdom instead). Indeed, this distinction became ever more clearly defined during the period covered by the chronicle, as seen in the elaborate hierarchy of oaths in which the Scottish heir performed homage for lands in England, acknowledging that such lands were not part of the Scottish kingdom without impugning the independence and dignity of the Scottish crown.

Through its uses of this wider definition of Scotland, *Proto-Fordun* gives a clear sense of a kingdom whose geographical extent was widely recognised and firmly established, presenting a sense of Scotland as a unified territory, inhabited by the Scottish people. This understanding is presented consistently throughout the text. Regions temporarily brought under the sway of the Scottish king are not treated by *Gesta Annalia I* as becoming part of Scotland; similarly, once these boundaries are established, areas temporarily lost to a rival crown are not treated as part of that kingdom instead.

II

This idea of the territorial integrity of Scotland would be severely tested by the events described in *Gesta Annalia II*, as large swathes of the kingdom fell under

English occupation and government. *Gesta Annalia II*, however, shares with *Proto-Fordun* a clear sense of the kingdom's extent and its geographical unity, which is not affected by the particular political allegiance of a given time, a point that the chronicler perhaps sought to emphasise in the context of the negotiations over David II's ransom and the possible succession of one of Edward III's sons. Although Edward I might have disagreed, the chronicle makes it clear, for example, that although he made most of Scotland south of the Forth 'fully and entirely under his control,' this area was still part of Scotland.[51] Likewise, an expedition of Edward III is described as taking place in Scotland, though it reaches no further than Haddington, south of the Forth.[52]

Similarly, outlying parts of the kingdom and areas with an apparently strong sense of regional identity are clearly included as part of Scotland, even if they have temporarily sworn allegiance to someone who is not the rightful king of Scotland (as Edward Balliol is portrayed in *Gesta Annalia II*) or if their leaders were in conflict with the rightful king, as can be seen in the struggles of Robert I to secure his position. His many trials in the early years of his reign included time 'left alone in the islands,' until Christiana of the Isles helped restore him to his earldom of Carrick.[53] Opposition to his realm came from many sources, including at times the 'Galwegians' and the 'men of Argyll.'[54] There is no sense that these are any different to the opposition he faces from elsewhere in the kingdom, and these regions are described in the same terms as other parts of Scotland. Armed groups are distinguished by region several times in the chronicle: at the battle of Falkirk in 1297, for example, both the men of Fife and the Brendans (that is, the men of Bute) found themselves cut off from the rest of the Scottish forces.[55] Similarly, regions are

---

[51] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'quae plenarie et integre suo tunc subjacebant imperio.' The description appears to be used to indicate that while these territories had submitted to Edward, they were not part of England: the French king similarly rules over both France and also 'other countries which lay under his control,' ('omni parte regni sui, regionibusque aliis, quae suae ditioni subjacebant'), without them becoming part of France itself: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 177 (p.375).

[52] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 176 (p.374).

[53] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 121 (pp.342-3): 'nunc solus in insulis relictus.'

[54] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 125 (p.345): 'Galwidienses'; 126 (p.345): 'Eradienses.'

[55] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330).

often given a geographical or political description to indicate their extent without any sense that these areas are not part of Scotland; descriptions such as 'the whole land [of Argyll]' are in this sense no different from others such as the 'whole land of Gowrie, Angus and Mearns.'[56]

As with *Proto-Fordun*, the Isle of Man has a somewhat more ambiguous status in *Gesta Annalia II*, and does not appear to be particularly regarded as part of Scotland, even if it is subject to the Scottish king. There is a single reference to Man in the text: in 1313, Robert I took the island's castles and 'brought the land under his sway.'[57] As noted above, this phrase is often used of places that are subject to a king from a different kingdom or territory, and it is not clear from the context whether the chronicle treats this instance as a case of Robert bringing part of his kingdom back under his control, as with Argyll, or as an expedition to secure the loyalty of a distinct, separate territory (as Ireland is clearly regarded in the account of Edward Bruce's expeditions there); there is no mention of a rebellious local lord or people, only of Robert's subjection of the island. [58] *Gesta Annalia II* appears, then, to regard Man, as a distinct, separate territory, albeit one brought under Scottish dominion, a perspective that it appears to share with *Proto-Fordun*.

Berwick, by contrast, seems to be treated as having once been actually part of Scotland, but which instead became part of England. Its location on the boundary between the two kingdoms perhaps meant that such a change did not disrupt the sense of territorial unity expressed elsewhere in the text. At the beginning of *Gesta Annalia II*, for example, Berwick is clearly a Scottish possession; Edward I came there to judge the Great Cause, and John Balliol garrisoned the town in preparation for Edward's coming invasion. The garrison was defeated, however, after Edward I used fake banners and ensigns to trick them into believing his army was actually a

---

[56] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 126 (p.345): 'Ergadiae, et totam terram'; 156 (p.362): 'tota terra de Goury, de Angus, et de Mernys.' Indeed, the chronicle also refers to the 'whole land of Allerton' ('tota terra de Allirdale') in England: 100 (p.329).
[57] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 130 (p.346): 'terram suae ditioni subjiciens.'
[58] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 132 (p.347).

Scottish force come to relieve them.[59] The entire garrison was wiped out, and Edward I slew 7500 inhabitants, of both sexes and all ages: if true, this would have represented most, perhaps nearly all, of the town's population.[60] It is not clear if the inhabitants themselves were regarded as Scottish or English, or a mixture, although it would perhaps have made little difference either way given Edward's insistence that hostile Scots were disloyal subjects rebelling against his rightful rule, rather than defenders of their own separate kingdom.

Berwick was recaptured by the Scots in 1318 after being 'in the hands of the English for twenty years.'[61] It had been the centre of English administration in Scotland and was the scene of the execution of Nigel Bruce and other nobles in 1306.[62] The description appears to suggest that English possession of the town was only temporary, and although the existing population had largely been wiped out in 1296 by Edward I, the town's new inhabitants likely comprised people from both sides of the border. Edward II failed to recapture the town the next year, and in 1320 the chronicle records that Robert I met there with papal legates, suggesting it had been re-integrated into the administration of the Scottish kingdom and resumed some of its former importance.[63] The town's continued prominence, and the significance of its location at the frontier of both kingdoms, is also shown by its being the site of the marriage of Robert's son, the future David II, to Joan, sister of Edward III, in 1328, perhaps to symbolise the (intended) future amity and unity of the two kingdoms.[64]

Berwick changed hands again in 1333, when it was surrendered to Edward III after the Scottish defeat at Halidon Hill ended the garrison's hope of relief. The chronicle does not describe this event in negative terms: rather, it meant 'saving for all the

---

[59] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 90 (p.324).
[60] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 90 (p.324).
[61] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 133 (p.348): 'quae fuit in minibus Anglorum per XX annos.'
[62] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 120 (p.342).
[63] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 135 (pp.348-349).
[64] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 142 (p.353).

inhabitants their lives, limbs and posssesions.'[65] This sympathy for common folk and preference for peace and order over war is typical of *Gesta Annalia II*: although the chronicle does not elsewhere tend to accept English occupation as the price of peace, the suffering inflicted on everyone, regardless of nationality, during times of war is a recurrent theme of the text. Although the chronicle is not explicit, it appears to imply that the entire town had resisted the siege, and that they were spared for surrendering, suggesting that the inhabitants identified themselves with the Scottish cause (rather than as an English town occupied and overseen by a Scottish garrison).[66]

By the time Berwick is next mentioned in the text, however, that no longer seems to be the case. In 1355, Scottish forces attempted to recapture the town, whose inhabitants, 'panic-stricken at the sudden arrival of the Scots,' fled, abandoning their gold and silver.[67] It is clear from the populace's reaction that the Scots were regarded as enemies, rather than compatriots.[68] The chronicle is critical of the Scots' treatment of the town: in contrast to Edward III, who had generously spared its population, these soldiers 'dealt unmercifully with what their enemies had, with much time and work, gathered together for themselves,' demonstrating again the author's sympathy for common people and distaste for greed and violence.[69] These Scots might have been serving a patriotic cause, but the chronicle does not hesitate to condemn such behaviour.

---

[65] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 149 (pp.356-7): 'salvis habitantibus in ea universis vita, membris et possessionibus.' Bower is more expressly critical of Edward III, stating he executed the hostage, Thomas Seton, a day before the agreed upon date for the town's surrender (although he still then spares the town), but *Gesta Annalia II* differs from other Scottish accounts in saying that execution took place because Alexander Seton refused to give up the town, even though the time had expired: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.27 (vol. 7, pp.90-3); Iain A. MacInnes, '"Shock and Awe": The Use of Terror as a Psychological Weapon During the Bruce-Balliol Civil War, 1332-1338,' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.40-59 at pp.51-52.

[66] Compare this sympathetic treatment of the inhabitants with that of Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.27 (vol. 7, pp.90-3), in which the townspeople, while explicitly Scottish, are blamed for selfishly and misguidedly urging the Scottish army to fight a battle that it could not win at Halidon Hill.

[67] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 173 (p.372): 'de subito adventu gentis Scotorum pavore perterriti.'

[68] Indeed, Bower's account of this assault on Berwick explicitly refers to the townspeople as English (perhaps to help excuse the Scots' actions): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.10 (vol. 7, pp.280-283).

[69] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 173 (p.372): 'at illi sine misericordia tractabant qui sibi multo tempore ac labore adversarii congregarunt.'

That the town was no longer regarded as Scottish is emphasised by the following chapter: Edward III feared that, if he left Berwick under Scottish occupation, 'they would take the place and the people from him.'[70] Although the inhabitants were not Scottish, it was considered possible with time for the Scottish crown to secure their loyalty and gain control of the area.[71] In the event, the Scots agreed to surrender the town when Edward's army arrived, as they were few in number and were unlikely to receive help 'from their own race, due to the feuds among the magnates.'[72] The criticism of Scotland's nobles is a familiar refrain in the chronicle, which repeatedly accuses them of pursuing selfish ends at the expense of the security and prosperity of the kingdom and its people. Though the Scots had feared his wrath, Edward III, by contrast, was magnanimous and kept to his word to let all the Scots leave unharmed, a sympathetic treatment that perhaps fits with the notion that *Gesta Annalia II* was related to efforts to persuade the Scottish nobility of the desirability of a marriage alliance between the children of Edward III and David II.[73]

Two later additions to the main text (which ends in 1363), which appear in some of the surviving manuscripts, record attempts to take Berwick Castle that support the sense that Berwick, even if the Scots maintained a claim to it, was no longer inhabited by Scots. In 1378, a force of commoners successfully took the castle, only for it soon to be retaken and all the Scots slain.[74] This appears to have been an opportunistic raid, without higher authority, rather than a patriotic movement of the low-born (like the armies of William Wallace). Similarly, a 1384 attempt saw the

---

[70] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 174 (p.373): 'timensque, si dimitteret eos sic, extollerat ei locum et gentem.' Cf. Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.12 (vol. 4, pp.286-7).

[71] The fluidity of allegiances in the border regions during this period is discussed in Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' pp.94-115.

[72] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 174 (p.373): 'tum quia succursum a gente sua, propter principum discordiam.' The use of 'gente' here indicates the Scots raiders were now surrounded by people of a different race.

[73] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 174 (p.373). Bower adds that the Scots not only left unharmed but 'more or less marvelously enriched,' as they were allowed to keep their plunder, a further sign of Edward's generosity to his foes (if not so much to his own subjects), and giving the Scots a small measure of triumph, for their wise and successful negotiations, in what would otherwise have been a squalid failure: 'quasi unusquisque mirabiliter locupletatus, expedite ad propria remeavit.'

[74] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 187 (p.382): 'quosdam mediocres.'

Scots take the castle, although they soon surrendered it back to the English.[75] In both cases, the inhabitants of the region oppose the Scots, and are not regarded as Scottish themselves.

Like Berwick, the castle of Roxburgh changed hands several times, and would play a central role in English administration of the region; *Gesta Annalia II* appears to regard it as no longer automatically, inherently, part of the Scottish kingdom.[76] After he took Berwick in 1355, Edward III based himself at Roxburgh 'before advancing any further into the land of Scotland.'[77] This somewhat ambiguous description might imply that, by being in Roxburgh, Edward was already in Scotland, but the next chapter says that Edward III only 'entered the land of Scotland' after marching on from Roxburgh, having met there with Edward Balliol.[78]

Although the boundary between the two kingdoms was itself fairly fixed, and is treated as such in both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, it was also fluid, in that people moved across it frequently, whether with violent or peaceful intent, and with regular changes of sovereignty in particular areas. This seems to have encouraged an understanding that claims of loyalty were expedient and not necessarily permanent, at least in the areas immediately along the border, without undermining the overall sense that both kingdoms had a distinct territorial integrity.[79] The national identity of a town or territory, as opposed to the loyalty of

---

[75] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 187 (p.382).

[76] James Douglas' capture of the castle in 1314 is its first appearance in the chronicle. In 1336, however, it is listed as one of the castles strengthened by the English, and in 1342 it was captured by Alexander Ramsay. It was then surrendered to the English, along with Hermitage Castle, after the defeat at Neville's Cross in 1346: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 130, 155, 161, 165 (pp.346, 360-1, 365, 367).

[77] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 175 (p.373): 'apud Roxburgh personaliter existenti, priusquam ulterius in terram Scociae progrederetur.'

[78] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 176 (p.374): 'terram Scociae crudeliter intravit.' Indeed, the chapter is headed 'The King of England comes to Scotland' ('De adventu regis Angliae in Scociam'). As Edward III only went as far as Haddington, there is no sense that Scotland was being used to only mean those lands north of the Forth, while the use of 'terram' suggests that Scotland is being used in a geographic rather than political sense.

[79] Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati,*' pp.97-113; Andy King, 'Best of Enemies: Were the Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Scottish Marches a "Frontier Society"?' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.116-135 at pp.130-131.

particular individuals, seems to have shifted only gradually, usually within a limited area accompanied by long-term occupation or population movements (forcible or otherwise), as the chronicle suggests took place in Berwick and Roxburgh.[80]

*

Proto-Fordun, through retaining the usage of its sources, hints at the development of the word 'Scotland', from having referred to a territory limited to the land north of the Forth and south of Moray (even though the king of Scotland ruled areas inhabited by Scots outside of these limits), to a meaning that encompassed more or less the entirety of the realm subject to that king (or, at least, all those parts of the kingdom chiefly inhabited by Scots). For the author of *Proto-Fordun* himself, however, the geographical, ethnic and political meanings of Scotland came to mean essentially the same thing: the land of Scotland was now the same as the place inhabited by the Scots and the realm ruled by the king of Scots, and this unity seems to have been firmly established during the period covered by the chronicle.

In *Gesta Annalia II*, this usage, indicating the full extent of the kingdom, is standard, and the sense of national identity suggested by this unity is such that even when one element of it is removed, for example because another king has claimed sovereignty over an area, occupied it and brought in a non-Scottish population, or because there is not even a king of Scots at all, what was understood by the term was not affected. This applied even in the most contested areas of southern Scotland during the Wars of Independence.[81] Scotland continued to mean a particular territory; a realm theoretically loyal to the king of Scots; and the lands traditionally inhabited by the Scots. These were all identified together as Scotland.

---

[80] As Brown points out that, although most of the nobility of southern Scotland submitted to the English kings at some point in this period, the English crown struggled to achieve consistent, long-standing support in the region, in contrast to Robert I: Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' pp.111-112.
[81] King, 'Best of Enemies,' p.135.

CHAPTER THREE: The Scottish People

I

In the 1440s, Walter Bower ended the *Scotichronicon*, his enormous history of the Scottish people, with a stirring declaration: 'Christ! He is not a Scot who is not pleased with this book.'[1] For Bower, the essential definition of a Scot was fairly straightforward: someone from Scotland, subject to the king of Scotland, who enjoyed the *Scotichronicon*. His chronicle followed *Proto-Fordun* (via Fordun) in describing the origins of the Scottish people from its earliest roots, its descent from Scota and Gaedel. By this interpretation, the Scots were a distinct group even before they arrived in Scotland, which they found mostly empty and eventually came to occupy entirely by themselves, having defeated or driven out any would-be fellow inhabitants. The Scots were the only rightful inhabitants of Scotland, subject to no other king but their own. This idea of regnal solidarity, of a unity between the people and the kingdom, which was also expressed in documents such as the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320, is particularly relevant to the discussion of Scottish identity, for the Scots were not unified in other ways: they lacked, for example, a single shared language that was distinctly theirs (unlike other kingdoms such as England and France, or even the Welsh and Irish people), yet this did not prevent the development of the overall idea of a single, distinct nation.

Yet despite Bower's apparent certainty, 'Scot' had not always been used to describe all the inhabitants of the kingdom. Indeed, the term had also applied to people who were expressly not part of the kingdom, for even into the tenth century 'Scoti' continued to be used to mean the Irish as well as the Scots.[2] Moreover, just as the term 'Scotland' had not always referred to the entirety of the realm, so the

---

[1] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 16.39 (vol. 8, pp.340-1).
[2] As Broun has pointed out, however, this was rather more of a literary (Latin) problem than a contemporary, vernacular one, for Gaelic speakers in Scotland in the tenth century called themselves *Albanaig*, and used *Goidil* to indicate the Irish: Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.9.

inhabitants of outlying regions such as Galloway and Lothian were not consistently referred to as 'Scots' until late into the thirteenth century.

Indeed, the meaning of these two terms, Scotland and Scot, did not always develop in conjunction. While the monks of Melrose described, in their chronicle, their own region as part of Scotland in 1216, in the same year they also portrayed the Scots as belonging to a different group, and they did not clearly identify themselves or those from the region as Scots until an entry in 1265.[3] Similarly, until the 1180s, royal charters in Scotland, as in England, often included a 'racial address' identifying the different groups to whom the charter applied, which, as well as Scots, included groups such as English, Welsh, French or Galwegian.[4] Contemporary writers greeted with astonishment the variety of races in the armies of David I, including not only Scots but Normans, Germans, English, Northumbrians, Cumbrians, men of Teviotdale and Lothian, Picts, Galwegians, men of the isles and Moravians.[5]

It is important to identify, therefore, not only whether there is a sense in the texts of the Scots as forming a single, unified people (and which groups are included or excluded from this), but also the extent to which such ideas of Scotland and of the Scots correspond in *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*. In both texts, not everyone living in Scotland, nor everyone subject to the Scottish crown, is necessarily considered Scottish, but although there is evidence of distinctive regional identities (particularly in military contexts), these do not necessarily contradict or undermine the sense of a wider national identity and unity. The two texts describe important periods in the development of Scottish identity, including not only the early origins of the Scots, but also changes to the Norwegian presence in the north and islands,

---

[3] In an entry for 1265 (although it was possibly written even later, in 1285x1291), Richard of Roxburgh, a Melrose monk, is described as a Scot: *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), pp.44-5, 103. Similarly, the thirteenth-century monks of Dunfermline who compiled a book of the miracles of Saint Margaret seem to have drawn a distinction between a local inhabitant and a Scot: Bartlett, *The Miracles of Saint Aebbe and Saint Margaret,* pp.xli, 84-5; Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.9; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, p.153; Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel,*' pp.64-8.

[4] G.W.S. Barrow, *Regesta Regum Scottorum II: The Acts of William I King of Scots 1165-1214* (Edinburgh, 1971) p.77; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.126-7.

[5] Edward J. Cowan, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review* 63 (1984), pp.111-35 at p.132.

the introduction (encouraged by the crown) of Anglo-Norman and Flemish noble families and, perhaps most significantly, the Wars of Independence and the effect these had on the relationship between Scotland and England.

*

In later centuries, Scotland would often be described as consisting of two different ethnic groups, with their own distinct languages and culture. This idea of Scotland as consisting of two distinct ethnic groups was notably expressed in a passage in Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* that has been attributed to the author of *Proto-Fordun*, demonstrating that the concept already existed as early as the 1280s.[6] *Proto-Fordun* described the inhabitants of Scotland as consisting of two markedly different groups, separated by language, which, for the author, explained the difference in customs and characteristics between these two groups.[7] Those who spoke the 'Teutonic' language ('*Theutonica*,' i.e. English) lived on the coasts and plains (the '*gens maritima*'), while those who spoke the 'Scottish' language ('*Scotica*,' i.e. Gaelic) lived in the mountains and islands (the '*gens montana*').[8] *Proto-Fordun* states that the '*gens montana*' were a 'fierce and untameable race, rude and unpleasant, much given to theft, fond of doing nothing, but quick to learn, and cunning, handsome in appearance, but their clothing is unsightly.'[9] By contrast, the '*gens maritima*' were a 'docile and civilised people, trustworthy, patient and courteous, decent in their attire, polite and peaceable, devout in worship, but

---

[6] Indeed, the depiction also built on stereotypes of barbarism and civilisation with a yet older heritage: Martin MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity in the Later Middle Ages,' in Dauvit Broun & Martin MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), pp.7-48 at pp.7-15.

[7] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'Mores autem Scotorum secundum diversitatem linguarum variantur,' ('the manners and customs of the Scots vary according to the difference of their language'). See also MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity,' p.19.

[8] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42).

[9] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42): 'ferina gens est et indomita, rudis, et immorigerata, raptu capax, otium diligens, ingenio docilis et callida, forma spectabilis, sed amictu deformis.'

always ready to resist injuries from their enemies.'[10] Notably, by calling these languages 'Scotica' and 'Theutonica,' the author appears to have been at pains to distinguish the languages of the Scots from those of Ireland and England.[11] He further distinguishes the languages of Scotland from those of her neighbours by noting that the highlanders were 'hostile not only to the English people and language, but also to their own nation, due to the difference in language.'[12] For Proto-Fordun, the language of England and of Lowland Scots was not the same. Likewise, although he notes that Isidore of Seville described, in the sixth century, the common origins of the Scots and the Irish, and their shared language and culture, Proto-Fordun continues to distinguish between the races and languages of the 'Scotica gens' and those of 'Hibernia.'[13]

Despite these apparent differences in their characters, the chronicle makes it clear that, whether they spoke Gaelic or English, they are all Scots.[14] The Gaelic-speakers, despite being wild and hostile are 'faithful and obedient to their king and kingdom,' and law-abiding if they were governed well.[15] The observation that the highland

---

[10] Skene (ed.), Chronica Gentis Scotorum 2.9 (p.42): 'domestica gens est et culta, fida, patiens et urbana, vestitu siquidem honesta, civilis atque pacifica, circa cultum divinum devota, sed et obviandis hostium injuriis semper prona.'

[11] The choice of 'Teutonic' perhaps also indicates an awareness that Scots (Inglis) and English were both related to Germanic languages: Bower, Scotichronicon, vol. 1 p.343 n.2

[12] Skene (ed.), Chronica Gentis Scotorum 2.9 (p.42):'populo quidem Anglorum et linguae, sed et propriae nationi, propter linguarum diversitatem, infesta.' Cf. Bower, Scotichronicon 2.9 (vol. 1, pp.184-185).

[13] Skene (ed.), Chronica Gentis Scotorum 2.9 (p.42). This passage, attributed to Isidore, is in fact from Bartholomew, and omits a section less flattering to the Scots, which explains that the wildness of lowland Scots had been tamed through the influence of the English: Bower, Scotichronicon, vol. 1, p.343 n.30-40; MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity,' p.15.

[14] The negative elements of this characterisation of Gaelic-speaking Scots (which likely included the author) has provoked debate as to whether this chapter provides evidence of the existence of a nascent concept of the 'Highland Line.' Although there is little evidence of any awareness of such an idea, there are also signs of a negative attitude towards Gaelic-speakers that originated in the writings of English-speaking clerics (based mostly in lowland areas) in the twelfth century, building (as Fordun does here) on older, classical stereotypes of barbarians: see, for example, G.W.S. Barrow, 'The lost Gàidhealtachd of medieval Scotland,' in William Gillies (ed.), Gaelic and Scotland: Alba agus a' Ghàidhlig (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.67-88; Barrow, The Kingdom of the Scots, chapter 16: 'The highlands in the lifetime of Robert the Bruce' (pp.332-349); Broun, 'Attitudes of Gall to Gaedhel,' pp.49-82; Alexander Grant, Independence and Nationhood: Scotland 1306-1469 (Edinburgh, 1984), pp.200-206.

[15] Skene (ed.), Chronica Gentis Scotorum 2.9 (p.42): 'Regi tamen et regno fidelis et obediens, necnon faciliter legibus subdita, si regatur.'

Scots will obey the law if they are well-led reflects an attitude present throughout *Proto-Fordun* (and also found in *Gesta Annalia II*) that it is the duty of a king to promote peace and justice in his kingdom, and prevent the in-fighting of the nobility. The Scots might belong to two different 'gens', but they belong to the same, single, unified Scottish 'nation' ('*natio*') and are subject to the same king.[16]

Both 'gens' and 'natio' were standard medieval terms for peoples or races; both terms carry a sense of shared descent, a fitting reminder for clerical authors that all races are ultimately descended from Adam.[17] Within *Proto-Fordun*, 'gens' is often used to refer to the Scottish people as a whole, but throughout the chronicle this distinction between 'natio' and 'gens' is made when the two terms appear together.[18] For example, Scotland is described as having been occupied in ancient by two 'races [gens] of different nations [natio],' i.e. the Picts and the Scots, making both an ethnic and a political distinction between the two groups, highlighting that they were not the same kingdom.[19] Similarly, Gurgunt, king of the Britons, is said to rule a great many 'races [gens] of his own nation [natio],' highlighting that his nation contained a variety of tribes or peoples.[20] The Irish are described as 'the Irish

---

[16] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42). As Grant has observed, *Proto-Fordun's* careful distinction has frequently been obscured by the translations of both '*gens*' and '*natio*' as 'race' (as in Felix Skene's 1872 translation, p.38) or 'people' (as in G.W.S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era In Scottish History* (Oxford, 1980), p.146): Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.77; see also Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.42-49. The recent edition of *Scotichronicon* is not particularly clear either, using 'fellow Scots' for 'natio' and 'people' for both 'gens' and 'populo': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.9 (vol. 1, pp.186-7).

[17] Medieval theories about the existence of different races were often derived from biblical evidence. *Proto-Fordun* itself describes how the 'whole human race was distributed in nations and kingdoms over the earth,' from the sons of Noah: *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 1.4 (p.6): 'quibus disseminatum est omne genus humanum, per nationes et regna super terram;' Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.4 (vol. 1, pp.8-11); Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Identity,' pp.42-45.

[18] For Scottish 'gens' see e.g. Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14, 35 (pp.417, 432); *Gesta Annalia* 7 (p.260). The Scots as a whole are also often simply referred to as 'Scoti,' e.g. *Gesta Annalia* 7, 11, 21, 23 (pp.260, 263-4, 274, 275). Other groups such as the English are described in similar terms, e.g. *Gesta Annalia* 15, 21 (pp.267, 274). 'Populus' is often used to indicate a body of people, without necessarily making any claims to ethnic or political identity, e.g. *Gesta Annalia* 21, 58, 63 (pp.274, 302-3, 307).

[19] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.35 (p.30): 'gentibus diversae nationis.'

[20] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.24 (p.21): 'propriae nationis gentibus.'

nation [natio], our neighbours and of the same race [gens] as ourselves.'[21] This distinction indicates that, although the Irish people are of the same 'gens' as the Scots (or at least the Gaelic-speakers), for *Proto-Fordun* they nevertheless belong to a different 'natio.'

This distinction is also evident in the terms used by *Proto-Fordun* to refer to other groups in a Scottish context. While the Picts, recognising their status as a separate kingdom, are described as 'natio' as well as 'gens,' other groups are not referred to as 'natio.' The Moravians are depicted as a people distinct from the Scots, with their own origin story: they are the 'gens Moravi.'[22] The rebellious MacWilliams, who are associated with Moray, are also distinguished from the Scots as the 'gens MacWilliam.'[23] While *Proto-Fordun* distinguished these groups from the Scots, however, it also pointedly presented them as disloyal subjects of the Scottish king: they belong to the Scottish kingdom, and are not described as a 'natio' in their own right. The men of Galloway and Argyll, who also feature in *Proto-Fordun* as rebellious groups with a strong regional identity, are put even more firmly in place: they do not constitute a distinct 'gens,' let alone 'natio,' and are described only in terms of where they are from. The men of Galloway are simply 'Galwegians' ('Galwalenses'), without a word for 'race' or 'nation,' and the men of Argyll are likewise only 'Erthgalenses.'[24] Their regional identity sits alongside, but not instead of, their Scottish identity as subjects of the crown and inhabitants of the kingdom.

*

The idea that the Scottish nation consisted of a combination of two different ethnic groups recurs, in different forms, throughout *Proto-Fordun*, from the earliest origins of the Scots until the author's own time. *Proto-Fordun* built on the origin-legend

---

[21] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.6 (p.149): 'Hyberniensis vicina nobis, ac ejusdem nostri generis natio.' This chapter forms part of a long digression from the narrative, describing how different empires and cities fell because they succumbed to sin, so it is possible that this was not *Proto-Fordun*'s work. The same passage describes the Britons as 'closely related to us by blood and other ties,' ('consanguineos et colligatos nostros Britones').

[22] E.g. Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.27 (pp.57-8); *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7).

[23] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 42 (pp.289-290)

[24] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 10, 11, 14, 40 (pp.262, 263-4, 266, 288).

material found in Vairement's chronicle by providing alternative versions of how the Scots made their way to Scotland via Spain and Ireland, but in all of these accounts the same fundamental point was made: that the Scots emerged from the union of Gaedel Glas, a Greek prince, and Scota, an Egyptian princess.[25] Their son, Éber Scot, is described later in the chronicle as 'the first Scot.'[26] Vairement was likely to have been responsible for the comment that Gaedel Glas gave his name to the Gaels, and Scota hers to the Scots, stating that the entire nation was now proudly known as Scots, and that use of Gaelic was in retreat. The idea of two distinct groups, originating with the founding figures of the Scottish people, seems to have resonated with *Proto-Fordun*, who retained the explanation, although his attitude towards Gaels tended to be more sympathetic than Vairement's.[27]

There is little explanation of how this division functioned in these earlier times; rather, the author is, as with some of the descriptions of the kingdom, projecting the situation of his own time back into ancient history. Throughout *Proto-Fordun*'s account of the initial arrival in and settlement of Scotland by the Scots, the Scots are portrayed as a single people, defined by a shared descent and loyalty to their leader. In several of the origin-legend sources used by *Proto-Fordun*, they were also associated with Ireland, which is presented in these legends as the divinely-ordained homeland of the Scots.[28] As Broun has shown, it is possible to trace the strands of this idea in *Proto-Fordun*, and the identification of the Scots with Ireland (and the claim to antiquity this offered) remained a potent concept even in the late thirteenth century.[29] *Proto-Fordun*'s own attitude towards this issue is less clear. The author does not go as far as later writers would in explicitly declaring that Scotland was the homeland of the Scots (as in Baldred Bisset's *Processus* in 1301), or ignoring the period in Ireland entirely (as in the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320),

---

[25] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.8 (pp.9-10).

[26] It has been suggested that this is because he was the first to settle Ireland, but it is also logical simply in dynastic terms: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.222-3.

[27] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.27 (pp.23-4); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.28 (vol.1, pp.64-8, 146 n.49); Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.72, 129-130; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.259.

[28] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.247; *Irish Identity*, pp.117-119.

[29] Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp.129-132.

and he included accounts in which a deserted Ireland seems to be the divinely ordained home for the wandering Scots.[30] His account of the inauguration of Alexander III not only emphasised the significance of the Stone of Destiny, brought to Ireland by Simón Brecc, but also highlighted the inclusion of the Irish ancestry in the ceremony, stressing the antiquity of the kingship.[31]

At the same time, however, *Proto-Fordun's* narrative is entirely concerned with how the Scottish kingship is established and develops in Scotland itself; indeed, Ireland is arguably treated as little more than a staging post in this wider narrative, which emphasises the connection between the Scottish kingdom, crown and people. *Proto-Fordun* was sympathetic towards Gaelic speakers, but there is no consistent sense in the chronicle that he regarded the Scots and Irish as part of the same nation. As noted above, he refers to 'the Irish nation, our neighbours and of the same race as ourselves.'[32] The point he is making here, that the Irish are poor and suffering because they did not stay united under one king, instead setting up many kings, is in keeping with the chronicle's theme of unity and loyalty to the crown, but this also serves to highlight the contrast between the Irish and the Scots, and shows that the author regards them as distinct. The Irish people are of the same 'gens' as the Scots but belong to a different 'natio.' Similarly, *Proto-Fordun* elsewhere makes a careful distinction between the Irish and Scottish languages, and differentiates between Irish levies and rebellious Scots in Argyll.[33] For *Proto-Fordun*, the Scottish kingship existed long before the Scots reached Ireland, but the kingdom emerges only when they arrive in what would become Scotland.

Indeed, this idea is highlighted by another key aspect of *Proto-Fordun*'s narrative of the Scottish kingdom's origins: the relationship between the Picts and the Scots. Building on what he found in Vairement's chronicle, *Proto-Fordun* emphasises that the Scots and the Picts arrived in the previously uninhabited Scotland at the same

---

[30] Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp.117-121.
[31] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).
[32] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.6 (p.149): 'Hyberniensis vicina nobis, ac ejusdem nostri generis natio.'
[33] E.g. Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4, 43 (pp.256-7, 290-1).

time, contrary to what other historians might have claimed.[34] This has the effect of presenting the Scottish kings of his own time as the inheritors of both the ancient Pictish and Scottish kingdoms, which together formed the geographical 'Scotland' north of the Forth, a unified territory even in ancient times.[35]

Proto-Fordun also highlights the intermingling of the two groups (including the story of the Scots providing wives for the Picts) and their close allegiance, which extends to a shared determination to preserve their independence and the integrity of their kingships and kingdoms, articulated in a defiant letter sent jointly by their kings to Julius Caesar.[36] This connection was perhaps intended to show that the Scots of Scotland were a different people from the Irish, and again hints at the idea of the Scottish people (and kingdom) emerging from different ethnic groups.[37] In *Proto-Fordun*'s account, the Pictish kingdom was eventually defeated and taken over by Kenneth MacAlpin, its leaders killed and its people absorbed into the Scottish kingdom; indeed, it was not only 'the kings and leaders of that race [the Picts] that were destroyed,' but that 'its whole stock and race also is said to have been lost, together with its own distinctive language,' a comment which draws together some of the key elements that were seen to define a nation.[38] Yet while the Pictish nation had vanished, the continued significance of this connection is evident in *Proto-Fordun's* accounts of the foundation of Scone and the inauguration of Alexander III, both of which explicitly declare that Scone was established by the Picts as the seat of their kings.[39]

---

[34] *Proto-Fordun* noted that, while there were Scottish kings in Scotland before Pictish ones, this was because the Picts were ruled by judges for around two centuries, and not because the Scots arrived much earlier. He provides several different accounts of the Picts' possible origins: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.29, 35 (pp.25, 30; trans. pp.25, 29); Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.242, 259.

[35] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.220-2; 240-52.

[36] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.30-31, 2.14-16 (pp.25-7, 46-9).

[37] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.247.

[38] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.4,8 (pp.147, 151). 'sic quidem non solum reges et duces gentis illius deleti sunt, sed etiam stirps et genus, adeo ydiomatis sui lingua defecisse legitur.' The comment is used to introduce the long digression on God's punishment of sinful kingdoms and peoples, and Fordun elsewhere alters material to downplay the significance of the Picts, so it is possible that *Proto-Fordun* was not the author of this comment.

[39] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (p.430); *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).

II

Proto-Fordun's treatment of the Picts presents the contemporary Scottish kingdom as the inheritor of two kingdoms that occupied the distinct, unified territory of Scotland north of the Forth. The absorption of the Pictish kingdom into the Scottish one, and the merging of Pictish identity into Scottish identity provides a parallel for the later absorption of outlying regions and their population into the wider Scottish kingdom, a process marked by the gradual use of the term 'Scotland' and 'Scots' to include these regions and their inhabitants. Evidence of this shift, and of the potential persistence of regional identities, can be traced in *Proto-Fordun*, although the chronicle is, for the most part, consistent in identifying the Scots as a united people, with a shared origin and ruler, across the kingdom.

Within that, however, *Proto-Fordun* does allow for the possibility of subjects of another kingdom residing in Scotland. For example, the chronicle records that, following the capture of William I in 1174, the English were persecuted cruelly 'both in Scotland and in Galloway.'[40] Indeed, it was not only the English who suffered: after the capture of 'their king,' both 'the Scots and men of Galloway' subjected their 'French and English relatives' to frequent attack.[41] This suggests that there was an English (and French) population resident in Scotland (and Galloway), but which was identified with the captors of William, even though they had presumably chosen to live within his kingdom (and, indeed, might have been invited there by the king or his predecessors). The English population was regarded as distinct and

---

[40] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11 (pp.263-4): ʻpersecutio quoque tunc Anglorum miserrima maximaque, tam in Scocia quam Galwallia, facta est.'

[41] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11 (pp.263-4): 'Scoti cum Galwalensibus, rege suo capto, Francos affines et Anglos impie et immisericorditer, mutua caede facta, crebris invasionibus occiderunt.' Some English sources interpreted these assaults as the Galwegians expelling foreigners planted in the region by William I: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 4, p.518 n.45-52.

not fully integrated into the kingdom, perhaps retaining a residual loyalty to England, or only staying there temporarily.[42]

The example also illustrates that Galloway was not straightforwardly regarded as part of Scotland, and nor were its people straightforwardly regarded as Scottish, a distinction contemporary enough for *Proto-Fordun* to carry it over from his source. The hostility towards a different linguistic group reflects the description of the *gens montana* and *gens maritima*, as does the key point that sharing the same king bound the Galwegians and Scots together in outrage and revenge.[43] The previous chapter described how William I had raised an army to support the campaign of Henry, the son of Henry II of England, against his father, levying his force from 'the highland Scots, whom they call *bruti*, and the Galwegians, who did not know how to spare either place or person, but raged in the manner of beasts.'[44] Both the highland Scots and the Galwegians demonstrate the ferocity and loyalty that *Proto-Fordun* attributed to Gaelic-speaking Scots, so despite their regional distinctiveness the Galwegians are clearly regarded as part of the Scottish kingdom.[45]

The distinctive identity of the region might also be reflected in its being the setting for frequent revolts against the Scottish crown.[46] The chronicle records that William's predecessor, Malcolm IV, had once gone into Galloway three times in a single year to put down revolts.[47] These risings are always treated in the text as acts of rebellion: *Proto-Fordun* is clear in regarding the people of Galloway as subject to the Scottish crown.[48] According to the chronicle, this was something rightly recognised within Galloway itself: while some Galwegians loyally sought revenge for

---

[42] They would also have been marked out by their language in most places north of the Forth or in Galloway, although this would not have necessarily been the case in Lothian and the southeast of the kingdom: Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, pp.10-14.

[43] Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' p.76.

[44] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 10 (pp.262-3): 'per montanos Scotos, quos brutos vocant, et Galwalenses, qui nec locis nec personis parcere norunt, sed bestiali more saeviendo.'

[45] Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' pp.74-76.

[46] Stringer, 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland,' p.84.

[47] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3 (p.256). These revolts were led by Fergus, described as 'regulus' of Galloway.

[48] This attitude is typical of chronicle sources, which have little interest in the perspective within Galloway: Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, p.192.

William's capture in 1174, others attempted to take advantage of his absence, and so, 'separating themselves from the kingdom of Scotland, that same year, they troubled the lands bordering theirs.'[49]

This revolt was led by Gillebrigte, a son of Fergus (who had rebelled against Malcolm IV), but was resisted by his brother, Uhtred, who is described as a 'true Scot.'[50] Gillebrigte had Uhtred mutilated and killed, prompting the newly-released William into action against the revolt.[51] Uhtred is regarded as a 'true Scot' for his loyalty to the Scottish crown; the term is here used as a political, rather than ethnic marker, a flexibility of approach that *Proto-Fordun* must have expected would be understood by his readers.[52] Indeed, it could also be taken to imply that Gillebrigte too is a Scot, albeit an untrue one.[53] Being regarded as a Scot was not, therefore, limited to those who were born or lived within a more narrowly defined idea of 'Scotland,' but could apply to anyone within the wider Scottish kingdom (all of whom should, according to the chronicle, have identified themselves with the interests of the Scottish crown).[54] Uhtred's son, Roland, with the help of the king, later defeated an army consisting of Gillebrigte's former supporters, described as a 'great many other Galwegians.'[55] This appears to draw a distinction between the Galwegians who were the enemies of the king, and those descendants and supporters of that 'true Scot', Uhtred, further emphasising the idea that to be a Scot was a matter not simply of origin or location, but also of loyalty and sympathy.

---

[49] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'se a regno Scociae eodem anno dividentes, contiguas sibi terras inquietaverunt.'

[50] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'quia verus extiterat Scotus'.

[51] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266). Uhtred's death was likely to have been the unintended outcome of the mutilation: Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, pp.95-6.

[52] Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' pp.76-7.

[53] Although Uhtred seems to have been far closer to the Scottish crown and court than his brother, this dispute was personal, based on competing claims to the lordship of Galloway, rather than patriotic. *Proto-Fordun*'s depiction of Uhtred glosses over his initial involvement in the revolt: Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, pp.79, 94.

[54] The emphasis on the kingdom and kingship, rather than descent or language, is also evident in *Proto-Fordun*'s distinction between the Scots and Irish.

[55] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 17 (pp.268-9): 'et aliis quamplurimis Galwalensibus'; Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, p.122.

The expected loyalty and service to the crown of regions such as Galloway is also evident in Alexander II's army for a campaign in Argyll in 1222, raised 'out of Lothian and Galloway, and other outlying provinces.'[56] The chronicle's account of a rebellion in Galloway in 1235 describes how, having set out to deal with the rebels ('rebellibus'), the king's army was ambushed by 'natives' ('indigenae'), but fought them off and forced them to surrender.[57] Here 'indigenae' appears to be used to indicate the local inhabitants of the region, rather than to make any statement about ethnicity, but it is notable that, despite this loyalty to their regional lords, *Proto-Fordun* again suggests that, with strong leadership, the rebellious Galwegians could be won over to the crown.[58]

After this revolt was defeated and the king had departed Galloway, the chronicle records that 'the Scots themselves who were then in the king's army' proceeded to pillage the region and sack churches, and strongly criticises this behaviour.[59] This awkward description might suggest that the king's army also contained men of other nations or regions, and that the chronicler seems to have expected the Scots to have more sympathy with those who ultimately shared the same king, and perhaps also that, as a superior race, the Scots should be held to a higher standard.

After his campaign in Argyll in 1222, Alexander II returned there the next year, as 'the natives had given him much cause for offence.'[60] Again, 'indigenae' seems to be used only to indicate the local population of the region, rather than an ethnic group. Frightened by the king's arrival, some of the 'men of Argyll' ('Erthgalenses') made

---

[56] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 40 (pp.288-9): 'coacto exercitu de Laudonia, et Galwallia, et aliis provinciis circumadjacentibus.' The 'outlying provinces' appears to mean, however, that these regions might not have been part of 'Scotland' itself yet.

[57] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 43 (pp.290-1).

[58] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 43 (pp.290-1). Although *Proto-Fordun* portrays this as the revolt of unruly subjects, this conflict arguably demonstrates the complex relationship of regional and national identities: the rebellion was a response to Alexander II's attempts to divide the inheritance of Galloway, in defiance of the Galwegians who wanted to keep the province united, even asking for it to be taken directly into Alexander's protection: Stringer, 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland,' p.102; Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway,* pp.141-143.

[59] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 43 (pp.290-1): 'Ipsi quoque Scoti eo tempore de exercitu regis.'

[60] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 40 (p.288): 'quia multis de causis offenses erat indigenis.'

peace, while others fled.[61] There is no sense, however, that Argyll was not seen as part of Scotland or that the men of Argyll were not Scots. The terms are used simply to indicate the region in question. The king does not leave Scotland to enter Argyll, and the men of Argyll are not distinguished from other Scots, unlike the Irish levies used by Somerled and later Thomas of Galloway.[62] Indeed, Somerled himself is treated by the chronicle as a rebellious subject of the Scottish crown, and his region part of the Scottish kingdom.[63] As the discussion of these regions during the disputes with the Norwegian crown indicates, these areas are regarded in the chronicle as historically Scottish and inhabited by Scots, despite the occasional claims of regional lords and rival kings, again highlighting the chronicle's explicit identification with the interests of the Scottish crown.[64]

This idea, that the land and its inhabitants are Scottish by origin and long custom, regardless of their lord, complements, rather than contradicts, the idea expressed elsewhere in the chronicle that loyalty to the crown can help identify someone as Scottish, as in the case of the Galwegians, who were also able to retain a strong sense of regional identity. Even in revolt, they remained part of the Scottish kingdom. As the authority of the Scottish king in the area increased, the word 'Scotland' increasingly came to include them, and likewise their population was increasingly referred to as 'Scottish.' Individuals such as Uhtred and Roland seem to have accelerated the process, at least at a personal level, by willingly associating themselves with the Scottish king and identifying with his interests (to their own personal benefit, of course).[65] *Proto-Fordun* provides evidence of different ideas of what it meant to be Scottish, whether based on ethnicity, shared heritage and

---

[61] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 40 (pp.288-9).
[62] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4, 43 (pp.256-7, 290-1).
[63] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 1, 4 (pp.254-5, 256-7).
[64] The Western Isles are described as belonging to Scotland 'by ancient right,' ('antiquo jure'), having been held unbroken from the arrival of the very first Scots to reach Britain: Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (p.427). In 1264, Alexander III sent an army to the Western Isles to punish those the chronicle calls the 'traitors who had, the year before, encouraged the king of Norway to land in Scotland,' again indicating that the islands were regarded as part of Scotland, and its inhabitants rightfully subjects of the Scottish crown: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1): 'hos proditores, quorum hortatu anno praecedenti rex Norgwagiae in Scocia applicuit.'
[65] Oram, *The Lordship of Galloway*, pp.79, 98.

origins, or on political allegiance, and suggests that these different senses of identity could be understood to operate in different parts of the kingdom without undermining either one another or the overall unity of the kingdom.

*

The treatment of Moray in *Proto-Fordun* is more complex. As with Galloway, the chronicle hints at the idea that Moray and its inhabitants have an identity separate from that of the rest of the Scottish kingdom, but is consistent in asserting that that they are subject to the Scottish crown. Unlike the inhabitants of Galloway, however, the Moravians are presented as a distinct ethnic group, who arrived in Scotland after being driven from their homeland on the Danube following an attempted revolt against the Romans.[66] Just as the Scots had once helped the Picts, so the Picts provided wives for the 'gens Moravie' and allowed them to settle in Caithness.[67] It has been suggested that this passage was part of Vairement's chronicle, intended to emphasise the distinctiveness of the lawless Moravians, in a region that was still proving resistant to royal control only a few decades before he wrote.[68]

The idea of the Moravians as wild and treacherous is made plain in *Proto-Fordun*. They are accused of murdering both Malcolm I and later his son Duf, on both occasions as they were displeased with the king's suppression of wrongdoing and

---

[66] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.27 (pp.57-8).

[67] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.27 (pp.57-8).

[68] It had been generally thought that Vairement adapted this from Geoffrey of Monmouth's version of the Pictish origin story, but more recent work has suggested that Geoffrey recast a Moravian origin story to feature the Picts; Vairement (and *Proto-Fordun* following him) is quite adamant that Geoffrey is mistaken. Ross suggests that the story has its roots in a source determined to slander the Moravians (and MacWilliams) by suggesting that the Scots originated from three different races, which was later reconciled with the conventional view of Picts and Scots by associating the Moravians with the Picts: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.9 (p.152); Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 1, p.373 n.8-48; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp.259-260; Alasdair Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams,' in Seán Duffy, *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, warlords and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600* (Dublin, 2007), pp.24-44 at pp.42-44; Alex Woolf, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Picts,' in Wilson McLeod, Abigail Burnyeat, Domhnall Uilleam Stiùbhart, Thomas Owen Clancy & Roisbeard Ó Maolalaigh (eds.), *Bile ós Chrannaibh: A Festschrift for William Gillies* (Ceann Drochaid, 2010), pp.439-450 at 442-7.

lawlessness in the region.[69] Malcolm IV likewise had to defeat the rebellious 'Moraviensium gentem' in 1163.[70] His action was provoked by the refusal of the Moravians to 'leave off their disloyal ways, or their ravages among their fellow-countrymen,' after their 'former lord, namely, the Earl Angus, had been killed by the Scots.'[71] The 'comprovinciali' appear to be fellow inhabitants of the province of Moray, rather than of the wider Scottish kingdom; the chronicler might be implying that loyal inhabitants of Moray were considered Scots, and disloyal ones were Moravians, a distinction that the author perhaps felt was shared by the Moravians themselves.

Having put down the revolt, Malcolm, following the example of Nebuchadnezzar's treatment of the Jews at Babylon, 'removed them all from their native land,' and then scattered them 'over the rest of Scotland, both beyond the mountains and this side of the mountains, so that not even one native of that land remained there,' replacing them with 'his own peace loving people.'[72] *Proto-Fordun* presents Moray as part of the Scottish kingdom, and, if he did not consider the Moravians to have been Scottish, it would appear that the region was now inhabited by Scots. Despite this, the persistence of Moray's separate identity was strong enough even in the

---

[69] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.25, 26 (pp.167-9).These passages are perhaps the work of Vairement, but they are also consistent with *Proto-Fordun's* treatment of the Moravians in *Gesta Annalia I*.

[70] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7).

[71] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7): 'a sua perfidia seu comprovinciali depopulatione nulla prece...'; 'cujus dudum dominus, scilicet, comes Angusius, a Scotis peremptus est.' The death of Angus is described in *Gesta Annalia* 1 (p.254). The description has echoes of the account of Duf's murder, where subjects in the north of the kingdom were 'oppressed by robbers from their own area': Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.26 (p.168): 'aquilones regis cives a propriis praedonibus oppressi sunt.'

[72] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7): 'ita per ceteras, tam extramontanas Scociae, quam cismontanas, regiones, eam totam segregando, transtulit, ut nec unus quidem illius terrae nativus permaneret ibidem, populum in ea peculiarem et pacificum collocando.' This passage, which might have inspired much of the bad reputation of Moray (and is, for example, followed in Bower), is likely to have been a colourful expansion of rather more terse and ambiguous entry in the *Chronicle of Holyrood*, which stated that 'rex Malcolmus Murievienses transtulit,' which might only have referred to the relocation of the bishop of Moray's church: *Chronicle of Holyrood* p.142 n.2; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.4 pp.489-90, n.1-10; Ross, 'Moray,' p.27; R. Andrew McDonald, '"Treachery in the Remotest Territories of Scotland:" Northern Resistance to the Canmore Dynasty, 1130-1230,' in *Canadian Journal of History,* 33 (1999), pp.161-192 at pp.167-8; Webster, *Medieval Scotland,* pp.38-9; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.189-91.

1280s for *Proto-Fordun* to include a description of William leaving Scotland in order to enter Moray in 1214.[73]

It has been suggested that one of the reasons for the ambiguous status of Moray within the Scottish kingdom is that it was once home to a royal dynasty that at one stage seems to have contested or even alternated the throne of the kingdom of Scotland with the predecessors of Malcolm III.[74] There is evidence of this idea within *Proto-Fordun*: Kenneth II, Malcolm II and Duncan all die violently in Moray, but the treachery is attributed specifically to supporters of the rival (Moray) line, rather than to Moravians in general.[75] This is always presented as the disloyal murder of the rightful king; by contrast, the deaths of Constantine II and Grim, kings of the Moray line, are presented as the just overthrow of usurpers.[76]

The association of Moray with a rival line of kings has also prompted historians to associate the people and region of Moray with the MacWilliams, another rebellious group with a claim to the throne.[77] Evidence for this particular association is, however, somewhat limited within *Proto-Fordun*, but the chronicle's presentation of these subsequent revolts does suggest that *Proto-Fordun* regarded both Moray and the MacWilliams as being, to some extent, different and separate from the rest of the Scottish nation.[78]

Thus, in 1179, William I campaigned in Ross against 'MacWilliam, whose real name was Donald Bane,' but was forced to lead another army against him in 1186, after MacWilliam continued his 'customary wickedness' during the next seven years.[79] Aided by 'the treachery of some disloyal subjects,' MacWilliam first 'removed from

---

[73] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (p.279).

[74] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.8-9; Grant, *Independence and Nationhood*, pp.206-209; Alex Woolf, 'The "Moray Question" and the Kingship of Alba in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries,' *Scottish Historical Review* 79.2 (2000), pp.145-164.

[75] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.32-33, 41, 44 (pp.174-6, 183-4, 187-8).

[76] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gesta Scotorum* 4.34, 38, 41 (pp.176-7, 180-1, 184).

[77] Ross, 'Moray,' p.24; Webster, *Medieval Scotland,* p.39; McDonald, 'Treachery,' p.8 ff.

[78] Ross, 'Moray,' pp.29-44.

[79] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 16 (p.268): 'Macwillelmum, sed vero nomine Donaldum Bane'; 'septem annis eo solitam continuante nequitiam.' It would appear from this that Moray remained loyal and was not part of the first uprising in 1179: Ross, 'Moray,' pp.29-30.

his king the whole of Ross, by his insolent usurpation,' then took Moray, and before long 'had seized the greater part of the kingdom, with fire and slaughter, and aimed at taking the whole of it,' though he was eventually defeated by the king's army.[80] In this way, the chronicle suggests that MacWilliam's campaign was aimed at securing the throne of Scotland itself, and not merely carving out part of the kingdom for himself or asserting the autonomy of a particular group. According to *Proto-Fordun*, MacWilliam claimed that he was 'of royal descent, and was the son of William, son of Duncan the Bastard, who was the son of the great Malcolm, king of Scotland, called Canmore.'[81] Duncan II was Malcolm's son by his first wife, and *Proto-Fordun* regards him as illegitimate, thus denying any MacWilliam claim to the throne via him.[82] Indeed, although Duncan expelled Donald from the kingdom after he claimed the kingdom ahead of his nephews, the chronicle makes it clear that neither had any claim to the throne ahead of the sons of Malcolm III and Margaret.[83]

Although MacWilliam and his descendants appear frequently in the chronicle, and continued to be active in the north of the kingdom, the text does not particularly associate them with Moray; if anything, they are more specifically associated with the even more outlying region of Ross, where they are active in 1179 and began their campaign in 1186, and whose nobles also allegedly encourage the 1211 MacWilliam campaign.[84] As well as their being active in regions that were not necessarily seen as part of 'Scotland' (but were very much seen as part of the wider kingdom), the sense that the MacWilliams themselves were not Scottish is also

---

[80] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 16 (p.268): 'Is proditione nonnullorum fretus perfidorum, primum quidem totam Ross importunitate tirannidis suae a rege suo extorserat, ac deinde totam Moraviam, non parvo tempore detinens, maximam partem regni caedibus et incendiis occupaverat, ad illud totum aspirando.' This is the one of only two explicit associations between Moray and the MacWilliams in *Proto-Fordun*: Ross, 'Moray,' pp.31-35.

[81] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 16 (p.268): 'se regio ortum semine, ac filium se fore Willelmi, filii Duncani bastardi, qui fuit filius magni Malcolmi regis Scociae, dicti Canmor.'

[82] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 20 (p.422): 'filium regis Malcolmi filium nothum.'. This term was first used to refer to Duncan II by William of Malmesbury, and seems to have come to *Proto-Fordun* from there: Ross, 'Moray,' pp.25-26.

[83] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 26 (p.426): 'legitimis itaque regis Malcolmi heredibus, Edgaro, scilicet, Alexandre, et David.'

[84] Ross, 'Moray,' p.42.

hinted at in their association with Ireland. MacWilliam's son, Guthred, is reported as arriving in Scotland from Ireland, and 'plagued many parts of the kingdom of Scotland,' with the encouragement of the thanes of Ross.[85] As with Somerled, who levied an army and fleet from Ireland and elsewhere before his defeat at Renfrew in 1164, the MacWilliams (or at least Guthred) appear to have relied on Ireland for shelter and support; the next MacWilliam revolt, led by 'Donald Ban, son of MacWilliam,' in 1214, was supported by 'the son of a certain king of Ireland.'[86] They 'entered Moray,' with a large force of wicked men, but were soon defeated.[87]

By consistently representing the MacWilliams as associated with illegitimacy, disloyalty, and areas either on the very edge or even beyond Scotland, the chronicle appears to deliberately casting them not only as a throwback to an older regime based around the Irish Sea and looking to the north and west (in contrast to the new dynasty in the south-east of Scotland influenced by England and Europe) but even as alien to Scotland, not part of the Scottish people, further diminishing their claim to the throne. Indeed, the chronicle's account of their final failed attempt to take the Scottish crown, in 1229, refers to 'gens MacWilliam', when some unrighteous men of that race rose up 'in the furthest bounds of Scotland,' a description that appears to distinguish the MacWilliams, like the Moravians, from the race of the Scots.[88]

*

The author of *Proto-Fordun* regarded essentially all the inhabitants of Scotland in his own time as Scots, whether Gaelic- or English-speaking, united by their loyalty to the king of Scotland, even in the westernmost and northernmost parts of the

---

[85] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 27 (pp.278-9): 'in pluribus regnum Scocise infestans.'
[86] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (pp.256-7); 32 (pp.282-3): 'Dovenaldus Bane filius MacWilliam,' 'filius cujusdam regis Hiberniae'; Stringer, 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland,' p.87; Macdonald, 'Treachery,' p.184; but see also Ross, 'Moray,' pp.35-38, who disputes the notion that other MacWilliams relied on an Irish base.
[87] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 32 (pp.282-3): 'in Moraviam intraverunt hostes regis Scociae... cum turba malignantium copiosa.' This account is very close to that of the *Chronicle of Melrose*: Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.182; *Chronicle of Melrose* (Stevenson, trans.), pp.40-1.
[88] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 42 (pp.289-90): 'quidam iniqui de genere MacWilliam... in extremis Scociae finibus.'

kingdom. Groups that had retained a distinct regional identity even in recent times were included in this. Despite their shared ancient origins, the Scots were also clearly distinguished from the Irish, as in the chronicle's account of the revolt of Thomas, son of Alan of Galloway in 1235, where his Irish soldiers are listed separately from the Scots and Galwegians at the battle.[89] *Proto-Fordun* presents a sense of a distinct Scottish kingdom, with a population of Scots united by their loyalty to the king of Scotland. Although some areas retained a strong regional identity and powerful local lords, and continued to be identified as such, particularly in a military context, no other kings had any claim over any part of this kingdom, or over the loyalty of the Scottish people.

The inhabitants of Galloway and Argyll, for example, do not constitute a separate 'gens,' separate from the king's other subjects. It is notable that one Galwegian, Uhtred, is described as being a 'true Scot', in contrast to his rebellious brother. While this might indicate that *Proto-Fordun* understood that to be Scottish was, in some respects, a political decision, it also suggests that the chronicler regarded it was the Galwegians as essentially of the same race and nation as the Scots, some of whom had mislaid their loyalty to the Scottish crown in trying to establish a separate kingdom. The Moravians, by contrast, are described in the chronicle as comprising a distinct race, as are the MacWilliams, seemingly to help dismiss their claim to the Scottish throne. In describing them as separate, the chronicle dismisses this dynasty's claim to the throne, which emphasises the idea that a nation comprised a group with a shared descent as well as a shared allegiance to a particular crown. In the case of the Scots, this was a descent from the earliest settlers in Scotland and beyond that from Gaedel and Scota. It is these elements that explain why the inhabitants of Galloway are not treated as a distinct race. Indeed, they share the same language and characteristics of the highlands Scots, the same factors used by *Proto-Fordun* in his explanation of the peoples of Scotland.

---

[89] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 43 (pp.290-1). The distinction between Galwegians and Scots in this case seems intended to make it clear who were the rebels and who were the king's army.

III

Gesta Annalia II presents, even more clearly than *Proto-Fordun*, a sense of a single, unified Scottish race, which extends across the entire kingdom of Scotland. Although *Proto-Fordun* does not suggest that the men of Galloway or Argyll belong to a different 'gens' from the Scots, they are treated as somewhat distinct. This is not the case in *Gesta Annalia II*. The groups are only mentioned directly once each in the chronicle, both in the context of Robert I's attempts to take control of Scotland following his inauguration, a period when he had to 'struggle against one and all in the kingdom of Scotland, with the exception of a very few well-disposed towards him.'[90] This context makes it clear that such groups all belong to the kingdom of Scotland, whether or not they supported the Scottish king. The chronicle records that, in 1308, Edward Bruce defeated a 'Donald of the Isles' and 'all the Galwegians,' who had 'approached the river Dee.'[91] In the same year, Robert himself defeated 'the men of Argyll' and allowed their leader, Alexander of Argyll, who was related to the Comyns by marriage, to seek refuge in England.[92] In these examples, both the Galwegians and the men of Argyll appear to be depicted as the

---

[90] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 118 (p.340): 'etiam contra omnes et singulos de regno Scociae, exceptis paucissimis sibi benevolis.'

[91] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 125 (p.345): 'Donaldus de Ilys'; 'Donaldum et omnes Galwidienses'; 'usque flumen de Dee accessit.' The passage also mentions that many 'nobles of Galloway' were slain ('nobilius Galwidiae'). *Gesta Annalia II* appears to present this as a rising against Bruce rule in Scotland, but other sources give different accounts. In Barbour's *Bruce*, for example, Edward Bruce launches an heroic expedition to wrest Galloway from English control, defeating forces of Galwegian and English troops: Barbour, *The Bruce*, book 9 ll.479 ff. (pp.344-55). A verse chronicle included by Bower alongside *Gesta Annalia II*'s account also has Bruce defeating a force of English and Galwegians: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.17 (vol. 6, pp.342-5). The English *Lanercost* chronicle, however, which often makes a distinction between the Scots and the Galwegians, presents this campaign as an unprovoked, brutal assault against the people of Galloway, who sought protection from the English king: *Chronicle of Lanercost 1272-1346* (trans. Herbert Maxwell) (Glasgow, 1913, reprinted in two-volume facsimile edition, Llanerch, 2001), pp.173, 188; see also Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.208-9. *Gesta Annalia II*'s identification of 'Donald of the Isles' as the leader of the Galwegians also appears to be mistaken; the verse chronicle has a Donald of Islay (identified as a son of Angus Mor Macdonald or his brother Alexander) fighting alongside Edward Bruce, while *Lanercost* also notes that Bruce's army contained men from the islands of Scotland. It has been suggested that Donald MacCan, whose family consistently fought for the English in Galloway, is more likely: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 4, pp.444-5, n.54, 63.

[92] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 126 (p.345): 'Ergadienses.'

local following of a regional lord, rather than being a separate nation; that is, as Scots whose lord has sided with the English or who opposed Robert I.[93]

The chronicle describes another group of Scots in similar terms, the Brendans (from Bute), who, with their lord John Stewart, were cut off from the other Scottish forces at the battle of Falkirk in 1297.[94] That these are regional identities associated with a particular lordship, rather than separate nations, is evident not only from this group being similarly described as belonging to the lord ('his Brendans') but from the chronicle's identification of another group similarly cut off: 'Macduff of Fife, and the men from there.'[95] The loss of these local groups is described in the chapter as just some of the 'severe losses among both the leading men and those of the middle rank of the Scottish race' that resulted from the battle.[96] These different lords and their followings, it is clear, all belong to the same 'gens', the 'Scottish race.' The close association of these regional groups with their lords, and the traditional role of the Scottish nobility in raising and leading troops from their own lands, is also evident in the chronicle's account of the battle of Dunbar in 1296, when the earl of Mar and the earl of Atholl both led 'all the forces at their command' from the field, contributing to the Scottish defeat.[97]

The description of the battle of Falkirk is one of the relatively few occasions when the Scots are referred to as a 'gens' or 'natio' within *Gesta Annalia II*. Indeed, the same chapter also uses 'Scots' repeatedly on its own. The text overwhelmingly uses

---

[93] *Gesta Annalia II* uses 'Galwidienses' and 'Ergadienses,' rather than *Proto-Fordun's* 'Galwallenses' and 'Erthgalenses.'

[94] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'Brendanis'. This name refers to St Brendan, whose cult flourished on the island to an extent that it allegedly inspired a popular alternative name for the island, which hints at how particular local customs could also be used to differentiate or identify Scots, although this sense of regional identity, as the chronicle makes clear, complements rather than undermines national identity.

[95] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'Macduff de Fyf, et ejusdem incolis.'

[96] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'gravi damno tam procerum quam mediocrim gentis Scoticanae.'

[97] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 93 (pp.325-6): 'toto robore suae potentiae.' Barbour's *Bruce* similarly identifies elements of Scottish armies by their region: for example, Robert I leads 'the men of Carrik halely, and off Arghile and of Kentyr, and off the Ilis,' as well as men 'off the plane land' at Bannockburn: Barbour, *The Bruce*, book 11, ll.340-345 (pp.420-423); Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' p.57.

more straightforward terms, referring simply to the 'Scots' or describing groups such as magnates or clerics as being 'Scottish' or 'of Scotland.' Terms such as 'gens' appear to be reserved in the text for occasions when all Scots are being referred to, rather than particular groups of them, and there is little sense of the fine distinction between 'natio' and 'gens' found in *Proto-Fordun.*[98]

It is, however, striking that every use of 'gens' in reference to the Scots in *Gesta Annalia II* occurs in a negative context. The example described above, which notes the suffering inflicted upon the entire nation, is the first description of the Scots as a race or nation within the text, and the chronicle continues to use the term within similar contexts, describing the (often self-inflicted) suffering of the Scots or criticising them. This suggests that use of the term was not simply a matter of stylistic preference, but perhaps that it was being deliberately associated with ideas of divine punishment, perhaps further evidence of the extent to which medieval clerics understood that races were divinely ordained, deriving their evidence for this from the Bible. In this sense it is comparable to *Proto-Fordun's* account of Kenneth MacAlpin's conquest of the Picts, which explains that God is 'the omnipotent ruler of all kings and kingdoms, and the wonderful preserver in the case of good deeds but terrible destroyer in the case of bad deeds,' and throughout history 'has often allowed strong races and kingdoms to perish when their sins demanded it, and will often allow it in the future.'[99] The text then embarks on a long diversion, over several chapters, to emphasise this point, invoking examples of the falls of various 'gentes' and 'nationes' from biblical and classical antiquity, from the tribes of Israel

---

[98] As with *Proto-Fordun,* 'populus' is not used with connotations of race or allegiance in *Gesta Annalia II*; it is, however, often used in the context of the 'common people' and the suffering inflicted upon them by oppressive kings and grasping nobles. See, for example, Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 108, 113, 123, 153 (pp.334, 337, 344, 359). The term is also used in conjunction with 'plebes,' emphasising the idea that it is used to contrast the common populace with the nobility: see, e.g., Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 102, 184 (pp.331, 381), and on one occasion to distinguish the lay from the ecclesiastical populace: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 86 (p.322).

[99] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.4 (p.147): 'Deus omnipotens, regum omnium et regnorum rector, atque secundum merita conservator mirificus, secundum vero demerita terrificus dissipator, robustas gentes, et regna peccatis exigentibus perire saepius permiserat, atque permittet in futurum.' *Proto-Fordun* (or possibly Fordun after him) adds a tag from Psalms to this passage (and Bower adds to this an additional quotation from Ecclesiasticus), further emphasising the biblical origins of this view of nations: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 4.4 (vol. 2, pp.278-82, 446, 447 n.41).

to the Romans, presenting these as moral lessons in the style of a medieval preacher, replete with abundant allusions to the Bible.[100]

Thus, in *Gesta Annalia II*, the defeat at Falkirk is attributed ultimately to the 'treachery of Scots'.[101] The use of the term emphasises that this was not simply the behaviour of a few particular Scots, but a widespread problem: the Comyns and their supporters abandoned the field; the future Robert I fought for the English; William Wallace and the nobles alike had too much 'arrogance and blazing jealousy.'[102] The treachery or disloyalty of the Scots is also alluded to on other occasions where 'gens' is used: Edward Balliol calls the 'Scottish race' a 'nation most false.'[103] The chronicle suggests that his accusation was based mostly on his own frustration at their failure to accept him as king. In the next chapter, however, the results of the division caused by his attempt to claim the throne are clear: although Edward Balliol had abandoned his campaign, Lothian was laid waste and the rest of the 'wretched Scottish race' now faced destruction at the hands of Edward III.[104] They were saved only when a great storm destroyed many of Edward's ships and stopped him crossing the Forth. The chronicle attributes this to the divine intervention of God and the Virgin Mary, sending a miracle for the 'salvation of the Scottish race.'[105] This might appear to be a positive context for the 'gentis Scotorum;' *Gesta Annalia II*, however, makes it clear that they had brought themselves to the brink of disaster, and were spared not through their own actions but as a divine response to the desecration of a church by English soldiers.[106]

The Scots are frequently referred to as a single 'gens' at such times, when they were at their most divided and preoccupied with factional disputes at the expense of the

---

[100] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.5-4.7 (pp.148-151); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 4.5-4.8 (vol. 2, pp.280-93 and notes pp.447-51). Bower adds even more biblical allusions to these chapters.

[101] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 102 (p.331): 'per Scotigenarum proditionem.'

[102] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'utriusque superbia et ardenti invidia.'

[103] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 175 (p.373): 'gente Scoticana, natione falsissima.'

[104] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 176 (pp.374-5): 'miserorum ... genti Scotorum.'

[105] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 176 (pp.374-5): 'pro salute gentis Scotorum.'

[106] The same chapter also records that Edward III was 'without respite, thirsting for the blood of the Scots' ('Scotorum sanguinem sine intermissione sciciente'). That 'gens' is not used on this occasion would perhaps reflect that this was not a failing of the Scots themselves or the result of their actions, but rather Edward's own greed and hatred.

greater wellbeing of the kingdom. In 1355, a group of Scots, having taken Berwick, chose to surrender the town to Edward III because they were unlikely to receive aid 'from their own race', as that nation's leaders were too busy feuding among themselves.[107] The chronicle, however, does not only criticise those Scots who failed to come to the aid of the men holding Berwick. The attackers themselves are sternly rebuked for the way in which they treated the inhabitants of the town, cruelly plundering the wealth that the people had, 'with much time and work, gathered together for themselves.'[108] The inhabitants had fled in terror at the arrival of the 'Scotsmen', abandoning to them all their gold and silver.[109]

Twice the chronicle records that certain Scots preferred to die rather than endure 'the woes of their race,' referring on both occasions to people who stayed loyal to David II, unlike some of their compatriots: in 1335, those nobles who refused to submit to Edward Balliol, and in 1363, the nobles who helped defeat the conspirators against the king.[110] 'Gens' is also used to refer to the Scots in the aftermath of the battle of Dupplin Moor in 1332, when Edward Balliol's victory and the death of so many Scots of all ranks meant that 'the Scottish people were exposed to great destruction.'[111] Yet again, it is striking that 'gens' is used to describe the Scots in the context of a lament for the woes that the nation has inflicted upon itself.

---

[107] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 174 (p.373): 'tum quia succursum a gente sua, propter principum discordiam.' This chapter also uses 'gens' to refer to the inhabitants of Berwick and its environs, perhaps to indicate that those inhabitants were not of the same race as their Scottish captors (rather, they were English): Edward III feared that the Scots 'would take the place and the people from him,' ('extollerat ei locum et gentem'). Terms such as 'habitator' are usually used in the text to indicate the local inhabitants of a region, but in those contexts the nation is generally assumed or not relevant, which might explain the use of 'gens' here.
[108] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 173 (p.372): 'at illi sine misericordia tractabant qui sibi multo tempore ac labore adversarii congregarunt.'
[109] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 173 (p.372): 'de subito adventu gentis Scotorum pavore perterriti.' The same chapter does not use 'gens' when describing the brave (but failed) assault made by the Scots on Berwick Castle, again highlighting that the term appears to be reserved for criticism or lament: 'Scoti, castrum Berwici fortiter expugnantes.'
[110] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 154, 184 (pp.360, 381). On both occasions, they would rather die 'quam videre mala gentis suae.'
[111] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 146 (p.355): 'genti Scotorum patuit ruina magna.'

'Natio' is used less frequently than 'gens' to refer to the Scottish nation, but its use also seems to be restricted to negative occasions, as in the example of Edward Balliol's description of the Scots as a 'nation most false.' The term is used in the description of the submission of the Scots to Edward I in 1304, when 'one and all of the Scottish nation' tendered him homage (except for the still-defiant William Wallace), while in a passage describing the events that led to the battle of Roslyn, the chronicle refers to 'a few outlaws (or, indeed, robbers) of the Scottish nation,' as the only people in Scotland south of the Forth who were not under Edward I's sway.[112] These men resisted Edward not from patriotism but from fear: they could not, 'because of their deeds, appear openly.'[113] The same passage refers several times to the Scots more generally and to Scottish forces, and these more positive portrayals use only 'Scoti.' The chronicle also says that a pact between Robert I and John Comyn was intended to bring about 'the liberation of the Scottish nation from the house of slavery and shameful subjection.'[114]

There is one use of the term to refer to an individual Scot. In 1356, the chronicle records that William Douglas went to France to fight the English, noting that he was 'of the Scottish nation.'[115] Serving French interests rarely turns out well for the Scots in *Gesta Annalia II*; in this case, Douglas was accompanied by 'many Scots,' many of whom were killed in the disastrous French defeat at Poitiers, though they managed to rescue their lord from the battle (against his will).[116] By highlighting his birth or nationality, the chronicle is perhaps suggesting that Douglas, who had grown up in France and maintained his connections there throughout his life, had become rather more French than Scottish in outlook and interest; he is portrayed

---

[112] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 111 (pp.336-7): 'ab omnibus et singulis Scoticanae nationis'; 107 (p.333): 'exceptis paucis exulibus, vel etiam praedonibus, de natione Scotorum.'

[113] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'propter sua facinora, juri parere non poterant.'

[114] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113 (pp.337-8): 'de domo servitutis, et indignae subjectionis materia, fieret deliberatio Scoticae nationis.' Not only is the Scots current situation unhappy (hence, perhaps, the use of 'nationis'), this also perhaps foreshadows the failure of this pact, for, the chronicle alleges, Comyn soon betrayed his partner to Edward I, yet another example of the division and factionalism that frequently brought ruin upon the Scots.

[115] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 177 (p.376): 'natione Scotus.' It is possible that this could be intended as 'a Scot by birth.'

[116] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 177 (p.376): 'plures de Scocia.'

elsewhere in the chronicle as one of the many magnates who prioritises personal gain over patriotism and national unity.[117]

Moreover, the few occasions in *Gesta Annalia II* where 'gens' is used to explicitly refer to the English as a distinct nation or people also occur in such a context. As noted above, the term is used when Edward III sought to retake Berwick from the Scots, perhaps to clarify that the inhabitants of Berwick were of a different race to the Scottish occupying force, but it is notable that this occurs when describing his fear that they will be lost.[118] The chronicle also records that, in 1311, Robert I twice entered England, causing great destruction and taking much plunder. This is interpreted by the chronicle as God's righteous judgement for the behaviour of the 'faithless English race,' again using 'gens' in conjunction with a negative description.[119] A similar description of both the English and the Scots occurs in the chronicle's account of Robert I's capture of Perth in 1312, when the king had 'the disloyal people, both Scots and English,' executed.[120] In this instance, the Scots and English are distinct races, but are alike disloyal. It is notable that their disloyalty need not mean that the Scots were no longer Scottish (although it is perhaps less obvious why loyalty to Robert should be expected from the English). Demonstrating mercy and sympathy towards the common folk (who perhaps had little choice in submitting to the English), which appears to match the general attitude of the chronicler, the king did not have every inhabitant of the town killed: he 'spared the rabble, and granted forgiveness to those who asked it.'[121]

---

[117] Michael Brown, *The Black Douglases: War and Lordship in Late Medieval Scotland 1300-1455*, (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.210-214; M. H. Brown, 'Douglas, William, first earl of Douglas and earl of Mar (*c.*1330–1384)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7924, accessed 16/10/ 2014]. In one of the chapters sporadically added to the end of *Gesta Annalia II*, the French king's admiral, John de Vienne, is similarly called 'of the Burgundian nation' (or possibly 'Burgundian by birth') ('natione Burgundus,'): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 189 (p.389).

[118] Bower's account of this assault on Berwick had explicitly referred to the townspeople as English (perhaps to help excuse the Scots' actions), but also keeps 'locum et gentem': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.10 (vol. 7, pp.280-3).

[119] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 128 (p.346): 'gens Anglorum perfida.'

[120] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 129 (p.346): 'perfida gens tam Scociae quam Angliae.'

[121] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 129 (p.346): 'Regis clementia plebe pepercit et veniam petenti conessit.'

The term 'natio' is also twice used to refer to the English, again during passages that are implicitly critical of them. This term is used during a description of the battle of Roslyn in 1302, where, according to *Gesta Annalia II*, by the power of God, a vastly outnumbered Scottish army was victorious.[122] The Scottish force consisted of John Comyn and Simon Fraser, and some of their men, who would prefer to die rather than be 'shamefully subjected to the English nation.'[123] The chronicle describes the decision of Robert I to take up arms 'in order to free his brethren,' moved by the suffering of the Scottish people, who, despite victories such as Roslyn, had nevertheless succumbed and been put 'under the awful yoke of slavery', suffering great insult and slaughter at the hands of 'the English nation.'[124]

In these examples, 'gens' and 'natio' are always used in ways that suggest the chronicle regarded the English and Scots as distinct races.[125] It is notable that regional groups, such as the men of Bute or Galloway, are regarded as forming part of a single Scottish 'gens', which further supports that the idea that terms such as 'gens' were used to refer to national groups, and that the inhabitants of different kingdoms were regarded as (with some exceptions) belonging to different races. There is, however, one example of 'gens' being used in the text in a different way, although it again occurs in a particularly negative context: the arrival of the Black Death in Scotland in 1350. This plague, the chronicle records, raged throughout the whole world, for years before and after this date, and struck down 'nearly a third of

---

[122] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 108 (pp.334-5).

[123] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 108 (pp.334-5): 'nationi Anglicanae subici indigne potius elegerunt.' In this passage, the Scots are again referred to only as 'Scoti', without 'gens', perhaps in part because it was only a small group of Scots, rather than the strength of an entire nation, but also because this was an example of the Scots managing to work together to throw off their oppressors and earn a glorious victory.

[124] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337): 'pro fratribus liberandis,' 'sub diro jugo servitutis,' 'Anglicana natione.' Perhaps surprisingly, given the suffering ascribed to the Scots in this chapter, there is no use of 'gens,' only 'Scoti' by itself. This is perhaps because, on this occasion, fault lies with the English nation, rather than with the Scots themselves, or because the chronicle seeks to present the coming of Robert I as a positive event for the Scots, rather than emphasising their misery. As noted above, the next chapter does use 'natio' in reference to the Scots, when John Comyn betrays Robert to Edward I.

[125] The French are also described as a 'gens' in *Gesta Annalia* 67, 177 (pp.309, 376).

the human race' ('fere tertia pars generis humani').[126] The Scots or the English might form individual nations with individual kings, and have their own origin myths and founding figures, but like all men they ultimately belong to the same race, under one God.

*

Despite such acknowledgements that all people are ultimately descended from the same source, and are all created by the same God, *Gesta Annalia II* nevertheless draws clear distinctions between different national groups. While groups such as the Galwegians are identified as a particular regional group, however, they are nevertheless part of the Scottish people. The Scots are broadly identified as the people who inhabit the kingdom of Scotland and are loyal to the king of Scotland. Within *Gesta Annalia II*, it is therefore made quite clear that inhabitants of areas occupied and governed by the king of England, or those who declined to swear allegiance to Robert I, were nevertheless still regarded as Scottish.

The only exception to this appears to have been Berwick and its surroundings. As discussed in the previous chapter, although Berwick appears to have been regarded as a Scottish town at the beginning of the chronicle, *Gesta Annalia II* is unusual in appearing to suggest that the town was no longer considered such by the mid-fourteenth century. Its population is presented as belonging to a different 'gens' from that of the Scots, and its loyalties are seen to lie with Edward III.[127]

It was also possible for people who were not considered Scottish to live within Scotland: *Gesta Annalia II* acknowledges that, at least in the time of Alexander III, there was an English population living peacefully within Scotland. The Wars of Independence, unsurprisingly, changed this: the chronicle records that one of the first responses to Edward I's invasion in 1296 was to formally deprive 'all the English beneficed clergy in the bishopric of Saint Andrews' of their benefices, on behalf of

---

[126] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 167 (p.368).
[127] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 174 (p.373).

the bishop.[128] This was done only a week before the battle of Dunbar, on account of 'very evident causes of mistrust and credible proofs of villainous plotting against the king and state,' and was soon followed by the expulsion from Scotland of 'each and every other Englishman, both cleric and layman' in the kingdom.[129] Despite living in Scotland, these monks and priors, who had come from English establishments to dependent houses in Scotland, continued to be seen as English and were identified as loyal to the English cause when conflict arose. This would suggest that there was more to national identity, as the chronicle at least understood it, than simply whether one lived in a particular place (even if that also entailed submitting to a different king).

Throughout the text, the folk of England and Scotland are clearly distinguished by the chronicler, even when they are loyal to the same leader, living in the same territory or serving in the same army. For example, at Slaines in 1307, John Comyn, earl of Buchan, led an army against Robert I that contained 'many nobles, both English and Scots', all of whom had different reasons for opposing the king (although the chronicle rejects the idea that some of them might have had valid reasons for regarding Robert as an illegitimate usurper).[130] Those who opposed him might have had been misguided in their loyalties but they were still Scots. Similarly, in 1308, Comyn allied with Philip Mowbray to lead an army consisting of 'a great many Scots and English,' while in 1333 Edward III's army contained not only 'the whole strength of Wales, Gascony, and England' but also 'Scots who supported Edward Balliol.'[131]

Although the chronicle emphasises that Scotland's cause should be placed above personal concerns, it is sympathetic towards the Scots of lower status who joined

---

[128] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 91 (p.325): 'omnes Anglici beneficiati in episcopatu Sancti Andreae.'
[129] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 91 (p.325): propter evidentissimas causas suspitionis, et probabilia argumenta conspiratoriae pravitatis contra regem et statum regni'; 'Similiter reliqui omnes et singuli Anglici, tam clerici quam laici.'
[130] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 122 (pp.343-4): 'multis nobilibus, tam Anglicis quam Scotis.' See, for example, Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati,*' pp.94-115.
[131] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 124 (p.344): 'Scotis et Anglicis quampluribus'; 149 (p.356): 'omni potential Walliae, Gasconiae, Anglia, adjunctis sibi Scotis, Edwardo de Balliol faventibus.'

the English, recognising that they often had little choice in the matter, and is rarely overtly hostile about nobles who do so (particularly if they return to the Scottish side). The chronicle records that Robert I spared the common people at Perth, and that when Andrew of Moray, with the help of the Earl of March and William Douglas, defeated the forces of the Earl of Atholl (warden of Scotland for Edward Balliol and Edward III) at Culblean, they too 'mercifully spared the common people who had been forced to serve' with the Earl.[132] They then besieged Cupar Castle, which contained 'many Anglicised Scots,' (the 'Scoti Anglicati') and granted the garrison a truce at the behest of the kings of France and Scotland.[133]

This striking phrase, 'Scoti Anglicati', refers to those Scots who have submitted to English dominion, but it is notable that the chronicle does not attempt to deny their Scottish identity, demonstrating that allegiance by itself did not wholly define nationality.[134] It carries a sense that these people have a kind of hybrid national identity, as if they are perceived as Scots who have mislaid part of their Scottishness. It is clear from the different contexts in which the term is used that it does not simply refer to Scots who speak English or English people who live in Scotland; the text does not display any confusion over who is English and who is an 'Anglicised Scot' (even if in reality the distinction might have been less clear for some of those who identified themselves with the English cause). The term is also used in the account of the events leading to the battle of Roslyn in 1302. John Comyn, lord of Badenoch and guardian of Scotland, and Simon Fraser, spent the years after John Balliol's exile harrying and harassing the officials appointed by

---

[132] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 129, 154 (pp.346, 359-60): 'plebi, quae invita erat cum eo, misericorditer pepercerunt.'

[133] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 154 (pp.359-60): 'in quo erant plures Scoti Anglicati.'

[134] Similarly, Barbour's *Bruce* and Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica* make little fuss about changing allegiances, although Gray often uses terms such as 'Scottish' or 'English' of a person as a shorthand to indicate their (often temporary) allegiance. For example, after the battle of Methven in 1307, Thomas Randolph 'remained English until he was recaptured by the Scots,' while Patrick Dunbar 'became English' after the Scottish defeat at Halidon Hill in 1333, before later rejoining Scottish allegiance: Sir Thomas Gray, *Scalacronica 1272-1363* (ed. & trans. Andy King) (Woodbridge, 2005), pp.52-5, 116-9; Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' p.96; Kate Ash, 'Friend or Foe? Negotiating the Anglo-Scottish Border in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica* and Richard Holland's *Buke of the Howlat*,' in Mark P. Bruce & Katherine H. Terrell (eds.), *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300-1600* (New York, 2012), pp.51-68 at p.55

Edward I in Scotland and 'the English and Anglicised Scots' in general.[135] The same passage also mentions some Scots south of the Forth who were not yet 'Anglicised': these were 'a few outlaws (or, indeed, robbers) of the Scottish nation,' who avoided submitting to Edward more from fear of being punished than from patriotism.[136]

That the 'English' element of these Scots was their allegiance, rather than any other difference in their established identity, is supported by the other constructions used to describe them in similar contexts. The chronicle's account of the siege of Perth in 1339 records that William Bullock had at that time surrendered Cupar Castle and sided with David II; he had previously served as 'lieutenant, and treasurer of all the English and their adherents in the kingdom of Scotland,' (that is, the Scots who sided with the English rather than with David II).[137] This passage also notes that Perth was held, 'on behalf of the English', by 'many Scots who adhered to Edward Balliol.'[138] The chronicle does not make explicit whether there is any difference between Scots loyal to Edward Balliol and Scots who were 'Anglicised,' and the context of their usage suggests indeed that there was little distinction, at least as far as the chronicler was concerned.[139] The chronicle also mentions that Edward III's army at the battle of Halidon Hill in 1333 contained 'many Scots who supported Edward Balliol.'[140] At this battle, 'the Scots were overcome.'[141] This refers to the army of David II, described simply as 'Scots' in contrast to those on the opposing side; the chronicle adds that those who 'supported the side of king David, and loved him dearly' had suffered particularly heavily, listing some of the most notable losses on his side.[142]

---

[135] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'Anglicos et Scotos Anglicatos.'
[136] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'exceptis paucis exulibus, vel etiam predonibus, de natione Scotorum.'
[137] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (p.364): 'thesaurarius omnium Anglicorum et eorum adhaerentium in regno Scociae.'
[138] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (p.363): 'ex parte Anglicorum... plures Scotos, qui Edwardo de Balliol adhaeserunt'; Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' p.105.
[139] Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' p.96.
[140] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 149 (p.356): 'sibi Scotis, Edwardo de Balliol faventibus.'
[141] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 149 (p.356): 'Scoti sunt devicti.'
[142] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 149 (p.356): 'maxime qui partem regis David favebant vel tenere diligebant.

*

There is within *Gesta Annalia II* a clear understanding of the Scottish people: they are a single, unified nation, distinct from their neighbours such as the English, and who live throughout the entire realm of the king of Scots. There are no other distinct races identified with the kingdom, although it is possible for people of other races to come to live within Scotland (as many English people do, at least before the Wars of Independence). *Proto-Fordun* depicts the Scots in similar terms, by presenting groups such as the Moravians and MacWilliams as outsiders to Scotland, not only geographically but perhaps even ethnically, separate from the Scottish race. In both texts, Scottish identity is not simply a matter of residence or even of political allegiance to the king of Scotland. In *Gesta Annalia II*, therefore, the English clerics and people expelled in 1296 had not become Scottish, despite living in Scotland; nor had those Scots who, for whatever reason, supported the English king in opposition to Robert I or David II become English. Even when Scots chose, or were compelled, to give their allegiance to the crown of England, other shared bonds continued to mark them as Scottish. Kingship, however, remained at the heart of this understanding of nations and identity, and the chronicles suggest that to oppose the king was to act against Scotland's interests. This applies especially to the nobility, depicted in *Gesta Annalia II* in particular as frequently acting in their own interests at the expense of the prosperity and well-being of the ordinary people of the realm.

For the authors of both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, then, the Scots formed an identifiable, united race, which alone possessed the right to occupy and rule in their kingdom, Scotland. Ideally they were all loyal to the crown of Scotland, a loyalty which united the Scots even when they were divided about exactly who should occupy it and which helped sustain the idea of a single, unified Scottish kingdom and people even through the Wars of Independence.

CHAPTER FOUR: Kingship

I

The death of Alexander III in 1286 is mourned in *Gesta Annalia II* as the beginning of Scotland's troubles: 'the losses of the times that followed clearly show how sad and harmful his death was for the kingdom of Scotland.'[1] Alexander, the chronicle states, had been the ideal king: under his rule, 'the church of Christ flourished, its priests were honoured with due respect, vice withered away, deceit disappeared, injustice ceased, truth was strong, and justice reigned.'[2] He was rightly called king because of the 'merits of his integrity,' because he ruled justly and fairly, and protected the rights of all while swiftly punishing rebellion, inspiring both love and fear not only in his subjects but even opponents such as the English.[3] His reign brought peace and prosperity and 'agreeable and secure freedom' to Scotland; without their great 'leader and pilot,' Scotland was bereft, and, worse yet, 'he left no lawful offspring to succeed him.'[4]

Alexander III is depicted in *Gesta Annalia II* as an ideal king, and his reign as a kind of golden age for Scotland, allowing the author to highlight the qualities he desired in a king.[5] They are perhaps qualities that one might expect a cleric to highlight, stressing piety, supporting the church, and maintaining a peaceful, orderly and well-governed society. These are, the chronicle suggests, the duties of a king, and his fulfilment of them explains why his rule is accepted; the glory of Scotland during Alexander's reign is deliberately contrasted with the woes that followed.

---

[1] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (p.309): 'Cujus mors tam lachrimosa fuerat regno Scociae et nociva, damna subsequentium temporum patenter declarant.'

[2] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (p.309): 'Christi floruit ecclesia, sacerdotes ejus debita honorabantur reverentia, aruit vitium, abfuit dolus, cessavit injuria, viruit virtus, viguit veritas, regnavit justitia.'

[3] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (p.309): 'suae probitatis merita'; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.192.

[4] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (p.309): 'jocunda libertate secura'; 'tanto caruisti duce et auriga'; 'nulla ab eo prole relicta ad succedendum legitima.'

[5] Norman H. Reid, 'Crown and Community under Robert I,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community – Essays Presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.203-22 at p.207.

Gesta Annalia II's belief that a good king was vital to a kingdom's well-being reflects a commonplace of medieval thought.[6] *Proto-Fordun* similarly laments the death of David I, stating that without its great king, Scotland was desolate: 'your harp is turned to mourning, and your pipes to the sound of those who weep. Your lamp is extinguished... the splendour of your glory has faded away.'[7]

The natural division of the world into different peoples and ruled by different kings was a given, supported by the authority of the Bible and by ancient history.[8] In the medieval period, groups once defined by a shared descent, language or set of laws, increasingly also identified themselves by a shared territory and a shared loyalty to a king, to the extent that kingdoms and peoples were seen to more or less correspond: a kingdom consisted of a people, a people formed a kingdom.[9] This idea of regnal solidarity was enhanced further by the development of foundation myths and royal genealogies that stressed the antiquity of a nation and its royal dynasty, highlighting the extent to which the crown was synonymous with the nation and was a focal point for such expressions of solidarity and unity (an idea that it was, of course, in the interests of kings to foster).[10] During the Wars of Independence, such origin myths were particularly useful as a riposte to English claims of sovereignty over Scotland, being used to prove that the Scots had their own ancient origins and were the only people with a right to Scotland, having

---

[6] Jean Dunbabin, 'Government,' in J.H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.457-519 at pp.482-4; Roger Mason, 'Kingship, Tyranny and the Right to Resist in Fifteenth Century Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review* 66 (1987), pp.125-51 at p.149; Sally Mapstone, 'Bower on Kingship,' in Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, pp.321-38 at pp.321-5; G.W.S. Barrow, *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992), p.23. Proto-Fordun contains several cautionary examples of how a weak or immoral king brings ruin upon his kingdom (although it is possible these were added later by Fordun), e.g. Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 3.46, 4.2, 4.5-7, 4.27 (pp.131-2, 145, 148-51, 169-70. Bower added further examples, e.g. *Scotichronicon* 2.18, 2.41 (vol. 1, pp.206-9, 258-63), 3.56, 4.5-8, 4.29 (vol. 2, pp.156-61, 280-91, 354-7).

[7] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436): 'Versa est in luctum cithera tua, et organa tua in vocem flentium. Extincta est lucerna tua... viror gloriae tuae emarcuit.'

[8] Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp.250-60.

[9] Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, p.260; Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp.8-9; Reynolds, 'Medieval Origines Gentium,' pp.389-90; Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.10.

[10] Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.259.

maintained this independence under their own kings since ancient times.[11] The

Declaration of Arbroath, for example, stated that there had been an unbroken line

of 113 Scottish kings.[12]

While extensive narratives of national origins existed in England and Wales by the

twelfth century (and earlier still in Ireland), Vairement's chronicle and, following it,

Proto-Fordun are the earliest surviving substantial narrative histories of Scotland in

this vein.[13] *Proto-Fordun* and later *Gesta Annalia II* are deeply concerned with the

nature of kingship, the role of the crown and its relationship to the people. The

crown has been seen as having a particularly important role in creating a sense of

solidarity and unity among the Scottish people, who lacked a single common

language, who emerged from many different groups, and whose kingdom was

divided by geographical barriers.[14] The significant extension of royal authority in the

twelfth and thirteenth centuries encouraged such an identification of crown and

community; it was unlikely to have been only coincidence that terms such as

'Scotland' and 'Scottish' acquired broader definitions in this period.[15] Indeed, kings

themselves could promote such trends: *Proto-Fordun*, for example, praises David I

for improving Christian worship in Scotland, highlighting his foundation of

---

[11] See, for example, Roger A. Mason, '"Scotching the Brut": The Early History of Britain,' in Jenny Wormald (ed.), *Scotland Revisited* (London, 1991), pp.49-60 at pp.51-54; Roger A. Mason, 'Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain,' in Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England 1286-1815* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp.60-84 at pp.60-4 (although this interpretation does not take into account the much earlier roots of Fordun's version of Scotland's origins).

[12] 'Declaration of Arbroath' (A.A.M. Duncan, trans.) in John Barbour, *The Bruce* (A.A.M. Duncan, ed.) (Edinburgh, 1997), pp.779-82. This total was achieved by including sixty Pictish kings, despite the Declaration presenting the Picts as one of the many peoples defeated by the Scots to win the kingdom: Dauvit Broun, 'The Birth of Scottish History,' *Scottish Historical Review* 76.1 (1997), pp.4-22 at p.14; Dauvit Broun, 'The Picts' Place in the Kingship's Past Before John of Fordun,' in Edward J. Cowan & Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.11-28 at p.14.

[13] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.40-9.

[14] See for example Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.11; Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' pp.18-37; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.53; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' pp.75-81; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, p.273; R.R. Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, II: Names, Boundaries and Regnal Solidarities,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6.5 (1995), pp.1-20 at p.15.

[15] Duncan, 'The Making of Scotland,'pp.127-38; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.10; Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' pp.18-9; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, II: Names, Boundaries and Regnal Solidarities,' p.17.

monasteries at 'Kelso, Melrose, Jedburgh, Holm Cultram near Carlisle, Dundrennan in Galloway, Newbattle, the monastery of Holyrood in Edinburgh called Crag, Cambuskenneth, Kinloss and near Berwick.'[16] These locations were significant: as well as a number in the heart of the kingdom, near Edinburgh and Stirling (the major royal centres either side of the Forth), these foundations were also located in Moray in the north and along the southern border of the kingdom, making a statement of royal authority and encouraging solidarity with the crown in the far flung regions of the kingdom.

Both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* use allegiance to the Scottish crown as one way of defining whether a region is part of Scotland or its inhabitants Scottish, presenting a sense of unity and correspondence between the king of Scots, the Scottish people and the realm of Scotland. In the period described by *Gesta Annalia II*, however, this idea was complicated by the long-standing presence of English kings and armies, and the complex political situation in Scotland that meant both Scots fighting against the English and those fighting alongside them could claim to be serving the Scottish crown.[17] Our understanding of these issues within Scotland has, however, been coloured by the extent to which surviving Scottish sources reflect the interests of the Bruce dynasty, whether because they reflect simply hindsight, being written in the knowledge of the eventual success of Robert I, or because they have been influenced by propaganda intended to legitimise the Bruce claim to the throne.[18]

Robert I certainly needed to convince not only sceptical outsiders, such as the Pope, but also his fellow Scots, of the legitimacy of his reign. After all, he had murdered his chief opponent before a church altar, been excommunicated and fought

---

[16] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35 (p.432): 'Calkhow, Melrose, Jedworth, Holmcultrane juxta Carlel, Dundranane in Galwidia, Newbotill, monasterium Sanctae Crucis in Edinburgh quod appellatur Crage, Cambuskeneth, Kynlos, et juxta Berwicum.' This list of foundations was inserted into Ailred's eulogy for David I; *Proto-Fordun* omits Ailred's list of monastic orders, but the list is included alongside the list of foundations in Fordun and Bower (both of whom list Newbattle after Jedburgh rather than after Dundrennan). Bower also mentions some other foundations near Carlisle and Newcastle: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.48 (vol. 3, pp.146-9, 263).

[17] Brown, '*Scoti Anglicati*,' pp.104-5.

[18] Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.32; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.189-90.

alongside, as well as against, the English crown. Having arguably simply usurped the rightful king, he faced substantial opposition to his rule within his own kingdom, and it was therefore in his interests to present a particularly persuasive and selective interpretation of Scotland's identities and of the relationship of the Scottish king to his subjects.[19] Thus, the Bruce cause and Scotland's cause have been conflated, and those who opposed it are presented as unpatriotic or treasonous, rather than motivated by a different interpretation of Scotland's identity. This issue is acutely relevant to *Gesta Annalia II*, which was written after the Wars of Independence and is strongly supportive of the aims of Robert's son, David II, particularly in his discussions with England about his ransom payments and the succession: the text is unequivocal about Robert I's status as a hero and his bond with the Scottish kingdom and people, claiming that he could command their support even at his lowest times because he was 'one of their fellow-countrymen.'[20]

That is not to dismiss any such evidence of the association between king and people as mere propaganda; indeed, such a portrayal would have little meaning or benefit were it not grounded in an idea that was widely understood and accepted, and the evidence of *Gesta Annalia II* suggests that the chronicler regarded the king as central to the nation's identity. This chapter will therefore discuss how the two chronicles present the role of kings and the qualities that they embody, and the relationship of the crown with the kingdom. It will examine how these chronicles link the history and status of the nation and its people with the history and status of the king, especially with regard to the idea of an ancient, long-standing independence, and the extent to which these chronicles might have been shaped by a particularly pro-Robert I and pro-David II vision of Scottish identity.

*

In both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, the king is the central figure in the narrative of Scottish history. They bind the kingdom together under their rule,

---

[19] Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.32.
[20] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337): 'de suis confratribus'; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.25.

protecting its rights and its people and embodying the qualities needed for a prosperous kingdom. Both texts also emphasise the need for the kingdom to be united rather than divided in its loyalties and interests, and although they at times display ambivalent attitudes towards individual kings and their dynasties, both texts are overwhelmingly supportive of the idea of the crown itself; the throne represented more than did the man currently occupying it.

The two chronicles highlight some similar aspects of the king's role, such as their duty to unite the kingdom and defend the people, but also emphasise slightly different qualities, reflecting the context of their composition as well as the preferences and interests of the authors. *Gesta Annalia II* tends to place more emphasis on martial qualities and the need to fight for Scotland than does *Proto-Fordun*, which tends to focus on the king's role in providing justice and bringing harmony, and as a (secular) moral leader and guardian of the church. That is not surprising, given that *Gesta Annalia II* deals with the period of the Wars of Independence, and this emphasis is also arguably evidence of the influence of Robert I's propaganda; after all, his reign had been legitimised by violence as much as by anything else, and his spiritual qualities were, perhaps, questionable. This attitude is made more complex, however, by both the relatively sympathetic treatment of John Balliol in early sections of the chronicle and passages that appear to indicate support for a possible English succession to the throne, a topic of much debate at the time of the chronicle's composition. *Proto-Fordun*'s attitude is also more complex than it might at first appear. While it celebrates the piety of Malcolm III and Margaret, and their descendants, for example, it is also critical of those kings whose piety leads them to forgo their worldly duties (such as Malcolm IV), writing in praise of the more vigorous attitude of William I.[21]

Both texts also contain hints of the idea that, should an individual king be found wanting, his subjects might be compelled to limit his powers or even remove him

---

[21] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257).

from office: he is a custodian of the kingdom, rather than simply its possessor.[22]
This attitude lies behind the presentation of David I and Robert I as the most
celebrated figures of their respective chronicles: David I improved his kingdom in
morals, in wealth, and even in warfare, while Robert I likewise restored the church
and secured Scotland's freedom, as it was under Alexander III. It was the duty of the
king to increase his country's prosperity and maintain its freedoms, whether that
meant building churches or making war. He was not only the protector of his
people, the administrator of government and justice, but also the embodiment of
the customs, values and qualities that define those people.

II

The significance of the Scottish kingship to Scotland's identity is evident in the very
structure of *Proto-Fordun*. It is built around a royal genealogy, explicitly presenting
the history of Scotland as the history of its kings. The duties *Proto-Fordun* expected
of a king, and the qualities he should demonstrate, provide a key theme throughout
the chronicle, particularly in its extensive treatment of Malcolm III and Margaret,
and their descendants.

Such qualities were identified at the very beginning of *Proto-Fordun*'s account of
Scotland's ancient origins. While the different versions given of Gaedel's arrival in
Egypt from Greece and his subsequent departure from Egypt arguably present him
as a surprisingly ambivalent and not necessarily particularly noble figure, the
account of his leadership of the wandering Scots sets out some of the key aspects of
Proto-Fordun's idea of Scottish kingship.[23] Having been established as king with the
support of his leading nobles, he is described as wholly occupied with 'the
protection of his race,' determined to maintain their independence and freedom
from slavery.[24] He established laws for his people, ruling justly and moderately;

---

[22] E.g. Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3 (p.256).
[23] Broun, *Irish Identity*, p.14.
[24] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.11, 15 (pp.11-12, 14): 'gentis suae tuitionem.'

these laws, the chronicle alleges, were still followed by the Scots of *Proto-Fordun*'s own time, emphasising the ancient roots of the Scottish people.[25]

Gaedel also provided lessons for his successors, urging his sons to be active in defence of their kingdom's independence and freedom: the noblest thing of all is live under the 'hereditary power of one's own nation,' rather than 'endure the rule of any foreign domination.'[26] This idea is central to the chronicle's presentation of the relationship between the king and the Scottish people: Gaedel's lesson seems to have been well-learned, as, during the ensuing centuries, the Scots are said to endure terrible hardship and poverty, under their own king, rather than accept a foreign ruler.[27]

These themes recur throughout *Proto-Fordun*. Throughout the chronicle, kings are praised for their wisdom and moderation, their efforts to preserve order and ensure justice, and for their defence of the kingdom's integrity and independence.[28] That is the duty of the king; only if they wield their authority properly can they expect loyal and obedient subjects.[29] Enemies, rebels and the lawless should be dealt with firmly and harshly, but mercy should be shown to loyal subjects and those who submit.[30] The king should be vigorous and able in war, but not seek it out for its own sake; peace is preferred, but not at the expense of the kingdom's independence and order.[31] The king should also be humble and pious, and defend the church.[32]

---

[25] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.19 (pp.17-8).

[26] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*1.16 (pp.14-5): 'nullius aliengenae dominantis imperium pati, sed successione solummodo propriae nationis uti spontaliter potestate.'

[27] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.20 (pp.18-9).

[28] See, for example, the descriptions of Eochaid VI, Kenneth I, Giric, Malcolm I, Kenneth II, Duncan I and, by contrast, lazy Selbach and neglectful Culen: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.45, 3.47, 4.3, 17, 25, 27, 28, 44 (pp.130-1, 132-3, 145-7, 159-60, 167-8, 169-70, 170-1, 187-8).

[29] As in the description of the *gens montana*: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42)

[30] E.g. Eochaid Buide, Duf: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, 3.32, 4.26 (pp.117-8, 168-9).

[31] For example, Kenneth I, Donald, Giric, Malcolm II, in contrast with the too-warlike Aedan and Alpin: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.27, 4.2, 3, 15, 17, 38 (pp.113-4, 145-7, 157-8, 159-60, 180-1).

[32] E.g. Eochaid VI, Giric, Malcolm II, and in contrast Aedan, Eochaid Buide, Culen: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.27, 32, 45, 4.17, 27, 39-40 (pp.113-4, 117-8, 130-1, 159-60, 169-70, 181-3).

Proto-Fordun also draws attention to the antiquity of the Scottish crown, and its claim to the entire realm. The Scottish king is presented as the inheritor of both the Pictish and Scottish kingdoms, so that Scotland can be seen as a unified territory even in ancient times. This is highlighted through the chronicle's emphasis on the simultaneous arrival of the Picts and Scots on the Scottish mainland, the provision of Scottish wives for the early Pictish settlers, and the inclusion of the claim that the two royal lines intermarried throughout their history.[33] The kings of the two ancient kingdoms also combined to assert the independence of this unified territory in a letter to Julius Caesar, in which they refused to submit to Roman authority, preferring instead freedom, which they valued above all else.[34] The chronicle's acknowledgement of the Scottish kingdom's Pictish inheritance is also evident in the repeated description of Scone as the place where the Pictish kings had established the seat of their kingdom (and where the Scottish kings of *Proto-Fordun*'s own time did the same).[35]

Proto-Fordun also asserts the antiquity of the crown through its acknowledgement of the kingship's Irish origins. This occurs not only in the origin-legend material, in which Ireland is arguably presented as the intended uninhabited homeland divinely ordained for the Scots, but also in the chronicle's account of the inauguration of Alexander III.[36] The account of the ceremony emphasised the role and significance of the Stone of Destiny, brought to Ireland by Simón Brecc, and thence to Scotland by Fergus son of Feredach, first king of Scots in Scotland: the Stone was kept at Scone because this had been the ancient seat of Albania, and all the kings of Scotland had first sat on the Stone, as Alexander did now.[37]

---

[33] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.29, 35, 3.53 (pp.25, 30, 138-9).

[34] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.15 (pp.47-8).

[35] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (p.430); *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5).

[36] Broun, *Scottish Independence*, p.247; *Irish Identity*, pp.117-121.

[37] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28 (pp.427-8).Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.176-82; Dauvit Broun, 'The Origin of the Stone of Scone as a National Icon,' in Richard Welander, David J. Breze & Thomas Owen Clancy (eds.), *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.183-98 at pp.186-96; Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.144-6.

The chronicle also highlighted the inclusion of the Irish ancestry in the ceremony, through the recitation of the king's genealogy by 'a highland Scot,' who read out the genealogy in Gaelic: 'Benach de Re Albanne Alexander, mac Alexander, mac Vleyham, mac Henri, mac David.'[38] The involvement of a poet to recite the genealogy seems likely to have been a traditional part of the ceremony, intended to emphasise the continuity and antiquity of the royal line.[39] In this sense, it is also a history of the Scottish people, as embodied in their new king, from their very origins to the present, occurring at the very moment that the new king was confirmed.

After quoting the start of the recitation in Gaelic, the chronicle provides a Latin translation, not only of those names mentioned but going as far back as Fergus, 'first king of Scots in Albania,' and adding that the recitation continued until ending with 'the first Scot, namely Éber Scot,' son of Gaedel and Scota.[40] The focus on Éber Scot as the very first Scot, and the last ancient ancestor named at the ceremony, arguably draws attention to the Irish origins of the Scots: he is regarded as the first to arrive in Ireland, suggesting that *Proto-Fordun* interpreted the Scots as originating through settlement in Ireland, as well as by descending from Gaedel and Scota.[41]

Proto-Fordun's account of the ceremony combined this with recognition of the Pictish inheritance of the crown: the chronicle describes Scone as the ancient capital of Albania; it notes elsewhere that it had been established as the seat of the

---

[38] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5): 'quidam Scotus montanus.'The term 'Scotus montanus' was likely intended only to indicate that the Scot was a Gaelic-speaker, rather than invoking stereotypes of wildness or rusticity; other depictions indicate that not only was this figure literate but perhaps wealthy and of high status: Bannerman, 'The King's Poet,'p.122; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots,* p.147; Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' p.75.

[39] Such a feature was a traditional element of Gaelic and Irish inauguration ceremonies, and this 'highland Scot' appears to be included on a seal of Scone Abbey that depicts this ceremony: John Bannerman, 'The King's Poet,' pp.120-3; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp.147-8; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.173.

[40] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5): 'Fergusii, primi Scotorum regis in Albania;' 'primum Scotum, videlicet, Éber Scot.'This Latin list of kings appears to have been inserted into an earlier account of the ceremony by *Proto-Fordun*, and derives from a list found in *Imagines Historiarum* by Ralph of Diss; that list does not end with Éber Scot but with Noah: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.178, 222-3.

[41] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.222-3.

kingdom by the Picts.[42] The ceremony, which appears to have contained a mixture of innovative and traditional elements, is therefore presented as symbolising the connection of the new Scottish king to his ancient predecessors, emerging from both the ancient Picts and Scots, while also stressing the contemporary prestige of the Scottish crown.[43]

The idea that the Scottish kingdom had emerged from these two different peoples, highlighted in *Proto-Fordun*'s account of Alexander III's inauguration, perhaps had a further significance for the author: Alexander III, who ruled over a kingdom of different linguistic and cultural groups, was himself descended from Malcolm III and Margaret, and therefore the product of a dynasty regarded as a fusion of English and Scottish royal dignity. Indeed, the chronicle depicts Malcolm and Margaret as the founders of a new dynasty, which combined two royal lines, just as the Scottish people had emerged from two ancient groups and Scotland emerged from two ancient kingdoms.

*

Proto-Fordun sought to extend Vairement's chronicle, which ended with the start of Malcolm III's reign, by supplementing it with other material and bringing it up to date with the addition of a history of the descendants of Malcolm and Margaret. It is their dynasty that receives the most extensive treatment in the chronicle. The role of Margaret, in particular, in establishing this new dynasty is evident in the chronicle's inclusion of an account of her ancestors, describing the achievements of

---

[42] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5); *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28, 31 (pp.427-8, 429-30); Broun, 'Origin of the Stone,' pp.195-6; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.221-3. Fordun (and Bower) altered this, so that the ancient seat was instead established by 'both the Scottish and Pictish kings.' This plays down the Pictish element of Scotland's past but which is inconsistent with *Proto-Fordun*'s narrative of the arrival of the Picts and Scots in Scotland: *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.28 (p.227); *Scotichronicon* 5.36 (vol. 3, pp.104-7); Broun, 'The Picts' Place,' pp.26-7.

[43] Elements such as Alexander being enthroned under a cross in the graveyard, and the nobles strewing garments at his feet, appear to be intended to emphasise the sovereignty of the Scottish crown, in the absence of papally-sanctioned anointment or coronation: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.179-182; Broun, 'Origin of the Stone,' p.192; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots,* pp.146-7.

the kings of England from whom she was descended.[44] The chronicle presents this English royal line as continuing through Margaret and her descendants, rather than with William I of England, who is presented as an intruder in the succession. The English throne and royal dynasty were, from the chronicler's perspective, reunited through the marriage of Margaret's daughter Matilda to Henry I.[45]

Margaret's English ancestry provided an added degree of pedigree and prestige to the Scottish crown, and highlights the role of Margaret in establishing the crown's identity. This English heritage was something Malcolm and Margaret themselves would emphasise, giving their children English, rather than Gaelic, names (even though Malcolm himself was a native Gaelic speaker), and this stress on their Anglo-Saxon heritage might have helped integrate the English-speaking aristocracy of Lothian into the realm.[46]

Proto-Fordun presents the union of Malcolm and Margaret as marking a rebirth and renewal of the kingdom, revitalising its institutions and making it prosperous, and placing proper Christian piety at the heart of both the crown and the kingdom. Malcolm is the successor of an ancient line, linking the Scottish kingdom to its past; Margaret's influence brings Scotland into the present.[47] The idea that this dynasty marked a new starting point would have helped provide a sense of historical legitimacy to the French and Flemish families whose arrival in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was encouraged by the Scottish kings; the success of this idea can be seen in the way that fifteenth-century genealogies of the Scottish crown would show the marriage of Malcolm and Margaret as a joining of the Scottish and Saxon royal lines, while Scottish nobles, particularly in the Lowlands, frequently extended their own genealogies only as far as this period, even when their origins in

---

[44] This is the first item in the *Gesta Annalia I* section of *Proto-Fordun*: Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 1 (p.406).
[45] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.61-2.
[46] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' p.68.
[47] See e.g. Barrow, *Scotland and Its Neighbours,* pp.38-9; Alan Macquarrie, *The Saints of Scotland: Essays in Scottish Church History AD450-1093* (Edinburgh, 1997), p.1.

Scotland were known to be older.[48] Wyntoun, in his chronicle written in the 1420s, would even describe Robert, duke of Albany, by the number of generations he was removed from Margaret.[49]

The sense that Malcolm and Margaret were the founders of a new dynasty is also suggested by *Proto-Fordun*'s portrayal of Donald, Malcolm's brother, and Duncan, Malcolm's son from his first marriage (described as 'illegitimate').[50] The chronicle explicitly dismisses the claims of both to the Scottish crown, and records that they were buried on Iona, the traditional resting place of Scotland's kings in *Proto-Fordun*.[51] While acknowledging their royal connections, this further disassociates Duncan and Donald from the new dynasty, who would be buried instead at the new royal centre of Dunfermline Abbey.[52] Dunfermline's continued importance as both a practical and symbolic royal centre is also evident within *Gesta Annalia II,* which records the birth of Robert I's son, the future David II, there in 1324.[53] Robert I's association with Dunfermline (his wife was buried in there in 1327, as was he in 1329) presented his reign as a continuation of the dynasty of Malcolm and Margaret, thus emphasising his legitimacy.[54] Edward I of England also appeared to

---

[48] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.68-9.

[49] Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.6, p.419; Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.65-6.

[50] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 20 (p.422): filium regis Malcolmi filium nothum'; 26 (p.426): 'dicti regis Malcolmi filius, sed nothus.'

[51] The chronicles states that Edgar, Alexander and David are Malcolm's lawful heirs ('legitimis itaque regis Malcolmi heredibus'): Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 26 (p.426). Evidence that Scotland's kings were actually traditionally buried on Iona is limited, but that does not undermine the point being made by the chronicle; indeed, the tradition seems to have arisen at around the same time that Alexander I had Donald's body moved there: Steve Boardman, 'Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,' in Richard Fawcett (ed.), *Royal Dunfermline* (Edinburgh, 2005), pp.139-153 at pp.140-1.

[52] Similar royal burial places associated with saintly monarchs were established throughout Europe at this time, for example at Westminster, associated with Edward the Confessor and St Denis, associated with St Louis: Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey & the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven, 1995); Elizabeth M. Hallam, 'Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship in France and England 1060-1380' in *Journal of Medieval History 8* (1982) pp.359-380; Boardman, 'Dunfermline,' p.143.

[53] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 138 (pp.350-1). Even the time of David's birth is noted, suggesting that the author of *Gesta Annalia II* was well-informed regarding the abbey.

[54] Boardman, 'Dunfermline,' pp.144-6. David II also intended to be buried there, though was eventually interred at Holyrood.

be making a similar association by choosing to winter at Dunfermline during 1303-4, after he had received the submission of almost all of Scotland's leading magnates.[55]

*

It is notable that the description of Alexander III's inauguration does not feature the new king being anointed and crowned; Scottish kings would not receive papal sanction for this until the coronation of David II.[56] The text does, however, stress the sanctity of Margaret, and the piety of her descendants, qualities that were perhaps intended to compensate for the lack of anointment by showing that the Scottish kingship enjoyed divine favour in a different way.[57] The next event described by *Proto-Fordun* after Alexander III's inauguration is his translation, one year later, of St Margaret's remains to a new shrine, highlighting this association.[58] The dynasty's descent from St Margaret renders them especially fitted to the idea, emphasised throughout *Proto-Fordun*, that a king should be a model of piety, a protector of the church and guardians of the kingdom's spiritual wellbeing, and this event highlights that, for the chronicler, Margaret remained a potent symbol of Scotland's Christian faith and the unity between Scotland's royal dynasty, church and people.

Margaret's holiness is established from her first appearance in the chronicle: she brought with her a holy relic, the Black Rood, which became 'no less feared than loved by all the Scottish race,' a physical manifestation of the strength of Scotland's Christian faith and of the connection between crown and faith; it would be one of the symbols of the Scottish crown removed by Edward I in 1296.[59] Later chronicles

---

[55] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 109 (pp.335-6); Boardman, 'Dunfermline,' p.144.

[56] Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' p.139.

[57] Taylor argues that *Proto-Fordun's* main source for this material stressed the English royal descent of Margaret and her dynasty to argue for papal sanction of anointment: Taylor, 'Historical writing,' pp.231-252.

[58] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 49 (p.295); Boardman, 'Dunfermline,' p.143; Taylor, 'Historical writing,' p.251. The chronicle does not mention that this followed Pope Innocent IV's formal canonisation of Margaret.

[59] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14 (p.417): 'omni genti Scotorum non minus terribilem quam amabilem.' The Rood was brought to Margaret and David I on their deathbeds, while David II is said to have carried the Black Rood at the battle of Neville's Cross in 1346

would credit her with continuing to serve Scotland: Margaret appeared in a vision to dissuade William I from a misguided invasion of England in 1199, while in 1263 she appeared in a vision to Sir John Wemyss, stating that it was her duty to rush to Largs to defeat the Norwegian invaders, as she had 'accepted this kingdom from God, and it is entrusted to me and my heirs for ever,' a presentation which emphasises her role as the founder of a new saintly dynasty.[60]

Margaret's devotion was, for the chronicler, evident in her marriage to Malcolm: she did so from a sense of duty and because it was God's will.[61] *Proto-Fordun's* account of Margaret includes many examples of how Margaret sought to pass on her faith to Malcolm and to her family.[62] The chronicle also goes further than its source material in presenting Malcolm as equally devoted to charity and piety.[63]

The chronicle's portrayal of the sons of Malcolm and Margaret similarly emphasises their piety and devotion to the church. Alexander I is described as a 'lettered and pious man,' than whom no one was 'more devoted to the clergy, more bountiful to strangers.'[64] Like his parents, he was zealous 'in searching for the relics of saints,' in providing sacred books and priestly vestments, and in acts of charity.[65] *Proto-Fordun* notes his gifts to three religious foundations in particular: the Augustinian priories at Kilrymont (that is, the town of St Andrews) and at Scone (which he

---

(presumably, a different fragment of the Holy Cross associated with St Margaret, since the original seemingly remained in English hands): Michael A. Penman, *David II, 1329-71* (Edinburgh, 2004), p.128; Michael A. Penman, 'The Scots at the Battle of Neville's Cross, 17 October 1346,' *Scottish Historical Review* 80.2 (2001), pp.157-180 at p.176; Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.24; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, p.96; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.17, 5.55 (vol. 3, pp.52-3, 160-3, 205 n.16).

[60] The William story was recorded by Roger Howden, while the Largs story appears in the collection of Margaret's miracles and in Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.15 (vol. 5, pp.336-9): Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, p.113; Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' p.66; Bartlett, *The Miracles of Saint Aebbe and Saint Margaret*, pp.xxxiv, l, 86-9.

[61] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14 (p.417).

[62] E.g. Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18, 32 (pp.420, 430-1); see also Lois L. Huneycutt, 'The Idea of the Perfect Princess: The Life of St Margaret in the Reign of Matilda II (1100-1118)' in *Anglo-Norman Studies* 12 (1989), pp.81-97 at p.85; Macquarrie, *The Saints of Scotland*, p.213.

[63] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18 (p.420); Keene, *Saint Margaret,* pp.108-112.

[64] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (p.429):'vir literatus et pius'; 34 (p.431): 'quo nemo in clericos devotior, in extraneos magnificentior.'

[65] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 34 (pp.431-2): 'in reliquiis sanctorum perquirendis, in vestibus sacerdotalibus librisque sacris conficiendis et ornandis studiosissimus.'

himself had founded), and the Benedictine abbey at Dunfermline founded by his parents.[66] These locations were highly symbolic: they represented perhaps the most resonant elements of the crown's identity, being, respectively, the site of the kingdom's holiest relics, its ancient royal seat and the home of its new, particularly devout, royal dynasty. That Alexander was seen as deliberately making such associations is clear: the chronicle states that he chose to build the new church at Scone, on the same spot where the ancient kings, from Cruithne, first king of the Picts, onwards, had established the seat of Albany.[67] In this way, not only was Alexander pointedly emphasising the crown's link to Scotland's ancient past, but, as the chronicle suggests, he was also emphasising the place of piety and faith at the heart of the identity of both crown and kingdom, an idea that was clearly recognised and approved of by the church.

Alexander's generosity to the church was, apparently, matched only by that of his brother, David I, who is credited by *Proto-Fordun* (in passages derived from Ailred's eulogy for David) with reforming the practices and organisation of the church in Scotland. This was part of the king's duty towards his people as much as to the church hierarchy: the chronicle declares that at David I's succession, there were 'only three or four bishops in the whole kingdom of the Scots,' and throughout the kingdom the new king found morals going to ruin (perhaps something of a surprise given the alleged devotion his predecessors had displayed).[68] By the end of his reign, however, David had restored the old bishoprics and created new ones, so that, according to *Proto-Fordun,* the kingdom now had twelve to sit alongside the many new monasteries that he founded in strategically important and symbolic locations.[69] Like his parents and brothers, he performed charity and adhered to the

---

[66] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (pp.429-30).

[67] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (pp.429-30).

[68] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35 (p.432): 'Nam cum ipse in toto regno Scociae tres vel quatuor tantum invenit episcopos, [ecclesiis] ceteris sine pastoribus tam morum quam rerum dispendio fluctuantibus.'

[69] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35 (p.432). Fordun follows *Proto-Fordun* in saying that Scotland had twelve bishoprics on David's death; Bower, however, follows Ailred in saying there were nine; the figure of twelve might have been arrived at by misreading 'novis' as 'novem' and adding this to the three already mentioned, which would have reflected the bishoprics of *Proto-*

canonical hours, and by example even encouraged the Scots to regularly visit church and pay their tithes.[70]

Such passages illustrate the role *Proto-Fordun* expected the king to play, both as a figurehead and as a direct influence on his kingdom. Through the example of David's piety, and his 'prudence and strength,' he 'wisely moderated the fierceness of his race,' and calmed their 'savage ways' with Christian religion.[71] David I is credited also with turning Scotland from a starved land with poor soil into one of such abundance that it could even feed neighbouring lands with its surpluses.[72] He adorned the country 'with castles and cities, and with lofty towers,' and improved trade so that the harbours now flowed with 'foreign merchandise, and added the riches of other kingdoms for your delight,' to the extent that the Scots had now swapped their 'rough cloaks' and 'nakedness of old' for 'expensive garments' and 'fine linen and purple cloth.'[73] These images of Scottish backwardness and ignorance are typical of barbarian stereotypes, but that David I and his relatives can be credited with such a change illustrates the extent to which *Proto-Fordun* regarded an ideal king as central to making Scotland become a modern, Christian kingdom equal in status and prestige to any other.[74]

*

Fordun's own time. This was not perhaps intended to mean that Scotland only had three or four bishoprics before David I founded more (though this is how it was read by many historians, from the fifteenth until the early twentieth century); rather that many of the offices had fallen vacant (so there were only three or four serving bishops) and that he revived them, a situation more reflective of the historical reality: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.38 (p.238); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 5.48 (vol.3, pp.146-7 & notes p.263); Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.257-8; Oram, *David I*, p.156; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, pp.60-8; Gordon Donaldson, 'Scottish Bishops' Sees Before the Reign of David I,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 87 (1952-3), pp.106-17.

[70] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 40, 41 (pp.436-7); Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' p.70.

[71] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 40 (p.436): 'in spiritu consilii et fortitudinis, gentis suae feritatem sapienter moderatus est;' 41 (p.436): 'Ipse barbaros mores tuos Christiana religione composuit.'

[72] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436).

[73] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436): 'castellis et urbibus decoravit, ipse te excelsis turribus extulit, ipse partus tuos peregrinis et mercatoribus foecundavit, et aliorum regnorum divitias tuis deliciis aggregavit. Ipse preciosis vestibus pallia tua pilosa mutavit, et antiquam nuditatem tuam bysso et purpura texit.'

[74] Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' pp.69-71.

Proto-Fordun's presentation of the sons of Malcolm and Margaret also highlights the need for a king to rule justly and fairly, and with authority, dealing harshly with those who threaten the kingdom's stability or autonomy, a theme throughout the chronicle. Edgar, for example, is said to have used 'nothing tyrannical, nothing harsh or serve in his treatment of his subjects;' he instead 'ruled and guided them with the greatest affection, goodness and kindness,' but was ruthless in his treatment of his uncle, Duncan (treated in the chronicle as a usurper and traitor).[75] Alexander I was perhaps too ferocious: although 'deferential and friendly to clerics and religious,' he was 'excessively terrifying to the rest of his subjects.'[76] David I allegedly surpassed them all in piety, and was a truly great king because he was also 'energetic among his own people,' and 'wise and careful in the just extension of his kingdom.'[77]

Malcolm IV, by contrast, is portrayed as someone who failed to achieve this balance between personal piety and a fierce defence of Scotland's interests. He is first described as 'no unworthy successor' to David I, vigorously putting down the revolts of Somerled, the Galwegians and the Moravians.[78] Yet the chronicle also records that such was his personal piety that he refused to marry, despite the entreaties of 'his councillors and all the people.'[79] Instead, he took a vow of chastity, even turning down the many opportunities for transgression that 'his royal authority' frequently

---

[75] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28, 30 (pp.427, 429): 'nihil tyrannicum, nihil durum aut amarum in suos exercens, sed cum maxima caritate, bonitate et benevolentia subditos rexit et correxit.' Edgar is said to be 'like his kinsman, the holy King Edward [i.e. the Confessor], in every way' ('cognato suo sancto regi Anglorum Edwardo confessori per omnia similis'). Margaret (and her family) was closely associated with Edward, and aspects of their cults developed in parallel. This comparison emphasises the sense the dynasties forming an extended, blessed royal dynasty.

[76] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 34 (p.431): 'in suos severior'; 'Satis enim humilis clericis erat et monachis, ceteris vero subditorum supra modum terribilis.' Fordun added that Alexander was 'surnamed Fers (fierce).'

[77] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35 (p.432): 'apud suos strenuus, in ampliando regno sagax et sollicitus.'

[78] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 1-4 (pp.254-7): 'Non immerito regi Scotorum David successit Malcolmus.'

[79] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257): 'quamvis a suis regni consulibus omnique populo imprecationibus multimodis exoratus.'

availed him of.[80] Qualities such as his 'exemplary humility and innocence,' 'purity of conscience,' and 'holiness and seriousness of disposition,' while admirable in a clergyman, are, however, less well-suited to a king, and so, 'among laymen, he seemed like a monk, having only his layman's dress in common with them,' and to his subjects he was like 'an angel dwelling upon earth.'[81] Despite being well-meaning, kind and pleasant, he faced 'many reproaches and sneers on the part of his subjects,' because, according to the chronicle, he was so fixed on 'heavenly things' that he looked down 'upon all earthly things' and 'almost abandoned the care and administration of his kingdom.'[82] This neglect allegedly caused him to eventually become 'so hated by all the common people,' that his brother William was appointed as guardian of the kingdom ('totius regni custos'), against Malcolm's will.[83] William is not referred to by this or a similar title in any charters of Malcolm, but it has been suggested that there was indeed a form of regency, or at least a transfer of some powers (necessitated by the king's illness, rather than his 'pious neglect'), during the latter stages of Malcolm's reign.[84]

---

[80] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257): 'Qui licet saepe, regiae dignitatis auctoritate, transgredi potuit, nunquam tamen transgressus est.' It has been suggested that Malcolm's refusal to marry, and lack of mistresses, was not so much the result of piety but of the illness of his last years: Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp.73-5.

[81] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 5 (p.258): 'titulo humilitatis et innocentiae, puritate conscientiae, morum sanctitate pariter et gravitate, ita excellebat, ut, inter seculares, quibus solo habitu congruebat, monachus, et inter homines, quibus imperabat, terrenus quidem angelus videbatur.'

[82] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257): 'Verumtamen multas ex suis pertulit regnicolis exprobationes et obprobria'; 'Equidem in coelestibus suum animum, amoris divini fervore concepto, locaverat, quod, terrena quaeque despiciens, curam pene regni sui simul et regimen praetermisit.'

[83] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4 (p.257): 'Quamobrem ab omni plebe tanto habitus est in odio.' Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, p.74.

[84] Two charters of this period refer to the previously unmentioned offices of 'justice of Scotia' and the king's 'supreme justice,' titles similar to those used to govern England when its kings were absent in France in this period. If *Proto-Fordun* understood this to mean that William acted as a kind of regent for an essentially absent king, 'custos' might have seemed the most appropriate phrase, even if it was only intended as a description rather than a title; the term was used for Scotland's Guardians after Alexander III's death, soon after *Proto-Fordun* was compiled, so such usage would be plausible. William is also described as 'tunc regni custodes' on Malcolm's death: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia*, 7 (p.259); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.3, 6, 12 (vol.4, pp. 256-7, 262-5, 280-1, 490 n.40, 498 n.4-5); Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp.73-4; Richard Oram, *Domination and Lordship: Scotland 1070-1230*, (Edinburgh, 2011), p.126; Stephen Boardman, 'Coronations, Kings and Guardians: Politics, Parliaments and General Councils, 1371-1406,' in Keith M. Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *The History of the Scottish Parliament, volume 1: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1235-1560*, (Edinburgh, 2004), pp.102-122 at pp.119-120.

According to *Proto-Fordun,* the nobles also feared that Malcolm, as well as neglecting his duties as king, was becoming too close to the English crown (in contrast to his brother, who had been an enemy of the English ever since they had taken away his patrimony, the earldom of Northumberland).[85] Such was the disapproval of Malcolm's behaviour that on his return from France in 1160, in order to 'protect the common weal' (and not, the chronicle insists, for any treasonous motives), a group of earls attempted to besiege him at Perth, although it was God's will that this siege should come to nothing, and the matter was resolved through the mediation of the clergy.[86]

Despite this, however, Malcolm is ultimately treated rather sympathetically in *Proto-Fordun:* not so much as a failed king but rather as someone unfortunately cast in the wrong role upon Earth. After his death in 1165, the chronicle describes him as a man of 'angelic holiness among men, and like some angel upon earth, of whom the world was not worthy,' taken away 'by the heavenly angels' in his prime.[87] This sympathetic impression is furthered by the inclusion of a dialogue alleged to have taken place when the late king appeared in a vision to a cleric who had been a close friend, in which Malcolm, when asked if Scotland would mourn his loss, replied that it would 'Not now, but when this time is past.'[88]

---

[85] Despite this apparent regard for his hostility, William's close bond with Richard I is also positively remarked on in the chronicle. This perhaps reflects an understanding that a pragmatic attitude towards England was best, wary when necessary but willing to be close when it was to the nation's benefit (as with Richard): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3, 4, 21, 23 (pp.256-7, 273-4, 275).

[86] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3 (p.256): 'nec pro singulari commodo seu proditione, ymmo rei publicae tuitione.' The Melrose chronicle similarly explains this revolt as a result of Malcolm's following Henry to France, although the earls seem to have objected primarily to the resulting neglect of his own kingdom, rather than any perceived slight against Scotland's independence: *Chronicle of Melrose (*Stevenson, trans.), pp.11-2; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.4 (vol.4, pp.258-61, 485-6 n.1-17); Anderson, *Early Sources*, vol.2, p.244; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, p.72; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.225-226; Oram, *Domination and Lordship*, pp.118-9; Boardman, 'Coronations, Kings and Guardians,' pp.119-20.

[87] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 5 (p.258): 'Hominem angelicae sanctitatis inter homines, et tanquam terrenum quendam angelum, quo dignus non erat mundus.'

[88] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 6 (pp.258-9): 'Scocia te planget? / Non modo, sed noviter.' This dialogue is also included in Bower and translated in Wyntoun ('Scotland menys þe full saire. / Nay, nocht ʒit, bot sall forþiremare'). These texts have slightly different arrangements: *Proto-Fordun'*s seventh exchange, 'Cur sic, care, taces? / Pro me loquitor mea vita,' appears in second place in Bower and first place in Wyntoun (as 'Qwhy art þov, deire lord, sa still? / For me my lif schawis þe

Proto-Fordun presents William I, Malcolm's successor, as a more balanced example of the qualities required in a king, renowned not only for his aggressive defence of the Scottish kingdom against internal and external enemies, but also for his 'thorough devoutness,' and his 'worthiness in God's sight.'[89] He was even said to have healed a boy of a 'grievous sickness' by his touch, at York in 1206, and was noted by Pope Lucius as someone with a great 'zeal for God,' and who took 'great efforts in guarding the laws of his kingdom.'[90] The chronicle even turns what would appear to be a criticism of military recklessness (and failure) into an example of how William and the Scots were divinely favoured: God intervened in William's campaign in support of the young king Henry by having William be captured, thereby preventing him from shedding further Christian blood in an unjust war.[91] Alexander II is similarly presented as 'a most gentle prince towards his people,' and friend of the church, but also as a leader who quashed rebellion swiftly and was prepared to defend Scotland.[92]

The defence of Scotland's autonomy is treated by *Proto-Fordun* (and later *Gesta Annalia II* also) as one of the most important duties of the king, as the chronicle's presentation of the magnates' contrasting responses to Malcolm IV and William I's attitudes towards the English crown illustrates. The chronicle is careful to highlight that, whenever Scottish kings were compelled to perform homage or negotiate with the English crown, they did not compromise the kingdom's autonomy or the status

---

skill'), which has *Proto-Fordun* / Bower's opening exchange ('Rex olim quid agis? / Servus quondam modo regno,') as seventh (although it seems more appropriate as a beginning). Wyntoun's arrangement is identical to that found in two manuscripts of the late 12th and 13th centuries, but it would appear that *Proto-Fordun* and Bower were working from different sources. The exchange, which contrasts Malcolm's earthly suffering with his heavenly relief, appeared not long after Malcolm's death, and its sentiments reflect efforts to present him as a most saintly and Christian prince: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* Appendix 6, p.452; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.11 (vol.4, pp.278-9, notes pp.496-7); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.4, pp.432-5; Oram, *Domination and Lordship*, p.129; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp.73-5.

[89] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (p.279): 'perfecta devotione'; 'egregius apud Deum'; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots,* p.113

[90] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (pp.279-80): 'gravi infirmitate'; 'zelum Dei habentis, regni sui leges magno cum labore observantis.'

[91] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11, 12 (pp.263-5).

[92] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 46 (p.292): 'princeps fuit populo mitissimus.' Alexander leads armies into England or against rebels in *Gesta Annalia* 34-36, 40-43, 45 (pp.283-6, 288-91, 291-2).

of the crown.[93] Good relations between the crowns are encouraged in the text (for example, Richard I and Henry III are both praised for their friendliness towards Scotland), but not subservience. Thus, in 1265, Alexander III levied an army to fight against Simon de Montfort, in support of Henry III and the future Edward I; he did so, the chronicle insists, voluntarily, although it also expresses relief that the rebellion was over before the Scots had been despatched, thus sparing them from any trouble.[94] Closeness to England is acceptable, but only as long as it is without challenge to Scotland's autonomy, highlighting that, for *Proto-Fordun*, it is the duty of the Scottish king (and, indeed, his nobles and clergy also), to protect Scotland's independence, ideally through peace but by war if necessary.

III

As with *Proto-Fordun,* the assertion of Scottish autonomy is central to *Gesta Annalia II*'s treatment of the relationship between the English and Scottish crowns. This can seem contradictory: the chronicle condemns Edward I for invading Scotland, and lavishes praise upon Robert I for restoring the kingdom's sovereignty and independence, but other parts of the text appear to adopt a more conciliatory tone, reflecting the chronicler's support for David II's attempt to negotiate a ransom settlement that would see a son of Edward III succeed to the Scottish throne.[95]

Gesta Annalia II's presentation of the guardians' attempts to act in place of a king after the death of Alexander III draws attention to what the chronicle regarded as the role of the Scottish crown. During the negotiations over a marriage between Margaret (the Maid of Norway), Alexander's heir, and the future Edward II, it fell to them, in the absence of a king, to protect 'the rights and customs, both ecclesiastical and secular,' of Scotland, and ensure that the kingdom remained 'free

---

[93] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 2, 26, 38, 61 (pp.255, 277-8, 286-7, 305-6).

[94] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 58 (pp.302-3): Alexander acted 'sua mera voluntate'; the Scots were 'ab ea vexatione cessavit.' The chronicle's presentation of this incident reiterates the text's disapproval of rebellion (as when William I was earlier criticised for supporting the sons of Henry II against their father).

[95] Boardman, 'Robert II,' pp.94-6; Penman, *David II*, pp.321-4.

and quit of all slavery and subjection,' as it had been during the reign of Alexander III.'[96]

After Margaret's death, however, there was no obvious successor. The chronicle depicts a kingdom on the verge of descending into war because of the rifts created by this issue; so complex and contentious was the matter that magnates would not talk openly about their views on the dispute for fear of the retribution of powerful parties with opposing views.[97] The resultant factionalism paralysed the government and threatened the stability of the kingdom: without a king, there was 'no superior who could, by the strength of his power, demand the execution of their decision, or compel the parties to observe it,' a succinct explanation of *Gesta Annalia II*'s understanding of the king's role in governing the kingdom.[98] According to *Gesta Annalia II*, this prompted the guardians to invite Edward I of England to help resolve the matter; only another king would have the necessary authority and status (and be removed enough from the factionalism of the Scottish nobility) to judge and execute the matter.[99] The chronicle highlights the guardians' concern to protect Scotland's autonomy when doing so: although Edward seemingly accepted the principle that, since he had been invited as an impartial umpire and not an overlord, the proceedings would 'not arouse any prejudice to the kingdom of Scotland, and also that he [Edward] should not acquire through this procedure any right of superior lordship,' the guardians nevertheless sought letters-patent to ensure that he would not push his own interests or undermine Scotland's ancient freedom.[100]

---

[96] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 69 (p.311). 'quod regnum Scociae foret liberum et quietum ab omni servitute et subjectione, sicut erat melius et liberius tempore quoad vixit Alexander III rex ipsius illustris, quoad jura et consuetudines, tam ecclesiasticas quam seculares;' Hector L. MacQueen, '"Regiam Majestatem", Scots Law and National Identity,' *Scottish Historical Review* 74 (1995), pp.1-25 at p.4.

[97] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70 (p.312).

[98] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70 (p.312): 'tum quia superiorem non habebant, qui eorum sententiam et potestatis rigoreni executioni posset demandare, vel partes compellere ad observantiam sententiae'; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.192.

[99] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70 (p.312); Duncan notes that this is not a particularly accurate account of the sequence of events: *The Kingship of the Scots*, pp.207-209.

[100] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70 (p.312): 'Ita tamen, quod talis vocatio vel comparitio nullum praejudicium generaret regno Scociae, ac etiam, ut per hoc nullum jus vel superioritas dominii sibi accresceret.'. Duncan has suggested that Edward I is treated fairly positively in this account, and that

The chronicle is in no doubt, however, that Edward saw this as a potential opportunity to take over Scotland, and that the guardians were aware of this possibility.[101]

The system of guardians put in place during the absence of a king (whether by interregnum, captivity or minority) demonstrates that the magnates of the kingdom believed in the necessity of the crown; even without an individual monarch in place or ruling directly, the office of the crown must be maintained.[102] The text therefore suggests that guardians were chosen on the basis of being seen to have something of the authority and power necessary to fulfil the role of king.[103] After Edward I overthrew John Balliol, he left the majority of government officials in place after securing oaths of loyalty from them.[104] If Edward thought that this was enough to keep the kingdom functioning with him at the top as new sovereign, then, according to the chronicle, he seems to have misunderstood the strength of national feeling among the Scottish leaders and general population. Even in the absence of their own king, the Scottish administration was able to summon a parliament and continued to function and arrange resistance to Edward.[105] Without the king, however, there was no one able to hold the nobility's rivalries and divisions in check, so their resistance to Edward's renewed campaign could not last indefinitely.

The need to maintain Scotland's autonomy did not preclude the possibility of closeness between the Scots and the English; *Gesta Annalia II* depicts an English and

---

the chronicle ignores his insistence on overlordship. The chronicle's presentation of Edward's involvement in both the Great Cause and in the marriage negotiations over Margaret, however, portrays the guardians as suspicious of his motives and seeking to limit his influence; given the deceit, guile and ambition attributed to him in the events that follow, his apparently positive behaviour here is more likely presented as having been a facade to mask his true intentions: *The Kingship of the Scots*, p.207

[101] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 68, 70, 72 (pp.310-1, 312, 313-4).

[102] See for example Norman Reid, 'The kingless kingdom: the Scottish guardianships of 1286-1306,' *Scottish Historical Review* 61 (1982), pp.105-129.

[103] Robert Stewart is later chosen as guardian in David II's absence not because he was the king's closest male relative but because it was supposed that as he was 'the most powerful of all, the general interests would be most strongly guarded by him,' ('quia cunctis erat potentior, [rerum summa] ab eo fortius tueretur,'): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 166 (p.368).

[104] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 97 (pp.327-8).

[105] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 97 (pp.327-8); Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.24.

Scottish nobility who, before the Wars of Independence, might otherwise have had much in common, holding land on both sides of the border and tied by marriage, friendship and culture. The earls of Gloucester, for example, proved themselves noble allies of the Bruces on several occasions in the text: Gilbert de Clare consoled Robert Bruce (his aunt's husband) after he had missed out on the kingship, and told the English king that the decision was unjust (despite being married to Edward I's sister, Joan).[106] Robert I was warned of John Comyn's accusations against him, and Edward I's subsequent plan to kill him, by his 'true and tried friend,' Ralph de Monthermer, Joan's second husband, who also took the title of earl of Gloucester.[107] Gilbert de Clare's son, also Gilbert, fighting for Edward II, was singled out as the most prominent casualty at Bannockburn.[108]

Such examples of good relations do not, however, detract from the overall theme that to be closely aligned with the English crown was to neglect Scotland's interests. *Gesta Annalia II* repeatedly condemns the factionalism that divided Scotland's leaders and left the country open to English invasion; chief among the crimes of both the Bruce and Balliol camps was their willingness, when out of power, to ally themselves to the English crown, thereby risking the kingdom's independence for their own gain and to diminish their rivals.[109] According to *Gesta Annalia II*, John Comyn of Badenoch turned to Edward I to undermine Robert I, while Robert I's grandfather, Robert Bruce, and Edward Balliol also pursued claims to the throne that could only be achieved with English support and would lead to English domination.

*

---

[106] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.11 (vol. 6 pp.30-2), p.207 n.33. *Gesta Annalia II* does not distinguish between the different earls.
[107] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 114 (pp.313-4); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.6 (vol. 6, pp.306-7), p.425 n.5.
[108] Skene (ed.), Gesta Annalia 131 (p.347); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.20 (pp.352-3), p.453 n.7.
[109] For example, Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 88, 94 (pp.323, 326); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.192-3.

Robert Bruce is, however, initially depicted as refusing Edward's guarantee of the kingship in exchange for English overlordship of Scotland; Bruce reportedly declared that, although he would accept the crown if it were offered fairly, he would 'never, in gaining that kingdom for myself, reduce it to servitude.'[110] According to the chronicle, Bruce then described Scotland as a kingdom 'which all its kings, with great toil and trouble, have until now preserved without servitude, in firmly-rooted freedom,' an emphasis on Scotland's ancient freedom that is evident in *Proto-Fordun* as well as *Gesta Annalia II*.[111] Edward promptly made the same offer to John Balliol instead; he, by contrast, had no such hesitation in signing away Scotland's autonomy if it meant he could be king, and is portrayed as willing (at least at first) to perform homage to Edward for the kingdom.[112] This passage indicates how the chronicle understood the link between the person of the king and the identity of the kingdom: Scotland could be free only if its king was free, and so, as the rightful, ideal king, Bruce was, ironically, unable to accept the succession.

This passage explicitly associates the Bruce cause with Scotland's cause. *Gesta Annalia II* presents Robert Bruce as the rightful claimant to the Scottish crown, even asserting that Edward I was told outright that, 'according to approved custom, the right of Robert the Bruce was the stronger,' although Edward allegedly preferred the Balliol, who he felt would prove more manageable.[113] *Gesta Annalia II* also states that, after Balliol was made king, Bruce 'never offered homage or fealty to John of Balliol,' thus freeing the Bruce dynasty from any possible accusations of treachery or usurpation, and emphasising their status as the legitimate rulers of Scotland.[114]

---

[110] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4): 'sin autem, nunquam in servitutem redigam acquirendo mihi regnum praefatum;' Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' p.37.

[111] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4): 'omnes reges ejusdem cum magno taedio et labore, sine servitute sub firma pace huc usque servaverunt.'

[112] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4); Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' p.37.

[113] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 71, 72 (pp.312-4); Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' p.37.

[114] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4): 'nec unquam Johanni de Balliolo homagium praestitit nec fideliatem.'

Despite his initial refusal of the throne, however, the subsequent appearances of Robert Bruce, the competitor, do not fit comfortably with the idea of a rightful king or patriotic hero. While John Balliol was garrisoning Berwick against the coming invasion, Bruce was writing to his supporters in Scotland, asking them to surrender their castles to Edward I, in exchange for which Edward had offered to make Bruce king of Scotland.[115] Characteristically, however, Edward declined to fulfil this promise. Robert I's father (the son of the competitor) is also portrayed somewhat ambivalently in the chronicle. After Bruce's supporters had allegedly abandoned the Scottish forces at Dunbar, thereby helping to inflict upon the Scots a catastrophic defeat, Bruce asked Edward to 'fulfil what he had previously promised' by giving Bruce the kingdom; Edward dismissed his overtures, replying 'have we nothing else to do but win kingdoms for you?'[116] Rather than attempting to win the kingdom himself, as his son would feel compelled to do, Bruce, 'that noble man,' instead rather less patriotically 'withdrew to his lands in England, and put in no further appearance in Scotland.'[117]

The presentation of these events in *Gesta Annalia II* creates a peculiarly mixed message: Robert Bruce is seemingly too patriotic to sacrifice Scotland's autonomy in exchange for the crown, but he and his son are later willing to give up that

---

[115] *Gesta Annalia II* attributes this to the 'grandfather' of Robert I, but as he died in March 1295, it would seem more likely to refer to Robert I's father: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 88 (p.323); Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.37-8; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.18 (vol. 6, pp.50-3, 217-8 n.40-53); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5, pp.276-7.

[116] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 94 (p.326): 'sibi jam dudum promiserat,' 'nunquid non aliud habemus facere, quam tibi regna lucrari?' The chronicle says that it was the 'general opinion' ('vulgarem opinionem') that Bruce supporters left the battle so that Balliol's supporters would be defeated, even if it meant their mutual enemy winning. This rivalry came at the expense of the protection of the common people; such discord is one of the major themes of *Gesta Annalia II*, although in this instance the accusation that it led directly to defeat at Dunbar (which the chronicle appears to accept, without explicitly condoning) is perhaps unfair; while Bruce was on Edward's side in 1296, the earls of Mar and Atholl are known to have fought on the Scottish side that year, and all the Scottish cavalry, not only their part of it, fled the battle: Alexander Grant, 'Bravehearts and Coronets: Images of William Wallace and the Scottish Nobility,' in Edward J. Cowan (ed.), *The Wallace Book* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.86-106 at p.99; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.194. Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, p.97.

[117] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 94 (p.326): 'vir nobilis'; 'ad terras suas in Angliam recessit, et in Scocia ultra non comparuit.' This story refers to Robert I's father, although the chronicle calls him only 'the elder Robert of Bruce' ('Robertus de Bruyse senior'), the same description used for the grandfather in *Gesta Annalia* 72 (p.314) but not 78 (p.323), which has 'Robertum de Bruyse avum.'

autonomy, and encourage partisan division and discord, for the same goal. These same incidents also appear in Wyntoun, and it has been suggested that *Gesta Annalia II*'s ambivalence arises from an attempt to adapt a pro-Comyn account into a pro-Bruce one; thus, Edward's promise of the throne in exchange for help is used as justification for their siding with him.[118] Although this would be on the same compromised terms that the competitor had already rejected, it could be regarded as a necessary step in getting the legitimate king on the throne; only after this could freedom be attained.[119]

Such a bargain would still rely on Edward to keep his word; his deceitfulness, however, is the only consistent element in the chronicle's presentation of these events. Indeed, in this part of the chronicle it is John Balliol who, despite his inferior claim, appears to behave like a king, standing up for the independence of Scotland and reasserting the dignity of its crown. The chronicle's portrait of John is not particularly flattering, but it is less hostile than one might expect from a source influenced by propaganda intended to legitimise Bruce rule.[120] Although humiliated after performing homage to Edward for the kingdom of Scotland (against the advice of the Scottish nobility), John is depicted in the text as then attempting to reassert his autonomy. According to *Gesta Annalia II*, MacDuff of Fife was unhappy after John ruled against him in a dispute, and so appealed to Edward to have him hear the case instead; losing jurisdiction over the laws of his kingdom in this way marked further humiliation and erosion of the distinct identity of the kingship.[121] John was compelled by Edward to attend a parliament in London, but on arrival accepted the

---

[118] *Gesta Annalia II* is, however, also more positive towards John than the 'Scottish Poem' found in *Liber Extravagans:* Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.189-207.Wyntoun*, Original Chronicle*, vol.5, pp.276-7, 290-3;

[119] Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.37-8.

[120] The Declaration of Arbroath, by contrast, essentially cuts John's reign out of Scotland's history: Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.34-5.

[121] MacDuff later fought with William Wallace, and died at Falkirk, in the name of John Balliol, so his appeal seems to have been pragmatic and self-serving rather than necessarily accepting Edward's overlordship: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 86 (pp.321-2); MacQueen, 'Regiam Majestatem,' p.4; John Bannerman, 'MacDuff of Fife,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community – Essays Presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.20-38 at pp.37-8; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.75-9.

advice of his nobles to send a proxy to the court in his stead, thereby asserting his status as an independent king of equal rank.[122] This, however, led only to further insult: Edward forced him to attend court in person anyway, to dictate his responses to his proxy there, and, humiliated, John 'returned home very greatly troubled.'[123] This event, however, seems to have marked a turning point, for John summoned a parliament of his own, and determined to restore the dignity of his office and his kingdom by withdrawing his fealty to Edward and refusing all such future summonses, even when Edward responded by depriving John of all his lands and possessions in England.[124]

John's recognition of his duties and obligations might have been belated, and ultimately futile, but, by his defiance and willingness to sacrifice his English possessions, he is presented here as at least trying to behave as a king of Scotland ought. He lacked Robert I's strength and authority, however, and was unable to control Scotland's self-serving magnates, for whom the chronicle reserves its strongest criticism.[125] According to *Gesta Annalia II*, Balliol and his son were handed over by one of his former supporters to Edward I.[126] John was stripped of the symbols of his office, and Scotland of the symbols of its kingship (such as the Stone of Destiny and the Black Rood).[127] He was then imprisoned in London before being released into exile on his French estates; the chronicle laconically notes, 'Thus ended the reign of King John of Balliol, who reigned three years and a half.'[128]

John is shown to have tried to act as a king should, but, perhaps in part because he should never really have been king, lacked the ability to do so successfully. This demonstrates how essential authority was to a successful rule, which arguably helps

---

[122] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 86 (pp.321-2); Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.77-9.
[123] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 86 (pp.321-2): 'cum confusione permaxima reversus est ad propria;' Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.77-9.
[124] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 87 (pp.322-3); Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' p.36.
[125] As, for example, at the battle of Dunbar: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 93 (pp.325-6); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.192-5.
[126] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 95 (pp.326-7).
[127] Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, p.96.
[128] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 95 (pp.326-7): 'Et sic finitum est regnum regis Johannis de Balliol, qui regnavit annis III cum dimidio.'

to legitimise Robert I's eventual rule. In this way, John Balliol provides an example for Robert I, and his successors: although he overcame his initial submissiveness to Edward, realising that he must fight for the freedom of Scotland and the protection of its people, he lacked the strength to heal the divisions within his own kingdom and unite the nobility behind his efforts. William Wallace, by contrast, had the necessary military prowess, but lacked the kind of royal dignity and authority necessary to keep these aristocratic rivalries in check.[129] The chronicle presents Robert I as the leader whose combination of strength and legitimate sovereign authority meant he could become the kingdom's saviour. He is presented as the ideal king, not only due to the rightness of his claim and his military prowess, but by his explicit self-identification as a Scot and with the Scottish cause, and by his concern to protect the freedom of the Scottish people in the face of the cruelty of their English enemies and the self-interest of so many Scottish nobles.[130]

*

The disruption caused by Scotland's nobles is a recurring theme throughout *Gesta Annalia II*, and the chronicle makes it clear that an ideal king must be able to control and unite them for the good of the kingdom. While *Gesta Annalia II* supports the Bruce claim, it nevertheless condemns the trauma inflicted on the kingdom by the refusal of its leading parties to act in concert for the good of the nation, a point perhaps made with the disagreements between David II and the Steward in the 1360s in mind. In that sense, the text denies the notion that the Bruce cause and the Scottish cause were naturally identical, and that those who rejected the Bruce cause were in some way unpatriotic. Rather, it is taking sides in this way that is itself unpatriotic; the supporters of Robert Bruce who abandoned the field at Dunbar are criticised in the same way as those nobles who betrayed Wallace by abandoning the battle at Falkirk.[131] As the chronicle notes, during John Balliol's reign, those who

---

[129] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 98 (p.328); Grant, 'Bravehearts and Coronets,' p.99; Fraser, 'A Swan from a Raven,' pp.10-6.
[130] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112-143 (pp.337-53).
[131] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 93 (pp.325-6).

supported the Bruce claim were regarded as traitors, but after Robert I came to the throne, it was those who supported the Balliols and Comyns who were now seen as the traitors.[132] They were all Scots, however, and the chronicle presents their preoccupation with pushing their own interests, instead of supporting the king (whichever faction he came from) and defending the realm, as a grave threat to the kingdom. This more nuanced understanding of the issue of factionalism suggests that the chronicler was aware of the way in which Bruce supporters had promoted their own cause by casting the Balliols and the dispossessed nobles as intruding usurpers who were not interested in defending Scotland and perhaps not even truly Scottish.

In each case, greed, ambition and jealousy caused these noblemen and their families to forsake the cause of their kingdom in order to pursue their own ends. Even William Wallace, despite his unrelenting resistance of the English forces, is not immune to such criticism. Although he was driven to resign the guardianship, preferring 'to serve with the common people', his rivalry and inability to work with the Comyns meant that he too retreated from the battlefield at Falkirk, in order to save himself and his supporters.[133] Due to the 'arrogance and blazing jealousy of both,' (that is, Wallace and the Comyns), the people of Scotland 'lay wretchedly overthrown' throughout the kingdom.[134] By this account, regardless of whether or not the future Robert I helped Edward I, the real cause of Scotland's defeat lay in the internal division and conflict of its leaders, just as at Dunbar. Indeed, as the

---

[132] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 93 (pp.325-6); Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' p.39; Grant, 'Bravehearts and Coronets,' p.96; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.192.

[133] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101, 102 (pp.330, 331): 'subesse cum plebe.'

[134] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'utriusque superbia et ardenti invidia'; 'miserabiliter jacuit prostrate.' It is not wholly clear to whom 'both' refers; Bower adds 'kingdoms' so that it refers to England and Scotland. Grant suggests that it here refers to the Balliol/Comyn and Bruce factions, as 'utriusque' is used in that way in the account of the battle of Dunbar, but the context would suggest that it is a reference to the 'parties' mentioned earlier in the sentence, i.e. Wallace and the Comyns. 'Utriusque' is used to 'both parties,' referring to those mentioned within the specific context of a sentence or paragraph, several times in *Gesta Annalia II*, and, other than Edward I in the opening line, the Comyns and Wallace are the only people mentioned in the preceding paragraph here: see e.g. Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70, 104, 189 (pp.312, 332, 383); Fraser, 'A Swan From A Raven,' p.17; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.190-2; Grant, 'Bravehearts and Coronets,' pp.95-8; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.34 (vol. 6, pp.94-7).

chronicle notes, the English rarely defeated the Scots, 'except as a result of jealousy among their leaders or by guile or deceit on the part of the natives going over to the other side.'[135] The text makes it clear that any party, whether Bruce or Comyn, Stewart or Balliol, can be guilty of the factionalism and division, brought about by a surfeit of self-interest, pride, jealousy, greed and ambition, that undermined Scotland's cause and inflicted such suffering on its people; for the chronicler, the people of Scotland should come first. The theme of noble self-interest leading to disaster for the Scottish people recurs throughout the chronicle, even within Robert I's own family.[136] Driven by vanity, ambition, and greed, Edward Bruce chose to launch a bloody and pointless campaign in Ireland, in which he 'committed countless murders' and was soon killed, after his impetuosity had forced his brother Robert I to come to his aid, at the cost of the many soldiers who starved to death.[137]

The chronicle likewise depicts the period of David II's exile in France, and later captivity in England, as marked by rampant aristocratic self-interest and greed, unrestrained by any higher governing authority, with little concern for the fate of the Scottish people, behaviour which is strongly criticised in the chronicle.[138] For example, although Edward III is heavily criticised for refusing to hold any peace

---

[135] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330): 'nisi invidia procerum, vel fraude et deceptione indigenarum, ad aliam partem se transferentium.' Grant suggests that the 'treachery' in question is Robert I fighting with the English at Falkirk, although the chronicle is somewhat non-committal about his involvement, saying that 'it is said by some' ('communiter autem dicitur') and specifically blaming the Comyns (and Wallace, though he was partly forced into it by their actions). While this does comment on the Bruce story, it seems intended more as a criticism of how excuses are found for Scottish defeats, which might indicate some scepticism about the Bruce story. It seems unlikely that Robert was directly involved on the English side in the battle: Fraser, 'A Swan From A Raven,' pp.18-9; Grant, 'Bravehearts and Coronets,' pp.95-8; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.128-135.

[136] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.192-5.

[137] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 132 (p.347): 'innumera exercuit homicidia.' Edward Bruce's involvement in Ireland and his death are similarly attributed to greed, ambition, and rashness in Bower, Barbour, and Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.37 (vol.6, pp.412-3; Barbour, *The Bruce*, pp.666-77; Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp.xlviii, 77; Colm McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland 1306-1328* (East Linton, 1997), pp.194-8; C.J. McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasions of Ireland,' *History Ireland* 1 (1993), pp.11-16 at p.12; Katie Stevenson, *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424-1513* (Woodbridge, 2006), p.157; R. James Goldstein, '"I will my process hald": Making Sense of Scottish Lives and the Desire for History in Barbour, Wyntoun and Blind Hary,' in Priscilla Bawcutt & Janet Hadley Williams (eds.), *A Companion to Medieval Scottish Poetry* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.35-48 at p.42.

[138] For example, Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 171, 175, 176 (pp.370-371, 373, 374).

negotiations, he is also given credit for admonishing (and then killing, during the ensuing argument) his brother, John of Eltham after John had burned down churches and the people sheltering within them as he rampaged across the west of the kingdom.[139] Even Andrew Moray, a guardian of Scotland (and Robert I's brother-in-law), a man who 'chose rather to die in battle than to see the misfortunes of their race,' is criticised, for, although he did much for Scotland's freedom, his refusal to abandon the fight against the two Edwards also caused the territories in which he fought to be 'reduced to such desolation and scarcity that more perished through hunger and want than the sword destroyed from the time of the outbreak of war.'[140] The death of Alexander Ramsay in 1342 (another who had 'done much for the king and the liberty of the kingdom') at the hands of William Douglas (who was 'possessed by envy'), is said to have undone all that had been 'tried for the good of the kingdom,' as endless feuding engulfed the land.[141] In 1355, meanwhile, the French king offered a vast quantity of gold to the 'guardian and nobles of Scotland' in exchange for attacking England: the chronicle says the Scots accepted due to a 'lust for gold' that caused them to 'often forego a shilling for the sake of a penny.'[142] The leading nobles simply kept the gold for themselves; all their greed brought was 'the destruction of Lothian by the king of England.'[143]

These problems are seen as almost inevitable; despite the best efforts of the guardians and Wallace, for example, only a king carries the authority and power to hold the magnates, and the country, together. The lament for Alexander III praises him for his mercy and fairness, but also for the speed and force with which he dealt

---

[139] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 151, 155 (pp.358, 360-1).
[140] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 154 (pp.359-360): 'magis elegerunt mori in bello, quam videre mala gentis suae'; 158 (p.363): 'Sed omnes partes, quas guerrando perambulavit, ad tantam vastitatem et inopiam deduxit, quod plures fame et egestate postea perierunt, quam quos tempore guerrae gladius devoravit.'
[141] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 162 (pp.365-6): 'Hic regi et libertati regni multum utilis fuit'; 'regnante invidia'; 163 (p.366): 'attemptata pro regni utilitate.'
[142] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 171 (pp.370-1): 'custodem et nobiles Scociae'; 'qui crebro per denarium amittunt solidum, auri cupiditate seducti.'
[143] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 171 (pp.370-1): 'destructio Laudoniae paulo post secuta est per regem Angliae.'

with dissent and rebellion.[144] Robert I was forced to spend the first part of his reign dealing with these internal divisions before finally freeing the kingdom from English oppression, only for them to re-emerge with the return of Edward Balliol and the minority and captivity of David II. Like John Balliol and William Wallace, the actions of the extended Comyn family are a mirror for Robert I: but while he was willing to sacrifice his English and family interests in order to devote himself to remedying the plight of the Scottish kingdom and people, the Comyns are presented as undertaking the opposite journey. John Comyn moves from being a guardian of the realm, leading the Scots to a hard-won victory at Roslin, to being forced to submit to Edward I and eventually betraying Robert I to Edward, despite having made a deal with Robert intended to restore the Scots to freedom from English subjection.[145] Robert, by contrast, is presented not as an instigator of factionalism but as a victim of it.[146] This presentation of Comyn as turning traitor and conspiring against Robert I fits the general narrative of Bruce propaganda, justifying Comyn's murder by Robert I as a divinely-guided sacrifice necessary to heal Scotland's divisions and emphasising the association of the Bruce cause with the Scottish one.[147]

David II is similarly portrayed as a protector of the people from the deviousness and venality of the predatory, feuding nobles. In 1362, a conspiracy was launched against David, the details of which are recorded only vaguely in *Gesta Annalia II*: a group of nobles opposed to the king, unnamed in this chronicle, came together with the intention of forcing him to agree to an unspecified but 'unrighteous' demand or face banishment; they even drew up and sealed indentures so that they all went

---

[144] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (pp.309-10).

[145] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107, 110, 112-113 (pp.333, 336, 337-8); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.191-212.

[146] The chronicle portrays his family as being pushed out of Scottish affairs by their Comyn and Balliol rivals, thus depicting Robert as a defender of his dynastic interests with nowhere else to turn, at least before his great revelation and return to the Scottish cause: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 101 (p.330).

[147] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 117 (p.340); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.195-7.

through with it.[148] The nobles sought to force David to settle with them by attacking the towns and countryside, where they 'divided up among themselves the loot taken from the people, and perpetrated other evils in damnable fashion,' but they succeeded only in making David II concerned lest 'the condition of the state was seen to weaken.'[149] *Gesta Annalia II* depicts his response as firm but also pragmatic and compassionate: David recognised the need to quickly restore order and security, so demanded that the rebels cease their action, and raised an army of men 'who would sooner die than see their race harmed and their land desolate' (a description that expressly associates the cause of David II with that of Scotland), thus forcing his opponents to seek peace.[150] David then preferred to 'forgive them rather than take revenge,' understanding that an overly harsh response would only encourage them to rebel again and cause further suffering, so he treated them mercifully and obtained new vows of fealty.[151] David is described as 'a most meek

---

[148] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2): 'ut ipsum super injusta petitione, ut omnibus visum est, eorum opinioni aflecterent aut exularent.' *Gesta Annalia II*'s reticence in naming those involved (principally Robert Stewart and the earls of Douglas and March), other than implicating Robert Stewart, is perhaps deliberate tact, since those involved were soon brought back into David II's orbit. Bower tones down *Gesta Annalia II*'s criticism of their actions, but includes their names in the text of Robert Stewart's submission. Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*, which ends, like *Gesta Annalia II*, in 1363, does name the rebels; its English author's greater remove from the politics of the Scottish court perhaps meant less need for tact. The precise motives and aims of the rebellious nobles are not clear; they seem to have been generally aggrieved with their treatment by David II and with his rule, including his use of the money raised to pay his ransom, but also had a range of personal and local objectives: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.25, 27 (vol.7, pp.322-7, 330-3, notes pp.494-6); Gray, *Scalacronica*, pp.202-5; Penman, *David II*, pp.284-6; Michael Penman, 'David II,' in Michael Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in honour of Norman Macdougall*, (Edinburgh, 2008), pp.49-71 at p.57; Stephen I. Boardman, *The Early Stewart Kings: Robert II and Robert III 1371-1406*, (Edinburgh, 1996), pp.17-8; Ranald Nicholson, *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages*, (Edinburgh, 1974), pp.168-70. Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.41-2.

[149] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2): 'in villas et burgos totamque patriam hostiliter irruentes, et spolia populi dividentes, ac mala alia damnabiliter perpetrantes'; 'rei publicae status deficere videretur'; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' p.41.

[150] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2): 'viri virtutis, mori citius cupientes, quam videre mala gentis suae et terrae desolationem'; Penman, *David II,* p.292. A similar description was applied to three supporters of David II in 1335, Andrew Moray, William Douglas, and Patrick, earl of March, who are said to be the only Scottish nobles yet to submit to Edward III or Edward Balliol: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia*, 154 (pp.359-360).

[151] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2): 'malens ignoscere quam ulcisi.' Penman suggests that this was a generous spin on the political calculation of David's response, but, with the exception of their assessment of David's meekness, both he and *Gesta Annalia II* essentially provide the same interpretation of David's actions: Penman, *David II,* p.292.

man,' which the chronicle suggests is part of his effectiveness as a ruler.[152] This echoes the description of Alexander III with which the chronicle began: just as the conspirators against David decided to give themselves up in the face of his unrelenting campaign, so any would-be rebels against Alexander III would soon, following his stern response, 'put a rope round their necks, ready to be hanged if that was his will and pleasure, and were subjected to his authority.'[153]

*

Robert I receives a rather abrupt and matter-of-fact epitaph in *Gesta Annalia II*. In a short entry only a few lines long, it records the date and place of his death, calling him an 'illustrious king', 'of pious memory', but the sole encomium to his talents is that he was, 'beyond all living men of his day, a valiant knight.'[154] There is no lament for his loss, no triumphal recitation of his achievements, not even an explanation of how he died. By contrast, the very next entry records the death of James Douglas in properly heroic fashion, describing his last glorious charge against the Saracens in Spain, and noting that 'the Lord conferred so much grace upon him during his life that he triumphed over the English everywhere.'[155]

There was perhaps little need for the chronicler to recount Robert's achievements again: the account of his inauguration included a ringing endorsement of his qualities, his sacrifices and his successes, and his death is recorded after a short sequence of chapters showing the final steps of his triumphant restoration of

---

[152] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2): 'vir mansuetissimus.'

[153] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (p.310): 'misso fune in collo, ad suspendium parati, si suae placitum esset voluntati, suo subderentur imperio.'

[154] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 143 (p.353): 'rex Scotorum illustris'; 'piae memoriae'; 'ultra omnes viventes suis diebus miles strenuus.'

[155] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 144 (pp.353-4): 'Dominus tantam gratiam in vita sua contulit, ut ubique locorum Anglicis triumphavit.' The text does not mention that Douglas happened to be carrying Robert I's heart with him at the time, a surprising omission since the detail would have added to the presentation of Robert as a pious hero and was well-known; perhaps the compiler quietly disapproved of the division of Robert's heart and body: Bower, Scotichronicon 13.20 (vol.7, pp.66-7, 197 n.2); Grant G. Simpson, 'The Heart of King Robert I: Pious Crusade or Marketing Gambit?' 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), pp.173-86 at pp.175-82.

Scotland to its former prestige and security.[156] In 1325, he renewed the alliance with France and made peace with the papacy (laconically described as having been 'at the urging of adversaries in some way roused against the king and kingdom').[157] This was swiftly followed by the birth of his son and heir, the future David II; in the next year, his enemy, Edward II, was overthrown, and Robert secured oaths of loyalty from the Scottish clergy and nobility to ensure the succession of his son, and, should David leave no heirs, the king's grandson, Robert Stewart.[158] In 1327, Robert negotiated a treaty of peace with the English crown, and, according to the chronicle, paid, as a sign of his own generosity and magnanimity (and, indeed, wealth), 'of his own free and unbiased will,' 30 000 marks in cash to Edward III, and secured this peace by arranging for his son, David, to be married to Edward's sister, Joan.[159]

Thus had Robert, according to the chronicle, returned Scotland to the condition of strength and prosperity it had enjoyed during the reign of Alexander III, and re-established a successful monarchy that was legitimised as much by its ability to fulfil its obligations to the people of Scotland as by its ancestry. Though it would not last for long, it was in a way the ideal moment for the heroic king to die. The extent to which Robert I had succeeded in restoring the independence and prestige of the Scottish crown was evident at the coronation of his son, David II, in 1331: the chronicle records that he was, by special permission of the pope, crowned with greater solemnity than any previous king of Scotland, and was the first Scottish king to be anointed.[160] The heirs of some of his chief supporters, and other nobles, were also knighted at the occasion, a way perhaps of binding them together and emphasising the chivalric idea of service to the king.[161] Yet while *Gesta Annalia II* presented Robert I as a great hero, such praise was not extended to his wider

---

[156] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 118 (pp.340-1).
[157] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 138 (pp.350-1): 'ad suggestionem adversariorum contra regem et regnum aliqualiter fuit mota.'
[158] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 138-139 (pp.350-1).
[159] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 141 (p.352): 'mera et spontanea voluntate.'
[160] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 145 (p.354).
[161] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 145 (p.354).

family. The portrayal of his father and grandfather is somewhat ambivalent, and the chronicle is openly critical of his brother, Edward, accusing him of jealousy and rashness, and needlessly leading many Scots to their death.[162] In this way, the chronicle attempts to stand above the factionalism of the time; while favouring the Bruce claim over that of Balliol, the text otherwise judges both John and Robert I on their performance as kings. The chronicle supports the institution of the Scottish crown, rather than any particular dynasty.

*

This distinction is appropriate to the context of *Gesta Annalia II*'s composition. Reflecting the interests of the clergy of St Andrews, and their bishop, William de Laundels, *Gesta Annalia II* appears to back David II in his attempts to persuade the Scottish nobility to support his negotiations with the English crown over his ransom payments and the Scottish succession. The chronicle's staunch support for and praise of Robert I serves to legitimise and strengthen the position of his heir, David II, but by linking this to the institution of the kingship, rather than the specific dynasty, suggests the possibility that another line of kings could similarly have Scotland's interests at heart.

This context even shapes *Gesta Annalia II*'s apparent criticism of David II regarding the payment of his ransom. The chronicle has no objection to the principle of paying the ransom, nor to the necessity of raising contributions from the kingdom to do so; it emphasises that, although many hostages were left in England as security, there would not be 'any other treaty, break-up or subjection of the kingdom, or any exaction whatsoever,' arising from the ransom.[163] These were terms far better than those received by the king of France after his release from captivity in 1360, and similar to the precautions taken in the marriage arrangement for Margaret. In 1359, therefore, David received permission from the pope to collect 'a tenth of all the income and revenues of the whole Scottish church,' for a period of three years, to

---

[162] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 133 (p.348).

[163] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 178 (p.377): 'sine fraude persolvendarum, absque aliquot tractatu, regni demembratione sen subjectione, vel exactione quacunque'; 182 (pp.379-80).

be used towards the payment of his ransom.[164] The king, however, also forced the clergy (along with the 'barons and freeholders of the kingdom') to contribute from their own temporalities and lands held from him, despite their opposition.[165] This action was wrong on several levels: the king broke his word, disobeyed the express instructions of the Pope, and, rather than protect the church, he treated its members unfairly and impoverished them, and extended this ill-treatment to his other subjects. In this, David acted not as a dutiful sovereign should but as if he were just another presumptuous, deceitful, grasping aristocrat. This criticism, however, demonstrates the difficulties into which David had been forced, thereby suggesting that David's negotiations were a more appropriate and kingly resolution to the problem, and would free the church and population from such ill-treatment.

This issue also shapes *Gesta Annalia II*'s treatment of Robert Stewart, the future Robert II. Stewart was opposed to David's negotiations with England, which would have removed him from the succession; the text's hostility towards Robert Stewart might therefore be intended to demonstrate that an English heir was better than the alternative.[166] The chronicle is repeatedly critical of his actions and efforts to lead Scotland in David's absence, which frequently led to disaster and suffering, with little concern for the common people.[167] His renewal of fealty to David II is highlighted in the aftermath of the conspiracy against the king in 1362.[168]

---

[164] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 180 (p.378): 'ad impetrandum decimam omnium fructuum ac reddituum totius ecclesiae Scoticanae;' Penman, *David II*, p.241; A.D.M. Barrell, *The Papacy, Scotland and Northern England, 1342-1378* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.23-4.

[165] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 180 (p.378): 'regni baronibus ac aliis liberetenentibus.' Bower reports on the grant of the tax, but misses out the criticism of David II: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.21 (vol.7, pp.312-3, 488 n.49).

[166] Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.42-43.

[167] See, for example, Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 152, 159, 165, 166, 171 (pp.358-9, 363-4, 367, 368, 370-1).

[168] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 184 (pp.381-2). David's wedding also took place during this stay at Inchmurdo in Fife; Robert's submission was therefore a very public occasion that emphasised the strength of the king and his dynasty. Bower includes the text of the submission, referred to but not included in *Gesta Annalia II*, suggesting that Bower perhaps found it in (or attached to) a lost manuscript of the chronicle, or at least, given that the submission took place in Fife, that a copy of the document was known among the Augustinians of St Andrews: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 14.27 (vol.7, pp.330-3, notes pp.495-6); Penman, *David II*, pp.292-5; Boardman, 'Chronicle Propaganda,' pp.41-2.

The chronicle's support for David II in this matter is also evident in its inclusion, in its genealogies of the contenders for the throne, of a genealogy of the English royal line, presented, like the Scottish dynasty, as descending from Saint Margaret and Malcolm III, making the point that any potential English succession would still be part of the Scottish royal line.[169] The chronicle's preference for the stability and prosperity of peace, rather than war and destruction, also reflected contemporary arguments about the need to come to an agreement with England, and the benefits that this would bring.[170] The inclusion of the agreement for the proposed marriage of Margaret (the Maid of Norway) and the future Edward II of England, which contained safeguards intended to preserve Scotland's autonomy, is arguably intended as an example of how previous leaders have accepted the possibility of an English succession without compromising the kingdom's independence.[171] Similarly, the marriage of David II to Edward III's sister, Joan, is recorded as a cause of celebration.[172]

Gesta Annalia II even describes the grandfather of Robert I as being 'of the noblest stock of all England,' implying that English origins are no barrier to becoming king.[173] John Balliol likewise had English descent, and while in other sources this is used to portray him as alien and foreign, *Gesta Annalia II* is relatively supportive of his efforts on Scotland's behalf, again highlighting that having Scotland's interests at heart is in some respects more important than ancestry or nationality in a king.[174]

*

Gesta Annalia II's support for David II's policy is implied through the chronicle's presentation of particular aspects of Scottish kingship. Notably, however, the

---

[169] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 80 (p.318-9). By tracing the descent from Malcolm and Margaret, the chronicle reflected an established tradition about the start of the royal dynasty, but also allowed the inclusion of this English genealogy.

[170] As, for example, in Spyny's 'quaestio.'

[171] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 69 (p.311).

[172] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 142 (p.353).

[173] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-4): 'Robertus sit de nobiliori prosapia totius Angliae.'

[174] Watson, 'The Demonisation of King John,' pp.34-9; Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.205-6; Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, pp.65-6; Beam, *The Balliol Dynasty*, pp.114-5, 162.

chronicle's apparent sympathy towards an English heir is expressed within a framework that emphasises the same ideals of Scottish freedom, and the same vision of the role of its king, as can be found in *Proto-Fordun*.

Both chronicles end with a royal wedding (or the hope of one), occasions that symbolised the present and future strength of the royal dynasty, although ironically neither of these weddings would produce an heir, thus bringing those dynasties to a close. Although these end points might be coincidental, the unintentional result of circumstance rather than a deliberate choice, that both chronicles should end at such a moment nevertheless highlights the way in which the success and prosperity of a kingdom and the success and prosperity of its king were seen as intrinsically connected. Similarly, the antiquity and status of the crown corresponded to that of the kingdom. In both texts, it is, moreover, the fundamental duty of the king to try to ensure the prosperity, stability and order of his kingdom, and a weak king under subjection to another power is equated with a weak, subjugated people. The texts highlight similar qualities in their presentation of an ideal king; *Proto-Fordun* perhaps places greater emphasis on the piety of kings, but *Gesta Annalia II* similarly depicts the need for a king to defend the spiritual well-being of the realm through ending discord and restoring relations with the wider church.

Gesta Annalia II is strikingly similar to *Proto-Fordun* in its emphasis on the need to deal swiftly with rebellion and to rule sternly but justly, and in placing the interests of Scotland over those of the individual king. Indeed, *Gesta Annalia II* frequently emphasises the necessity for loyalty to the institution of the crown over loyalty to any given dynasty or faction. In both texts, the king is a symbol of the unity of the people, who are bound together by their loyalty to him, and it is the king's duty to defend that unity against external enemies and internal division. For both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, the king is the most powerful symbol of Scotland's identity; just as Scotland is synonymous with the Scottish king's realm, so the Scots are synonymous with his subjects.

CHAPTER FIVE: Church

I

Christianity was central to the identity of Scotland and the Scottish people (as indeed it was to other polities and peoples throughout Europe). The Declaration of Arbroath, sent to the pope in 1320, includes in its potted history of the Scots not only the many enemies they had defeated, and their uninterrupted line of 113 Scottish kings, but also the detail that the Scots were among the first people to be called by Christ to join 'His most holy faith,' despite being 'settled in the uttermost ends of the earth.'[1] This explicitly places Christianity at the heart of how a people were defined, standing alongside their antiquity, their king and their territory as one of the key elements that unified them. The Scots were particularly special in this respect because God sent St Andrew, 'the first apostle by calling,' (though admittedly 'second or third in rank') to 'confirm them in that faith' and 'protect them as their patron for ever.'[2]

Proto-Fordun and *Gesta Annalia II* similarly identify the Christian faith as a central part of Scotland's identity, and highlight the role played by the church in the life of the kingdom.[3] Both texts were produced by clerics, both of whom were likely associated with the diocese of St Andrews, and have a distinctly ecclesiastical outlook. They are not, however, histories of the church in Scotland or of the authors' religious houses: they generally display little interest in the appointments of church officials or in wider theological or ecumenical matters, and both

---

[1] 'Declaration of Arbroath,' p.780.
[2] 'Declaration of Arbroath,' p.780.
[3] Such examples even include the relatively mundane. For example, during Robert I's flight from his many enemies after the battle of Methven, 'the English ordered an enquiry be made about him through the churches, as if he was a lost or stolen thing' ('quasi res perdicta cum furto subtracta, per ecclesias inquiri jubetur'): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 121 (pp.342-3). The clerical perspective of the author of *Gesta Annalia II* is also evident in the note that Thomas, earl of Mar, was 'urged on by the devil' ('instigante diabolo') to divorce his wife and that Alexander Ramsay, though he spent seventeen days in captivity without food, was at least 'fortified by partaking of the Saving Host' (i.e. he had received Communion; 'munitus perceptione hostiae salutaris') before he died: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 76, 162 (pp.317, 365-6); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.49 (vol.7, pp.152-3).

chronicles are dominated by narratives of Scotland's kings.[4] Despite this, the clerical perspective of their authors is evident, in their interest in matters pertaining directly to the church in Scotland, but also in the often moralising tone of the texts, which frequently explain events as being God's will, or as evidence of His (dis)pleasure. The texts highlight the importance of piety in Scotland's leaders (particularly *Proto-Fordun*), and stress the need for loyalty, order and hierarchy; *Gesta Annalia II* is particularly forthright in condemning the discord and strife that follows from failing to adhere loyally to a king or pursuing selfish feuds. Both texts also display an interest in the ideal relationship between the crown and the church, and in defining the relationship between the Scottish church itself and the wider Christian world (particularly the English church). The two chronicles present the Scottish church as fully in line with contemporary worship and practice and equal in status to any other in the wider fellowship of the Roman church. At the same time, however, the chronicles also emphasise the independence of the Scottish church, its links with the ancient roots of the kingdom, and its rejection of outside authority, particularly that of the English church but at times even that of Rome itself.[5]

*

The clerical outlook shaping both *Proto-Fordun and Gesta Annalia II* is evident in their style as well as in their content. For example, both texts make occasional use of biblical allusions or comparisons.[6] Thus in *Proto-Fordun*, the closeness and

---

[4] Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.163.

[5] On these topics generally, see, for example, Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.101-60; Brown, *The Wars of Scotland*, pp.114-34; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, pp.61-83; Grant, *Independence and Nationhood*, pp.89-119; David Ditchburn, *Scotland and Europe: The Medieval Kingdom and its Contacts with Christendom, c.1215-1545, volume 1: Religion, Culture and Commerce* (East Linton, 2000), pp.33-92; Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, pp.243-68.

[6] It is not clear to what extent the allusions in the sections of *Proto-Fordun* that survive in Fordun's *Chronica* are the work of *Proto-Fordun*; Fordun included extra liturgical details in chapters that were based on the *Gesta Annalia I* section. For example, *Proto-Fordun* records that Malcolm III died on 13th November 1093 ('anno Domini MXCIII tertio Idus Augusti'), but Fordun adds that this was St Brice's day. Likewise, *Proto-Fordun* records that David I died at Carlisle on 22nd May 1153 ('ab incarnatione Domini MCLIII, IX Kalendas Junii apud Careolum,') while Fordun adds that he had gone to Carlisle after Easter, and died on 'the Sunday before Ascension Day'('post Pascha, Carlele adiit… anno Domini MCLIII, XI kalendas Junii, dominica ante ascensionem'): *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 19, 39 (pp.421-2, 435-6); *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.20, 34 (pp.218-9, 233-4).

friendship between William I and Richard I of England is compared to that of David and Jonathan, while Malcolm III learns to be pious from the example of Margaret, 'as David the prophet sang in the Psalm, "with the holy you will be holy."'[7] The chronicle records similarly that Malcolm's son, Edgar, 'remembered that saying of Solomon's, "in the days of good things be not unmindful of evil," which prompted him to give the estate of Coldingham to the monks of Durham, in honour of 'his leader, Saint Cuthbert.'[8] Such allusions and direct comparisons are somewhat rarer in *Gesta Annalia II,* but do occur. For example, Robert I can withstand his many hardships and escape his enemies because he is guided by God, who 'knows how to rescue the godly from their trials, and how in His mercy to free from danger those who trust in Him.'[9] Most notably, Robert I is said to be 'like another Judas Maccabeus' for his fierce defence of his people in the face of English aggression.[10] Although this comparison carries a religious resonance, emphasising the providential nature of Robert I's rise to power and defence of the Scots, it is also significant in a chivalric context, as Judas Maccabeus was regarded as one of the great knightly heroes of the Biblical past; the same comparison had been made in the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320, and Robert's chivalric reputation was firmly established by this time.[11]

---

[7] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 21 (pp.273-4); *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 18 (pp.420-1): 'sicut sanctus propheta David in psalmis cecinit, cum sancto sanctus eris.' The quotation is from Psalm 18:25.

[8] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 29 (pp.428-9): 'illud tamen Salomonicum reminiscens, "In diebus bonorum non immemor sis malorum"'; 'sancti Cuthberti ducis sui.' The quotation is from Ecclesiasticus 11.25; the attribution to Solomon suggests at some point this was confused with Ecclesiastes. Unfortunately, Ranulf, bishop of Durham, soon demonstrated that he did not deserve such a gift, by conspiring to have Edgar's friend, Robert, son of Godwin, kidnapped, so the donation was promptly taken back.

[9] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 114 (pp.338-9): 'novit pios a temptatione eripere, et in se sperantes a periculis misericorditer liberare.' This follows a line from Proverbs 21:30; the first part of the quotation (to 'eripere') is in 2 Peter 2:9 but the remainder does not appear in the Vulgate Bible: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 6, p.425 n.27-29.

[10] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337): 'tanquam alter Machabeus.' Bower also includes this description: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 12.4 (vol.6, pp.300-1).

[11] Barbour also compares the Scottish people to the Maccabees, and Edward Bruce to Judas Maccabeus for his boldness: Barbour, *The Bruce*, pp.69, 356; 'Declaration of Arbroath,' p.780; Carol Edington, 'Paragons and Patriots: National Identity and the Chivalric Ideal in Late-Medieval Scotland,' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.69-81 at pp.73-7.

This clerical outlook is also evident in the way in which events are dated in both texts: both primarily give years in Anno Domini form; regnal years are less common, and an accompanying AD year is usually given in the same chapter.[12] The primacy of AD years is typical of medieval chronicles generally.[13] *Proto-Fordun* even acknowledges this decision, declaring, when introducing a history of the Roman emperors (included because of their four centuries of war with the Scots, and the gloriousness of their history), that 'I intend to use the same system of chronology in this little chronicle as is used in Roman history for dating the accessions of the emperors, which are given in the years of our Lord's Incarnation.'[14] The implication of this is that the Scots have a similarly glorious history, so it should be recorded in the same way; the choice of AD to record events also places that history in a universal and explicitly Christian context.[15]

---

[12] *Proto-Fordun* often uses a combination of AD year and regnal year of the Roman emperor for earlier history. Fordun occasionally uses regnal years where *Proto-Fordun* has AD. For example, in *Gesta Annalia I*, William II of England died in 1100 ('anno Domini MC') and Edgar in 1107 ('ab incarnatione Domini MCVII'), but Fordun says that William died in the fourth year of Edgar's reign ('Ejus autem anno quarto') and Edgar died after reigning nine years and three months ('Postquam Edgarus in pace bona novem, ut supradictum est, annis et tribus mensibus regnum rexisset'). Fordun also dates Edgar's death one day later than *Proto-Fordun*: Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 30 (p.429); *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.27 (pp.226-7). Fordun differs slightly from *Proto-Fordun* on other dates also, e.g. *Gesta Annalia I* states that Matilda, sister of Alexander I and wife of Henry I of England, died in the tenth year of Alexander's reign of 17 years and 4 months; Fordun says that she died in 1117, the 11th year of a reign of 17 years and 21 days, though both texts give the same date and year for Alexander's death: It would appear that *Proto-Fordun* has calculated Alexander's reign from the death of his brother Edgar to his own death in 1124, while Fordun perhaps preferred to calculate it from his inauguration, as Bower later does with the reigns of David II and Robert II: *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 32, 34 (pp.430-1, 431-2); *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 5.29, 30 (pp.228-30); Boardman, 'Coronations, Kings and Guardians,' at pp.105-106.

[13] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p.124. Regnal years in *Proto-Fordun* are generally used to mark royal deaths (and occasionally royal births or marriages), e.g. Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 16 (p.419); *Gesta Annalia* 19, 28 (pp.270-1, 279-80). They are not used in *Gesta Annalia II*, a chronicle that includes a period when Scotland had no king, although reign lengths are noted in the genealogical material.

[14] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.18: 'Juxta cujus igitur imperatorum sucessiones, qui per annos notantur incarnationis dominicae... chroniculae, tempora praetenduntur.' This introduces a long digression into Roman history: it is possible that the comments were not the work of *Proto-Fordun*.

[15] This is particularly typical of medieval chronicles that sought to depict the history of a people within a wider universal context; the same chapter discusses the 'Four Empires' scheme of history, complementing an earlier discussion of the 'Six Ages' of the world and a computation of the age of the world; again, these digressions from the narrative of Scottish history might not be the work of *Proto-Fordun*: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.7, 2.18 (pp.8, 51); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.7-8, 2.18 (vol.1, pp.16-25, 206-7, notes pp.100, 359; Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, pp.113-124.

The extent to which time was thought of in terms of the liturgical calendar can be seen in the way in which the chronicles often use holy days, as well as calendar days of the month, to date events, a mixture typical of medieval chronicles.[16] *Proto-Fordun* makes greater use of a wider range of holy days and feast days to do so, drawing on many saints that do not feature in *Gesta Annalia II*, including not only major saints venerated across Europe but also some distinctly British ones, such as Cuthbert, Oswald and Botulph.[17]

On occasion, *Proto-Fordun* also uses calendar dates in combination with holy days. This often marks events of royal significance, although this usage is far from systematic. For example, Alexander II was knighted by John of England in 1212 'on the middle Sunday of Lent, the Letare Jerusalem, 8th of March.'[18] Alexander III was born 'on the day of St Cuthbert's translation, Wednesday, the 4th of September,' and married on 15th May, 1239, noted as Whitsunday that year.[19] Similarly, Alexander III's son, Alexander, was born 'on the 21st of December 1264, the day of St Agnes the Virgin.'[20] This style is also evident on occasion in *Gesta Annalia II*:

---

[16] *Proto-Fordun* is somewhat inconsistent, perhaps reflecting the preferences of its sources; several dates appear in both forms on separate occasions. Compare, for example, '15th August' and 'Assumption of the blessed Virgin Mary,' in Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 13, 61 (pp.265, 305-6). *Gesta Annalia II* also alternates between giving dates in the Roman format, and in day-of-the-month style; while the use of the modern system of numbered days of the month became more common in chronicles in this period, it was not standard and such mixed usage was not unusual: Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p.125.

[17] There are very few precise dates in *Proto-Fordun* before the *Gesta Annalia I* section; perhaps the most notable is the arrival of St Regulus and the relics of St Andrew: they came ashore on 28th September: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.48 (pp.77-8). In *Proto-Fordun*, around half of the dates are calendar dates, while in *Gesta Annalia II* calendar dates appear around four times as often as holy days. Both texts use Christmas, Candlemas, Lent, Easter, Whitsunday, the Nativity of John the Baptist and Michaelmas several times in dating events; *Proto-Fordun* also mentions Ascension Day, the Feast of the Holy Trinity, Martinmas, and the feast days of St Bartholomew, St Simon and St Jude, St Peter in chains, St Nicholas, St Maurice, St Stephen, St Agnes the Virgin, St Botulph, St Oswald and the translation of St Cuthbert. *Gesta Annalia II* also refers to Allhallowmas, the Nativity of Mary and the feasts of St Peter and St Paul, St Calixtus, St Matthew, and the Finding of the Holy Cross.

[18] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 26 (pp.277-8): 'media Dominica XL ad Laetare Jerusalem, VIII idus Martii.' This chapter also uses Candlemas as a date.

[19] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 44 (p.291): 'in die translationis sancti Cuthberti, pridie nonas Septembris, feria IIII, aetatis anno patris sui LXIIII incipiente, et regni sui XXVII pene finito.'

[20] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1): 'XII kalendas Januarii, die videlicet, sanctae Agnetis virginis, anno Domini MCCLXIIII.' Alexander was born on 21st January, which is indeed St Agnes' Day;

David II was born on 'Monday the 5th of March, in the first week of Lent,' and Roxburgh Castle was captured by Alexander Ramsay on '30th of March 1342, which that year was Easter Eve.'[21]

Gesta Annalia II occasionally uses holy days to date events. For example, the wedding of Alexander II and Yolande took place on St Calixtus's day, while John Comyn, earl of Buchan, asked Robert I for a truce on Christmas Day 1307, and the battle of Bannockburn took place on 'the day of the nativity of St John the Baptist, in 1314.'[22] More strikingly, the chronicle also records that John Balliol was made king 'on the last day of November 1292,' without mentioning that this was St Andrew's Day.[23] The choice of date had surely been deliberate, intended to associate the new king with Scotland's patron and highlight the link between Scotland's regnal and religious identities; the chronicler appears to be explicitly denying this association, distancing Balliol not only from Scotland's cause but also from the patron saint of the author's own diocese.[24]

*

In their use of Anno Domini rather than regnal years, and the frequent use of holy days to date events, both chronicles display a conventional clerical outlook, conceiving of their chronology in explicitly Christian terms.[25] They are, however, more interested in the affairs of Scotland's kings than in ecumenical and theological

---

this was perhaps a scribal error when using the Roman calendar. The king apparently received the news of the birth of his son and of the death of his enemy, the king of Norway, on the same day.

[21] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 138 (pp.350-1): 'quinto die Martii, die Lunae, in prima ebdomada Quadragesime'; 161 (p.365): 'Tricesimo die mensis Martii, anno MCCCXLII, qui illo anno fuit in vigilia Paschae.'

[22] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67, 122, 131 (pp.309-10, 343-4, 346-347): 'in die natalis beati Johannis Baptistae, anno Domini MCCCXIIII.'

[23] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 85 (p.321): 'ultimo die mensis Novembris.'

[24] St Andrews Day was celebrated as a feast day in Scotland, despite falling within Advent. Bower also uses a calendar date for the inauguration; neither *Scotichronicon* nor *Gesta Annalia II* gives any details of the ceremony other than to say it was in the customary fashion; *Gesta Annalia II*'s accounts of the inaugurations of Robert I and David II are similarly brief and vague. The English chronicle of Guisborough gives a much fuller account of John's inauguration, portraying it as a far more religious occasion than *Proto-Fordun's* comparable account of Alexander III's inauguration: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.14 (vol. 6, pp.38-9); Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.146-9; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.179.

[25] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p.125.

matters; *Proto-Fordun* provides much less religious detail for many events than related sources such as the *Chronicle of Melrose*.[26] Nevertheless, both chronicles also emphasise the role of God in shaping events and take a firm moral stance on many aspects of the history that they narrate.[27] Throughout both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, the particular course of events, such as battles, is attributed to God's will and is often presented as a lesson, whether an act of divine mercy and generosity, a reward for pious behaviour or a punishment for moral failings.

This perspective, entirely conventional for medieval writers throughout Europe, often comes across as a certain degree of ambivalence toward violent retribution. In *Proto-Fordun*, for example, the defeat of the Christians at Hattin in 1187 came after the Christians there had 'offended His divine majesty,' and so were justly punished when God 'made the Christian people subject to foreigners.'[28] This event had been preceded by divine omens, further evidence of God's direct presence and involvement in the earthly world: there was a total eclipse of the moon, followed by a partial eclipse in which the sun glowed like fire and the earth looked as if it was bathed in blood.[29] Such omens also signalled the impending death of Malcolm IV in 1165, when two comets were seen in the August before his death in December.[30] It was likewise the will of God that John of England should die in 1216, so that he 'was

---

[26] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' pp.163-174.

[27] In this respect, the texts are typical of chronicles by medieval clerics: see for example, Given-Wilson, *Chronicles,* pp.21-56; Antonia Gransden, 'The Chronicles of medieval England and Scotland: Part I,' *Journal of Medieval History* 16 (1990), pp.129-139 at p.134-5.

[28] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 18 (pp.269-70): 'qui nunc populum Christianum… propter suam divinae majestatis offensam, alienigenis nutu suo excitatis subjecit.' The chronicle observes that God had once punished the Jews in similar fashion; the idea that being subject to foreign or outside powers was a punishment and humiliation for a nation or people recurs throughout *Proto-Fordun* (and, indeed, *Gesta Annalia II*): see, for example, the presentation of Welsh suffering as a warning to other nations not to fall under the English yoke: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 45, 65 (pp.292, 308-9).

[29] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 18 (pp.269-70)

[30] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 5 (p.258). The author of the chronicle does not always seem entirely convinced by such omens, saying these comets only 'according to some, foreboded the king's death' ('secundum quosdam, regis mortem praefigurabant'), although he then describes a comet as 'a star which appears, not at all times, but mostly against a king's death, or a country's downfall,' ('cometa est stella, non omni tempore, sed maxime contra obitum regis, [aut] contra excidium apparens regionis'), or occasionally to warn of storms or wars. The incident also appears in the *Chronicle of Melrose*, with the same explanation, and appears to have been based on account of the comets that preceded the Norman conquest in 1066, updated to refer to Malcolm: Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.159.

to end his evil deeds and plotting as well as his life,' thus providing righteous punishment for his crimes.[31] 'God's will' is the only explanation *Gesta Annalia II* can put forward for the devastation and the 'strange and unusual,' painful kind of death caused by the Black Death.[32] *Gesta Annalia II* similarly attributes Robert I's destructive raids into England in 1311 to God's power, so that 'the faithless English race, which had tortured many unjustly, was now, by God's righteous judgement, subjected to awful scourges,' while Robert's campaign in England in 1322 was God's just reward for the violence done by the English to Scottish churches earlier in the year. [33]

It is of course the Scots on whose behalf God is most frequently seen to intervene in the chronicles, whether striking down their enemies or, occasionally, punishing them for their own misdeeds. There is a strong sense in both chronicles that this is because the Scots are a chosen people, divinely favoured ahead of others.[34] Such favour was well-deserved: *Proto-Fordun* declares that the Scots became Christians as early as 203.[35] The chronicle emphasises the strength of Scotland's long-standing Christian identity, equal (at least) to that of any other nation, by highlighting the arrival of Palladius, the first bishop in Scotland, in 430; he is credited with bringing the Scottish church into line with the rest of Europe, as the Scots had previously been guided in their faith only by priests and monks.[36] St Ninian is credited with

---

[31] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 35 (pp.284-5): 'Deo disponente, malitias et insidias cum vita finiens.'
[32] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 167 (pp.368-9): 'in modum ac insolitum nutu divino moriendi hoc accidit detrimentum.'
[33] Robert I is by far the most frequent recipient of God's favour in *Gesta Annalia II*: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 128 (pp.345-6): 'gens Anglorum perfida, quae multos injuste cruciaverat, jam justo Dei judicio diris subicitur flagellis'; 137 (pp.349-50); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.195-7.
[34] This is again conventional: writers elsewhere similarly described their own nations in such terms. See for example, Andrea Ruddick, 'National Sentiment and Religious Vocabulary in Fourteenth-Century England,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 60 (2009), pp.1-18.
[35] This assertion might have been intended to show that the Scots adopted Christianity at roughly the same time as the Britons, who the chronicle suggests first sought conversion in the 180s: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.30, 35 (pp.60-1, 64-5); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.40 (vol.1, pp.256-9, notes p.381).
[36] *Proto-Fordun* appears to be consciously identifying Palladius with the Scots of Scotland, rather than those of Ireland; the chapter heading (and the next chapter) differentiates between Palladius in Scotland and Patrick in Ireland. Similarly, the conversion of St Oswald and the Angles is attributed to Scottish, rather than Irish, missionaries: Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.8, 36 (pp.93-4, 122-3).

converting the inhabitants of the kingdom south of the Forth, and St Kentigern with extending the diocese of Glasgow as far south as the Rey Cross at Stainmore; these claims consciously equate the development of the Scottish church with that of the Scottish kingdom.[37] It is to the kingdom's credit, and a further sign of divine favour, that someone as wise and holy as St Columba should flourish there.[38] The most potent symbol of Scotland's status as a most Christian and divinely-favoured kingdom is its patron saint, St Andrew. The arrival of his relics is presented as a blessing from God, and they allow Scotland to assert its special status since ancient times.[39]

God's protection of his favoured kingdom is evident throughout *Proto-Fordun*. For example, the chronicle states that, despite their sins, God chose to spare the Scots and the Picts from a plague that ravaged the rest of Europe.[40] The arrival of Saint Margaret and her relatives in Scotland 'did not come about by chance, but… through the providence of God.'[41] Indeed, it was 'by God's behest,' rather than her own, that her brother Edgar Atheling sanctioned her marriage to Malcolm III.[42] Among the items brought with them to Scotland was the Black Rood; the chronicle observes that it would become venerated by 'all the Scottish race,' a symbol of the bond of unity between the Scottish people, their crown and God.[43] God's active role in moving Scotland towards her destiny extended to protecting its holy royal family, providing a miraculous cloud of mist to hide them from their enemies as they fled Edinburgh Castle, carrying the body of Margaret.[44]

---

[37] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.9, 29 (pp.94, 115).

[38] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.26 and ff. (pp.112-3 ff.)

[39] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.46-8 (pp.75-8). That *Proto-Fordun* acknowledges that the relics arrive in Pictland, but are now a symbol of Scotland, supports his presentation of Scotland as a successor to the Pictish as well as Scottish kingdoms.

[40] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.40 (pp.125-6).

[41] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 12 (pp.415-6): 'Et ideo non hoc casu contigisse, sed summa Dei providentia illam ibidem credimus applicuisse.'

[42] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14 (p.417): 'ymmo Dei ordinatione.' This description of how she came to marry Malcolm might be 'Turgot's conventional phrase,' but its inclusion here indicates that it was a convention that made sense to the author of *Proto-Fordun*: Macquarrie, *The Saints of Scotland,* p.213.

[43] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14 (pp.417-8): 'omni genti Scotorum.'.

[44] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 20 (p.422).

Gesta Annalia II similarly presents Robert I as divinely favoured, explicitly stating that he was sent by God as a champion to save the Scots.[45] The sequence of chapters that follows this contains the most divine intervention in the chronicle, repeatedly describing God's role in guiding and protecting Robert as he attempted to secure his (and Scotland's) position. Thus, Robert was 'inspired by God' ('Deo inspirante') in deflecting the accusations levelled against him by John Comyn to Edward I, and it is with God's guidance and grace that Robert managed to escape safely home before Edward I could have him killed.[46] His victories are achieved with 'the Lord's help, by his own strength, and by his human valour,' and when he was suffering, without allies, God 'took pity on him.'[47]

While Robert I, with God's influence, was heroically putting the needs of Scotland and her people ahead of his own, his rival, John Comyn, is presented as doing the opposite, to the extent that he even breaks a sacred oath intended to end the internal divisions causing so much suffering to the Scots.[48] This treatment of the rivalry between Comyn and Bruce justifies Comyn's murder before the altar in Dumfries, the space which ritually enacted Christ's sacrifice and symbolised the bond between God and man, as a kind of sacrifice necessary to heal Scotland's factionalism and discord.[49] Having been so inspired and supported by God, Robert's faith would continue to be rewarded: at Bannockburn in 1314, Robert I succeeded because he trusted 'not in the numbers of his people, but in the Lord God,' unlike Edward II, who foolishly had trusted 'in the glory of human power.'[50] Indeed, the chronicle seems to regard beating the English as the surest sign of God's favour: of

---

[45] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.195
[46] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113-117 (pp.337-40); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.195-6.
[47] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 118 (pp.340-1): 'Domino opitulante, propriis viribus, et humana virtute'; 121 (pp.342-3): 'Domino miserante.'
[48] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 113 (pp.337-8).
[49] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.194-7.
[50] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 131 (pp.346-7): 'non in multitudine populi sed in Domino Deo spem ponens'; 'gloriae humanae potential confisus.'

James Douglas, the chronicle says that 'the Lord conferred so much grace upon him during his life that he triumphed over the English everywhere.'[51]

Both chronicles record God intervening to thwart Scotland's enemies. In *Proto-Fordun*, for example, Somerled was defeated 'through God's vengeance' ('ultione divina') after twelve years of rebellion against the devout Malcolm IV; it was God who surrendered the Macwilliams into Alexander II's hands; and it was 'at God's command' ('Dei nutu') that Hakon of Norway's fleet was scattered and thrown on the shore by a storm before the battle of Largs in 1263.[52] John's invasion of Scotland was stopped at Haddington, because 'God was pleased to halt him,' to end the shedding of blood.[53]

Gesta Annalia II likewise says that it is 'by God's doing' and 'the mercy of God' that Edward I should have left Scotland soon after his victories at Dunbar in 1296 and Falkirk in 1298, when a lengthier stay on either occasion might have allowed him to completely subjugate all of Scotland.[54] In 1355, Edward III 'burnt down the whole monastery and famous church of the Friars Minor,' and some English soldiers desecrated 'the white kirk of the Virgin, which stands by the sea'; the Virgin Mary therefore intervened on behalf of 'the wretched Scottish race,' so that God thwarted Edward's planned conquest by scattering his fleet in a storm, even saving the Scottish canons on board while their English captors perished.[55] In attributing earthly events to the workings of God, the chronicles display a conventional clerical attitude, but there is a distinctly patriotic flavour to their understanding of those workings that stresses the divine favour in which the Scots were held.[56]

---

[51] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 144 (pp.353-4): 'Dominus tantam gratiam in vita sua contulit, ut ubique locorum Anglicis triumphavit.'

[52] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 4, 42, 55 (pp.256-7, 289-90, 299-300).

[53] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 34 (pp.283-4): 'Deo placente resistente, et pie sanguinis effusioni parcente.'

[54] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 107 (p.333): 'Deo procurante'; 'pietas Dei.'

[55] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 176 (pp.374-5): 'combusta prius solemni basilica fratrum minorum cum toto monasterio eorundem'; 'albam ecclesiam ejusdem virginis, juxta mare situatam.'; 'miserorum... genti Scotorum.'

[56] The idea of the Scots as a chosen people was perhaps most cogently expressed in the Declaration of Arbroath, which paralleled their journeys with those of the Israelites, and stressed that their

Indeed, the English are often portrayed in *Gesta Annalia II* as being particularly ungodly, in contrast to the Scots.[57] One might perhaps expect the chronicle to criticise the violence of Robert's campaign in England in 1322: his forces are accused of 'despoiling monasteries, and setting fire to very many cities and towns,' as far south as York; this is instead praised as God's reward for the English having, earlier that year, 'despoiled and looted the monasteries of Holyrood, in Edinburgh, and Melrose,' killing even the sick and destroying the altars, and burnt down Dryburgh monastery and 'very many other holy places.'[58] Edward I was guilty of many crimes against God and the church: not only did he inflict suffering on the English, the Welsh, and the Scots (indeed, he 'troubled the whole world with his wickedness'), but he 'destroyed churches, put prelates into chains,' and 'hindered the passage to the Holy Land.'[59] He even removed 'all the lead from the refectory of Saint Andrews' to use in the siege of Stirling, while Edward III had the monasteries of Dunfermline, Saint Andrews, Lindores, Balmerino, Arbroath and Coupar-Angus rebuild the walls and towers of Perth, by which the monasteries 'were greatly impoverished.'[60]

God's desire to aid the Scots, and spare them from unnecessary suffering, was even evident in their defeats. *Proto-Fordun* states that William I was not captured at

---

divine favour was evident in having received St Andrew as a patron saint: 'Declaration of Arbroath,' pp.779-780; Cowan, 'Myth and Identity,' p.118; Cowan, 'Identity, Freedom and the Declaration of Arbroath,' p.39; R. James Goldstein, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Nebraska, 1993), p.91.

[57] The first criticism of the English generally in *Gesta Annalia II* is when 'all the English beneficed clergy in the bishopric of Saint Andrews,' ('omnes Anglici beneficiati in episcopatu Sancti Andrae') were guilty of 'villainous plotting against the king and state,' ('conspiratoriae pravitatis, contra regem et statum regni'), for which they were all expelled from Scotland, soon to be followed by 'each and every other Englishman, both cleric and layman' in the kingdom ('omnes et singuli Anglici, tam clerici quam laici'): Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 91 (p.325).

[58] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 137 (pp.349-50): 'spoliatis monasteriis, oppidis et villis quampluribus igne succensis, penitus devastavit'; 'spoliatis prius et praedatis monasteriis Sanctae Crucis de Edinburgh et de Melrose'; 'et alia pia loca quamplura.'

[59] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 123 (p.344): 'nequitiis totum orbem perturbavit'; 'ecclesias stravit, praelatos vinculavit'; 'passagium terrae sanctae suo dolo impedivit.'

[60] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 111 (pp.336-7): 'totum plumbum refectorii Sancti Andreae deponi mandavit'; 155 (pp.360-1): 'Cujus occasione constructionis dicta monasteria vehementer fuerunt depauperata.' Although Edward III is elsewhere criticised for committing atrocities against Scottish churches, and here for impoverishing them, this chapter also acknowledges that he left the ecclesiastical buildings of Elgin unharmed even as he caused destruction throughout Moray.

Alnwick in 1174 so much as he was, 'by the just workings of divine mercy, deprived of the opportunity of shedding blood,' and it was 'God's plan,' knowing of William's fierceness, that further conflict should be averted and the kingdoms of Britain restored to peace.[61] William's capture was also a moral lesson on the need for a war to be just: William's capture was deserved, for he had launched his campaign in support of Henry II's son Henry, a 'wicked son, who waged an unjust war against his father, a war motivated by no love of justice.'[62] In *Gesta Annalia II*, God is similarly willing to teach the Scots a lesson (albeit one where their error is less explicitly laid out): Edward Balliol's victory at Dupplin Moor, which promised ruin for the Scottish race, was caused not by 'human power, but by divine revenge.'[63]

II

God's role in the changing fortunes of the Scottish crown and people is also reflected in the chronicles' sense of the necessity of closeness between the Scottish church and the king. Thus the chronicles highlight not only the need for a new king to secure the acceptance of the leading clergy as well as the nobility, but also the role played by the church in formally making someone king. Both texts highlight religious elements in inauguration ceremonies that otherwise seem to have been largely secular in nature, suggesting that the chroniclers thought of inauguration as essentially a liturgical ritual, whether or not the ceremony itself was intended as such.[64]

---

[61] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11 (pp.263-4): 'divina disponente clementia, ab effusione Christiani sanguinis raptus'; 'divini nutu consilii.'

[62] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 12 (pp.264-5): 'haec merito passus est, impio filio, contra patrem bellum injustum colore non zelo justiciae prosequenti, subsidium praebens.' Indeed, according to the chronicle, William's support for the young Henry was particularly misguided given that William already had the most just reason of all for war: 'the kingship and crown of all England was his by right, and this was well known,' ('Justissimam belli dereliquit causam, cum sibi de jure notorio totius Angliae principatus cum corona debeatur,'). It goes on to say that, if William's action was a ruse to weaken his enemies, it fooled even his own supporters, and so he 'waged a righteous war unrighteously,' ('injuste justum gerendo bellum'), which often leads to defeat or death.

[63] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 146 (pp.354-5): 'quos non vis humana, sed ultio divina prostravit.'

[64] Bower would also interpret the inauguration of Alexander III in such a light: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.173-179; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, pp.140-146; Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' p.139.

For example, *Proto-Fordun* gives the clergy the key role in the inauguration of William I in 1165: William gathered 'the prelates and magnates of Scotland,' at Scone, where together they 'unanimously set up [William] as king'; he was then 'raised to the king's throne by Richard, bishop of Saint Andrews, with other bishops to help him.'[65] The account of Alexander II's inauguration in 1214 begins and ends with the funeral arrangements for his father, William I, which gave a leading role to the bishop of Glasgow and emphasise William's devotion to Arbroath Abbey.[66] Although the description of the inauguration itself seems to give a lesser role to the clergy (Alexander is raised to the throne by seven earls and the bishop of St Andrews, who is named last), the chronicle nevertheless notes that Alexander succeeded with the 'approval of God and man,' and that the inauguration had 'more pomp and ceremony than any before then.'[67]

This sense of increasingly elaborate, and increasingly religious, inauguration ceremonies is also evident in *Proto-Fordun*'s description of Alexander III's inauguration in 1249, which highlights the presence of David of Bernham, bishop of Saint Andrews, and Geoffrey, bishop of Dunkeld.[68] The chronicle's account of the inauguration draws attention to the importance of the Stone of Destiny, but also highlights the religious elements of the ceremony, emphasising the sovereignty of the Scottish king, despite the lack of papally-sanctioned anointment. Like his predecessor, Alexander III was consecrated king by 'the bishop of Saint Andrews, assisted by the rest;' this, rather than Alexander's sitting on the throne, is presented as the moment when he becomes king.[69] The act of the nobles strewing garments at

[65] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 7 (pp.259-60): 'praelati Scociae, cunctique proceres'; 'quem ibidem unanimes in regem erigunt'; 'a Ricardo episcopo Sancti Andreae, et aliis episcopis coadjuvantibus, in regem benedicitur, atque regali cathedra sublimatur.'
[66] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 29 (p.280).
[67] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 29 (p.280): 'assumpserunt, et secum usque ad Sconam adducentes, sublimius et gloriosius, tam honorifice quam pacifice, quam eo usque quisquam, et secundum Deum et homines in regem sublimatus est.'
[68] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 47 (p.293). Geoffrey receives a particularly flattering introduction.
[69] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-5): 'episcopus Sancti Andreae et ceteri coadjuvantes in regem, ut decuit, consecrarunt.' The use of the word 'consecrated' is not meant in the sense of 'anointed' but rather that the king was now formally set apart from his subjects: Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' p.139.

his feet appears to be an allusion to the biblical inauguration of Jehu as king of Israel, after he was anointed by God, thus presenting Alexander as being similarly anointed, despite the lack of unction, and replicating the role of priests in making a biblical king.[70] That the ceremony takes place under a cross in the church graveyard acts as a symbol of the crown's relationship with God, of whom (and no other) the king holds the kingdom, and which gives the king his status.[71]

Gesta Annalia II provides further evidence of the increasing role of the church in the ceremony: the inauguration of John Balliol in 1292 takes place within the abbey church itself.[72] The account of the ceremony is otherwise perfunctory, noting only that after John was made king, he was 'raised up on the royal throne, as was the custom;' no one in attendance is named, and, as noted above, the date is given as simply 'the last day of November 1292,' not as the day of Scotland's patron saint.[73] Despite having God's favour, Robert I's inauguration at Scone in 1306 is treated in similarly brief fashion, the chronicle noting that it was performed 'in which the kings of Scotland were customarily distinguished,' but not naming anyone in attendance or describing the ceremony.[74] For Edward Balliol's inauguration in 1332, the attendance of William of St Clair, bishop of Dunkeld and 'the abbots, priors, and Estates of Fife and Fothreve, Stratherne, and Gowry' is noted, although the main role is given to Duncan, earl of Fife; the chronicle downplays the legitimacy of the ceremony by suggesting that their attendance might have been more by

---

[70] It is not entirely clear if *Proto-Fordun* was aware of these specific connotations, but given the selective nature of the account, the author clearly felt it had some symbolic value: Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.164-165; Broun, 'Origin of the Stone,' p.192; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.181.

[71] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.181

[72] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 85 (p.321); Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.181; Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' p.147

[73] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 85 (p.321): 'prout moris est, in cathdra regali positus, more debito sublimatus'; 'ultimo die mensis Novembris, anno Domini MCCXCII.'

[74] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 118 (pp.340-1): 'in sede positus regali, modo quo reges Scociae solebant insigniri... ibidem coronatus est.' As with John's inauguration, only a calendar date is given, although the ceremony took place on Lady Day.

compulsion than by choice, as it followed Edward's capture of Duncan at Dupplin Moor and his obtaining the submission of the rest.[75]

The underwhelming presentation of Edward Balliol's inauguration contrasts with that of David II's coronation, which, although brief, emphasised the prestige and holiness of the occasion, and drew attention to the religious aspects of the ceremony. David was 'anointed king of Scots, and crowned at Scone,' by James Ben, bishop of St Andrews, with the chronicler adding that no prior kings of Scotland 'were anointed, or with such ceremony crowned;' these elements are conspicuously absent in the account of Edward Balliol's inauguration, which follows two chapters later.[76] The chronicle highlights these elements not to downplay the legitimacy of earlier kings, but to emphasise the achievement of Robert I in gaining the right to have Scotland's kings recognised in this way, demonstrating their status as sovereign kings comparable to any other in Europe. As the Scottish king had now gained this right, however, Edward Balliol's failure to be crowned or anointed is, then, presented as evidence that he lacked legitimacy. It also highlights that David II was a king made by God, with the bishop of St Andrews given the pivotal role in this transformation, presenting these elements of Scotland's identity as intrinsically linked.

Indeed, not only did the king depend on the church to confirm the legitimacy of his position and his divinely-sanctioned authority, but, *Proto-Fordun* suggests, he should also depend upon the advice of the clergy. For example, in the chronicle's account of the dispute between Malcolm IV and several earls over his closeness with Henry II of England, which escalated to the point that the earls prepared to besiege Malcolm at Perth, it was through the intervention of the clergy that Malcolm came to an understanding with his nobles and the matter was peacefully

---

[75] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 147 (p.355): 'abbatibus prioribus, et communitate de Fyff et Fithirester, de Stratherne, et de Gowry, ad pacem Edwardi jam receptis'; 146 (pp.354-5).
[76] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 145 (p.354): 'inunctus est David rex Scotorum... et coronatur apud Sconam a domino Jacobo Ben, episcopo Sancti Andreae'; 'ante quem nullus regum Scociae legitur fuisse inunctum, vel cum tali solemnitate coronatum.'

resolved.[77] The earls are said to have acted 'to protect the common weal,' rather than for treasonous or selfish reasons. [78] Although the text is critical of Malcolm, however, it also states explicitly that it was God's will that they should fail to capture him: the text is sympathetic to their motives, but does not condone their actions, and the point of the story is not that nobles have a right to overthrow a king but that king, nobles and clergy should all be working towards the same aim of a united, peaceful and prosperous kingdom. The chronicle's account of the revolt of Thomas of Galloway in 1235 similarly shows the bishop of Whithorn and the abbot of Melrose (with the help of Patrick, earl of Dunbar) intervening to persuade Thomas to seek a peace with Alexander II rather than send his men to certain defeat.[79]

Proto-Fordun presents the church as playing a vital role in conducting affairs of state, and protecting the kingdom from dangers without and within. Of the group that went to Normandy to negotiate William I's release from Henry II's captivity, the chronicle names only Richard, bishop of Saint Andrews, and Richard, bishop of Dunkeld.[80] The chronicle also puts the clergy in the leading role in raising the money owed to Richard I for the restoration of William's rights in the Quitclaim of Canterbury, recording that 'the prelates and rectors of churches, the earls, also, and lords,' of the kingdom agreed to pay the money, dividing the cost among themselves.[81] To do so, they put the cause of Scotland above their personal interests, paying regularly and 'gladly,' even though it 'involved loss and expenditure from their own resources.'[82] *Proto-Fordun* also records that in 1250 it was on the advice of the clergy that the magnates of Scotland sent an embassy to Henry III to ask for a renewal of peace and a marriage between Henry's daughter

---

[77] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3 (p.256).

[78] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3 (p.256): 'ymmo rei publicae tuitone.'

[79] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 43 (pp.290 -1).

[80] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 13 (p.265).

[81] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 21 (pp.273-4): 'Totius regni Scotorum praelati ecclesiarumque rectores, comites etiam et procereres, jussu domini sui regis.'

[82] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 21 (pp.273-4): 'licet non sine dispendio jacturaque rerum suarum fieret, terminis connectis temporisbusque praefixis... gratanter persolverunt.'

and the young Alexander III.[83] Similarly, during a dispute between Alexander III and Edward I about the marches of the two kingdoms in 1278, the bishops of Saint Andrews, Glasgow and Dunblane were sent on the king's behalf to Berwick to settle the matter (alongside an unspecified assortment of magnates).[84] Although these negotiations failed to settle the matter, their conciliatory behaviour was a contrast to their English counterpart, the bishop of Durham, who the chronicle blames for starting the dispute.[85]

Gesta Annalia II is less explicit in prioritising the role of clerical leaders in such matters. For example, although the bishops are listed first in each of the groups, all the guardians of Scotland after the death of Alexander III are named, and the text often lists the bishops or clergy of Scotland alongside the nobility and community when parliaments are held or opinions expressed.[86] Indeed, Henry, abbot of Arbroath, is apparently given the task of delivering letters patent to Edward I not because of his prestige but because of his unpopularity, so that he would not be much missed by the 'many of the nobles and others of his country' who hated him, if things went wrong (as they very nearly did for him).[87]

*

Proto-Fordun also suggests that the church depended on the protection of the king, lest greedy magnates should seek to exploit it. The period of Alexander III's minority is described as a time when 'good judgement and justice slept in the kingdom of Scotland,' and the need for a strong king is evident in the chronicle's lament, 'woe

---

[83] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 49 (pp.295-6).

[84] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 62 (p.306). The English party sent to discuss the matter was similarly led by the bishops of Norwich and Durham, alongside the sheriff of Newcastle and other knights and clerics.

[85] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 62 (p.306).

[86] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 68; see also 71, 81, 86, 139, 146 (pp.310-1, 312-3, 319, 321-2, 351, 354-5).

[87] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 86 (pp.321-2): 'multis regni sui proceribus et aliis extiterat odibilis.' Henry was so at odds with his community that they obtained a papal mandate for the bishop of St Andrews to investigate the allegations against him; Bower retains the description of him as hated but adds, earlier in the chapter, that he was 'wise, just, and plain-speaking': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.18 (vol. 6, pp.50-3, 217 n.5-6).

to the kingdom whose king is a boy!'[88] *Proto-Fordun* accuses the king's councillors of acting tyrannically in pursuit of their own interests, with 'oppression of the poor, disinheriting of nobles, exactions laid upon the citizens, and violations of churches.'[89] Each time a group of councillors was replaced, their successors proved equally bad, and the situation led to 'worse grinding down of the poor and spoliation of churches than has been seen in Scotland in our day.'[90] Even churchmen could be corrupted by power and drawn into the factionalism and discord: the chronicle records that Robert, abbot of Dunfermline and the king's chancellor, was accused of trying to use to the king's great seal to alter the succession to the throne (in favour of Alexander's illegitimate sister), and had to publicly give up the seal to the king.[91] The chronicle condemns this factionalism and discord, taking no sides.[92]

In its portrayal of these events, the chronicle suggests that a mature king is the only person able to unite the nobles and prevent them placing their own advancement over that of the kingdom as a whole. Without such a figure, even the church is prey to the greed and self-interest of the feuding magnates, a circumstance that only increases the spiritual suffering of the people; it is therefore a king's Christian duty to uphold order and protect the church.[93] Alexander II's swift response to the

---

[88] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 51 (p.297): 'Sopitis igitur in regno Scociae judicio et justitia'; 50 (pp.296-7): 'Vae! regno, ubi rex est puer.' This phrase is based on Ecclesiastes 10:16, highlighting the chronicle's clerical perspective on kingship: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.5 (vol.5, pp.302-3, 445 n.9); Norman H. Reid, 'Alexander III: The Historiography of a Myth,' in Norman H. Reid (ed.), *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III 1249-1286* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.181-213 at p.187.
[89] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 50 (pp.296-7): 'oppressiones pauperum, exheredationes nobilium, angariam civium, violentias ecclesiarum.'
[90] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 52 (pp.297-8): 'pauperum contritiones et ecclesiarum spoliations sequebantur, quales visae non sunt in Scocia nostris temporibus.' The comment suggests not only the scale of the oppression, but also that such disorder was no longer a problem in the chronicler's own time, i.e. after Alexander III reached majority.
[91] The great seal was also stolen by a group of disaffected ex-councillors when they kidnapped the king in 1257: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 50, 52 (pp.296-7, 297-8).
[92] Reid, 'Alexander III,' p.189.
[93] Indeed, this duty appears to have been explicitly expressed in the inauguration oaths taken by kings. Although *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* do not mention such oaths, there is evidence to suggest that kings swore Biblically-inspired oaths to such an effect. The Guisborough chronicle records an oath allegedly sworn by John Balliol, while Bower inserts a reference to such an oath in his version of the inauguration of Alexander III, and includes an account of the oaths to be sworn 'in every royal coronation,': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 4.6 (vol.2, pp.284-5, 448 n.22-30), 10.1 (vol.5,

murder of Adam, bishop of Caithness, for example, is therefore praised in the chronicle.[94]

This theme similarly runs throughout *Gesta Annalia II*: for example, the dispute over the succession between Bruce and Balliol supporters threatened to tip the country into war, as there was no figure whose authority could force a decision and make the parties respect the outcome.[95] *Gesta Annalia II* repeatedly condemns such discord and division, and the nobles who, by acting in such a way, destroy the common people it is their Christian (and, indeed, chivalric) duty to protect; like *Proto-Fordun*, the text emphasises the need for a strong king to encourage and, if necessary, enforce unity and peace.[96] This need for concord and order is a central theme in medieval Christianity, essential for achieving redemption; the chronicles, in that sense, provide a distinctly clerical perspective, even if they have stripped out some of the religious detail of their sources.[97]

*

A strong king and a strong church are both, then, necessary for the stability, prosperity and even the salvation of the kingdom. *Proto-Fordun* highlights this bond, for example, in the description of Alexander II's birth at Haddington in 1198: the arrival of an heir to the throne was an occasion of great gladness for the kingdom, and clerical and lay people alike rejoiced, with clerics singing hymns and praising God, while common folk, when they heard the news, spent the day celebrating rather than working.[98] After the birth of Alexander III's son, Alexander,

---

pp.292-3, notes pp.438-9); Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.153-5); Roderick J. Lyall, 'The Medieval Scottish Coronation Service: Some Seventeenth-Century Evidence,' *Innes Review* 28 (1977), pp.3-21 at pp.16-21.

[94] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 41-42 (pp.289-90).

[95] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 70 (p.312); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.192

[96] See, for example, Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 158, 162, 163 (pp.363, 365-6, 366); Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' p.193; Edington, 'Paragons and Patriots,' p.72; Maurice Keen, *Chivalry,* (New Haven, 1984), pp.8-17; Richard Barber, *The Knight and Chivalry* (3rd edition, Woodbridge, 1995), pp.29-46.

[97] Grant, 'The Death of John Comyn,' pp.194-195. A similar perspective is evident, for example, in the fourteenth-century French chronicle of Jean de Venette: Jean Birdsall (trans.) & Richard A. Newhall (ed.), *The Chronicle of Jean de Venette* (New York, 1953), pp.5-8.

[98] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 23 (p.275). The rejoicing at this event was noted in several other chronicles, including Melrose and Roger of Howden: Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.165.

in 1264, 'in every part of Scotland, praise to God resounded.'[99] In this way, the chronicle illustrates the importance of the crown to the kingdom and to the church, and its role in unifying the nation, but also shows that it was ultimately upon the mercy of God that they depended.

Both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* conceive of the king in religious terms: Robert I, for example, is portrayed as a divinely-sent saviour, whose duty as a king involves uniting the kingdom in peace, and reuniting that kingdom (and its crown) with the wider Christian world, by restoring relations with the papacy, achievements that were confirmed when the right of his successors to be anointed was granted. *Proto-Fordun* similarly presents the king as fulfilling a religious role, as a moral exemplar and guardian of the church, and emphasises the personal piety of kings and their devotion to the church; Scotland is emphatically presented as a strongly Christian realm, ruled over by pious, devout kings. In this context, it is no surprise that the chronicle should place so much emphasis on Malcolm III and, particularly, Margaret, as the founders of the current royal dynasty: Scotland's kings not only reform the church and endow upon it great wealth, they are themselves descended from a saint.

Margaret's arrival in Scotland and her marriage to Malcolm are presented as acts of providence, and the chronicle devotes much attention to the influence of Margaret's faith and teaching upon her own family, showing how her example established Christian piety as a defining feature of the Scottish crown and, by extension, the entire kingdom.[100] Her marriage is compared to that of the biblical Esther, who was 'through divine providence, joined in wedlock to King Ahasuerus for the salvation of her fellow-countrymen,' presenting Margaret as a spiritual saviour of the kingdom.[101] Malcolm himself is presented as an epitome of the just

---

[99] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 56 (pp.300-1): 'per omnes fines Scociae duplici de causa laudes Deo resonabant.' The occasion was even more special because Alexander III learned of the death of his enemy, the king of Norway, on the same day.

[100] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 12, 14 (pp.415-6, 417).

[101] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 14 (p.417): 'Nam sicut olim Hester Assuero regi pro salute concivium suorum divina providentia.'

and pious king. Although the chronicle does not mention Margaret's formal canonisation (perhaps because in Scotland it had long been taken for granted that she was a saint), it does record that in 1250 the young Alexander III translated her bones at Dunfermline to a grand new shrine, an event that highlighted the sanctity of Scotland's royal dynasty.[102]

Proto-Fordun's description of Alexander I's donations to the church emphasised the connection of this dynasty with Scotland's earliest origins and holiest sites, pointedly putting Christian faith at the heart of the crown's identity but also putting the crown at the heart of Scotland's Christian identity, in a manner of which the chronicler clearly approved. The chronicle singles out as particularly significant his gifts to three highly symbolic sites: St Andrews, home to Scotland's holiest relics; Scone abbey, which he himself founded, at the ancient royal seat of the kingdom; and Dunfermline abbey, founded by his parents, the royal centre (and final resting place) of this saintly new dynasty.[103]

Piety and Christian virtue are among the most praiseworthy qualities of kings in *Proto-Fordun*, a clerical attitude evident in its descriptions of Malcolm III's successors.[104] No-one was 'more devoted to the clergy, more bountiful to strangers,' than Alexander I, and he was zealous in 'searching for the relics of saints,' in providing sacred books and vestments for priests, in his generosity to new people, and in washing, feeding and clothing the poor.[105] His predecessor, Edgar, is compared to his ancestor, Edward the Confessor, in piety.[106] Such holiness and

---

[102] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 49 (pp.295-6); Boardman, 'Dunfermline,' p.143; Taylor, 'Historical writing,' p.251; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.558; Marinell Ash, 'The Church in the Reign of Alexander III,' in Norman H. Reid (ed.), *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III 1249-1286* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.31-53 at p.31.

[103] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 31 (pp.429-30)

[104] Duncan, 'Sources and Uses,' p.165; Derek Baker, 'A Nursery of Saints: St Margaret of Scotland Reconsidered,' in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women* (Oxford, 1978), pp.119-142 at p.119.

[105] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 34 (pp.431-2): 'quo nemo in clericos devotior, in extraneos magnificentior'; 'in reliquiis sanctorum perquirendis, in vestibus sacerdotalibus librisque sacris conficiendis et ornandis studiosissimus.' As with Margaret and Malcolm, the chronicle stresses Alexander's dedication to the Works of Mercy.

[106] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 28, 30 (p.429).

devotion to the church continued with their successors: Alexander II was described as being 'towards the church of Christ, another Peter.'[107]

David I, however, surpassed all others, not only in his successful government of the kingdom but in his dedication to the Christian faith.[108] *Proto-Fordun* credits him with reforming the organisation and practices of the church in Scotland, thereby fulfilling not only a duty to the clergy but to the spiritual needs of the kingdom.[109] He is said to have restored all the old bishoprics and created new ones, to have founded many new monasteries, to have improved the lives of priests and, by his good example, encouraged the people to visit church regularly and pay their tithes to the church.[110] Indeed, he even helped to reshape the morals of the Scots, teaching them about 'wedded chastity' and taming their wilder impulses, and brought new prosperity to the realm.[111] While the contrast with Scotland before David is doubtless exaggerated, the chronicle uses the comparison to emphasise the sense that Scotland was a deeply devout, modern, and flourishing Christian kingdom, the equal in status of any other in Christendom and an active member of the universal church, all under the auspices of this most distinguished and saintly king.[112] By presenting such examples as among David's greatest achievements, the chronicle highlights the extent to which the interests of the crown, the church, and the nation, were intimately connected, intertwined and indivisible from one another.

Proto-Fordun also expresses the idea, however, that such devotion cannot be allowed to prevent the king from ruling properly; a king, pious as he might be, is not a cleric, nor should he be, and thus to do so is to fail in his fundamental duty

---

[107] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 46 (pp.292-3): 'ecclesiae Christi alter Petrus.'

[108] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35 (p.432).

[109] Similarly, *Proto-Fordun* states that Giric, recognising the importance of divine worship, granted the church its freedom from the servitude that it had endured since Pictish times (although it is not clear what form this freedom and servitude took): Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.17 (pp.159-60); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 4.17 (vol.2, pp.318-21, 468-9 n.13-18).

[110] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 35, 41 (pp.432, 436).

[111] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436): 'pudicitiam conjugalem.'

[112] Broun, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel*,' pp.69-71; Richard Oram, *David I: The King Who Made Scotland* (Stroud, 2004), pp.206-7.

towards his kingdom. This is illustrated in the chronicle's depiction of David's successor, Malcolm IV. He is presented, at first, as a vigorous defender of Scotland's stability in the face of rebellion; but he also refused to marry, despite the pleadings of his subjects, taking a vow of chastity.[113] Such purity and devotion to the church as he displayed, however, is not kingly: to his subjects, he seemed more like a monk, or even an angel, than a lay leader, and his neglect of government made him unpopular, as did his increasing friendship with England.[114] The chronicle is sympathetic towards him personally, as a devout, innocent 'man of angelic sanctity,' who was simply not suited to the role of king forced upon him, but it is critical of him as a king.[115] The needs and the duties of the crown and the church might be intertwined, but their roles require different attributes.

The active interest of the crown in spiritual matters is also illustrated by a story from the reign of Alexander III. The chronicle records that, in 1261, a mysterious but 'marvellous and venerable cross' was discovered at Peebles; according to the chronicle, it was not known when and by whom the cross was put there, but some people believed that it had been hidden there by Christians around the year 296, during Maximian's persecution of Christians in Britain.[116] Soon after the discovery of the cross, a stone urn was also found nearby, containing 'the ashes and bones of a man's body, which had been torn limb from limb.'[117] As with the cross, no one knew whose remains these were, but some thought they belonged to the man whose name had been found written in the stone where the cross was found, namely a bishop called Saint Nicholas.[118] Many miracles then occurred at the site, and it attracted many crowds, so Alexander III, demonstrating his piety, had, on the

---

[113] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 1-4 (pp.254-7).

[114] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 3-5 (pp.256-8).

[115] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 5 (p.258): 'Hominem angelicae sanctitatis.'

[116] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 54 (p.299): 'quaedam magnifica crux et venerabilis.'

[117] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 54 (p.299): 'cineres et ossa continens cujusdam corporis humani, quasi membratim detruncati.'

[118] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 54 (p.299).

recommendation of the bishop of Glasgow, 'a splendid church built there, to the honour of God and of the Holy Cross.'[119]

Gesta Annalia II presents Alexander III in a similar vein, highlighting his devotion to the church and depicting him as an ideal king who combines personal piety and generosity towards the church with a firm, just rule that brings order to the kingdom. The chronicle demonstrates the same kind of clerical perspective on kingship as *Proto-Fordun* by putting Alexander's devotion to the church, and the effect of this on the moral well-being of his kingdom, first among his achievements: during his reign, 'the church of Christ flourished, its priests were honoured with due respect, vice withered away, deceit disappeared, injustice ceased, truth was strong, and justice reigned.'[120] Robert I is likewise presented as an ideal, Christian, king, one guided and favoured by God, who brings concord and unity back to the kingdom, and restores its relationship with the papacy.[121] The extent of his success is evidenced by the inauguration of his son, David II, who in 1331 was the first Scottish king to be anointed and crowned, by permission of the pope. This action not only represented papal recognition of the sovereign status of the Scottish kings; as noted above, it also presented David II as a king made by God, and, with the bishop of St Andrews given the pivotal role in this transformation, demonstrates again the harmony of crown, church and kingdom.

III

Proto-Fordun often equates the independence and freedom of the Scottish church with that of the kingdom. After the capture of William I in 1174, the terms of his release in the Treaty of Falaise included having Scotland's bishops and prelates bind

---

[119] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 54 (p.299): 'Unde rex, de consilio episcopi Glasguensis, ecclesiam ibidem honestam in honorem Dei et Sanctae Crucis fieri fecit.' The urn appears to have been from a Bronze Age burial; although the cross no longer survives, and the name of Nicholas is likely to have been a misreading, this is thought to be evidence of post-Roman but pre-Irish Christian organisation in the area: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 5, p.459; Reid, 'Alexander III,' p.187.

[120] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 67 (pp.309-10): 'Christi floruit ecclesia, sacerdotes ejus debita honorabantur reverentia, aruit vitium, abfuit dolus, cessavit injuria, viruit virtus, viguit veritas, regnavit justitia.'

[121] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 138 (pp.350-1).

themselves to Henry II 'by the bond of their oath and sworn fealty.'[122] The chronicle presents them as reluctant, doing so only 'at their lord the king [William]'s command,' but accepting that in the circumstances William had little choice other than to compel them to give such fealty.[123] This represented an unprecedented level of formal (and contractual) subjection, not only of the king (and his heirs), who was now explicitly said to hold Scotland of Henry II and his heirs, but of Scotland's church, now to be subject to the English church.[124]

In the next chapter, however, the chronicle suggested that the Scottish clergy should not regard such oaths as an admission of any kind of real English dominion over the church in Scotland. The chronicle includes an account of the council held by Henry II at Northampton In 1176, attended by William I and his leading churchmen, at which it was forcefully demanded that the Scottish church be subject to an English archbishop.[125] The Scots, however, unanimously rejected the proposal, and instead secured, by the authority of Pope Alexander III, 'the former status of their church', with 'its independence buttressed' and protected by 'privileges,' a probable reference to *Super anxietatibus*.[126] Prior to the council, a papal legate, Vivian, had arrived in Scotland, renewing many ancient decrees and establishing new ordinances, but also 'treading underfoot and crushing all that stood in his path, well-equipped to capture and not too heavily encumbered to seize,' emphasising the chronicle's view that the Scottish church should be independent and free of

---

[122] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 13 (p.265): 'sub obligatione sacramenti fideique sponsione.'

[123] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 13 (p.265): 'ad edictum domini sui regis.'

[124] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.102-8; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, pp.99-101; Rees Davies, '"Keeping the Natives In Order": The English King and the "Celtic" Rulers 1066-1216,' *Peritia* 10 (1996), pp.212-224 at pp.218-223; R.R. Davies, *Domination and Conquest: The experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100-1300* (Cambridge, 1990), pp.75-8.

[125] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266).

[126] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266): 'Quod vero periculum imminens totis nisibus declinantes, ab eis unanimiter, sub tamen induciarum remedio, praestantiori consilio refutatum est. Quorum subinde industria ecclesiae suae pristina dignitas auctoritate apostolica confirmatur, et libertas ab Alexandro papa privilegiorum munimine roboratur.' As noted above, the Scots seem to have taken advantage of the dispute between York and Canterbury about which should be the metropolitan for the Scots to avoid making submission: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.112; Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi,*' pp.119-20; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, p.99; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.264; Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.164.

outside interference (including potentially the pope, if he starts to interfere with the church rather than defending its rights).[127]

The authority and independence of the Scottish church is further asserted in *Proto-Fordun's* account of a speech by 'a certain Scottish cleric, named Gilbert,' at the Northampton council, who was outraged by this attempt by the archbishops of York and Canterbury to 'make the Scottish church subordinate.'[128] Gilbert accuses the English, motivated by 'a perverted lust, a desire to rule,' of using their strength and their courage not for noble ends but with 'the insolence of tyranny,' and of turning their 'wisdom grounded in liberal learning, but now full of sophistry, into obscure word-play,' with the aim to 'make subject to yourselves all adjacent provinces and races.'[129] There is no sense in this passage of the universality of the Christian faith, or of a shared purpose and common identity among the clergy of both kingdoms. Indeed, Gilbert asserts that these bordering races, though fewer in numbers and weaker than the English, were nevertheless nobler than them 'in blood, and in antiquity.'[130] This is a point already demonstrated by *Proto-Fordun's* account of the origins of the Scots, and these qualities are invoked in the chronicle to express the legitimacy of the Scottish crown and the unity of the Scottish people. The Scottish church is here being depicted as an equivalent element in defining the independence of the kingdom and its identity. Moreover, according to Gilbert, ancient texts even prove that, if anything, the English 'ought to be subject, in all

---

[127] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266):'conculcans et comminuens obvia quaeque, expeditus capere nec impeditus rapere.'

[128] The chronicle does not claim to offer a completely accurate transcript of Gilbert's speech, but that he spoke 'these or such like passionate words,' suggesting that the views reflected the chronicler's own time, rather than 1170s: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'quidam clericus Scotus, Gilbertus nomine'; 'Scoticanae subjectionis ecclesiae conatum,' 'haec verba, seu talia cum impetus exaltavit,'; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.26-27 (vol.4, pp.326-31, notes pp.526-8).

[129] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'perversa quadam libidine, aviditate dominandi'; 'tyrannidis in audaciam'; 'nec tuam liberalis scientiae prudentiam versutas sophisticatam in glosulas callide transumtares'; 'adjacentes quasque provincias, et gentes... tuae contendis ditioni subdere.'

[130] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'non multitudine, dico, seu potential, sed et genere te nobiliores, et temporis antiquitate digniores.'

humility,' to these more senior nations, or at the very least 'share power with them, preserving brotherly love,' rather than reign over them.[131]

Through Gilbert's speech, the chronicle makes clear its view that the church in Scotland has its own distinct identity and that it is separate and independent from the church of England, which was then 'trying to suppress your own mother, namely the Scottish church, which has been from the outset catholic and free, not basing your action on any lawful reason, but on the premise of your power.'[132] The speech goes on to make a series of claims illustrating the extent to which the English church was dependent on the Scots, alleging that it was the Scots who first converted the English people from their heathen ways, who baptised their leaders and people, and educated the English in the Christian faith, providing resources and training English priests.[133] This speech in essence summarises *Proto-Fordun*'s account of the early development of the English church under Scottish influence.[134] In exchange for this long, glorious history of help and support, the English now offered the Scottish clergy only 'the most utterly wretched enslavement.'[135] The chronicle certainly suggests a firm belief in the independence of the Scottish church, and in stressing its antiquity and distinctiveness, it associates this with the independence of the Scottish kingdom as a whole, presenting the church as an essential component of the identity of the kingdom.

Reaction to Gilbert's rhetoric was, according to *Proto-Fordun*, mixed. The chronicle does not present anyone disputing Gilbert's fundamental argument that the Scottish church was distinct and separate, and that there was no historical basis for any claim to English dominion over it. Those among the English who simply

---

[131] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'pristina si scripta consideres, humilis obedire debueras, seu, totius saltem rancoris extinct fomite, fraternal de cetero caritate servata perenniter conregnare.'

[132] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'nullius juris ratione, sed potentiae praeambula vi matrem tuam, ecclesiam, videlicet, Scoticam catholicam, ab initio liberam, opprimere niteris.'

[133] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8).

[134] See e.g. Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 3.35-40 (pp.121-6); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 3.42-48 (vol. 2, pp.118-35); 8.26 (vol.4, pp.326-31, 527 n.43-50). It is not clear if the presentation of the Irish missionaries as Scots was the result of accidental misunderstanding, or deliberate editing.

[135] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'in ultimam deduceres et miseram servitutem.'

dismissed him as 'a smoke-belching and impetuous Scot,' allegedly did so because he had the audacity to 'expressed a view contrary to their wishes.'[136] Other English clergy, however, apparently praised Gilbert for having 'vented his feelings fearlessly, speaking out for his own country and flattering no man, undeterred by the stern demeanour of his listeners.'[137] The archbishop of York was apparently amused: he rose with a smile, patted Gilbert on the head, and told the crowd 'That arrow did not come from his own quiver.'[138] It is striking that Gilbert is described as acting for his country ('pro sua patria'), and not simply for his church: they are regarded as one and the same, and to give up sovereignty of the church was akin to giving up the sovereignty of the crown. However the English might have felt about him, the Scots were apparently in complete agreement with his sentiments, for they were unanimous in rejecting the English demands, an attitude with which the chronicler appears to agree, given the text's repeated emphasis on this independence of the Scottish church.[139]

This insistence on the independent status of the Scottish church, and its conflation with the independence of the kingdom, is also evident in the chronicle's celebration of William I after his death in 1214. After listing William's pious qualities and devotion to the sacraments, the chronicle illustrates 'that distinguished king's worthiness in God's sight' by recounting a miraculous act performed by William in

---

[136] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'quia suae voluntatis contrarium protulit, fumosum Scotum, et impetuosum, naturaliter reputabant.'

[137] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'ex eo quod intrepide pro sua patria, nulli blandiens, animi motum eructaret, quem audientium non terruit austeritas, multum laudabant.'

[138] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 15 (pp.266-8): 'surgens risibili vultu caput Gilberti manu concussit, astantibus dicens: "ex propria pharetra non exit ista sagitta."' The phrase is a medieval proverb; Bower provides an interpretation emphasising Roger's apparent recognition of the justness of the Scottish cause and the divine inspiration behind Gilbert's outburst (despite his desire to subject the Scottish church to York), based on Matthew 10:19: it was as if to say 'When you stand before kings and rulers to defend justice, do not think in advance what to say. For what you are to say will be given you in that hour.' *Proto-Fordun* is perhaps more ambiguous, presenting it more as a condescending dismissal of Gilbert's claims, with Roger excusing the outburst without condoning the sentiments (and thus, for the chronicler, reflecting the arrogance of the English church): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.27 (pp.330-1, 528 n.6).

[139] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 14 (p.266).

York in 1206, when he healed a boy of 'grievous sickness' with his touch.[140] William was also 'beloved by God and by worthy men,' and was sent a golden rose by Pope Lucius in recognition of his 'zeal for God,' and his 'great efforts in guarding the laws of his kingdom,' explicitly linking the spiritual and secular role of the king.[141] This golden rose, usually given to the prefect of Rome after being carried by the pope on Laetare Sunday, like Margaret's Black Rood, was among the Scottish regalia removed by Edward I in 1296.[142]

The last of William's achievements listed here is that 'Pope Innocent and Pope Celestinus had, before this, written to him about the freedom of the Scottish church.'[143] This is a reference to *Cum universi*, the papal bull of 1192 confirming that the Scottish church was subject directly to the papacy, a special daughter, ending any claims over it by the archbishops of England.[144] The bull referred to the Scottish church as a collective body, corresponding to the kingdom, with nine named bishoprics subject to no outside metropolitan but also, unusually, to no internal

---

[140] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (pp.279-80): 'Quanti meriti fuerat ille rex egregius apud Deum'; 'gravi infirmitate.' Bower includes this detail in its chronological place in 1206 rather than at William's death, and possibly has another source for it: Duncan notes this assessment reflects 'the point of view of a conventional Scottish churchman,' (though placing *Proto-Fordun* in the fourteenth- rather than thirteenth-century); Owen's argument that this was intended to provide a pious gloss on an otherwise unsatisfactory meeting with John of England does not reflect this context of the anecdote within the chronicle. The story has echoes of the 'royal touch' by which English and French monarchs healed scrofula (a mark of their regal status and holiness), which had become an established custom in both kingdoms in the mid-13th century. In England, this custom drew on both the influence of the French court and the precedent of miracles associated with Edward the Confessor, who was also associated with the Scottish royal dynasty through St Margaret. *Proto-Fordun* is possibly trying to present William in a similar light, though this did not become an established custom of Scottish kings. Indeed, the chronicle presents it more as a one-off incident rather than a habit, and the fact that it is referred to as a generic 'gravi infirmitate' rather than the more specific 'morbus regius,' supports the idea that it was intended simply as an example of William's general piety and holiness: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 8.66 (vol.4, pp.472-7, 609 n.27-29); Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.165; D.D.R. Owen, *William the Lion 1143-1214: Kingship and Culture*, (East Linton, 1997), p.97. Frank Barlow, 'The King's Evil,' *English Historical Review*, 95 (1980), pp.3-27 at pp.14-27; Stephen Brogan, 'The Royal Touch,' *History Today*, 61.2 (2011), pp.46-62 at p.46.

[141] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (pp.279-80): 'Ut autem a Deo dilectus est, ita ab hominibus condignis uno'; 'zelum Dei habentis, regni sui leges magno cum labore observantis.'

[142] Pope Lucius seems to have been at odds with the city of Rome, leaving soon after and giving the rose instead to William, his 'favourite of the day': Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.272-273; Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi*,' p.125; Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.155-156;

[143] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 28 (pp.279-80): 'Cum et ante hoc Innocentius papa et Celestinus scripserunt sibi de libertate ecclesiae Scoticanae'; Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' pp.164-165.

[144] Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi*,' p.116; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.275.

one.[145] The chronicle does not seem to regard the issue of the bull itself as being a particularly significant moment, but rather as a confirmation of something the chronicler regarded as a given.[146] It presents this, however, as the achievement of William, rather than of the Scottish clerics; it is the duty of the king to ensure the freedom and privileges of the church, just as vigorously as he must defend the freedom and privileges of his kingdom.[147]

Proto-Fordun suggests that this even includes defending that freedom against the papacy, for not all popes were well-disposed towards Scotland and its leaders. The chronicle declares that Pope Innocent III was favourably inclined towards John of England because of John's annual tribute to the papacy and his subjection of England to papal authority.[148] The text is critical of John for his ill-treatment of the English church, but also critical of his willingness to place his kingdom under another's authority, even that of the pope: the chronicle records a dispute between John and a rustic named Peter, who rebuked John for his cruelty and, even as John had him hanged, insisted that, by giving sovereignty of the kingdom to another, John had essentially ended his own reign.[149]

The chronicle records that it was Gualo, a papal legate sent to support John, who in 1216 set up John's son, the young Henry III, as king, and, after being informed of

---

[145] This perhaps had the effect of diminishing the status assumed by St Andrews as the leading bishopric of the kingdom: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.143.

[146] Duncan has argued that the bull made little real difference to the freedom enjoyed by the Scottish church, a view which has been disputed: Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.275; Barrell, 'The background to *Cum universi*,' pp.119-21; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.140-4; Dauvit Broun, 'The Welsh Identity of the Kingdom of Strathclyde,' *Innes Review* 55.2 (2004), pp.111-80 at pp.158-167.

[147] The actual credit is perhaps due more to Jocelin, bishop of Glasgow, than to William. The bull reflects Jocelin's aspirations rather more directly than those of the other Scottish bishops, and its terms closely resemble those of the exemption he had achieved for his diocese in 1175 and confirmed in 1179, after it had been undermined by the implication of *Super anxietatibus* that the status of all of Scotland's bishoprics awaited investigation: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.135-44; Broun, 'The Welsh Identity of the Kingdom of Strathclyde,' p.145.

[148] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 36 (pp.285-6).

[149] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 32 (pp.282-3). This tale appears in several other sources, including the chronicle of Lanercost and (in a longer version), Bower's *Scotichronicon*, in some of which he referred to as 'Peter of Pontefract' or 'Peter of Wakefield,' although Wyntoun says that 'Peris Carole [or Carl] wes his name': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 9.4-5 (vol. 5, pp.11-7 & notes p.200); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle* vol. 5, pp.56-9; Joseph Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Edinburgh, 1839), pp.10-3.

'the troubles, oppression, and unbearable evils which were perpertrated in England by the king of Scotland,' put an interdict on 'the king himself, along with his army, and the whole kingdom of the Scots,' to the great distress of the Scottish church.[150] At Gualo's instruction, Pope Honorius III declared 'all the prelates of Scotland excommunicated,' as they had given communion to Alexander II and his army, who had already been excommunicated for opposing John (particularly, the chronicle notes, refusing Gualo's request to surrender Carlisle to Henry III).[151] The chronicle does not blame or criticise Alexander for leading the Scots into such a difficult position, and supports the Scottish clergy for attending to the spiritual needs of their king and compatriots rather than yielding to the papacy.[152] This excommunication and interdiction threatened the very souls of those who died before it was lifted, yet despite this traumatic experience, the chronicle strikes a defiant tone, emphasising that these judgements were falsely imposed, blaming not the Scots but the corruption of the papal legate Gualo, and even the pope himself.[153]

When Master Walter of Wisbech was sent, with papal authority, to remove the interdict on Scotland, Gualo delayed absolution until peace was restored between Alexander II and Henry III (or, alternatively, 'according to some', until he had 'slaked the thirst of his moneybag with draughts of money').[154] Although Alexander II and the laymen with him were able to receive absolution from the archbishop of York and the bishop of Durham, and the king confirmed the peace by doing homage for his possessions in England, Gualo refused to include the leading Scottish clergy in

---

[150] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 36 (pp.285-6): 'Audiens itaque Gualo molestias, gravamina, et intolerabilia mala, quae per regem Scociae in Anglia sunt facta, ipsum regem cum exercitu et totum regnum Scotorum interdixit.' See also Keith J. Stringer, 'Kingship, Conflict and State-Making in the Reign of Alexander II: The War of 1215-17 and its Context,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.99-156 at pp.147-50.

[151] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 36 (pp.285-6): 'denunciati sunt excommunicati omnes praelati Scociae.'

[152] Andrew D.M. Barrell, 'Scotland and the Papacy in the reign of Alexander II,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.157-78 at p.159.

[153] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 36 (pp.285-6); Duncan, 'Sources and uses,' p.164.

[154] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 37 (p.286): 'vel secundum quosdam, donec suae sitim crumenae pecuniae poculis interim mitigaret'

the peace.[155] Instead, a general interdict was declared in Scotland, and the clergy excommunicated.[156] The only Scottish churchman who was not excommunicated was William, bishop of St Andrews, who obtained absolution from Gualo only after swearing that he had not aided any enemies of the late John of England.[157]

After this, the prior of Durham and the archdeacon of York were sent by Gualo to give absolution to the Scottish clergy. They journeyed throughout Scotland, making the Scottish clergy swear to abide by the legate's commands, giving absolution to the Scots who assembled 'naked and barefoot before the doors of the churches,' and corruptly gathering 'costly procurations, along with endless supplies of money and many gifts,' as they went.[158] Even then, Gualo insisted that all of the 'bishops of the kingdom, the king's household clergy, and all the beneficed clergy of the kingdom, who had either taken part in the war, or had in some way ministered to the combatants,' be reserved for him to absolve; even abbots who had been absolved were suspended from office until they 'should have more fully earned pardon from the legate himself.'[159] Having met Gualo at Northallerton, some of these clerics were forced by him to go to Rome to receive absolution; others were absolved there after he had been 'appeased with large sums of money,' and he deprived many of their benefices or suspended them until 'the demands of his greed had been fully satisfied.'[160]

---

[155] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 38 (pp.286-7). The chronicle makes it clear that this homage applied only to land in England, and was not a threat to Scotland's own sovereignty, but merely 'the English king's right from old time,' ('ex antiquis regi Angliae debito').

[156] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 38 (pp.286-7).

[157] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 38 (pp.286-7): 'ad consilium quorundam nescio quo spiritu ductorum.'

[158] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'nudos et discalciatos ante fores ecclesiarum'; 'procurationes sumptuosas, cum infinita pecunia et donariis plurimis.' This humiliation is toned down in Bower, who has only 'barefoot' ('nudipedes') instead of 'nudos et discalciatos,' while Wyntoun gives 'baireheid on þar feit baire,' (or the slightly more humbling 'hewide and fut and schankis bar'): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 9.32 (vol. 5, pp.94-9); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.78-9.

[159] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'Episcopos autem regni, et clericos domesticos regis, et omnes beneficiatos totius regni, qui vel bello interfuerant, vel bellantibus aliquo modo ministraverant'; 'donec ipsius legati gratiam plenius mererentur.'

[160] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'copiosa, pacatus pecunia'; 'donec suae cupiditatis exactione sufficienter fuerat satisfactum.'

Although initially sympathetic to the Scottish clergy, who suffered for supporting their king, *Proto-Fordun* is ultimately extremely critical of their conduct in these events. Where once the church had been defiant in the face of threats to their independence and privileges, on this occasion it was 'God's just judgement' that they felt Gualo's 'tyranny,' for they had refused to 'follow wise counsel,' and instead foolishly 'made their judge one who was not their judge,' having yielded to his demands because they selfishly feared 'more for their cassocks than for their consciences.'[161] This emphasises the idea that the Scottish church (and kingdom) should not be subject to interference from any external authority, and presents the prelates as sacrificing this autonomy not from duty but for self-interest (a theme applied primarily to magnates in *Gesta Annalia II*).[162]

Alexander II, at least, was looking out for the independence of his church, sending messengers to Rome to secure the renewal of 'the privileges formerly granted to his predecessors.'[163] The Scottish clergy were taught a valuable lesson: that they must always thereafter 'struggle with a will to guard their privileges, and the liberties of the kingdom.'[164] Here *Proto-Fordun* strongly identifies the interests of the Scottish church with those of the Scottish kingdom: interference in the liberty of the church was interference with the liberty of Scotland itself, and it was the duty of the king and the church together to prevent this, binding them together in defining the nation's identity. In a similar way, *Gesta Annalia II* notes that the guardians of Scotland, in negotiating with Edward I for a marriage between Margaret, Maid of

---

[161] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'justo Dei judicio'; 'sanum consilium sequi noluerat, sed timentes suae tunicae magis quam conscientiae de non suo judice suum judicem fecerunt, tyrannidem ipsius experti.'

[162] Oram, *Alexander II,* pp.54-8. Bower gives the same interpretation, adding that the Scottish clergy accepted Gualo instead of appealing to the papal curia, and including a poem allegedly written by a disgruntled cleric lamenting the lost liberty of the Scottish church, which had once been the freest of any church under Rome, but was now 'subjected as a slave': Bower, *Scotichronicon* 9.32 (vol.5, pp.94-9).

[163] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'privilegia praedecessoribus suis olim indulta renovavit.' This refers to the renewal of Cum universi by Pope Honorius III in 1218: Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.525; Bower, *Scotichronicon* 9.33 (vol. 5, pp.99-103, 236 n.15-18; Oram, *Alexander II*, pp.194-7.

[164] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 39 (pp.287-8): 'pro suis privilegiis et regni libertatibus tuendis de cetero velle contendere didicerunt.'

Norway, and his son, Edward, were determined to protect 'the rights and customs, both ecclesiastical and secular,' of Scotland, thus ensuring that it remained 'free and quit of all slavery and subjection,' as it had been during the reign of Alexander III.[165]

Several later examples in *Proto-Fordun* seem intended to demonstrate that the Scottish clergy had indeed learned their lesson, showing them determined to defend their liberties and united with the king in defiance of interfering papal legates. During Alexander III's reign, a papal legate, Ottobonus, was sent to England to help resolve the dispute between Henry III and the English barons. The chronicle records that he wrote to the Scottish bishops requesting 'four marks from each parish church, and six marks from each cathedral church,' to support his diplomatic effort, double the usual rate.[166] The money, 2000 marks in total, was received by Alexander, who then 'expressly stopped this payment,' and appealed to the pope on the matter.[167] Then, in 1268, Ottobonus summoned all the bishops of Scotland, and two abbots or priors representing the other Scottish clergy, to meet with him; the clergy sent the abbot of Dunfermline and the prior of Lindores, but the bishops decided that only Richard, bishop of Dunkeld, and Robert, bishop of Dunblane, would attend on their behalf, thus ensuring that no statutes 'that might damage them might be passed in their absence.'[168] Ottobonus responded by enacting some new statutes (concerning the 'the secular and regular clergy of the Scots'), but 'the bishops of Scotland utterly refused to observe them.'[169]

---

[165] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 69 (pp.311): 'quod regnum Scociae foret liberum et quietum ab omni servitute et subjectione, sicut erat melius et liberius tempore quoad vixit Alexander III rex ipsius illustris, quoad jura et consuetudines, tarn ecclesiasticas quam seculares.'

[166] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'ut de singulis ecclesiis parochialibus quatuor marcas, de ecclesiis quoque cathedralibus sex marcas nomine procurationis suae, sibi destinarent'; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.291.

[167] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'omnino fieri prohibuit.'

[168] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'ipsis absentibus, in eorum praejudicium vel gravamen statueretur.'

[169] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'Legatus quoque nova quaedam statuta, tam de secularibus quam religiosis personis Scotorum, praecipue constituit, quae penitus episcopi Scociae facere recusarunt.' As with Gualo, the chronicle's account of these events is somewhat muddled and obscure, and the content of this single chapter is spread across Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.21-22, 24-

In the same year, the church and crown of Scotland alike were similarly outraged when Pope Clement IV asked the Scottish clergy for contributions towards a crusade. The chronicle declares that 'the king and the clergy, with one voice and with one heart, refused to do this.'[170] The chronicler is firmly on the side of the Scots in this matter, despite their apparent support for the general idea of crusades: the chronicle records that this crusade was supported by 'many, in all lands,' including 'Louis, the most Christian king of France,' and many French nobles, along with Edward and Edmund (sons of Henry III), and many other Englishmen.[171] Indeed, the chronicle acknowledges that the crusade itself attracted support in Scotland, recording that, 'among others, David Earl of Athol, and Adam Earl of Carrick, and a great many other Scottish and English nobles,' died alongside Louis and his son.[172] Rather, the Scots objected to the Pope's request for a tenth of the Scottish clergy's income because the money was expressly intended to pay the expenses of the English, and because the request was made at 'the urging of Ottobonus, and the suggestion of the king of England.'[173] The next year, Henry again sent ambassadors to Scotland to ask for the money, and the Scottish clergy again protested and appealed to the pope.[174] The chronicle presents the Scottish king and church as determined that no other church or monarch had the authority or jurisdiction over them to impose such a tax, even the papacy itself, and that using the pretext of a crusade to interfere in Scotland was particularly ignoble.

This refusal of the Scottish crown to yield any authority over the kingdom, and *Proto-Fordun's* prioritising here of loyalty to the Scottish king above loyalty to the papacy, is also evident in the chronicle's account of the contested succession to the earldom of Menteith, following the death in 1258 of Walter Comyn, who held the

---

25 (vol. 5, pp.356-63, 366-73 & notes pp.471-80; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.290-1; Ash, 'The Church in the reign of Alexander III,' pp.44-5.

[170] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'Quod rex et clerus uno ore et uno corde facere contempserunt.'

[171] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'magna... ubique terrarum'; 'Lodovicus, Christianissimus rex Franciae.'

[172] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 60 (pp.304-5): 'Inter quos David comes Atholiae, et Adam comes de Carryk, et alii quamplures nobiles Scotorum et Anglorum.'

[173] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4): 'hortatu Octoboni et ad instantiam regis Angliae.'

[174] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 59 (pp.303-4).

title by right of his wife, Isabella. In *Proto-Fordun's* version of this dispute, Isabella (unnamed in the text) and her new husband, 'an English knight of ignoble birth, named John Russell,' appealed to Pope Urban IV after they had been driven from Scotland and the inheritance claimed instead, with widespread backing among the magnates, by Walter Stewart, 'on his wife's behalf' (he had quickly married Mary, who was perhaps a cousin of Isabella and is also unnamed in the text).[175] The pope sent an envoy, Pontius, to York to investigate the case, and he in turn summoned Walter Stewart and the leading Scottish churchmen to bear witness on the matter.[176] Alexander III refused to allow them to be so summoned, and appealed to the pope against his envoy. The chronicle insists that he was entirely right to do so, for it was 'against the privileges of the king and kingdom of Scotland,' for anyone to be 'called to account by anyone outside his own borders;' such a summons wronged not only the king, but also 'his kingdom, and his people,' and denied him his ancient privileges, for he was ready to judge the matter by the laws of his own kingdom.[177] Alexander III's steadfast defiance is celebrated, in contrast to the criticism of John for giving up his sovereignty of England to the pope.[178] Alexander's insistence on having his subjects tried by his laws in his kingdom is a sign of his strength; failing to do so would have shown the Scots to be as subjugated as the Welsh, whose cases were tried in London, and would have been a personal humiliation, just as John Balliol was humiliated by having cases heard by Edward I in *Gesta Annalia II*.[179]

Proto-Fordun's emphasis on the need for the Scottish church to assert its rights and defends its liberty is similarly evident in its presentation of the Scottish clergy's

---

[175] Walter Stewart had quickly married Mary (also unnamed in the text); Duncan argues that there is little evidence to support the idea that Mary was Isabella's sister, and was more likely a cousin: Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.584; Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 53 (pp.298-9): 'cuidam ignobili Angligenae militia, Johanni Russel nomine'; 'ex parte uxoris suae.'

[176] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 53 (pp.298-9).

[177] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 53 (pp.298-9): 'contra privilegia regis et regni Scociae, ut aliquis extra proprios fines ad alicui respondendum vocaretur'; 'non solum se et regnum suum ac suos super hiis citationibus gravari, sed et privilegia sua antiqua in hac parte adnullari.' See also Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.11, 14 (vol. 5, pp.320-5, 332-5 & notes p.454-5, 459); Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, pp.583-4.

[178] Reid, 'Alexander III,' p.187

[179] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 45, 86 (pp.291-2, 321-2).

opposition to an attempt to have them pay tithes to aid the Holy Land in 1275.[180] The pope sent Bagimond to Scotland, who held a council at Perth where he decreed that all beneficed clergy must, 'under the compulsion of an oath and the threat of excommunication,' pay a tithe on 'all the goods and income of the Church' that was based not on 'the old taxation, but according to their real worth.'[181] The Scottish bishops and abbots did not object outright to making a contribution, but to the imposition of a new method of assessing that contribution, which would have substantially increased how much they needed to pay.[182] They therefore sent Bagimond back to the pope to request on their behalf that they should be taxed at the old rate, but paid over seven years rather than six.[183] The Scottish request was, however, unsuccessful.[184]

*

This resistance of the Scottish church to external authority is, then, a theme throughout *Proto-Fordun*. The chronicle stresses the independence of the church in Scotland, particularly its independence from England, and does so in terms very similar to those used to stress the autonomy of the Scottish crown and kingdom. Indeed, the interests of crown, kingdom and church are seen to be in alignment in this respect; the status and security of each depends on that of the others. This link is demonstrated in the symbols highlighted within *Proto-Fordun* as symbolic of the

---

[180] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 62 (p.306).

[181] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 62 (p.306): 'omnes beneficiate... sub districtione juramenti et excommunicationis, persolverent decimas, non secundum antiquam taxacionem, sed secundum verum valorem omnium bonorum et proventuum ecclesiasticorum;' D.E.R. Watt, 'Bagimond di Vezza and His "Roll,"' *Scottish Historical Review*, 80 (2001), pp.1-23 at pp.1-5.

[182] The new assessment had had the effect of doubling papal income from England: Watt, 'Bagimond di Vezza,' pp.4-5.

[183] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 62 (p.306): 'septem annis utique pro sex computatis.' Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.35 (vol. 5, pp.400-5 & notes pp.497-8); Ash, 'The Church in the Reign of Alexander III,' p.45.

[184] It is not clear why Bagimond should agree to return to Rome with this request. In the Pluscarden chronicle, it is not the proud Scots but the sympathetic Bagimond himself who, having seen the country's poverty, asks the pope for this relief; Bower, on the other hand, says that he only went back to Rome at great expense to the Scots, and returned having spent yet more, 'because, as the common saying goes, legates do not want to be entertained unless it is in a luxurious fashion.' The rest of the chapter, and the start of the next, is then devoted to jokes about the greed of legates: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 10.35 (vol. 5, pp.400-5 & notes pp.497-8); Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, p.291; Ash, 'The Church in the Reign of Alexander III,' p.45; Watt, 'Bagimond di Vezza,' p.5.

Scottish crown and the Scottish people: items such as the Black Rood, and figures such as Saint Margaret, which embody the unity of the kingdom's Christian identity and its royal identity. It is the duty of king and church alike to make sure that the kingdom continues to enjoy this ancient freedom, a theme also evident in *Gesta Annalia II*. In *Proto-Fordun*, such ideas of Scotland's independence and its status as a unified kingdom, pre-dating the Wars of Independence, are clearly identifiable.

Both chronicles strip out many of the liturgical details and church business in their sources, yet both nevertheless display a distinctly clerical (and fairly conventional) perspective. The king, and his relationship with the church, is central to Scotland's identity as a Christian nation, and both texts depict Scottish kings as divinely favoured: *Proto-Fordun* emphasises the piety of Scotland's current dynasty, descended from the saintly Margaret and Malcolm III, who improved the fabric of the Scottish church and the moral behaviour of the Scots, bringing harmony, unity and prosperity to the kingdom. *Gesta Annalia II* presents Robert I as Scotland's providential saviour, sent by God to heal Scotland's wounds and restore her status. In both texts, an ideal king must allow the kingdom to flourish and prosper, through the encouragement and support of the church, and by the meting out of justice and the maintenance of order. A king must resolve division within the kingdom, by preventing factionalism and putting down rebellion, lest his subjects suffer, physically, materially and spiritually; to keep order is a moral duty, both for a king and for his subjects.

CHAPTER SIX: Language and Ethnicity

I

In *Proto-Fordun*, it was said that the Scottish people differed in character and temperament according to which language they spoke, either the 'Scottish' language ('Scotica,' i.e. Gaelic) or the Teutonic ('Theutonica,' i.e. English, or 'Inglis' as it was known in Scotland).[1] The Teutonic speakers lived on the coasts and plains (the 'gens maritima'), while those who spoke Gaelic inhabited the highlands and islands (the 'gens montana'). The 'gens maritima' were civilised and sophisticated, peaceful and pious, but would stand up to their enemies; the 'gens montana,' on the other hand, were wild and savage, violent and lazy, but attractive (if badly dressed).[2] In *Proto-Fordun*'s formulation, language was fundamental to this distinction, the element from which their contrasting characters sprang.[3] The association between a language and a people is evident: the 'gens montana' are said to be 'hostile not only to the English people and language, but also to their own nation, due to the difference in language.'[4]

Yet despite the apparent idea that a language and a people should correspond, *Proto-Fordun*, whose author was likely to have spoken Gaelic himself, nevertheless stresses that the Scots, for all these differences in language and disposition, formed a unified nation: the Gaelic-speakers, wild and aggressive though they might be, were 'faithful and obedient to their king and kingdom,' and law-abiding if they were governed well.[5] The Scottish people consisted of two different 'gentes,' which together formed the single Scottish 'natio,' a formula that stresses the

---

[1] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42; trans. p.38): 'Mores autem Scotorum secundum diversitatem linguarum variantur,' ('the manners and customs of the Scots vary according to the difference of their language.'); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 2.9 (vol. 1, pp.184-5).
[2] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42).
[3] Martin MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity,' p.19; Robert Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.48.
[4] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42; trans. p.38):'populo quidem Anglorum et linguae, sed et propriae nationi, propter linguarum diversitatem, infesta.'
[5] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42; trans. p.38): 'Regi tamen et regno fidelis et obediens, necnon faciliter legibus subdita, si regatur.'

correspondence of king, kingdom and people.[6] This is a theme that recurs throughout both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, as does the emphasis on the need for a strong king to promote order and end discord within the kingdom.

The idea that peoples could be identified and united not only by their loyalty to one particular king, or by common laws and shared ancestry, but also by a shared language, which could symbolise the unity and distinctiveness of a nation, and influence its character, was a commonplace of medieval thought.[7] Indeed, in many places, the words for language were often used as synonyms for the words for peoples (including the Latin 'lingua').[8] Just as the division of the world into different kingdoms and peoples was seen as natural, with biblical example to support it, so the division of the world into different languages, and the correspondence of language and peoples, was seen as natural, a process that started with the tower of Babel.[9] Isidore of Seville, an author cited several times in *Proto-Fordun*, asserted in the early seventh century that peoples sprang from different languages, not the other way around.[10]

Similarly, to extinguish a language was to destroy a people; to raise support for his wars in France, Edward I declared that the French king sought to remove the English language from the earth, while for Henry of Huntingdon, writing in the twelfth century, the most shocking part of the extinction of the Picts was the

---

[6] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42; trans. p.38); Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.77; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.48.

[7] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' pp.2-9; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' pp.47-8; Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350* (London 1993), pp.197-204; Reynolds, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium*,' pp.383-9; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, p.257.

[8] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.2; Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, p.202.

[9] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.9; Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, p.198.

[10] Given *Proto-Fordun*'s interest in Scotland's different ethnic roots and language, it is possible that he is responsible for the inclusion in Fordun's *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* of Isidore's discussion of the different uses of Greek dialects, and the explanation of the varieties of Latin in his own time (that of the church, of Italy, France and Spain, which in turn are divided into distinctive regional dialects): Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 1.19 (pp.17-8); Bower, *Scotichronicon* 1.20 (vol. 1, pp.50-1 & p.343 n.30-40); MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity,' pp.14-5; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.9; Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, p.198.

'disappearance of their language, that God created, among the rest, at the origin of languages.'[11] *Proto-Fordun* makes a similar point, noting that it was not only 'the kings and leaders of that race [the Picts] that were destroyed,' but that 'its whole stock and race also is said to have been lost, together with its own distinctive language.'[12] One of the crimes of which William Wallace stood accused in 1305 was his refusal to spare anyone who spoke English; this was a poetic and powerful way of describing Wallace's actions, but not to be taken literally unless a nice distinction was being made between the English of the English and the English spoken by Wallace.[13]

Yet, as we have seen, this idea alone could not explain the unity of the Scottish people, for they lacked a single common language. Both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* were composed during a period of significant change to the linguistic situation in Scotland. In the late eleventh century, Gaelic was the most commonly spoken and dominant language throughout much of the kingdom, other than the southeast around Lothian, where English was more common, and parts of the north and islands where Norse was also spoken.[14] The twelfth century, however, saw the arrival of new language groups into the kingdom and the use of Inglis spread, aided by factors such as the growth of burghs and the immigration into Scotland of English, French and Flemish nobles and merchants, encouraged by the Scottish crown; as Inglis increasingly became the language of crown and court, so Gaelic use

---

[11] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum* 1.8 (Diana Greenaway, ed.) (Oxford, 1996), p.24, cited in Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.49; Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, pp.202-203; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.2; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities,* p.272.

[12] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 4.4,8 (pp.147, 151): 'sic quidem non solum reges et duces gentis illius deleti sunt, sed etiam stirps et genus, adeo ydiomatis sui lingua defecisse legitur.' The comment is used to introduce the long digression on God's punishment of sinful kingdoms and peoples, and Fordun elsewhere alters material to downplay the significance of the Picts, so it is possible that *Proto-Fordun* was not the author of this comment.

[13] Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' pp.77-78.

[14] Moreover, at this time, it was not long since Pictish and Brythonic had been spoken in Scotland: William Gillies, 'The Lion's Tongues: Languages in Scotland to 1314,' in Thomas Owen Clancy & Murray Pittock (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, volume 1: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.52-62 at pp.60-1; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.76; Webster, *Medieval Scotland,* p.16; Simon Taylor, 'Babbet and Bridin Pudding or Polyglot Fife in the Middle Ages,' *Nomina* 17 (1994), pp.99-118 at pp.99-100.

decreased and its cultural status diminished.[15] The union of Malcolm III and Margaret was also a union of Gaelic and English-speakers, and so in its way a symbol of the nation that reinforced the idea of this as a new royal dynasty; their new royal centre at Dunfermline lay not far from the Forth, located on the boundary between the English and Gaelic speaking parts of the realm.[16] By the later fourteenth century, when *Gesta Annalia II* was composed, however, Gaelic had more or less retreated from Fife and southern Scotland, and from the hinterland of the east coast burghs.[17]

Lacking linguistic unity, then, the Scots were bound instead by the sense of regnal solidarity also implied in *Proto-Fordun*'s description, by their obedience to the same king and the same laws, and through sharing the same territory, Scotland, and having the same ancient origins (despite, in fact, the relatively recent arrival, from many different places, of many Scots).[18] In this, the Scots were different from a people such as the Welsh or the Irish, who could identify themselves as a distinct

---

[15] Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.76; Gillies, 'The Lion's Tongues,' p.62; Christian Robinson and Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, 'The Several Tongues of a Single Kingdom: The Languages of Scotland, 1314-1707,' in Thomas Owen Clancy & Murray Pittock (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, volume 1: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.153-63 at pp.153-156; David Murison, 'Linguistic Relationships in Medieval Scotland,' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Scottish Tradition* (Edinburgh, 1974), pp.71-83 at pp.76-81; McNeill & MacQueen (eds.), *Atlas of Scottish History*, pp.426-7; G.W.S. Barrow, 'The lost Gàidhealtachd of medieval Scotland,' in William Gillies (ed.), *Gaelic and Scotland: Alba agus a' Ghàidhlig* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.67-88 at pp.67-9; Geoffrey Barrow, 'The Anglo-Norman Impact, c.1100-c.1286,' in Bob Harris & Alan R. MacDonald, *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707, volume 1: The Scottish Nation: Origins to c.1500*, (Dundee, 2006), pp.17-31 at pp.27-30; R. Andrew McDonald, 'The Western Gàidhealtachd in the Middle Ages,' in Bob Harris & Alan R. MacDonald, *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707, volume 1: The Scottish Nation: Origins to c.1500* (Dundee, 2006), pp.66-89 at pp.71-2; Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation*, p.27.
[16] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.68-70.
[17] Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots*, pp.332-3; Grant, *Independence and Nationhood,* pp.200-2; McNeill & MacQueen (eds.), *Atlas of Scottish History,* pp.426-7; Taylor, 'Babbet and Bridin Pudding,' p.100.
[18] Appropriately enough, the earliest surviving piece of poetry in Scots, seemingly from shortly after the death of Alexander III and preserved in Wyntoun, makes this same point about the bond between king, kingdom and people: 'Quhen Alexander our kynge wes dede, / þat Scotlande lede in lauche and le,... / Our golde wes changit in to lede. / Crist, borne in virgynyte, / Succoure Scotlande, and ramede, / þat is stade in perplexite': Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle*, vol.5 pp.144-5; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' pp.79-81.

nation through a shared culture based on a common language, even though they lacked a comparable unifying political structure.[19]

This is an issue of which *Proto-Fordun* appears to have been aware, although other Scottish chronicles drew little attention to the matter.[20] In the passage quoted above, the chronicle is very careful about the terminology used to describe Scotland's languages, apparently to distinguish it from those of Scotland's neighbours: the languages of Scotland are not called English or Inglis, and Irish or Gaelic, but instead 'Theutonica' and 'Scotica.'[21] This distinction is reinforced in the rest of the passage, which distinguishes between the races and languages of the 'Scotica,' and those of 'Hibernia,' and describes the mountain-dwelling Scots as hostile to the language of the English and, separately, to that of their coastal-dwelling fellow Scots, implying that these were not the same language.[22] The versions of English and Gaelic spoken in Scotland were closely related to and mutually comprehensible with those spoken in England and Ireland, but they were not identical, and many might have regarded the Scottish forms as distinct to their own kingdom; *Proto-Fordun*, however, goes rather further than others might have done in giving them labels that overtly proclaim that distinctiveness.

*

Proto-Fordun's brief description of the God-fearing and polite lowland Scots appears to have been added to this section because the descriptions found in his older sources, which portrayed Gaelic-speakers only (as fairly stereotypical noble barbarians), did not reflect the linguistic and cultural divisions of Scotland in his time. *Proto-Fordun*'s characterisation of the Gaelic-speakers as wild but loyal and

---

[19] Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, I: Identities,' pp.16-20; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' pp.12-13; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp.273-276; Grant, 'Aspects of National Consciousness,' p.75.

[20] As Cowan notes, the issue of language division is largely ignored in Barbour, Wyntoun, and the later *Liber Pluscardensis*: Cowan, 'Myth and Identity,' p.113.

[21] Given *Proto-Fordun*'s interest elsewhere in the roots of languages, the choice of 'Teutonic' perhaps indicates an awareness that English (and Inglis) were derived from Germanic languages: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 1 p.343 n.2; MacGregor, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity,' p.13.

[22] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.42).

willing to serve the king is also evident in the chronicle's description of William I's army in Northumberland in 1172, which consisted of 'the highland Scots, whom they call *bruti*, and the Galwegians, who did not know how to spare either place or person, but raged in the manner of beasts.'[23]

Proto-Fordun depicts the marriage of Malcolm III and Margaret as the start of a new royal dynasty in Scotland, one which combined a particular sanctity with the ancient dignity of both the Scottish and English crowns.[24] Margaret and her sons are presented in the chronicle as modernising Scotland, bringing the kingdom into greater contact and exchange with Europe and bestowing great prosperity on the nation. Among the many achievements of David I, he 'adorned you with castles and cities, and with lofty towers,' and 'enriched your ports with foreign merchandise, and added the riches of other kingdoms for your delight.'[25] David had also 'exchanged your rough cloaks for expensive garments, and covered your nakedness of old with fine linen and purple cloth;' he even 'calmed your savage behaviour by means of the Christian religion,' and 'wisely moderated the fierceness of his race.'[26] This presentation of David's achievements reflects the contrasting depictions of the Gaelic-speakers and Inglis-speakers: David and his family had, as it were, turned badly-dressed and wild Gaels into wealthy, devout Scots (at least in part of the kingdom).

Many of these achievements were linked to ethnic and linguistic changes in Scotland: Augustinian canons from England were brought into new religious foundations; English, Flemish and French nobles arrived in Scotland (where they were integrated into, rather than placed on top of, the existing hierarchy), and

---

[23] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 10 (pp.262-3): 'per montanos Scotos, quos brutos vocant, et Galwalenses, qui nec locis nec personis parcere norunt, sed bestiali more saeviendo devastans,'; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.244-5.

[24] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.61-70.

[25] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436): 'castellis et urbibus decoravit, ipse te excelsis turribus extulit, ipse partus tuos peregrinis et mercatoribus foecundavit, et aliorum regnorum divitias tuis deliciis aggregavit.'

[26] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa*, 41 (p.436): Ipse preciosis vestibus pallia tua pilosa mutavit, et antiquam nuditatem tuam bysso et purpura texit. Ipse barbaros mores tuos Christiana religione composuit;' 40 (p.436): 'in spiritu consilii et fortitudinis, gentis suae feritatem sapienter moderatus est.'

merchants from these lands settled in the increasingly prominent and important burghs. In *Proto-Fordun*, the Scottish royal dynasty descending from Malcolm III and Margaret is presented as representing both the kingdom's ancient past and its modern identity, a status embodied in its combination of Gaelic and English heritage.[27] This idea that the crown, and with it the kingdom, had achieved its greatness through uniting these different ethnic or linguistic groups perhaps, then, provided an alternative to the idea of a single linguistic identity that united the Scottish people, giving them a distinctiveness that the roots of their two main languages denied them.[28]

II

The idea that the dynasty of Margaret and Malcolm III embodied Scotland's linguistic diversity is evident in *Proto-Fordun*. When Margaret and her family arrived in Scotland, Malcolm is able to speak to the English arrivals himself because he had 'learnt the English and Roman languages fully as well as his own,' during his time in England after his father's death.[29] It is taken as given that Malcolm's 'own language' here is Gaelic (as it was for the author of *Proto-Fordun*); it is his speaking English that requires explanation.[30] The detail also serves to emphasise Malcolm's readiness to learn even before his marriage to Margaret and his suitability as a match for her in modernising Scotland and bringing it into closer contact with

---

[27] Boardman, 'Late Medieval Scotland,' pp.61-70.

[28] It would perhaps be laying too much weight on St Margaret's childhood time at the Hungarian court of Andrew I to link this to the idea, attributed to Andrew's predecessor, St Stephen, that a kingdom with one language and one custom would be weak, which was to say that a kingdom could benefit, materially and martially, from foreign incomers: Baker, 'A Nursery of Saints,' pp.132-134; Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts,' p.50; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp.257-258.

[29] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa*, 13 (p.416), 'Anglicam enim linguam simul et Romanam aeque ut propriam plene didicerat.' The 'Roman tongue' refers to French, rather than Latin, and although his time in England pre-dates the Norman conquest, it is not unlikely that he would have learned French at the court of Edward the Confessor: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 3 p.205 n.48-50.

[30] This detail comes from the Dunfermline compilation version of Turgot's *Life of Margaret,* written at a time when the king's English should still be unusual enough to remark on; it does not appear in versions of that text; Turgot wrote the life for Malcolm and Margaret's daughter, and it is likely that she would have known that much at least about her father; other evidence also suggests that Turgot was not the author of the account of Malcolm and Margaret's marriage: Bower, *Scotichronicon*, 5.16 (vol. 3 pp.48-51 & notes p.204); Taylor, 'Historical writing,' pp.237-43.

Europe. Whether Margaret herself learned Gaelic is not clear; Turgot's *Life* (but not *Proto-Fordun*) records that Malcolm, as he was fluent in English, acted as her interpreter during one of the church councils she held, but also that she spent much time visiting and conversing with Scotland (north of the Forth)'s many hermits.[31] Barbour's *Bruce* also includes a colourful (and perhaps somewhat far-fetched) tale suggesting that Margaret could also speak and write in French: Margaret had apparently predicted the capture of Edinburgh Castle in 1314, leaving in her chapel a sign depicting 'a castell, a ledder up to the wall standand, and wrat outht him as auld men sais in Frankis, "Gardys vous de Francais."'[32]

The idea of Malcolm and Margaret as the founders of the Scottish dynasty is also evident in *Gesta Annalia II*: the genealogies of both Bruce and Balliol in 1292 begin with the marriage of Malcolm and Margaret and describe the successors of all their children, even though the claims specifically relate to their descent from Malcolm and Margaret's great-grandson, David, earl of Huntingdon.[33]

Another reference to language in *Proto-Fordun* serves to emphasise the antiquity of the Scottish kingdom and crown. Alexander III's inauguration at Scone in 1249 is presented as a mixture of older customs intended to link the Scottish king with his predecessors and to Scotland's ancient past (with a particular emphasis on the role of the Stone of Destiny), and apparent innovations stressing the sanctity and prestige of the Scottish crown.[34] During the ceremony, a highland Scot recited the

---

[31] Both examples are ambiguous on this matter; it is only one council that is described, and that apparently the most important one, so it could have taken place relatively early in her reforming efforts (and, in practice, perhaps Malcolm was needed not so much to interpret but to preside and give more authority to her proposals, and that Turgot played down his role). It is also not stated explicitly that the council was held in Gaelic, although that seems likelier than Malcolm interpreting from Latin to English for Margaret; nor is it stated whether the queen habitually visited the hermits unaccompanied: Macquarrie, *The Saints of Scotland,* pp.213-215; Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots,* pp.170-173; Murison, 'Linguistic Relationships,' p.71.

[32] Barbour, *The Bruce*, p.399. The twist was that people assumed this meant that the castle would be captured by Frenchmen, but it was actually a Scot called William Francis who climbed the crag and scaled the walls. The present St Margaret's Chapel, the oldest surviving building in Edinburgh Castle, was, however, built during the reign of David I.

[33] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 73-4 (pp.314-315).

[34] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.176-182; Broun, 'The Origin of the Stone,' pp.186-196; Duncan, 'Before Coronation,' pp.144-146.

king's ancestry in Gaelic; the first few names are recorded in Gaelic in the chronicle: 'Benach de Re Albanne Alexander, mac Alexander, mac Vleyham, mac Henri, mac David.'[35] The recitation of the royal genealogy seems likely to have been a traditional part of the ceremony, representing the continuity and antiquity of the royal line.[36]

Proto-Fordun also includes a Latin translation of the quoted speech, with a much longer list of names, and by highlighting that the highlander spoke in Gaelic, the text perhaps implies that the rest of the ceremony was not in Gaelic. As with the focus on the Stone of Destiny and the mention of Éber Scot, regarded as the first Scot to arrive in Ireland, this detail appears intended to highlight the Irish origins of the Scottish kingship, even at a time when the Gaelic language was becoming less culturally dominant.[37] The link between Scone and the ceremony, on the other hand, draws attention to the kingdom's Pictish roots, thus presenting the ancient kingdom as emerging from these two peoples, in the same way, perhaps, that the current royal dynasty fused the English and Scottish heritage (and language) of the present Scottish kingdom.[38]

This extension of the genealogy makes a further point about the relationship between the Scottish king, kingdom and people: the first Scot preceded the arrival of the Scots in Scotland; the arrival of the Scots in Scotland preceded the establishment of the first king of the Scots in Scotland. It articulates a sense that the nation existed even before it had a king and before it had a territory; the king is defined by the people, not the other way around. *Gesta Annalia II* describes Robert I in similar terms, as being the rightful and ideal king to save Scotland because,

---

[35] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 48 (pp.294-295). As Broun notes, it is possible that the reference to Gaelic as 'materna lingua' means not 'his mother tongue,' but rather 'the mother tongue;' given that the language is referred to in Latin as 'Scotice,' which would further emphasise the ceremony's affirmation of Scotland's ancient roots: Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.186-187 n.60.

[36] Similar recitations of genealogy were a traditional element of Gaelic and Irish royal and noble inauguration ceremonies: Bannerman, 'The King's Poet,' pp.120-123; Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, pp.147-148; Broun, *Scottish Independence,* p.173.

[37] Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.129-132; Broun, 'Defining Scotland,' p.10.

[38] Broun, *Scottish Independence,* pp.221-223; Broun, 'Origin of the Stone,' pp.195-196.

unlike his rivals, he was 'one of their [the Scots] fellow-countrymen,' and the Scots were 'his brethren.'[39]

III

Proto-Fordun's treatment of the complex linguistic situation within Scotland reveals something of the text's attitude towards the identity of the Scottish nation. *Gesta Annalia II* contains rather less explicit discussion of the topic; indeed, the only examples of vernacular speech quoted in the text are, perhaps surprisingly, of Edward I speaking French.

On each of these occasions, Edward I is behaving particularly deviously and villainously, as when he decided to reject the Bruce claim to the throne.[40] Having been advised by Anthony Bek, bishop of Durham, that, although Robert Bruce had a stronger claim than John Balliol, he would also be more likely to cause trouble for the English king, Edward 'answered in the French tongue,' declaring '"Par le sank Dieu, vous aves bun chante;" which is to say, "By Christ's blood, you have sung well. Things shall proceed otherwise than I had previously arranged."'[41] Edward similarly spoke in French when he received notice of John Balliol's decision to withdraw his fealty to Edward and sent John's messenger home without safe-conduct.[42] Edward also resorted to French when breaking a promise to Robert Bruce (the competitor's son) after defeating the Scots at Dunbar in 1296: instead of giving Bruce the crown, Edward refused, saying, 'in the French language: "Ne avonis ren autres chose a fer,

---

[39] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 112 (p.337; trans. p.330): 'de suis confratribus'; 'fratribus.'

[40] Boardman, 'Robert II,' p.84.

[41] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 72 (pp.313-314): 'Gallica lingua respondit, dicens: "Par le sank Dieu, vous aves bun chante," quod est dicere, "Per sanguinem Christi, tu bene cantasti, aliter ibit negotium quam prius disposueram."'

[42] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia,* 86 (pp.321-322): Edward on this occasion says 'A ce foll, felim tel, foli fet... Sul ne voit venir a nous, nous vendrum aly.' The chronicle does not translate this phrase; it has been suggested that this is because a translation was not necessary in the later fourteenth century, but that it was by the time Wyntoun and Bower were writing in the fifteenth century (Bower's slightly different version is given as 'I tell you, foolish felon, you commit a great folly, because if the man who has sent you does not wish to come to us, we shall come to him,'). *Gesta Annalia II* does provide translations for Edward's other French phrases, so that seems an unsatisfactory explanation; as the French here is corrupt, and other versions attempt corrections, perhaps it was simply not understood: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 11.18 (vol. 6, pp.50-3 and notes p.217); Wyntoun, *Original Chronicle* vol.5, p.273.

que avous reamys ganere?," which is to say: "Have we nothing else to do but win
kingdoms for you?"'[43]

The chronicle presents Edward as apparently making a point of breaking into French
on each of these occasions of unsavoury behaviour, seemingly implying that these
conversations were not otherwise conducted in French. By doing so, the chronicle
presents Edward as being, despite his ancestry and status, in some way removed
and alien from the English themselves (whether or not it is intended to show him as
actually being French instead of English).[44] By doing so, the chronicle distinguishes
his cruel and cunning nature as an individual from the qualities of the English
people more generally. This distance is a contrast to Robert I's closeness to his
subjects, as one of the Scots' 'own people,' who was a righteous king who set out
with the intention of protecting his nation; Edward, on the other hand, not only
harassed the Welsh and Scots, causing strife through 'the whole world,' but even
oppressed his own subjects: he 'lashed the English with dreadful whips.'[45] The
Scottish and English peoples are in a sense connected by both being oppressed by
Edward I, who also seems to reject the common tongue shared by many in both
realms, a separation from his subjects that is contrasted with the connection
between the Scottish king and the Scots.[46]

This presentation of French as alien (and the chronicler's apparent belief that such
quotations required translation) highlights another aspect of the linguistic situation
of Scotland in this period.[47] It has been assumed that the Scottish nobility, like their
English counterparts, primarily spoke in French, even at the time of the Wars of

---

[43] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 94 (p.326): 'in Gallica lingua ita respondit: "Ne avonis ren autres chose a
fer, que avous reanis ganere?" Quod est dicere, "Nunquid non aliud habemus facere, quam tibi
regna lucrari?"'
[44] *Gesta Annalia II* dates from a period when a similar association between the English language and
the English nation seems to emerge in England: Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-
1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' pp.3-4, 10-12; Thorlac Turville-Petre, *England the
Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340*, (Oxford, 1996), pp.9-22.
[45] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 123 (p.344): 'Anglicos diris flagellis verberavit, et suis nequitiis totum
orbem perturbavit.'
[46] Boardman, 'Robert II,' p.84.
[47] Boardman, 'Robert II,' p.103 n.57.

Independence.[48] Yet, despite the arrival of many Anglo-Norman families in the twelfth century, there is little evidence to suggest that French became the habitual language of the Scottish court and nobility, in the way that it would be in England for several centuries.[49] Latin remained the dominant language of the church, and of the government; the English copy of the Treaty of Birgham was in French, the Scottish copy in Latin.[50] This applied even to private correspondence with the English kings and nobility, and with the French: most of what survives is in Latin, with only occasional examples of French; likewise Edward I wrote in French to his English officials in Scotland but in Latin to his Scottish officials.[51] This reflects, perhaps, that the immigrant families who came to Scotland in the twelfth century, not all of whom were of Norman background (nor were they all nobles), did not simply replace the Scottish aristocracy but integrated into it; language division in Scotland was not a marker of social status in that respect.[52] This is perhaps reflected in the way that *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* present the Scottish kings as closer to their subjects than their English counterparts are to theirs.[53]

The language of one other individual is referred to in *Gesta Annalia II*. This is one William Bullock, who is described as having been 'warden of the castle of Cupar, chamberlain of Scotland, on behalf of Edward of Balliol, and lieutenant, and treasurer of all the English and their adherents in the kingdom of Scotland.'[54] The

---

[48] See, for example, Watson, 'The Enigmatic Lion,' p.21; Murison, 'Linguistic Relationships,' pp.72-8.

[49] Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, pp.77, 172-4, 334; G.W.S. Barrow, 'French after the Style of Petithachengon,' in Barbara Elizabeth Crawford (ed.), *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Renaissance Scotland,* (Edinburgh, 1999), pp.187-194 at pp.187-190; Boardman, 'Robert II,' pp.81-82.

[50] Barrow, 'French after the Style of Petithachengon,' p.187,

[51] Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots*, p.173.

[52] Dauvit Broun, 'Anglo-French acculturation and the Irish element in Scottish identity,' in Brendan Smith (ed.), *Britain and Ireland 900-1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change*, (Cambridge, 1999), pp.135-53 at pp.136-43.

[53] One exception is Edward Balliol, whose claim is rejected by *Gesta Annalia II*; his Englishness is depicted as alienating him from the Scots, just as Edward I is alienated from the English.

[54] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (pp.363-4): 'custos castri de Cuper, camerarius Scociae ex parte Edwardi de Balliol, et locum tenens, ac thesaurarius omnium Anglicorum et eorum adhaerentium in regno Scociae.' There does not appear to be any record of him serving as a treasurer for the English: Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.49 (vol. 7, pp.154-7, notes pp.245-6); Bruce Webster, 'Scotland without a King, 1329-1341,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown Lordship and Community – Essays presented to G. W. S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.223-38 at p.231.

chronicle records that he became David II's 'liege man' in 1339, surrendering Cupar Castle in exchange for ample compensation for his land and possessions, and having held high office under Balliol, he rose to become 'chamberlain of Scotland with King David, the most important among his principal councillors,' and was respected for his shrewd advice both by the Scots and by the king of England.[55] He appears to have been a Scot (although the chronicle does not make it explicit), and his career after changing allegiance illustrates the way in which it was possible for such political allegiances to change without apparently contradicting or conflicting with someone's national identity. Having 'risen suddenly from the lowest depths,' and accumulated great wealth, his career (and life) came to an abrupt end when he was suspected by David II of treason.[56] Among his many qualities, however, Bullock was particularly distinguished for 'the succinct eloquence of his speech in his mother tongue,' although the chronicle does not note which tongue that would be.[57] It seems unusual to point out that he was eloquent in his mother tongue (indeed, Bower simply omits this detail): it could imply that he was not thought so eloquent when speaking in another tongue (a comment, perhaps, that he lacked the fluency in Latin one might expect from a cleric), or perhaps that he used his vernacular mother tongue even in circumstances where others would not; both scenarios give a sense of the complex linguistic situation within Scotland in the period.[58] It also highlights that in Scotland, language was not a marker of social class or political

---

[55] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (pp.363-4): 'homo legius'; 'cum rege David camerarius Scociae, et inter primos consiliarios maximus.' Although Cupar Castle fell in the spring or summer of 1339, Bullock appears to have still been paid by Edward Balliol in December 1339; perhaps this is evidence of the slyness which prompts *Gesta Annalia II*'s suspicion of him: Webster, 'Scotland without a King,' p.234; Brown, *The Wars of Scotland,* pp.241-4.

[56] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (pp.363-4): 'subito de infinis ad alta conscendit.' His death was a royal retaliation for William Douglas' murder of Alexander Ramsay; Bullock was imprisoned and starved to death, as Ramsay had been. Bower's treatment of Bullock is more sympathetic than *Gesta Annalia II's. Gesta Annalia II* implies he was corrupt, self-serving and over-ambitious; Bower says that he was the victim of jealousy, and lists his death alongside Ramsay's as the prelude to sad times for Scotland. Bower also credits Bullock with a valiant defence of Cupar Castle, before selling it out, and with being unsurpassed in intelligence, coming up with a particularly cunning plan to take Edinburgh Castle (*Gesta Annalia II*, by contrast, simply states that he was there): Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.38, 44, 46, 49 (vol. 7, pp.124-7, 140-7, 152-7; Brown, *The Wars of Scotland*, pp.245-6; Penman, *David II*, p.90.

[57] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 159 (pp.363-4): 'compendiosi sermonis eloquentia prae omnibus suo tempore lingua materna claruit.'

[58] Bower, *Scotichronicon* 13.49 (vol.7, pp.152-7, 245 n.72).

allegiance; there were Gaelic-speakers and Inglis-speakers, noble and common, on both Bruce and Balliol sides in these conflicts.

The general lack of interest shown by the chronicle in matters of language would suggest that the chronicler did not regard it as a significant marker of national identity. The English and Scots are not distinguished by the language they speak, even when they are serving the same king and in the same army (although neither is it suggested that they speak a similar language). When Edward I sought to take Berwick in 1296, his forces tricked the defending garrison into thinking a Scots relieving force had arrived by disguising themselves with 'deceitfully counterfeited banners and war-ensigns of the Scottish army.'[59] The Scots did not realise the deception until they had opened the gates and let the enemy in, which would suggest that they not only saw nothing untoward but heard nothing untoward either. A similar incident is described in *Proto-Fordun*: William I was captured at Alnwick in 1174 when he was ambushed by the enemy, 'pretending that they were Scots.'[60] Other chronicles also provide accounts where the failure to distinguish the language of one side from the other played a crucial role in the outcome of the battle: Walter of Guisborough says that the English were able to escape from Wark-on-Tweed in 1296 by repeating the Scottish password and pretending to be Scots, while the Westminster chronicle says that the English were defeated at Otterburn in 1388 because, in the dark, they could not distinguish the Scots, since all the combatants were speaking the same language, and so cut down many of their own side.[61] Similarly, nowhere in *Gesta Annalia II*, even in the example of William Bullock, is there any mention or acknowledgement that the people of Scotland speak two different major languages.

*

---

[59] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 90 (p.324): 'vexillis et signis bellicis Scoticani exercitus dolose confictis.'
[60] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 11 (p.263): 'Scotos fore simulantibus.'
[61] King, 'Best of Enemies,' p.116; Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' p.8.

Gesta Annalia II also provides some tantalising glimpses of other ways and customs by which the Scots were distinguishable from their neighbours: for example, it gives a reminder that Scotland had its own customary weights and measures: food was so plentiful at Perth during the future Edward II's stay there in 1303 that 'a lagen of good wine, in Scottish measure, sold for four pence.'[62] That the chronicle should specify a Scottish gallon suggests, however, that the author's intended readership would not necessarily take this for granted, not because the chronicle was intended for an audience beyond Scotland, but because the Scots were quite used to using other measures as well as their own (indeed, all wine would have been imported).[63]

According to *Gesta Annalia II*, the Scots also had a distinctive way of walking and style of dress, by which they could be distinguished from the English. As Robert I neared the Scottish border on his return from the court of Edward I (where he had faced accusations of treachery from John Comyn), he spotted a messenger, who 'he suspected, both from his gait and from his dress, to be a Scot.'[64] Upon speaking to this messenger, Robert discovered that he was carrying messages on behalf of John Comyn intended to betray Robert to Edward I (again), so Robert had the messenger beheaded.[65] That different peoples had different styles of dress, or wore their hair in different ways, or ate different food, and could be identified by these differences, was a commonplace of medieval thought, as natural as their different languages.[66] Unfortunately, the chronicle does not expand on what was so distinctive about the gait and clothing of the Scots, perhaps because the author simply took the fact for

---

[62] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 109 (pp.335-6): 'lagena vini boni mensurae Scoticanae pro quatuor denariis venderetur.' A Scots lagen (from the Latin for 'flask'), or gallon, was around three and a half times larger than an English wine gallon: Ronald Edward Zupko, 'The Weights and Measures of Scotland before the Union,' *Scottish Historical Review* 56.2 (1977), pp.119-145 at p.130.

[63] Elizabeth Gemmill and Nicholas Mayhew, *Changing values in medieval Scotland: A study of prices, money, and weights and measures*, (Cambridge, 1995), pp.215-9.

[64] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 115 (p.339): 'quam in cessu quam in habitu ipsum fore Scotum suspicatus est.'

[65] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 115 (p.339). As the chronicle cheerfully puts it, 'The messenger's head was cut off, and God greatly praised for guiding this prosperous journey,' ('caput nuncii praeciditur, et Deus pro directione prosperi itineris plurimum collaudatur').

[66] Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, pp.197-8; Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, pp.257-8; Robert Bartlett, 'Symbolic Meanings of Hair in the Middle Ages,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6.4 (1994), pp.43-60 at pp.45-6; R.R. Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, III: Laws and Customs,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6.6 (1996), pp.1-23 at pp.12-9.

granted. It is notable, however, that Robert I was unable to tell from these visual clues whether the messenger was a supporter of his cause or of Comyn's, a reminder of the complex loyalties of this civil war within Scotland, in which the different factions did not straightforwardly follow the linguistic or geographical divisions of the kingdom.

Proto-Fordun states that David I, by bringing new prosperity to the kingdom, encouraged the Scots to adopt much finer, more luxurious clothes than they had previously worn.[67] The idea that the Scots had once been known for their poor quality, unattractive clothing also appears in his description of the highland Scots, whose 'unsightly clothing' contrasted with their lowland counterparts, who were 'decent in their attire;' the chapter also records Isidore stating that the 'characteristic dress' of the Scots 'greatly disfigures them.'[68] Both *Gesta Annalia II* and *Proto-Fordun* would appear to suggest that highland and lowland Scots could be distinguished both from one another and from the English by their clothing, and that it was therefore possible for soldiers to easily disguise themselves as the opposing side (which also reflects the similarity of their arms and armour). Bower later provided a riposte to stereotypes about the coarse, unsophisticated clothes of the Scots, including in his chronicle a poem mocking the peculiarities of English clothing, which not only looked androgynous and ridiculous but symbolised their vanity and idleness.[69]

*

Understandably, neither *Proto-Fordun* nor *Gesta Annalia II* presents the Scots as a nation united by a shared language; there is no single Scottish language synonymous with the people. Although *Proto-Fordun* attempts to present the

---

[67] Skene (ed.), *Capitula ad 'Gesta Annalia' Praefixa* 41 (p.436).

[68] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* 2.9 (p.428): 'amictu deformis,' 'vestitu siquidem honesta,' 'multum eos tamen deformat proprius habitus.' External surprise at or disapproval of the Scots' apparent lowly dress was common: Davies, 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, III: Laws and Customs,' p.14; A.A.M. Duncan, 'The Dress of the Scots,' *Scottish Historical Review* 29.2 (1950), pp.210-2.

[69] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, 4.39 (vol. 2, pp.388-91)

languages of Scotland as being distinct to that kingdom, both texts provide evidence of Englishmen being able to disguise themselves as Scots without, it seems, any need to alter their speech; they need only match the distinctive appearance of the Scots, a marker of identity mentioned in passing in both texts. Yet both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* also reveal the way in which language was nonetheless central to conceptions of Scottish identity, and make use of these ideas in articulating their sense of that identity by linking together Scotland's linguistic, ethnic identity and its regnal identity. *Proto-Fordun* explicitly depicts Malcolm III as a Gaelic speaker and St Margaret as an English speaker, and they are presented as the founders of a new dynasty, with the inherited prestige of their illustrious predecessors: their union symbolises not only the joining of these English and Scottish royal lines, but the English and Scottish elements of the kingdom. The inauguration of Alexander III similarly highlights the continued importance of the kingdom's ancient Gaelic (Irish) roots, even at a time when Gaelic was losing its status as the language of crown and court. This sense of the shared identity of the king and his subjects is something also picked up on in *Gesta Annalia II*, particularly in its portrayal of the bond between Robert I and his subjects, his 'brethren,' the contrasting distance between Edward Balliol and the Scots, and the alienating distance between Edward I (whose use of French marks him out from his own oppressed subjects) and more or less everyone else in Britain. The extent to which ideas about language, and the complex linguistic situation of the kingdom, underpinned understandings of Scottish identity in this period is evident in the way in which language is consistently used to support and illustrate the wider themes of *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, as the examples above demonstrate.

CONCLUSION

When *Proto-Fordun* was written in the late thirteenth century, Scotland had only recently become the standard term for the entire kingdom, having once been the name only for the part of the Scottish king's realm north of the Forth and south of Moray. This change meant that Scotland the kingdom and Scotland the territory corresponded; no longer was Scotland only one territory among many in the kingdom. Moreover, all the inhabitants of this realm had come to be identified as Scots, regardless of whether they lived in Galloway or Lothian, Fife or Caithness, or whether they spoke Inglis or Gaelic. This sense of the unity of the kingdom's allegiance, its territory, and its inhabitants became so established that in *Gesta Annalia II* parts of the kingdom under English occupation or in allegiance to the English king continued to be identified in this way.

This sense of the unity of the Scottish people had solidified even as the kingdom became, in some respects, more diverse, with an influx of English and European settlers (both ecclesiastical and lay, noble and common) and the shift from Gaelic to Inglis in many parts of the kingdom (including the Scottish crown and court). Both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* emphasise the extent to which this sense of identity revolved around the Scottish kingship, uniting the nation despite their differences in language and character. The inclusion within the terms Scotland and Scot of areas and population on the peripheries of the kingdom was driven in part by the gradually increased royal presence and authority in these regions; it is not surprising that all the areas under the rule of the king of Scots, all subject to his same laws, would come to be regarded as forming a unified territory. *Proto-Fordun* consistently emphasises that these outer regions were always subject to the king of Scots, presenting conflict in places such as Galloway as treachery and rebellion against a rightful king, rather than as a reflection of any sense of a distinct sovereign identity in a region. In *Gesta Annalia II*, this same idea recurs, presenting failure to support the king (be he Bruce or Balliol) as treacherous, regardless of what someone's individual interests might be.

In both chronicles, it is the duty of the king to protect this unity, by preventing internal discord and disharmony, and by defending Scotland's freedom and independence from external forces (whether English, Norse, or even, potentially, undue papal interference). These themes dominate both texts: *Proto-Fordun* repeatedly presents Scottish kings as swiftly subduing revolt and reiterating their autonomy; exceptional circumstances such as catastrophic defeat might mean temporary subjection, but Scotland's right to its ancient freedom is emphasised throughout. *Gesta Annalia II* likewise foregrounds these themes, blaming the dissension, factionalism and self-interest of Scotland's nobility for undermining the Scottish cause at crucial moments; Robert I is presented as a heroic figure not simply for resisting the English but for first uniting the kingdom behind his rule, the prerequisite of successful resistance. At times the treatment of Robert I seems like Bruce propaganda, but the chronicle makes it clear that factionalism of any kind undermines the kingdom, and that the king should always be supported. The fairly sympathetic presentation of John Balliol in *Gesta Annalia II* illustrates both of these ideas: his initial humiliation reflected his failure to stand up for Scotland's freedoms and rights; having resolved to defend his kingdom, however, he was then undermined by the failure of adherents to the Bruce cause to support him, for which they are severely criticised.

It is notable that *Gesta Annalia II*, in addition to this nuanced portrayal of John Balliol's reign, is also not particularly hostile towards the English people simply for being English, even when Scotland is occupied by English armies. The chronicle's ire is instead directed at individual English kings, in particular Edward I. These aspects of the text point towards the political circumstances of the chronicle's own time in the 1360s. Supportive of Scotland's kings throughout, *Gesta Annalia II* can be seen as sympathetic towards David II's efforts to reduce his ransom payments by arranging for a son of Edward III to succeed him as king of Scots; the contemporary debate over this issue is evident in the text's presentation of its themes, notably its suggestion that a king of English descent would not necessarily have to mean the end of Scotland's liberty. This context is also evident in the negative portrayal of the

future Robert II, who was opposed to a scheme that would remove him from the succession. A similar stance towards the English people is also evident in *Proto-Fordun*, which reserves its anger for kings such as Henry II or the archbishops who sought to make the Scottish church subject to an English metropolitan, rather than the people as a whole, and highlights the royal English ancestors of the current dynasty through its descent from St Margaret.

Proto-Fordun explicitly links this idea of the autonomy of the Scottish church with the autonomy of the Scottish kingdom; the ancient, independent status of both is emphasised, and the chronicle suggests that an attack on one is an attack on both. The chronicle emphasises the need for Scotland's clerics (and its king) to defend the rights of their church, and the rights of the kingdom must similarly be defended. Indeed, Scotland's current dynasty is particularly suited to the role of leading a particularly devout Christian nation because of their descent from the saintly Margaret, whose sense of duty and piety is, the chronicle suggests, passed on to her descendants. The chronicle also shows Scotland's kings themselves fostering this sense of unity between church and crown. *Gesta Annalia II* does not stress the personal piety of Scotland's kings in this way, but nevertheless depicts Robert I as divinely inspired and assisted, sent by God to save the Scottish people and heal the division tearing the kingdom apart, something particularly evident in its portrayal of the killing of John Comyn.

Indeed, Robert I is presented as the rightful heir of Alexander III, restoring the kingdom to the condition it enjoyed in that time. The eulogy for Alexander III at the start of *Gesta Annalia II* makes clear the bond between the king and kingdom: a strong leader means a strong kingdom; without one, the kingdom is at the mercy of internal division and external enemies. These are the same qualities required of kings in *Proto-Fordun*. This identification of the king with the kingdom is also evident in the emphasis, particularly in *Proto-Fordun*, on the antiquity of the Scottish royal line, which is equated with the antiquity of the kingdom itself. This is depicted not only through *Proto-Fordun*'s account of the origins of the Scots, but

also in the chronicle's account of the inauguration of Alexander III. As well as presenting the king as divinely-sanctioned, despite a lack of anointment, and as independent of any other earthly power, the chronicle highlights the role of the Stone of Destiny and the significance of the Scone location, presenting the king as heir to the ancient traditions of the Scottish kings and of the Pictish kingdom. Most strikingly, the inauguration also includes the reading of the king's genealogy, in Gaelic, all the way back to Éber Scot, son of Gaedel and Scota, and who is described as being the very first Scot, demonstrating the continued significance of the ancient figures and symbols described in the chronicle.

This draws attention to another element of Scottish identity, its relationship with Ireland (indeed, the recitation of the genealogy is itself common in similar Irish and Gaelic ceremonies). This is not something particularly evident in *Gesta Annalia II*, following a trend to downplay the Irish heritage seen in other sources from the early fourteenth century onwards, such as the Declaration of Arbroath. *Proto-Fordun*, however, draws attention to these Irish roots, emphasising the antiquity of the Scottish kings and their claim to status as a sovereign kingdom and symbolising their connection to the earliest inhabitants of Scotland as well as their contemporary status. The antiquity of the kingdom is also highlighted by associating the present kingdom of Scotland with the ancient kingdoms of the Picts and the Scots within Scotland.

The idea of the Scottish people and kingdom as being formed from different ethnic groups is also reflected in the chronicle's portrayal of the current Scottish royal dynasty as coming from the union of the English and Scottish royal lines, and thus connecting the English-speaking and Gaelic-speaking heritage of the kingdom.

Gesta Annalia II likewise uses language to illustrate the relationship between the king and the people, with the contrasting example of Edward I. He is depicted as an oppressor not only of the Scots and the Welsh, but even of his own subjects in England. Where Robert I is presented as acting entirely out of concern to protect his subjects, highlighting the bond between the king and his fellow-Scots, Edward I is

depicted as alienated and disconnected from the English, seeking an unjustified dominion over other nations (in contrast to the Scots who, as the Declaration of Arbroath similarly points out, are content with their own kingdom). This presentation is heightened by the chronicle's depiction of him as speaking in French when acting in a particularly deceitful manner; indeed, it is the Scots, not Edward, who share a common bond of language with the ordinary folk of England.

Throughout both *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II*, these elements are all drawn upon to articulate a strikingly consistent sense of Scotland as an independent kingdom, equal in status to any other and subject to none, and of the need for internal unity to maintain this. Both chronicles repeatedly emphasise this point, for example in *Proto-Fordun*'s depiction of Gilbert's speech at Northampton and highlighting of the Quitclaim of Canterbury, or in *Gesta Annalia II*'s portrayal of Robert I. Both chronicles attempt to reconcile sources with apparently contradictory perspectives to fit these themes: neither text, for example, is particularly hostile towards England (in contrast to later chronicles), while still asserting Scotland's independence from it, as with *Proto-Fordun's* use of material celebrating the English ancestry of St Margaret as a way of highlighting the status of Scotland's royal dynasty. Within *Gesta Annalia II*, material highly favourable to Robert Bruce, extremely hostile to Robert Stewart, and somewhat ambivalent about John Balliol, is all adapted to a framework that consistently emphasises the need for peace and unity among Scotland's leaders in order to defend the realm and its people.

The Wars of Independence are often presented as a crucial phase in the establishment of Scotland's national identity, turning the nation defiantly away from any association with England and rejecting any opposition to the Bruce succession. Yet, as the comparison of *Proto-Fordun* and *Gesta Annalia II* demonstrates, there was a great deal of continuity over this period. Alongside other increasingly assertive expressions of Scotland's independence in the thirteenth-century, *Proto-Fordun* makes the same insistence on the need to maintain Scotland's liberty and autonomy as *Gesta Annalia II*. Likewise, both texts insist on

the need for unity amongst Scotland's nobility and an end to discord. The context of *Gesta Annalia II*'s composition suggests a complex attitude towards identity that is evident in its recognition that the partisanship of the Bruce and Balliol groups caused immense damage to Scotland, and its lack of hostility towards the English nation.

Taken together, the two texts indicate that the sense of Scottish identity seen in *Gesta Annalia II,* from its depiction of the role of the king and church in binding the nation together, to its understanding of what Scotland was and who the Scots were, drew on well-established ideas; or, at least, ideas that were well-established within the clerical community of the diocese of St Andrews. Indeed, this sense of continuity between the two texts might provide a hint as to why they became so closely associated with one another; *Gesta Annalia II*, even if it was not directly intended to be a continuation of *Proto-Fordun*, seems to be something of a sequel in spirit, and fits the role surprisingly neatly, despite the very particular context of its composition, drawing the same themes out of Scotland's most recent history as *Proto-Fordun* had done several generations earlier. *Proto-Fordun's* presentation of Scotland's history shows that this sense of Scottish identity was already well-developed along the same lines even before the death of Alexander III and the beginning of Scotland's troubles.

APPENDIX: Manuscripts of *Gesta Annalia*

Gesta Annalia I and *Gesta Annalia II* survive in the following manuscripts (identified by the sigla used by Broun, following Skene), in all of which they are preceded by some or all of Fordun's *Chronica*:[1]

A: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Codex Helmstadiensis 538. Skene used this mid-fifteenth century manuscript as his main text for his edition of Fordun's *Chronica*.[2] It contains the five books of Fordun's *Chronica* (fos.1r-132r), followed by a blank page (fo.132v), then the fifteen chapters of material regarded as Fordun's sixth book (fos.133r-139r), another blank page (fo.139v), the dossier of documents (starting with the Declaration of Arbroath) (fos.140r-164r), another blank page (fo.164v), and then all of the '*Praefixa*' and *Gesta Annalia* material, without any gaps or breaks, from the ancestry of St Margaret until 1385 (165r-219r).[3]

C: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.9.9. This late fifteenth-century manuscript contains the five books of Fordun's *Chronica* (fos.1r-121r), the chapter rubrics for a sixth book (which correspond to the sixth book of Bower's *Scotichronicon*) (fos.121v-122v), two chapters of *Scotichronicon* book 5 (fos.122v-123v), a set of 23 chapters corresponding to the first eight chapters of Bower's book 6 and the fifteen of Fordun's apparent sixth book (fos.123v-134v), and the *Gesta Annalia* material from the '*Praefixa*' until 1285 (i.e. the end of *Gesta Annalia I*, Skene's chapter 66) (fos.135r-168v), with a book division after the death of Malcolm IV in 1165 (Skene's chapter 6) stating 'Explicit liber quintus. Incipit VI^tus' (fo.149v).[4] This is followed in a new foliation by the dossier of documents (1-34v), also broken up by a book division, stating after the *Processus* of Baldred Bisset that 'Hic finitur liber sextus,'

---

[1] Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.20; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, p.xlv. These manuscripts have been examined on microfilm: University of St Andrews, ms38423/10.

[2] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, p.xlvi; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.20.

[3] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.11-2; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.20; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxvi-xxvii; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.200.

[4] Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 6, p.259; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxiv-xxvi Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.202; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.15-6; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.23-4. The two chapters of Bower's fifth book, inserted after the list of rubrics, are printed as Bower, *Scotichronicon*, 5.36a, 39a (vol.3, pp.108-9, 118-23).

(fo.25v; notably, it does not state that another book then begins) and then the remaining chapters of *Gesta Annalia* (i.e. *Gesta Annalia II*) until 1385 (fos.35r-60v).[5] This manuscript appears to most clearly indicate the development of *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*: a dossier of documents was added to *Gesta Annalia I*, with the *Processus* being regarded as the end of a book, before other documents were added later; Gesta *Annalia II* was then added to this compilation, possibly at the same time as *Gesta Annalia I* and the documents were added to Fordun's *Chronica*.[6]

D: Dublin, Trinity College, MS 498. This manuscript, with numbered pages, dates from c.1450 x c.1465.[7] It includes only the fifth book of Fordun's *Chronica* (pp.223-64), followed immediately by the *Gesta Annalia* from 1153 to 1363 (pp.264-355; that is, Skene's *Gesta Annalia* chapters 1-185, without the '*Praefixa*' or the later additional chapters); this is followed, after a blank page (p.356), by the dossier of documents (pp.357-96; it includes two additional items not found in the other dossiers).[8] This manuscript is notable for including several changes (in both *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*) that present David, earl of Huntingdon, as William I's elder brother and thus the rightful heir to Malcolm IV.[9] It has been posited that this was intended to justify Robert, earl of Fife, holding on to power after his elder brother acceded to the throne as Robert III in 1390.[10] Skene thought that this

---

[5] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum,* pp.xxiv-xxvi*, appendix II: Documenta Quaedam*, p.405; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.202; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.15; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.23-4.

[6] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.15-6.

[7] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxix-xxx; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, pp.200-1; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.24.

[8] Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxix-xxx; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, pp.200-1; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.24; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.10-2.

[9] David is described as William's elder, not younger, brother, and instead of being in England when William became guardian, here the older David is abroad, fighting for Christ against the Saracens. It also states that William becomes king because David, the older brother, was overseas, and adds a note of David's foundation of Lindores Abbey to a description of William's foundation of Arbroath monastery. In the *Gesta Annalia II* material, the sons of David, earl of Huntingdon, are listed as 'Malcolm, David and William,' instead of 'Malcolm, William and David,' and it is said that William became king because it was thought that David had died while fighting Saracens with the king of Aragon: Skene (ed.), *Gesta Annalia* 1, 4, 7, 29, 74 (pp.254, 257, 259, 280, 315).

[10] Dauvit Broun, 'Review of Bower, *Scotichronicon* vols.5 & 6,' *Scottish Historical Review* 73 (1994), pp.132-5 at p.135; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.10, 22-3 n.16. Although a plausible context, that does not entirely explain why the manuscript should portray David so positively, seemingly at William's expense; although some of the changes note his absence (which might render him an unfit ruler), others emphasise his piety and heroism, as well as his seniority.

manuscript represented an early draft of Fordun's chronicle, rather than a later abbreviation of it, and that this presentation of David, earl of Huntingdon, was an error later corrected; although he primarily used the text of manuscript **A** for his edition, his own arrangement of the *Gesta Annalia* chapters nevertheless resembles that found only in this version.[11]

G: London, British Library, MS Add. 37223. This manuscript, from c.1450, contains the five books of Fordun (fos.1r-116r), followed by a blank folio (unnumbered), then the fifteen chapters of his sixth book (fos.117r-123v), another blank folio (fo.124), the dossier of documents (fos.125r-151v), a further blank folio (unnumbered), and then the whole of the '*Praefixa*' and *Gesta Annalia*, from Margaret's ancestors to 1385 (fos.152r-212r).[12] Manuscript **A** is derived from this one.[13] Although the sections appear in a different order, *Gesta Annalia I* and the dossier of documents contain the same book divisions here as they do in manuscript **C** (fos.146v, 168r).[14]

I: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E xi. This dates to the late fifteenth century and consists of *Gesta Annalia* from 1153 to 1363 (fos.116-166v), with a book division in the same place as **C** and **G** (fo.118v) and a notable gap between Skene's chapters 66 and 67 (fo.142r; i.e. between *Gesta Annalia I* and *Gesta Annalia II*, where the dossier appears in manuscript **C**).[15] It forms part of Skene's manuscript **B**, but has been identified as in fact being a separate document attached to that manuscript, perhaps intended to complement the copy of Fordun's chronicle included in **B**.[16]

---

[11] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.12; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxxii-xxxiii, xlvi.

[12] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.199; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.25-6; Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.11-2; W.F. Skene, 'Notice of an Early MS of Fordun's Chronicle,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 10 (1874), pp.27-30.

[13] Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, p.199; Broun, *Irish Identity,* p.26; Broun, 'A New Look,' p.12.

[14] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.16.

[15] Broun, 'A New Look,' pp.10, 25 n.53; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.21-3; Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol.9, pp.201-2; Skene (ed.), *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, pp.xxvii-xxviii.

[16] Broun, 'A New Look,' p.10; Broun, *Irish Identity,* pp.21-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript sources

A: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Codex Helmstadiensis 538 (University of St Andrews microfilm ms38423/10 reel 14)

C: Cambridge, Trinity College, MS O.9.9 (University of St Andrews microfilm ms38423/10 reel 17)

D: Dublin, Trinity College, MS 498 (University of St Andrews microfilm ms38423/10 reel 15)

G: London, British Library, MS Add. 37223 (University of St Andrews microfilm ms38423/10 reel 13)

I: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E xi (University of St Andrews microfilm ms38423/10 reel 16)

Printed primary sources

Anderson, Alan Orr (ed.), *Early Sources of Scottish History, A.D. 500 to 1286* (2nd edition, Stamford, 1990), vol. 2

Anderson, Majorie Ogilvie (ed., with additional notes by Alan Orr Anderson), *A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood* (Edinburgh, 1938)

Barbour, John, *The Bruce* (ed. A. A. M. Duncan) (Edinburgh, 1997)

Barrow, G.W.S. (ed.), *Regesta Regum Scottorum II: The Acts of William I King of Scots 1165 - 1214* (Edinburgh, 1971)

Bartlett, Robert (ed. & trans.), *The Miracles of Saint Aebbe of Coldingham and Saint Margaret of Scotland* (Oxford, 2003)

Birdsall, Jean (trans.) & Richard A. Newhall (ed.), *The Chronicle of Jean de Venette* (New York, 1953)

Bower, Walter, *Scotichronicon* (eds. D.E.R. Watt et al), 9 vols. (Aberdeen & Edinburgh, 1987-98)

Chronicon de Lanercost (ed. Joseph Stevenson) (Edinburgh, 1839)

Chronicle of Lanercost 1272-1346 (trans. Herbert Maxwell) (Glasgow, 1913; reprinted in facsimile, 2 vols., Llanerch, 2001)

Chronicle of Melrose (trans. Joseph Stevenson), printed in *The Church Historians of England*, vol.4 part 1 (London 1856), pp.77-243; reprinted in facsimile in *Medieval Chronicles of Scotland: The Chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood* (Llanerch 1988), pp.7-124)

'Chronicle of Scottish History 1056-1401,' in Catherine R. Borland, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library* (Edinburgh 1916), appendix iv, pp.329-332.

Declaration of Arbroath (trans. A.A.M. Duncan) in John Barbour, *The Bruce* (ed. A.A.M. Duncan) (Edinburgh, 1997), pp.779-782

Duncan, A.A.M. (ed.), 'A Question about the Succession, 1364,' in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society XII* (Edinburgh, 1994), pp.1-57

Fordun, John, *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (ed. William F. Skene) (*Historians of Scotland vol. 1,* Edinburgh, 1871)

Fordun, John, *Chronicle of the Scottish Nation* (ed. William F. Skene; trans.Felix Skene) (*Historians of Scotland vol. 4,* Edinburgh, 1872)

Gray, Sir Thomas, *Scalacronica 1272-1363* (ed. & trans Andy King) (Woodbridge, 2005)

Liber Extravagans, in Walter Bower, Walter *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9 (ed. D.E.R. Watt) (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.54-127

Turgot, *Life of Margaret* (Dunfermline version) (ed. & trans. Catherine Keene) in Catherine Keene, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2013), pp.135-221.

Wyntoun, Andrew, *The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun* (ed. F.J. Amours), 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1903-8)

Secondary sources

Ash, Kate, 'Friend or Foe? Negotiating the Anglo-Scottish Border in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica* and Richard Holland's *Buke of the Howlat*,' in Mark P. Bruce & Katherine H. Terrell (eds.), *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300-1600* (New York, 2012), pp.51-68

Ash, Marinell, 'The Church in the Reign of Alexander III,' in Norman H. Reid (ed.), *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III 1249-1286* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.31-53

Baker, Derek, 'A Nursery of Saints: St Margaret of Scotland Reconsidered,' in Derek Baker (ed.), *Medieval Women* (Oxford, 1978), pp.119-142

Bannerman, John, 'The King's Poet and the Inauguration of Alexander III,' *Scottish Historical Review*, 68.2, pp.120-149

Bannerman, John, 'MacDuff of Fife,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community – Essays Presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.20-38

Barber, Richard, *The Knight and Chivalry* (3rd edition, Woodbridge, 1995)

Barlow, Frank, 'The King's Evil,' *English Historical Review*, 95, pp.3-27

Barrell, A.D.M., 'The background to *Cum universi*: Scoto-papal relations, 1159-1192,' *Innes Review,* 46.2, pp.116-138

Barrell, A.D.M., *The Papacy, Scotland and Northern England, 1342-1378* (Cambridge, 1995)

Barrell, Andrew D.M., 'Scotland and the Papacy in the reign of Alexander II,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.157-178

Barrow, Geoffrey, 'The Anglo-Norman Impact, c.1100-c.1286,' in Bob Harris & Alan R. MacDonald, *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707, volume 1: The Scottish Nation: Origins to c.1500* (Dundee, 2006), pp.17-31

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The Idea of Freedom in Late Medieval Scotland,' *Innes Review,* 30, pp.16-34.

Barrow, G.W.S., *The Anglo-Norman Era In Scottish History* (Oxford, 1980)

Barrow, G.W.S., Kingship *and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306* (Edinburgh, 1981)

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The lost Gàidhealtachd of medieval Scotland,' in William Gillies (ed.), *Gaelic and Scotland: Alba agus a' Ghàidhlig* (Edinburgh, 1989), pp.67-88

Barrow, G.W.S., 'A Kingdom in Crisis: Scotland and the Maid of Norway,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 69, pp.120-141

Barrow, G.W.S., *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992)

Barrow, G.W.S., 'Observations on the Coronation Stone of Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 76, pp.115-121

Barrow, G.W.S., 'French after the Style of Petithachengon,' in Barbara Elizabeth Crawford (ed.), *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Renaissance Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1999), pp.187-193

Barrow, G.W.S., *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the eleventh to the fourteenth century* (2nd edition, Edinburgh, 2003)

Barrow, G.W.S., *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (4th edition, Edinburgh, 2005)

Bartlett, Robert, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350* (London, 1993)

Bartlett, Robert, 'Symbolic Meanings of Hair in the Middle Ages,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6.4, pp.43-60

Bartlett, Robert, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity,' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 31.1), pp.39-56

Beam, Amanda G., *The Balliol Dynasty 1210-1364* (Edinburgh, 2008)

Binski, Paul, *Westminster Abbey & the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven, 1995)

Boardman, Stephen I., *The Early Stewart Kings: Robert II and Robert III 1371-1406* (Edinburgh, 1996)

Boardman, Stephen, 'Chronicle Propaganda in Fourteenth-Century Scotland: Robert the Steward, John of Fordun and the "Anonymous Chronicle,"' *Scottish Historical Review,* 76, pp.23-43

Boardman, Stephen, 'Coronations, Kings and Guardians: Politics, Parliaments and General Councils, 1371-1406,' in Keith M. Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *The History of the Scottish Parliament, volume 1: Parliament and Politics in Scotland, 1235-1560* (Edinburgh, 2004), pp.102-122

Boardman, Steve, 'Late Medieval Scotland and the Matter of Britain', in Edward J. Cowan and Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.47-72

Boardman, Steve, 'Dunfermline as a Royal Mausoleum,' in Richard Fawcett (ed.), *Royal Dunfermline* (Edinburgh, 2005), pp.139-153

Boardman, Steve, 'Robert II,' in Michael Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in honour of Norman Macdougall* (Edinburgh, 2008), pp.72-108

Brogan, Stephen, 'The Royal Touch,' *History Today*, 61.2, pp.46-62

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Origin of Scottish Identity,' in Claus Bjorn, Alexander Grant & Keith J. Stringer, *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen, 1994), pp.35-55

Broun, Dauvit, 'Review of Bower, *Scotichronicon* vols.5 & 6,' *Scottish Historical Review*, 73, pp.132-135

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Birth of Scottish History,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 76.1, pp.4-22

Broun, Dauvit, 'Defining Scotland and the Scots Before the Wars of Independence,' in Dauvit Broun, R.J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.4-17

Broun, Dauvit, '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), pp.9-30

Broun, Dauvit, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (Woodbridge, 1999)

Broun, Dauvit, 'Anglo-French acculturation and the Irish element in Scottish identity,' in Brendan Smith (ed.), *Britain and Ireland 900-1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change* (Cambridge, 1999), pp.135-153

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Picts' Place in the Kingship's Past Before John of Fordun,' in Edward J. Cowan & Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.11-28

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Absence of Regnal Years from the Dating Clause of Charters of Kings of Scots, 1195-1222,' in John Gillingham (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies 25: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2002* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp.47-63

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Origin of the Stone of Scone as a National Icon,' in Richard Welander, David J. Breze & Thomas Owen Clancy (eds.), *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.183-198

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Declaration of Arbroath: Pedigree of a Nation?' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Declaration of Arbroath: History, Significance, Setting* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.1-12

Broun, Dauvit, 'The Welsh Identity of the Kingdom of Strathclyde,' *Innes Review,* 55.2, pp.111-180

Broun, Dauvit, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain: From the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh, 2007)

Broun, Dauvit, 'Attitudes of *Gall* to *Gaedhel* in Scotland before John of Fordun,' in Dauvit Broun & Martin MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), pp.49-82

Brown, M.H., '"I have thus slain a tyrant": *The Dethe of the Kynge of Scotis* and the right to resist in early fifteenth-century Scotland,' *Innes Review,* 47, pp.24-44

Brown, Michael, '"Rejoice to Hear of Douglas": The House of Douglas and the Presentation of Magnate Power in Late Medieval Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 76, pp.161-184

Brown, Michael, *The Black Douglases: War and Lordship in Late Medieval Scotland 1300-1455* (Edinburgh, 1998)

Brown, Michael, *The Wars of Scotland 1214 – 1371* (Edinburgh, 2004)

Brown, Michael, 'Aristocratic Politics and the Crisis of Scottish Kingship, 1286-96,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 90, pp.1-26

Brown, Michael H., '*Scoti Anglicati*: Scots in Plantagenet Allegiance during the Fourteenth Century,' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.94-115

Canning, J.P., 'Law, sovereignty and corporation theory, 1300-1450,' in J.H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.454-476

Carpenter, David, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066-1284* (London, 2003)

Catto, Jeremy, 'Written English: The Making of the Language 1370-1400,' *Past & Present,* 179, pp.24-59

Cowan, Edward J., 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 63, pp.111-135

Cowan, Edward J., 'Identity, Freedom and the Declaration of Arbroath' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.38-68

Davies, Rees, '"Keeping the Natives In Order": The English King and the "Celtic" Rulers 1066-1216,' *Peritia*, 10, pp.212-224

Davies, R.R., *Domination and Conquest: The experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100-1300* (Cambridge, 1990)

Davies, R.R., 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100 – 1400, I: Identities,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6.4, pp.1-20

Davies, R.R., 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100 – 1400, II: Names, Boundaries and Regnal Solidarities,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6.5, pp.1-20

Davies, R.R., 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100-1400, III: Laws and Customs,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6.6, pp.1-23

Davies, R.R., 'The Peoples of Britain and Ireland 1100 – 1400, IV: Language and Historical Mythology,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6.7, pp.1-24

Ditchburn, David, *Scotland and Europe: The Medieval Kingdom and its Contacts with Christendom, c.1215-1545, volume 1: Religion, Culture and Commerce* (East Linton, 2000)

Donaldson, Gordon, 'Scottish Bishops' Sees Before the Reign of David I,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 87, pp.106-117

Dunbabin, Jean, 'Government,' in J.H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350-c.1450* (Cambridge, 1988), pp.457-519

Duncan, A.A.M., 'The Dress of the Scots,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 29.2, pp.210-212

Duncan, A.A.M., 'The Making of Scotland' in Gordon Menzies (ed.), *Who Are The Scots?* (London, 1971), pp.127-138

Duncan, A.A.M., *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1975)

Duncan, A.A.M., 'The War of the Scots, 1306-23: The Prothero Lecture,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 6.2, pp.125-151

Duncan, A.A.M., *The Kingship of the Scots, 842-1292: Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh, 2002)

Duncan, A.A.M., 'Before Coronation: Making a King at Scone in the Thirteenth Century,' in Richard Welander, David J. Breze & Thomas Owen Clancy (eds.), *The Stone of Destiny: Artefact and Icon* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.139-168

Duncan, A.A.M., 'Sources and Uses of the Chronicle of Melrose, 1165-1297,' in Simon Taylor (ed.), *Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland 500-1297: Essays in honour of Marjorie Ogilivie Anderson on the occasion of her 90th birthday* (Dublin, 2000), pp.145-186

Duncan, Archie, 'Revisiting Norham, May-June 1291,' in Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle & Len Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c.1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.69-83

Edington, Carol, 'Paragons and Patriots: National Identity and the Chivalric Ideal in Late-Medieval Scotland,' in Dauvit Broun, R. J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.69-81

Ferguson, William, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation: An Historic Quest* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.43-44

Frame, Robin, *The Political Development of the British Isles 1100-1400* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1995)

Fraser, James E., '"A Swan from a Raven": William Wallace, Brucean Propaganda, and *Gesta Annalia II*,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 81.1, pp.1-22

Gemmill, Elizabeth and Nicholas Mayhew, *Changing values in medieval Scotland: A study of prices, money, and weights and measures* (Cambridge, 1995)

Gillies, William, 'The Lion's Tongues: Languages in Scotland to 1314,' in Thomas Owen Clancy & Murray Pittock (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, volume 1: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.52-62

Given-Wilson, Chris, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London, 2004)

Goldstein, R. James, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Nebraska, 1993)

Goldstein, R. James, '"I will my process hald": Making Sense of Scottish Lives and the Desire for History in Barbour, Wyntoun and Blind Hary,' in Priscilla Bawcutt & Janet Hadley Williams (eds.), *A Companion to Medieval Scottish Poetry* (Cambridge, 2006), pp.35-48

Goodman, Anthony, 'Anglo-Scottish Relations in the Later Fourteenth Century: Alienation or Acculturation?' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.236-254

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974)

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England II: c.1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London 1982)

Gransden, Antonia, 'The Chronicles of medieval England and Scotland: Part I,' *Journal of Medieval History,* 16, pp.129-139

Grant, Alexander, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland 1306-1469* (Edinburgh, 1984)

Grant, Alexander, 'Aspects of National Consciousness in Medieval Scotland,' in Claus Bjorn, Alexander Grant & Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Nations, Nationalism and Patriotism in the European Past* (Copenhagen, 1994) pp.68-95

Grant, Alexander, 'The Death of John Comyn: What Was Going On?', *Scottish Historical Review,* 86.2, pp.176-224

Grant, Alexander, 'Bravehearts and Coronets: Images of William Wallace and the Scottish Nobility,' in Edward J. Cowan (ed.), *The Wallace Book* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.86-106

Hallam, Elizabeth M., 'Royal Burial and the Cult of Kingship in France and England 1060 – 1380' in *Journal of Medieval History,* 8, pp.359-380

Hammond, M., 'Ethnicity, personal names and the nature of Scottish Europeanization,' *Thirteenth Century England*, 7, pp.82-93

Hammond, Matthew, 'The Use of the Name "Scot" in the Central Middle Ages, part one: "Scot" as a by-name,' *Journal of Scottish Name Studies,* 1, pp.37-60

Hammond, Matthew H., 'Ethnicity and the Writing of Medieval Scottish history,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 85, pp.1-27

Huneycutt, Lois L., 'The Idea of the Perfect Princess: The Life of St Margaret in the Reign of Matilda II (1100-1118),' *Anglo-Norman Studies,* 12, pp.81-97

Keen, Maurice, *Chivalry* (New Haven, 1984)

Keene, Catherine, *Saint Margaret, Queen of the Scots: A Life in Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2013)

King, Andy, 'Englishmen, Scots and Marchers: National and Local Identities in Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*,' *Northern History*, 36, pp.217-232

King, Andy, 'Best of Enemies: Were the Fourteenth-Century Anglo-Scottish Marches a "Frontier Society"?' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.116-135

King, Andy, 'War and Peace: A Knight's Tale. The Ethics of War in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*,' in Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle & Len Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c.1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp.148-162.

Lyall, Roderick J., 'The Medieval Scottish Coronation Service: Some Seventeenth-Century Evidence,' *Innes Review,* 28, pp.3-21

MacGregor, Martin, 'Gaelic Barbarity and Scottish Identity in the Later Middle Ages,' in Dauvit Broun & Martin MacGregor (eds.), *Mìorun Mòr nan Gall, 'The Great Ill-Will of the Lowlander'?: Lowland Perceptions of the Highlands, Medieval and Modern* (Glasgow, 2007), pp.7-48

MacInnes, Iain A., '"Shock and Awe": The Use of Terror as a Psychological Weapon During the Bruce-Balliol Civil War, 1332 – 1338,' in Andy King and Michael A. Penman (eds.), *England and Scotland in the Fourteenth Century: New Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp.40-59

Macquarrie, Alan, *The Saints of Scotland: Essays in Scottish Church History AD450-1093* (Edinburgh, 1997)

MacQueen, Hector L., '"Regiam Majestatem", Scots Law and National Identity,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 74, pp.1-25

Mapstone, Sally, 'Bower on Kingship,' in Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9 (D.E.R. Watt, ed.) (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.321-338

Mason, Roger, 'Kingship, Tyranny and the Right to Resist in Fifteenth Century Scotland,' *Scottish Historical Review*, 66, pp.125-151

Mason, Roger A., 'Scotching the Brut: Politics, History and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Britain,' in Roger A. Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England 1286-1815* (Edinburgh, 1987), pp.60-84

Mason, Roger A., '"Scotching the Brut": The Early History of Britain', in Jenny Wormald (ed.), *Scotland Revisited* (London, 1991), pp.49-60

McDonald, R. Andrew, '"Treachery in the Remotest Territories of Scotland:" Northern Resistance to the Canmore Dynasty, 1130 – 1230,' in *Canadian Journal of History,* 33, pp.161-192

McDonald, R. Andrew, 'The Western Gàidhealtachd in the Middle Ages,' in Bob Harris & Alan R. MacDonald, *Scotland: The Making and Unmaking of the Nation, c.1100-1707, volume 1: The Scottish Nation: Origins to c.1500* (Dundee, 2006), pp.66-89

McNamee, C.J., 'The Bruce Invasions of Ireland,' *History Ireland,* 1 (1993), pp.11-16

McNamee, Colm, *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland 1306-1328* (East Linton, 1997)

McNeill, Peter G.B. and Hector L. MacQueen (eds.), *Atlas of Scottish History to 1707* (Edinburgh, 1996)

Murison, David, 'Linguistic Relationships in Medieval Scotland,' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Scottish Tradition* (Edinburgh, 1974), pp.71-83

Neville, Cynthia J., 'The Political Allegiance of the Earls of Strathearn during the Wars of Independence,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 65, pp.133-153

Nicholson, Ranald, *Scotland: The Later Middle Ages* (Edinburgh, 1974)

Oram, Richard, *The Lordship of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 2000)

Oram, Richard, *David I: The King Who Made Scotland* (Stroud, 2004)

Oram, Richard, *Domination and Lordship: Scotland 1070-1230* (Edinburgh, 2011)

Oram, Richard, *Alexander II King of Scots, 1214-1249* (Edinburgh, 2012)

Owen, D.D.R., *William the Lion 1143-1214: Kingship and Culture* (East Linton, 1997)

Penman, Michael A., 'The Scots at the Battle of Neville's Cross, 17 October 1346,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 80.2, pp.157-180

Penman, Michael A., *David II, 1329 – 71* (Edinburgh, 2004)

Penman, Michael, 'David II,' in Michael Brown & Roland J. Tanner (eds.), *Scottish Kingship, 1306-1542: Essays in honour of Norman Macdougall* (Edinburgh, 2008), pp.49-71

Reid, Norman, 'The kingless kingdom: the Scottish guardianships of 1286-1306,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 61, pp.105-129

Reid, Norman H., 'Alexander III: The Historiography of a Myth,' in Norman H. Reid (ed.), *Scotland in the Reign of Alexander III 1249 – 1286* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.181-213

Reid, Norman H., 'Crown and Community under Robert I,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community – Essays Presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.203-222

Reid, Norman H., '"A great prince, and very greedy of this world's honour." The Historiography of Alexander II,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.49-78

Reynolds, Susan, 'Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm,' *History,* 68, pp.375-390

Reynolds, Susan, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900 – 1300* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1997)

Reynolds, Susan, 'Fiefs and Vassals in Scotland: A View from Outside,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 82, pp.176-193

Robinson, Christian and Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, 'The Several Tongues of a Single Kingdom: The Languages of Scotland, 1314-1707,' in Thomas Owen Clancy & Murray Pittock (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, volume 1: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.153-163

Ross, Alasdair, 'Men For All Seasons? The Strathbogie Earls of Atholl & the Wars of Independence, c.1290 – 1335,' *Northern Scotland,* 20 (2000), pp.1-30

Ross, Alasdair, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams,' in Seán Duffy, *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, warlords and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600* (Dublin, 2007), pp.24-44

Royan, Nicola, with Dauvit Broun, 'Versions of Scottish Nationhood, c.850-1707,' in Thomas Owen Clancy & Murray Pittock (eds.), *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, volume 1: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)* (Edinburgh, 2007), pp.168-183

Ruddick, Andrea, 'National Sentiment and Religious Vocabulary in Fourteenth-Century England,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 60, pp.1-18.

Simpson, Grant G., 'The Declaration of Arbroath revitalised,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 56, pp.11-33

Simpson, Grant G., 'The Heart of King Robert I: Pious Crusade or Marketing Gambit?' 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), pp.173-186

Simpson, Grant G., 'The Declaration of Arbroath: What Significance When?' in G.W.S. Barrow (ed.), *The Declaration of Arbroath: History, Significance, Setting* (Edinburgh, 2003), pp.108-115

Skene, W.F., 'Notice of an Early MS of Fordun's Chronicle,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* 10, pp.27-30

Smith, Anthony D., *The Antiquity of Nations* (Cambridge, 2004)

Stevenson, Katie, *Chivalry and Knighthood in Scotland, 1424-1513* (Woodbridge, 2006)

Strickland, Matthew, 'Treason, Feud, and the Growth of State Violence: Edward I and the "War of the Earl of Carrick," 1306-7,' in Chris Given-Wilson, Ann Kettle & Len Scales (eds.), *War, Government and Aristocracy in the British Isles, c.1150-1500: Essays in Honour of Michael Prestwich* (Woodbridge, 2008), 84-113

Stringer, Keith J., 'Periphery and Core in Thirteenth-Century Scotland: Alan son of Roland, Lord of Galloway and Constable of Scotland,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown Lordship and Community – Essays presented to G.W.S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.82-113

Stringer, Keith J., 'Kingship, Conflict and State-Making in the Reign of Alexander II: The War of 1215 – 17 and its Context,' in Richard D. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214-49* (Leiden, 2005), pp.99-156

Taylor, Alice, 'Historical writing in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland: the Dunfermline compilation,' *Historical Research,* 83, pp.228-252

Taylor, Simon, 'Babbet and Bridin Pudding or Polyglot Fife in the Middle Ages,' *Nomina*, 17, pp.99-118

Turpie, Tom, 'A Monk from Melrose? St Cuthbert and the Scots in the later middle ages, c.1371-1560,' *Innes Review,* 62, pp.47-69

Turville-Petre, Thorlac, *England the Nation: Language, Literature, and National Identity, 1290-1340* (Oxford, 1996)

Watson, Fiona, 'The Enigmatic Lion: Scotland, Kingship and National Identity in the Wars of Independence,' in Dauvit Broun, R.J. Finlay & Michael Lynch (eds.), *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh, 1998), pp.18-37

Watson, Fiona, *Under the Hammer: Edward I and Scotland: 1286 – 1306* (East Linton, 1998)

Watson, Fiona, 'The Demonisation of King John,' in Edward J. Cowan & Richard J. Finlay (eds.), *Scottish History: The Power of the Past* (Edinburgh, 2002), pp.29-46

Watt, D.E.R., 'Bagimond di Vezza and His "Roll,"' *Scottish Historical Review*, 80, pp.1-23

Webster, Bruce, 'Scotland without a King, 1329-1341,' in Alexander Grant and Keith J. Stringer (eds.), *Medieval Scotland: Crown Lordship and Community – Essays presented to G. W. S. Barrow* (Edinburgh, 1993), pp.223-238

Webster, Bruce, *Medieval Scotland: The Making of an Identity* (London, 1997)

Woolf, Alex, 'The "Moray Question" and the Kingship of Alba in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries,' *Scottish Historical Review* 79.2, pp.145-164

Woolf, Alex, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Picts,' in Wilson McLeod, Abigail Burnyeat, Domhnall Uilleam Stiùbhart, Thomas Owen Clancy & Roisbeard Ó Maolalaigh (eds.), *Bile ós Chrannaibh: A Festschrift for William Gillies* (Ceann Drochaid, 2010), pp.439-450

Zupko, Ronald Edward, 'The Weights and Measures of Scotland before the Union,' *Scottish Historical Review,* 56.2, pp.119-145

Web Articles

http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/0/commonwealth-games/28501031 [accessed 09/08/2014]

Brown, M.H., 'Douglas, William, first earl of Douglas and earl of Mar (*c.*1330–1384)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7924, accessed 16/10/2014]