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Abstract

This thesis aims to shatter the myth that the Davidian-era in Scottish history was characterized by an enlightened reform of the kingdom under a dynasty of pious rulers. Rather, the period saw the aggressive assertion of Scottish power and the imposition of Canmore rule over North Britain. It will be shown that King David I and his grandsons, Kings Malcolm IV and William I, had little interest in transforming the Gaelic realm of Alba into an Anglo-Norman political society. Instead, the feudalisation was undertaken to cement royal control over territories that had only recently fallen within the orbit of Scottish Crown, or those that were conquered by the Davidians themselves during the course of the 12th century. Nor was their great program of Church patronage driven by genuine Christian charity. David and his grandsons used feudal land-grant charters to endow reformed monastic orders in order to build up diplomatic capital with the Papacy, and eliminate the claims of York to supremacy over the Scottish Church. Such claims threatened the independence of the Scottish Crown, and the Davidians used their familiarity with feudal practice and language to side-step assertions of overlordship made by a succession of English kings. Through an examination of charters, landscape evidence, diplomatic agreements, and papal correspondence, this thesis invalidates the notion of a benign reformist initiative on the part of the Davidian kings, and exposes the imperialistic ambitions behind the feudalisation of Scotland.
List of Abbreviations


*CS* Chronicon Scotorum, Cork: University College Cork, 2000, CELT Project: Corpus of Electronic Texts; available online: http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T1000016/


Chapter 1: Historiography

Introduction

In the century between the years 1113 and 1214 C.E the kingdom of Scotland underwent a transformation that has become known to history as the Davidian Revolution. The extent to which this program of reforms changed Scotland should not be underestimated. During the reigns of David I (r. 1124-1153), and his two grandsons Malcolm IV (r. 1153-1165) and William I (r. 1165-1214), Scotland’s first coins were minted, its first towns established, castles and cathedrals built, a parish system put in place, and new monastic orders introduced. While these changes were all important parts of the revolution, none has attracted as much attention, nor been as contentious among scholars, as the introduction of feudalism into Scotland by the Davidian kings. It is the intentions behind the feudalisation that this thesis intends to take as its topic.

The aim of this first chapter is two-fold. First, it will discuss those works produced prior to the twentieth century which have had a long-term impact on succeeding scholarship. These writers did not deal in any great detail with the feudalisation, but they created many myths and biases about the period which still haunt modern historians. Second, the chapter will explore the conclusions of the most important scholars of the 20th and 21st centuries, when the historiography began to specifically investigate the feudal settlement.
Fantastical Tales: The Medieval Chroniclers

The two main chronicles from late medieval Scotland, *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* by John of Fordun and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*, present their readers with a paradox. They are more immediate to the events which they describe than the works of modern historians. However, these chronicles are also less reliable due to their having been composed by writers who were more concerned with ecclesiastical matters, and therefore not focused upon the primary goal of present-day historical practice: objectivity. Moreover, both Fordun and Bower included within their works the *Lament for David, King of the Scots*, written by Aelred of Rievaulx, which lauds David as a pious ruler. However, given that these chronicles are the very first non-contemporary documents to consider High Medieval Scotland, an examination of their nature and contents is well advised; particularly as they are very much responsible for the establishment of King David I’s reputation as a civilizing force in the history of Scotland.

John of Fordun’s c. 1360 *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*¹ did much to create the myth of King David. Fordun (*d.* 1386), an Aberdeenshire priest, trumpets David’s reign as if he was a reincarnation of his Old Testament namesake. However, biblical imagery may not have been the intention. Michael Brown has suggested that Fordun was writing a type of political propaganda for a Scottish kingdom engaged in the continuing assertion of its independence, this time by non-violent means following the 1357 Treaty of Berwick which had concluded

---

the Second War of Independence. Brown asserts that Fordun’s treatment of David was part of a contemporary process which glorified the leaders and achievements of the Scots.²

Brown may be correct in his argument about the intentions of the work as a whole, but there is little Scottish nationalism to be found in Fordun’s praise of David’s Norman acculturation, or his patronage of foreign monastic orders. Moreover, he touts David as the ‘pride of his race,’ but credits his mother Queen Margaret, a Saxon princess raised in Hungary, for his upbringing.³ In addition, Fordun’s account of David’s reign centres upon his familial links with the royal house in Norman England, and affairs in that kingdom which involved him, with very little attention paid to his activities in Scotland itself.⁴

Further, the historical accuracy of Fordun must be brought into question. His high flowing language leads Fordun into making impossible claims in relation to David’s reign. For instance, he proclaims that “there was no king like (David) among the kings of the earth in his day.”⁵ Fordun touts David’s sometimes brutal military conquests as “expanding his kingdom by fair means.”⁶ Even his opportunistic invasions of Northern England during the Anarchy are portrayed by Fordun as being in gallant defence of his niece, the Empress Matilda.⁷ Nevertheless, it is Fordun’s use of such fawning language, and his inclusion of the

³ Fordun, 221
⁴ Ibid, 221-224
⁵ Ibid, 224
⁶ Ibid
⁷ Ibid. The Anarchy is a term used here, as elsewhere, to refer to the period of civil conflict between the House of Blois and the House of Anjou for control of England and Normandy following the death of Henry I without surviving legitimate male issue in 1135, see for instance David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: The Penguin History of Britain 1066-1284*, (London: Penguin, 2003), 163-178.
sermonic *Lament for David, King of the Scots*, originally penned by Aelred, the Abbott of Rievaulx, which has successfully established David’s reputation as a saint-like figure and modernizer.

Aelred of Rievaulx was born in England in 1110, the son of Eilaf, the village priest of St. Wilfrid’s parish in Hexham. He did not begin his professional life as cleric like his father, but instead entered the service of King David sometime after his ascension to the Scottish throne in 1124. Aelred spent his teenage years in the company of Prince Henry, and eventually became one of the court stewards. In 1134 with David’s blessing, and even possibly his encouragement, Aelred entered the Cistercian monastery at Rievaulx in Yorkshire, of which the Scots king was a generous patron. In 1147, Aelred was elected as Abbott and in that position he travelled many times to Scottish court and throughout England on monastic and diplomatic business until his death in 1167.9

During his lifetime Aelred of Rievaulx composed many literary works, among them seven histories, which included *the Genealogy of the Kings of the English, the Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor, and the Battle of the Standard*.10 His *Lament for David, King of the Scots* was composed after David’s death in May 1153, and was included as a preface in an edition of *the Genealogy of the Kings of the English*, which was prepared by Aelred for Henry of Anjou, in celebration of that year’s peace agreement between Stephen and the Angevins. It can therefore be seen as neither completely a history, nor a lamentation, but as a ‘mirror for

---

8 Ibid, 227-244
10 Dutton, 8-9
princes.’¹¹ In the Lament David is portrayed as the ideal Christian ruler. Aelred characterizes him as having been “a gentle king, a just king, a chaste king, a humble king.”¹² He claims that David “delighted in an abundance of peace,”¹³ even though the king had in fact spent much of his reign at war; largely self-initiated. Aelred readily explains that David was so repentant at the destruction wrought on England by his armies that he considered renouncing his crown and entering religious life.¹⁴ Although the Lament was largely composed for an English audience, it nevertheless was adopted by Fordun and later writers, and this repetition in the historiography has resulted in a continuous portrayal of David as a pious and well-intentioned ruler by scholars.

If there is a piece of late medieval Scottish historical literature that came close to providing its readers with something approaching modern historical analysis, then it is Walter Bower’s Scotichronicon. Bower, one of the first graduates of the University of St. Andrews, was abbot of the Augustinian monastery of Inchcolm in Fife from 1417 until his death in 1449.¹⁵ In the aftermath of the assassination of King James I (r. 1406/24-1437), Bower, who in his role as abbot had sat on the royal council, withdrew from public life and set about composing the forty short ‘books’ which came to be Scotichronicon.¹⁶ Throughout this work Bower used his first hand knowledge of the mechanics of politics to add commentary to Fordun’s account; thereby moving beyond the simple narrative structure

---
¹¹ Ibid, 10
¹² Aelred, 46
¹³ Ibid 48
¹⁴ Ibid, 55
¹⁶ Watt, xi
which typified the work of his predecessor, and providing readers with analysis of the events described.\textsuperscript{17} Tellingly, however, Bower added no analysis to Fordun’s account of David’s reign. He seemed to have been content with Fordun’s treatment of it.\textsuperscript{18} The emphasis on David as a champion of the Church and founder of the great monasteries of Scotland was again repeated, as was the inclusion of Aelred’s \textit{Lament}. There can be no better indication that David’s pious reputation as a civilising force in Scottish history was well established by the 15\textsuperscript{th} century than the fact that Bower did not add further to Fordun’s account, even from a political angle as he was wont to do.

\textbf{Fire and Brimstone: The Scottish Reformation}

George Buchanan’s \textit{The History of Scotland}, published in 1582,\textsuperscript{19} is typical of historical writing during the Reformation, and also the first major work of historical literature to treat Davidian Scotland as an identifiable period of national transformation.\textsuperscript{20} Buchanan (1506-1582) was a prominent poet and literary, who, despite his later fervent Protestantism, served as a member of the young Queen Mary’s retinue at the French court and was responsible for teaching her the classics, especially Livy.\textsuperscript{21} His \textit{History} was originally published in Latin and aimed to cover Scottish history from the arrival of the Celtic tribes in Britain to the political and religious upheavals of his own Reformation-era Scotland. While

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, xii  \\
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid, 64-68  \\
\textsuperscript{19} George Buchanan, \textit{The History of Scotland} (1582), v.1, ed. and trans. James Aikman, (Glasgow: Blackie Fullarton, 1827)  \\
\textsuperscript{20} The term “Davidian Scotland,” is used here to refer to years in which the ‘Davidians,’ being David I and his grandsons Malcolm IV and William I, ruled Scotland (1124-1214).  \\
\end{flushright}
comprehensive, and containing effective psychological insight, his work is coloured by hostility towards the French and Catholics, which resulted from the nationalistic Calvinism which was so much a part of the intellectual culture of his times.\textsuperscript{22} For example, the arrival of Margaret of Wessex at the Scottish court in the entourage of her hunted brother, Edgar Ætheling, and her subsequent marriage to Malcolm III in c.1070, is presented by Buchanan as a noble act of defiance on the part of the Scots to the cruelty of the French-Norman usurpers, whose conquest of England he saw as ‘barbaric.’\textsuperscript{23} If that passage is indicative of his nationalism, his treatment of David I’s reign displays Buchanan’s Protestant disdain for the hierarchy of the Catholic Church. He provides a significant amount of material on David’s monastic foundations, but states that despite the praise which should be given to the king for his various accomplishments, David’s enrichment of the monasteries not only greatly impoverished the Scottish Crown in succeeding generations, but was also responsible for the degeneration of monastic learning and piety in Scotland.\textsuperscript{24} While Buchanan’s personal biases limit the usefulness of his work as a piece of proper historical literature, the link which the \textit{History} makes between the Canmore dynasty’s cultural associations with the Anglo-Norman world, and the resultant transformation of Scotland during their reigns, would prove to be a recurring theme in the succeeding historiography.

\textsuperscript{22} Alexander Broadie, \textit{The Scottish Enlightenment: The Historical Age of the Historical Nation}, (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2001), 43
\textsuperscript{23} Buchanan, 338-340
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, 351-352
Scotland at the Globe Theatre: Jacobean Britain

Between the Scottish Reformation and Enlightenment, almost nothing was written about Canmore Scotland. The only piece of relevant literature produced was the 1611 play Macbeth, by William Shakespeare. However, in its contemporary form it was not meant to be read by scholars and gentleman of leisure. Instead, it was intended to be performed on stage by actors. The Warwickshire wordsmith undoubtedly played fast and loose with historical facts at times, but there is evidence that Shakespeare did possess a copy of Buchanan’s History of Scotland.\(^{25}\) Certainly, there are parallels that can be drawn between Buchanan’s interest in a psychological interpretation of history and Shakespeare’s portrayal of MacBeth’s personal struggle with his murder of King Duncan I.\(^{26}\) However, historical accuracy was not the dominate factor in the composition of Macbeth. Instead, it was the political agenda of King James VI & I which shaped the contents. It is hard to imagine Shakespeare not anticipating that James would take a keen interest in Macbeth as a piece of literature. The king was himself a widely-published author, with over seventy separate editions of his various works circulating by 1640.\(^ {27}\) But more than that, King James had a political agenda. His main objective was to promote the idea of a union of his two kingdoms of England and Scotland to form a united kingdom of Britain. Until that was achieved, he and his Stuart dynasty were the only links holding the two realms together, being as it was

\(^{25}\) Henry N. Paul, The Royal Play of Macbeth: When, why, and how it was written by Shakespeare, (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), 204

\(^{26}\) Paul, 214-5

\(^{27}\) Neil Rhodes, “Wrapped in the strong arms of Union: Shakespeare and King James.” In Shakespeare and Scotland, eds. Willy Maley and Andrew Murray, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 38
no more than a personal union, and therefore embodied by James personally.\textsuperscript{28} The portrayal of Macbeth as a negatively introspective and haunted Moravian usurper, in contrast to the rightful claimants, Duncan I and Malcolm III, certainly served James’ political agenda, legitimating his rule as it did, given the Stuarts descent from the House of Canmore.

After \textit{Macbeth}, Scottish medieval historical writing experienced a period of marked inactivity. The scarcity of production can be best explained by considering the broader political environment of the time. Edward Cowan has suggested that the dearth of historical literature in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century was due to the instability stemming from the Civil War, particularly the campaigns of Montrose.\textsuperscript{29} It is certainly easy to accept that between 1639 and the restoration in 1660 little was accomplished in scholarship on medieval Scotland. It is equally understandable if not much else was achieved following the removal of James VII & II in the ‘Glorious Revolution’ of 1688. Nor likewise during the Argyll and Monmouth rebellions which preceded it. Similarly, the Highland rising of 1715 and Prince Charles’ invasion in 1745, both in the cause of a Stuart restoration, would have provided Scotland’s intellectuals with little time to ponder the events of centuries past. Indeed, as is discussed below, many of the leading lights of the Scottish Enlightenment were caught up in the strife, and were only able to put pen to paper after the Jacobite cause lay in tatters following Battle of Culloden.

\textsuperscript{28} Rhodes, 37-8
A Time Lost Amid Progress: The Enlightenment

While the writers of the early modern era might be legitimately criticized for lacking objectivity, at least they had treated the Canmore period as a relevant and important phase in Scottish history. The same cannot be said for the historians who wrote during the Enlightenment. In their minds they were living in a time of unmatched technological innovation, intellectual freedom, and prosperity. The thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment saw their society as the pinnacle of progress, and all previous periods in history as characteristically immature and unsophisticated. William Robertson and David Hume were both scholars who epitomized the Enlightenment’s inattention to medieval Scotland, and yet also bequeathed enduring theories to the historiography of the period.

William Robertson was a Presbyterian churchman who, while serving as minister of Greyfriars in Edinburgh, opposed the Jacobites during the rising of 1745. He later became principal of the University of Edinburgh, and served as personal chaplain to George III and as Historiographer Royal. In 1759 Robertson published *A History of Scotland*, in which he asserted that a period in history was worth consideration if it was one of progress in the laws and manners of a nation. It is therefore indicative of the low esteem in which Robertson held the medieval era in Scotland, therefore, that in his *History* he recommends that scholars dismiss the period as barbaric and abandoned its study. For Robertson, it was the great power of the Scottish nobility in relation to a weak sovereign that made the Middle Ages un-

---

30 Cowan, 13-14
31 William Robertson, *The History of Scotland*, (New York: Derby and Jackson, 1856)
32 Robertson, 201
33 Ibid, 203
The common people of medieval Scotland, in his view, could not move towards the liberty that was being enjoyed by intellectual elites in Robertson’s own Enlightenment-era Edinburgh, until the independent power of the nobility had been eliminated. As this was not achieved until the reign of James VI, who was able to use English resources against the Scottish magnates following the personal union in 1603, the medieval period, in Robertson’s opinion, is best left unstudied. But, even though Robertson is dismissive of the Middle Ages, his work introduced into historiography the idea of a weak Scottish crown, and the importance of controlling the kingdoms’ chief magnates.

The second Enlightenment historian to be considered here is David Hume. Although best known today for his philosophical work, in 1763 he published the multi-volume *History of England to the Revolution of 1688*. In it Hume is even more dismissive of medieval Scotland than was Robertson. He considers Scotland to have had no real history before the Wars of Independence. Indeed, he barely conceals his disappointment at the English failure to conquer the Scotland. Hume’s negative opinion of the earlier medieval period can be explained by the same philosophy of progress that guided Robertson’s work. However, whereas the minister took the time to propose the existence of a powerful and repressive nobility as the obstruction to development, Hume felt it laughable that “a nation

---

34 Ibid, 405-7  
37 Hume, 83-84  
38 Ibid, 87-88
so rude and unpolished should be possessed of any history."\(^{39}\) Such a dismissive tone towards the study of medieval Scotland was to be reversed, however, by the antiquarian movement of Victorian Britain.

**Antiquarian Ethnographers: The 19\(^{th}\) Century**

Thanks to the Victorian antiquarians, Scottish historiography in the 19\(^{th}\) century moved beyond the bully-pulpit nationalism of the Reformation era and ended the neglect of the Enlightenment. However, an obsessive concern with ethnicity limits the reliability of the work of this period. In a recent study, Matthew Hammond has identified the driving force behind the ethnic focus of nineteenth-century historical scholarship. While he notes that this was an era which saw the emergence of history as an academic discipline throughout Europe, an emergence which was bound up with the development of nationalism, Hammond asserts that in Scotland the concern was not with the development of nationalist feeling, but rather with determining the racial origin of the Scots.\(^{40}\) This ethnic identification of the Scottish people was important to scholars of the 19\(^{th}\) century as they believed that a people’s history was as much of a determinant of their race as any anthropological category, such as physical characteristics, language, or culture.\(^{41}\) In an era concerned with industrial advancement and British imperial power, the overriding agreement among the Victorians was that their

---

\(^{39}\) Ibid, 113

\(^{40}\) Matthew H. Hammond, “Ethnicity and the Writing of Medieval Scottish History,” *Scottish Historical Review* 85:1 (April 2006), 2-4

\(^{41}\) Hammond, 4
Scotland was not Celtic, but rather Teutonic.\textsuperscript{42} However, whether the Scots were Teutonic by origin or design was open to debate.

For some, such as the racial theorist John Pinkerton, the Scots were Germanic in origin. He felt that the Scots must be seen as an industrious and rational people and therefore of the Teutonic race, rather than Celtic. He believed the Celts to be an idle people who had become overly romanticized.\textsuperscript{43} In order to achieve this end, Pinkerton identified the Scots of Dáil Riata as migratory Goths, whose Teutonic natures were corrupted by the indolent culture of Celtic Ireland, well before they arrived on Scottish shores.\textsuperscript{44} Thanks to the Anglo-Norman influx during the reigns of the Canmore kings, however, Pinkerton believed that the Scots were re-introduced to their Teutonic heritage, and began development into a civilised nation once more.\textsuperscript{45}

In contrast, the antiquarian W.F. Skene asserted in his classic \textit{Celtic Scotland: A History of Ancient Alba} that Scotland was in fact a fully Celtic kingdom, inhabited by ethnic Gaels at the dawn of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{46} Skene saw Malcolm III as a Gaelic warlord, “the last of his race,”\textsuperscript{47} whereas the reign of his son David harkened in a new era of Norman (or Teutonic) rule based on feudalism.\textsuperscript{48} By identifying every military threat faced by the Canmores as Celtic backlashes towards what he saw as David’s feudalisation of the entirety of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid, 4, 6
\item Ibid, 3-4
\item John Pinkerton, \textit{Enquiry into the History of Scotland}, v.2, (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne,1814), 140
\item John Pinkerton, \textit{Enquiry into the History of Scotland}, v.1, (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne,1814), 17
\item Skene, 1886, 384
\item Ibid, 459-460
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Scotland, Skene argues for a general Gaelic resistance to an unwanted Teutonic transformation. Therefore, both Skene and Pinkerton, despite their disagreements as to the ethnic origins of the Scots, created through their debate a racial demarcation in Scottish medieval history that has endured in the field until the present.

**Scoto-Norman Studies: The 20th Century**

At the dawn of the 20th century, scholarship on Davidian Scotland began a transition towards more rigorous academic study, which was not as affected by ethnic, nationalist, or religious particularities as it had been hitherto. Published in 1900, Hume Brown’s *A History of Scotland* took a more pragmatic view of David’s feudalisation. He did not focus on cultural affinity, religious devotion, or ethnic biases as motivations, but rather insisted that David required a force of Norman knights and a following of loyal feudal barons to secure his control over the realm of *Scotia*, that is the lands north of the principality of Cumbria, which had been ruled by his late brother, Alexander I (r. 1107-1124), in co-operation with the Mormaers. Similarly, Brown dismisses portrayals of David as a saintly king, such as in the case of Aelred’s *Lament*. Instead, while acknowledging that the king had significantly transformed the government of Scotland, he insists that David’s “conduct was purely selfish” and that his tactics could occasionally “place him precisely on the level of the average ruler of

---

49 William F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland: A History of Ancient Alba, v.3 Land and People*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1890), 63-64, for Skene this feudalisation extended even into the ancient provincial earldoms in David’s reign.

50 Skene, 1886, 460

51 Hammond, 7


53 Brown, 70, 73-4
his time.” Furthermore, Brown sees David as an autocrat, who sidelined the earls, seldom held councils, and used his baronage as rubber-stamp for decisions he had already made. Moreover, Brown argues that David undertook feudal settlement north of Forth, something that would be rejected by some later scholars, such as Geoffrey Barrow, who had more thorough charter scholarship at their disposal.

Building on Brown’s shift towards objective scholarship, the middle part of the century saw the emergence of Scoto-Norman studies with R.L.G. Ritchie’s *The Normans in Scotland*, published in 1954. No longer could the feudalisation of the Scottish kingdom be considered separate from the rise of the Norman world as a whole. Ritchie’s intention was to tell the story of the development of Scotland as a ‘civilised country’ during the reign of King David I, whose tenure brought transformations akin to those which had occurred in Norman-era England, albeit without the Conquest. Importantly, Ritchie asserts that all of the kingdom’s territories were feudalised, and that by the end of the reign of David’s grandson, Malcolm IV (*d.* 1165), the Normans could not be distinguished from the Scottish people in the historical record. Therefore in Ritchie’s mind, the Davidian period is when Scottish medieval history becomes a part of the wider narrative of the Norman transformation of Britain. In other words, Scotland became part of the High-Medieval Norman cultural milieu.

---

54 Ibid, 87
55 Ibid, 88
56 Ibid, 89
57 See below for a discussion of Barrow’s scholarship.
59 Ritchie, v-vi
60 Ibid, xv
It is that milieu which Ritchie credits for the acculturation of the younger sons of Malcolm III and St. Margaret of Wessex, and so for the feudalisation of Scotland as well. Ritchie lauds the refinements in courtly manners, gastronomy, clothing and ceremony which he sees as being part of a French *elegantia* which won over the future Canmore monarchs Edgar, Alexander, and David.\(^61\) For David, who spent more time in Norman England than any of his brothers as a result of his holding the earldom of Huntington, the Norman influence was more than simply cultural. Ritchie emphasises that David became familiar with their techniques of land management and governance as an Earl and member of the court of his brother-in-law, Henry I.\(^62\) According to Ritchie, there was no other impetus for the feudalisation of Scotland than this natural cultural affinity and political familiarity.\(^63\) There were, in his opinion, no military threats to David’s rule that would have necessitated the settlement of Norman knights within the Scottish realm.\(^64\) Rather, like the Victorian Teutonic advocates, Ritchie surmises that as David desired to introduce institutions to improve Scotland, and he naturally utilized the superior practices he observed in the government in Norman England.\(^65\)

While Ritchie’s emphasis on the study of Canmore Scotland as part of a greater Norman transformation of Britain set the tone for much of the succeeding scholarship, his trumpeting of the virtues of French culture and institutions would recede into the background. In 1975, as part of the first Edinburgh History of Scotland series, A.A.M.

---

\(^61\) Ibid, 134-135  
\(^62\) Ibid, 142-143  
\(^63\) Ibid,179  
\(^64\) Ibid, vi  
\(^65\) Ibid, 179
Duncan put forth his interpretation in *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*. Unlike Ritchie, Duncan aims to cover a much longer period, essentially prehistory to 1286, and so only devotes one chapter to David’s reign. Even though it is a survey text, Duncan’s work is important for two reasons. First, Duncan directly attacks Ritchie’s assertion that David feudalised the entirety of Scotland during his reign. He points out that the grants made by David were for the most part quite small, and the largest, namely Annandale to Robert de Brus, Lauderdale to Hugh de Moreville, and Renfrewshire to Walter Fitz Alan (the Steward), were in areas which should be considered peripheral to the core of Scotia. Furthermore, Duncan insists that David’s feudalisation was successful exactly because he did not import his foreign vassals into core regions of the kingdom, thus avoiding armed confrontation with his Gaelic magnates.

Second, Duncan views the importance of the Honour of Huntington rather differently than does Ritchie. Whereas Ritchie regards David’s tenure as earl as a period which bequeathed onto the future Scots king an admiration of Norman institutions, Duncan sees the acquisition by the Canmores of a portion of the former rights of Earl Waltheof, through David’s marriage to his daughter Maude, as creating an impetus for the maintenance by the Scottish crown of a force of mounted knights. Such a contingent would be utilized time and again, as successive Canmore rulers fought to assert their claim to

---

67 Duncan, 135
68 Ibid, 135-136
69 Ibid, 142
Waltheof’s earldom of Northumbria. It is in Duncan’s work, therefore, that we see the emergence of the notion that the Scottish crown had far reaching territorial ambitions in this period, which required feudal institutions and levies to realise.

Whilst Ritchie and Duncan form fundamental parts of the debate about feudalisation, scholarship during the past half-century has been dominated by the work of Geoffrey Barrow. In common with Ritchie’s conception of the Canmore-era as part of the broader Normanization of Britain, Barrow undertook an intensive study of the surviving documentary material relating to the feudal settlements, and in so doing developed what has become known as the ‘Barrovian Thesis.’ In this interpretation, Barrow asserts that the Davidians reformed Scotland by undertaking the importation of feudalism in its completed form, and introduced knights from the Anglo-Norman world into the kingdom as feudal tenants to facilitate the process. Importantly, Barrow also argued for the continuity of native structures alongside this Normanization. As Richard Oram has pointed out, however, the image of the Davidian Revolution as a total transformation of Scotland has become the all-encompassing conception of Barrow in both academia and popular history, largely due to
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his tendency to deal almost exclusively with feudal documentary evidence, rather than to engage in a discussion of evidence indicative of Gaelic continuity.73

At the very outset of his career, Barrow was asking important questions about the extent of feudalisation in Davidian Scotland. In an article published in 1953, he raised the issue of when feudal institutions were set up north of the Forth.74 Barrow also wondered about the place occupied by the Gaelic magnates in what he felt was a social revolution in the Scottish kingdom.75 In his quest for answers to these questions, Barrow undertook an investigation of royal charters related to the feudal holdings of the Earls of Fife. He found that feudalism had affected crown-magnate relations north of the Forth, in that here was the most senior of the Gaelic Mormaers, Fife, holding land for knight fee from the king.76 However, Barrow also determined that Fife was a special case, as it was held by a family with close connections to the Canmores, and therefore likely experienced an early exposure to Norman culture as a result of that contact.77 As early as 1953, then, Barrow had asserted that part of his argument which is now largely ignored: that whilst Normanization was ongoing in certain parts of David’s realm, native lordship structures and relationships were largely maintained within the core of Scotia itself.

Barrow’s interpretation of the feudalisation of Scotland has remained largely consistent over time. This work has been largely defined by the assertion that a completed
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form of feudalism was imported by the Davidian kings from the Anglo-Norman world, rather than developed within Scotland itself, and this theory has become known as the ‘Barrovian Thesis.’ Like Barrow’s argument for a territorially limited feudalisation, his ‘Thesis’ was present in his early scholarship. This interpretation can be seen in Barrow’s 1973 *Kingdom of the Scots*,\(^{78}\) which reproduces an article he published originally in 1956.\(^ {79}\) In this piece, Barrow dismisses the notion that feudalism had entered Scotland prior to the reign of David I, based on evidence that Duncan II (r.1094) was only accepted as king on the basis that he not introduce Anglo-Normans into Scotland, and that Alexander I (r. 1107-1124) was overawed by the then Earl David’s knightly retinue in their dispute over the attachment of certain lands to the principality of Cumbria in 1113.\(^ {80}\) Instead, Barrow insists that was David I who was responsible for the scale and effect of Scottish feudalisation.\(^ {81}\) It is here that he gives us the ‘Barrovian Thesis.’ Barrow argues that David, having been brought up at the Norman court in England, and himself thoroughly familiar with feudal institutions and practices due to his tenure as earl of Huntington, was the king who reproduced Anglo-Norman feudalism in its completed form into Scotland.\(^ {82}\) Barrow does caution, however, that the extent of David’s transformation must not be exaggerated, as he sees little evidence for the feudal settlement beyond the Forth-Clyde line.\(^ {83}\)

\(^{78}\) G.W.S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from the eleventh to the fourteenth century*, (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1973)

\(^{79}\) Barrow, 1973, vii

\(^{80}\) Ibid, 274-5

\(^{81}\) Ibid, 280-1

\(^{82}\) Ibid, 282

\(^{83}\) Ibid
The twin themes of a completed form of Norman feudalism being imported into the southern regions of the Davidian realm, and continuity in the Gaelic heartland of Scotia were likewise asserted by Barrow in *Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History*, published in 1980. In this volume, Barrow proved the contribution of Anglo-Norman society to the governmental reform program of the Canmores, through an intensive investigation, in many cases for the first time, of charters, chronicles, parish registers, linguistic evidence, and material culture from the period. Although the work mainly offers a deep genealogical study of the Anglo-Norman, Breton, and Flemish noble families who settled in Scotland during the period, and generally Barrow repeats his previous assertions, he does make a major addition. In the course of studying the familial histories of the feudal immigrants, Barrow determined that it was primarily younger sons who chose to undertake settlement in Davidian Scotland. He gives as an example the case of the future royal dynasty of the Stewarts. The two elder sons of Alan, a Breton knight in the service of Henry I, inherited their father’s lands in Normandy and England respectively, while his youngest son Walter, opted to enter David’s service in Scotland, and secured the position of hereditary royal steward, and the grant of the feudal lordship of Renfrewshire. Barrow argues that Walter would never have come north and taken part in the administration of the Scottish kingdom, had there not been feudal land tenure available to compensate him for taking the risk. Barrow, therefore, sees the feudalisation as creating an incentive for vassal recruitment. More than that, he argues that
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because David could not risk removing native lords to create these feudal tenures, he concentrated them in the southern regions which were outside of Scotia proper. 89 Hence, Barrow’s continued insistence that feudalisation did not reach into the northern Gaelic heartland.

Barrow’s Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000-1306, 90 offers a tight presentation of the various elements of the Barrovian Thesis, which as discussed, had been expounded to this point only in the form of articles, charter collections, and genealogical studies. 91 Importantly, as this is a very recent volume, it shows the longevity and consistency of Barrow’s interpretation. In Kingship and Unity, he again emphasises that feudalism was neither developed from scratch, as in Normandy, nor imposed by conquest atop proto-feudal structures, as in England after 1066. Instead, Barrow insists that the Davidian kings were able to make use of a feudal tradition that had reached a high level of refinement in the Anglo-Norman world. 92 He again argues that this feudalisation was carried out peacefully, largely because the fiefs created to attract the foreign vassals who were to staff the reformed kingdom were carved out of royal demesne, or newly acquired territories, and not from within the Gaelic heartland of Scotia. 93 Barrow does extend his discussion further in time in this instance, and also credits Malcolm IV (r. 1153-1165) and William I (r. 1165-1215) for
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the continuation of their grandfather’s policies, and for completing the work of the Davidian Revolution.\textsuperscript{94} Even more than David I, Barrow argues, these two kings sought to build up the knightly image of the Scottish crown on the international stage.\textsuperscript{95} Therefore Barrow sees the transformation as having extended beyond David’s reign, and lasting until the death of William, almost a century later.

\textbf{New Kids on the Block: The Late 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} Centuries}

Emblematic of a recent increase in scholarly focus on Davidian Scotland is the publication, in 2004, of the first ever biography of David I, entitled \textit{David I: The King who made Scotland}, written by Richard Oram of the University of Stirling.\textsuperscript{96} At the outset, Oram cautions readers that his biography is not intended to be a treatise on the nature of crown-magnate relations during David’s reign, but rather the story of the man himself.\textsuperscript{97} Nevertheless, as the majority of the historiography since the late medieval period has focused upon David’s personality as a force of change in and of itself, Oram’s study should be considered highly relevant.

Oram sees David’s Anglo-Norman acculturation during his youth as the basis for both the reforms of the Davidian Revolution,\textsuperscript{98} and also as the explanation for why the feudal settlement was ultimately limited to the peripheral territories of the south, represented by his principality of Cumbria.\textsuperscript{99} Oram asserts that David was seen as a foreign Anglo-
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Norman lord by his Scottish subjects, which resulted in his finding little support among the Gaelic leadership after his ascension in 1124. Because of this, his rule was essentially limited to his former principality, as well as the royal demesne, and therefore David could only continue his infiefments in these areas. In fact, Oram considers David to have been “king of Scots in little more than name.” To Oram’s mind, therefore, David’s feudalisation was not an attempt to impose control in peripheral areas, but rather in territories that for him were his kingdom. He lacked the political support to implement land reforms within the Gaelic heartland.

In contrast, Canadian medievalist R. Andrew McDonald argues that the Davidian feudalisation was purposely focused on eliminating military threats against the Scottish throne. While researching for an intended book on the Canmore dynasty, McDonald continually encountered evidence of resistance to the descendents of Malcolm and Margaret, rather than proof which legitimated the orthodox view that the Scottish High Middle Ages were a time of stability and progress. The resultant shift in his project’s topic produced a work which is the first to consider the entire Canmore period from the perspective of the dynasty’s enemies. In Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings 1058-1266, published in 2003, McDonald argues that the impetus for the feudalisation of the Davidian-era was the military threat posed by royal claimants, and the semi-independent rulers just outside the Scottish realm who felt threatened by the expansionist Canmore
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kings. He blames the hitherto limited treatment of threats to the Davidians in the historiography on biased chronicle sources, which have tended to be accepted by historians without critique. McDonald asserts that medieval writers such as Aelred of Rievaulx trumpeted the qualities of the winners, whilst degrading the losers. Therefore the rebels’ historical agency has been lost, and a proper understanding of the origins of Scottish feudalisation along with it.

The work of another Canadian medievalist, Cynthia Neville, is based on a thorough study of the surviving charters and other documents of the period. However, unlike Barrow who tends to concentrate on the products of the royal chancery, Neville focuses her attentions on those left behind by the nobility of medieval Scotland. Such a methodology has allowed Neville to trace the gradual changes in the legal processes and aristocratic society of the Celtic core of the kingdom, and more importantly, the extent to which feudalisation affected crown-magnate relations there. In her 2010 *Land, Law and People in Medieval Scotland*, Neville notes that there is general agreement among scholars that the reign of King David I began an important period of transformation in Scotland, but that it was by no means complete by the end of the Davidian-era. The process would lead eventually to the hybrid Gallo-Norman kingdom, but she insists that this would not be achieved until the
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reign of Robert III (r.1390-1406).\textsuperscript{109} While Neville argues that the Davidian Revolution was not characterized by a Celtic versus Norman paradigm, and that interactions did occur between the Gaelic magnates and the foreign vassals, she cautions against the idea that there was an immediate accommodation between the two groups which produced a hybrid society in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century. Rather, Neville argues that there was instead continuity in the relationship between the king and the Mormaers of Scotia.\textsuperscript{110} Furthermore, the Gaelic lords of Scotland had only partially accepted the notion of written forms of allegiance by 1150; they were quite willing to form agreements in writing, but were not interested in using the wax seals which typified the agreements of later centuries, preferring to continue using kin-ties and oaths as guarantees.\textsuperscript{111} Neville reached a similar conclusion in her 2005 *Native Lordship in Medieval Scotland*, asserting that even within the earldoms themselves, the magnates maintained control based on native traditions, even whilst recruiting some feudal vassals in certain areas; these provinces were, therefore, smaller facsimiles of the kingdom itself.\textsuperscript{112}

**Conclusion**

As the preceding historiographical survey as shown, there is one point on which all scholars agree: that a transformation of Scottish society did occur during the reign of David I and his immediate successors. However, there has been a marked disagreement as to the nature and extent of, as well as the impetus behind, the feudalisation element of the
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Davidian Revolution. While the argument that follows is in agreement with those scholars who see a barrier between feudalised regions and a Gaelic core, it differs as to why the feudal settlement was patterned thus. The divergence can be best explained by exploring the motivations of the Davidian kings. This thesis intends to demonstrate that David and his grandsons undertook the feudalisation of Scotland for two purposes. First, they sought to use feudal mechanisms to impose royal authority on areas conquered within the last century, but where the writ of the king of Scots did not yet run without difficulty and opposition.

Second, the Davidsians intended to use those same feudal mechanisms to affect their conquest of the northern English counties, and also to provide a platform for the endowment of the Church, which they hoped would raise the profile of the Canmore dynasty and, alongside the effective use of feudal language and symbolism in diplomatic encounters, help to side-step claims of English overlordship. As such, the recurring theme throughout the discussion will be an emphasis upon revealing the imperialistic nature of the Scottish Crown in this period, rather than trumpeting the piety and modernizing achievements of the Davidian kings, as has been done by the majority of the scholars examined in this chapter. It is hoped that the thesis which follows contributes to a new understanding of the Davidsians as aggressive rulers who sought to forge for themselves a larger and stronger kingdom, able to dominate the north of Britain.

The second chapter will begin with an identification of both the core kingdom of *Alba* and those territories that found themselves under the power of the Scottish kings, but were outside the traditional realm of Gallo-Pictish lineage. Such an exercise is critical for the
argument being presented, as hindsight can blind us to the fact that the eventual
incorporation of these peripheral regions into Scotland was anything but inevitable at the
start of the 12th century. The remainder of the chapter will consist of an examination of
evidence indicating the existence of differing governance structures in these two areas.
Within the core the focus will be on proving the continuity of traditional lordship structures
and Crown-magnate relationships. Conversely, the establishment by the Davidian kings of a
new feudal governance regime in the periphery will be traced. The highly legalized nature of
royal power in the periphery, and the central part played by written charters and castles in
the empowerment of the king’s feudal vassals, will be discussed as mechanisms intended to
create, through artificial means, the dependable Gaelic lordship that existed in the core.

The third chapter will place the feudalisation firmly into the context of the
competition between the kingdoms of Scotland and England during the medieval period.
The Davidian feudal settlement will be shown not to have been the result of a benign
reformist agenda, as claimed by some of the scholars surveyed above, but rather to have
eremanated from the desire on the part of these highly ambitious Scottish rulers to aggressively
contest English hegemony, and impose their authority over most of North Britain. The
chapter will begin by illustrating the two points of contention between England and
Scotland during this period: 1) control of the northern counties, and 2) English claims of
overlordship. The discussion will then proceed to describe how the Davidians employed
feudal mechanisms, practices, and language in both the secular and ecclesiastical spheres to
contest the English Crown on both of these issues. This will include an analytical narrative of
King David’s involvement in the Anarchy, which illustrates the use of feudal lordship structures and language in his conquest of the English North. The same fluency in feudal practice will then be demonstrated to have allowed his grandsons, Malcolm IV and William I, to maintain an ambiguous relationship with the English Crown during the Angevin Supremacy. Finally, the use of land grant charters in ecclesiastical patronage will be illustrated as a strategy intended to invalidate English claims of overlordship, through the fostering of good relations with the Papacy.

Finally, a brief conclusion will summarize the form and function of the 12th century feudalisation program as it has been described in chapters two and three, and will link the nature of the Davidian Revolution to the imperialistic objectives which this thesis will claim drove the policies of Kings David I, Malcolm IV, and William I.
Chapter 2 – A Realm of Two Kingdoms

Introduction

In this chapter the nature and extent of the Davidian feudal settlement will be examined. It will be shown that this feudalisation was not an all-encompassing political reform, but rather the limited employment of new mechanisms in the imposition of Scottish rule upon territories not then fully under royal control. However, in the lands which had been ruled by the kings of Scots since the 9th and 10th centuries, very little changed as a result of the settlement, and relations between the Crown and the provincial Mormaers largely retained their traditional structure. To prove this argument, the chapter will begin by defining what is meant by term ‘core,’ representing the kingdom of Alba, and ‘periphery,’ denoting the territories to the north, west, and south of the core which found themselves being drawn into the orbit of the Scottish kings in the 11th and 12th centuries. Having developed an appreciation for these two very different areas, the divergent methods of governance used in each by the Davidian kings will be examined. To illustrate the lack of change in the core, the similarities between lordship in the heartland of the kingdom before and during the reigns of David and his grandsons will be highlighted. Additionally, the minor charter dispositions which did occur in the core will be shown as provisions for the maintenance of the royal household, donations to the Church, and in the special case of the earldom of Fife, a single instance of a provincial enfeoffment explained by a close relationship with the royal family. Conversely, the feudalisation of the periphery will be shown as a determined policy on the part of the Davidian kings to create new lordship structures.
intended to cement royal control. The feudal settlement of foreign nobles into large lordships in three regions, Strathclyde, South Lothian, and the marches of Galloway, will be described as an attempt to re-produce in these outlying regions the relationship which existed between the king and his Mormaers in the core. Finally, the chapter will close with a section contrasting the legalized and highly visible form of government in the peripheral territories with their traditional counterparts in the core. This will emphasise the importance of charters and castles in the legitimation of feudal lordship.

**Defining Scotland: The Core and Periphery**

As the argument of this thesis centres upon establishing that the feudal settlement was limited to the peripheral zones of the Scottish realm and did not apply to the traditional core of the kingdom, it is necessary to begin by briefly defining which territories fall into these two categories. To do so it would be helpful to dispense with the modern label of ‘Scotland’ altogether. In the medieval period, the two terms available to contemporaries were the Gaelic *Alba* and the Latin *Scotia*. Unfortunately, the logical application of either these terms in the creation of an English-language territorial designation results in ‘Scotland.’ One way around this dilemma, which began to be employed from the early 13th century, was to conceptualize both a ‘lesser Scotland’ and a ‘greater Scotland.’ The former term was used to indicate the lands to which the terms *Alba* and *Scotia* were usually applied; that is all territory roughly between the Mounth in the north, the line connecting the head of the River
Spey to the boundaries of the Lennox in the west and the Firth of Forth in the south.¹ This was the realm of 9th century Gallo-Pictish heritage, not much changed from that ruled over by Kenneth I (r. 843-858). Originally termed Pictland, or Pictavia, a coup in 878 of Gaelic retainers from within the Pictish king’s court led to the emergence of the term Alba to denote the kingdom which they had seized.² When the push into Lothian as far as Edinburgh by King Indulf (r. 954-962) is taken into account, we then have a solid definition of what is meant by the term ‘core.’³ Thus, the ‘Gaelic heartland’ of the kingdom consisted of such territories as Fife, Strathearn, and Lothian north of the Tweed. These formed the historic inheritable lands of the kings of Scots by the 11th century. The Davidians could rely upon the loyalty of the core, and therefore only minor settlements of individual knights and grants to religious houses were undertaken there.⁴

The latter term, ‘greater Scotland,’ was an imprecise label supposedly denoting all of mainland Britain north of the Forth-Clyde line.⁵ For the purpose of defining the ‘periphery,’ however, such a label is problematic as the authority of the king of Scots would have been initially imperceptible on the Irish Sea coast, and in northern regions such as Caithness.⁶

² CKA, 154-5; AU, 878.2; Alex Woolf, From Pictland to Alba 789-1070, The New Edinburgh History of Scotland v. 2, ed. Roger A Mason, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 341
³ CKA, 159; Hector I MacQueen and Peter G.B McNeill, eds, Atlas of Scottish History to 1707, (Edinburgh: The Scottish Medievalists and Department of Geography, the University of Edinburgh, 1996), 74-5. This gain of north Lothian was in addition to the seizure of Lennox from the kingdom of Strathclyde sometime before the coup, likely in the reign of Constantine I (r. 862-877), CS, 872.
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These were lands over which the Canmores did not initially claim overlordship. Indeed, it was the post-Davidian kings, Alexander II (r. 1214-1249) and Alexander III (r. 1249-1286), who would undertake their conquest before pushing further west into the Isles. Furthermore, it ignores earlier gains south of the Forth which have been included in the definition of the ‘core’ above. Here again it may be helpful to consider contemporary terminology. An 1161 enfeoffment charter, issued at Roxburgh by the chancery of Malcolm IV, used the term “land of the king of the kingdom of Scotland.” Geoffrey Barrow has argued that this label was applied by the royal clerks to encompass all lands ruled by the king of the Scots, whether by virtue of being within Alba, or by having fallen at some point within the orbit of the Scottish monarch. The ‘periphery,’ therefore, are those lands outside Alba which the clerks of the chancery were designating as being within ‘the land of the king.’ Such territories included Moray, the former kingdom of Strathclyde, and Lothian south of the Tweed. These were a collection of lands to the north, west, and south of the core that would be brought under strict Scottish rule by the Davidian kings through their feudalisation. This imposition of royal lordship was cemented by the establishment of castles and the settlement of loyal knights in the periphery.

**Continuity in the Core: The Kingdom of Alba**

In this section the continuity of traditional lordship structures and practises within the core during the Davidian period will be demonstrated. The nature of royal lordship and
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the strong working relationship between the king and his provincial rulers before the 12th century will be examined, and evidence indicative of the maintenance of these structures and practices in the reigns of David and his grandsons will be highlighted, as will the continued enjoyment by the Mormaers of exclusive legal jurisdiction within their lands. Finally, attention will be paid to the small number of enfeoffments which did occur in the core during the period. It will be shown that these were limited to settlements of household knights and officials, as well as grants to monastic houses. As part of this discussion, the enfeoffment of a ‘core’ territory, the earldom of Fife, will be shown to be a special case of close familial relations and cultural affinity between the royal house and the mac Duib kinship which ruled the province.

In order to appreciate the continuance of traditional lordship in the core during the Davidian period, it is necessary to examine the governance structures which were in place before the ascension of David as king of Scots, and also to highlight the retention of such structures after 1124. In the Gaelic kingdom of Alba, royal lordship was characterized by a system of itinerancy which was also common to the Anglo-Saxon period in England, and also to the various principalities of contemporary Wales. Royal governance in medieval Scotland was therefore exercised by a travelling monarch, who held court from a series of power-centres throughout the kingdom, dispensing justice, bestowing patronage, and feasting with the local leadership.10 These sites served as seats of government for the surrounding province or district, which were in turn divided into individual shires. The
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oversight of the shires themselves, varying greatly in size, was a responsibility granted to a hereditary royal official known as a thane. These men were responsible for the collection of all royal taxes, paid in kind, which they then submitted to the king when his progress brought the royal court into their district. The title of thane emerged from the Old English *thegnian*, and while it was certainly within the former Northumbrian region of Lothian that the greatest concentration of these officials was to be found, thanes also served the Gaelic provincial Mormaers north of the Forth as well.\(^{11}\) Here, the thanes also managed shires, which were largely of ancient Pictish lineage, and could have been considered as petty sub-kingdoms in the post-classical period.\(^{12}\)

There is little evidence that the Davidian kings did anything to replace, or even to limit, the ancient office of the thane. Nor is there any indication that they desired to do so. Indeed, as late as the reign of King Edgar (r. 1097-1107), the Canmore dynasty was still creating new thanages within the royal demesne. At Ednam, a certain Thor was established by Edgar as thane, and granted lands there which were referred to as waste. Thor seems to have been expected to establish a community at Ednam which included the foundation of a church.\(^{13}\) Over time, thanes were given increased responsibilities. In the reign of Malcolm IV (r. 1153-1165) thanes were employed to enforce royal legislation within their districts, including ensuring that those failing to pay the tithe to the Church were punished by
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forfeiture. Likewise, King William I (r. 1165-1214) empowered thanes to enforce the judgements and directives of the royal Justiciars.

As with the office of thane, the existing shire structure was not superseded, as can be seen in King David’s 1128 grant of protection regarding lands in the “shire of Edinburgh,” which were held by Holyrood Abbey. Likewise, the governmental unit of the shire appears in the charters produced in Malcolm’s chancery. In an 1163 grant to Bishop Matthew of Aberdeen the term ‘schiram,’ or shire, precedes references to a handful of such districts including Tullynessle, Rayne, and Davoit. Therefore, quite apart from undertaking a feudal governmental reform in the core, the structures of traditional royal lordship there, being the office of thane and the district-unit of the shire, were not abolished or circumscribed by the Davidian kings; indeed the thanes of Scotland were granted greater responsibilities as the period progressed.

Like the office of thane, the importance of the more exalted position of Mormaer, and the relationship between these great magnates and the Crown, remained undiminished during the Davidian period. It must be stated that the origin of this office is at present a matter of great debate among scholars of early medieval Scotland. For our purposes, however, the concern is not with the origins of this office, nor is it the connection between
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the ancient Gaelic lineages and the comital families of later centuries. Instead, of interest here
is the continuity of the central role played by these magnates in Scottish political life
throughout the Middle Ages, whatever their various genealogical backgrounds may have
been. In the pre-Davidian kingdom of Alba the Mormaers were clearly regarded as second
only to the king himself. Their standing in relation to the monarch can be observed in the
10th or 11th century legal tract *Leges inter Brettos et Scottos*, in which the *wergelds* of the
different levels of Alban society are listed. While the payment due for the killing of the king
is mandated at 1,000 *kine*, the compensation required upon the murder of a king’s son is
150 *kine*; which is exactly the same amount owing if the man killed is a Mormaer.19 No
other level of society shares this *wergeld*, the next compensational level being that of a thane,
whose death does indeed mandate a similar payment as that of a Mormaer’s son.20 In pre-
Davidian society, therefore, the office of Mormaer stood only one step away from the throne
and its holders were valued as much as princes of the royal house.

In Davidian Scotland, the Mormaers were likewise key participants in the political
life of the realm. As Richard Oram has argued, there are likely many parallels that can be
found between the duties of early and high medieval Mormaers.21 Only two of these will be
considered here; namely those of military leader and dispenser of justice. In the first
surviving reference to the office of Mormaer, these men are found as leaders on the
battlefield. The *Annals of Ulster* record that at the 918 Battle of Corbridge, which saw King

19 Woolf, 346
20 Ibid, 346, 348-9
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Constantine II (r. 900-943) defeat the Viking leader Ragnall, none of the Mormaers were killed during a flanking manoeuvre undertaken by the Norsemen.\footnote{AU, 918.4} During the reign of Malcolm III (r. 1058-1093), which saw multiple invasions of England carried out over the course of almost two and a half decades, the Mormaers were called upon constantly to summon and organize their provincial levies of bowmen and spearmen, which together formed the common army.\footnote{Neville, 2005, 13-14; Barrow, 1980, 161} The role of these Gaelic magnates as the greatest generals and logisticians in the kingdom did not change even when David I introduced the feudal levy into the Scottish military. Their continuing importance can be best observed in the person of Maol Íosa, Mormaer of Strathearn (\textit{fl.} 1138-1150). When King David summoned the common army for service in his English campaign of 1138, Maol responded by gathering the levies of Strathearn, and leading them during the Battle of the Standard.\footnote{Neville, 2005, 17} Beyond being a battalion commander, the Mormaer also took part in the council of war which preceded the contest. In his \textit{De bello Standardii}, the Cistercian abbot Aelred of Rievaulx notes that it was Maol who advised David to position Gaelic infantry in the vanguard.\footnote{Aelred, 258-9} The diplomatic importance of the Mormaer was certainly grasped by the English, as one of the hostages given to guarantee the peace following the battle was Maol’s own son.\footnote{Neville, 2005, 19}

The other role in which the Mormaers maintained their importance during the Davidian-era was in the administration of justice. Indeed, in this arena they are not only on an equal footing with the feudal baronage, but rather superior to them. And while Cynthia
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Neville has recently asserted that scholars must be careful not to be drawn into forming a narrative which juxtaposes fanciful ideas of ‘native barbarism’ and ‘European civility’ against each other, there was certainly a difference between the Gaelic nobility and the aristocratic immigrants in terms of their legal powers, and in this instance it is a judgement that finds in favour of the Mormaers.\textsuperscript{27} The Gaelic magnates had greater legal powers within their own territories because in Davidian Scotland the extent to which a magnate had jurisdiction over matters of law and justice in his lands was related to how much of his particular lord-Crown relationship was governed by a written enfeoffment charter.\textsuperscript{28} Since the Mormaers held their office not by virtue of feudal tenure, but by tradition, they were able to continue to administer justice free of royal oversight.\textsuperscript{29} The feudal baronage on the other hand required the express consent of the Crown in their enfeoffment charters to have legal jurisdiction in their lands.\textsuperscript{30} Even if granted, these powers were often strictly limited, even in the case of a very powerful feudal baron, such as Robert de Bruce. In the 1172 charter which conformed Bruce’s lordship of Annandale, King William I saved unto himself jurisdiction over a number of crimes including murder, arson, and grave theft.\textsuperscript{31} Moreover, the legal powers of the Mormaers were not restricted to their own provinces. For example, Gille Brigte of Strathearn (1171-1223) not only witnessed many charters alongside the feudal baronage during the reign of William,\textsuperscript{32} but also served as Justiciar of Scotia.\textsuperscript{33} Such was the dominance
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of the Gaelic nobility in the application of judgements that in a recent study on the development of Scots law, WDH Sellar failed to discern any introduction of Anglo-Norman legal principles during the Davidian period, but instead argues for a seamless application of the common law of the realm.\textsuperscript{34} The height of the feudal-era in Scotland therefore saw the continuity of the Mormaers’ importance in the legal affairs of the kingdom, and in the traditional administration of their provinces.

While the discussion thus far has proven that the core was characterized by continuity, there were in fact a small number of feudal settlements and land grants made in the core by the Davidian kings. However, not only were these of limited quantity, they were also undertaken for quite limited purposes: the provision of an income for members of the royal household, and as a means of patronizing the Church. Examples of the former include the grant by King David of two ploughgates at Newbattle in Lothian to his ironsmith Robert, and the grant of several manors in West Lothian to his chamberlain Herbert.\textsuperscript{35} Examples of the latter are the grants of several estates in Lothian to Durham Priory made by David in 1126, and his grant of Airth on the Forth River to Holyrood Abbey in 1147.\textsuperscript{36} None of these charters required the performance of service in the feudal levy, nor did they pertain to any areas of the kingdom over which the Canmores’ hold was tenuous, and therefore cannot be considered as having been intended for the strengthening of royal rule.
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On a much grander scale was the enfeoffment of the entire earldom of Fife, however, and this must be explained if the argument that the Crown did not seek to alter the traditional rights of the Mormaers to rule their provinces is to be sustained. Indeed, not only did Earl Duncan (fl. 1133-1154) hold his province by feudal charter, but he became the first Mormaer to enter into a fealty relationship for lands outside of his hereditary Gaelic regality, when he was granted West Calder in Mid-Lothian in exchange for knight service. However, Barrow argues that the earls of Fife were a special case due to their close familial links with the Canmores. Like the royal house their kin-group had married into the Anglo-Norman nobility of England, in this case the de Warranes, and they were subject to the same cultural influences as were the Davidian kings. It should be noted, however, that just because they had been granted their province by feudal tenure did not mean that the earls of Fife were any less covetous of their prerogatives as Mormaers, and they certainly did not view their province in the same terms as they did their manorial fiefs. For example, when King David attempted to grant the shire of Kirkcaldy to Dunfermline Abbey in 1136, the earl resisted the alienation up to the point of employing force against royal agents, and David was required to issue a stern edict to obtain satisfaction.

The Davidian feudalisation, therefore, did little to change the exercise of lordship and the administration of law in the Gaelic core of the kingdom. Even as the Mormaers became more involved with royal government and more familiar with Anglo-Norman

---

37 CKD, no. 267
38 CKD, no. 268
39 Barrow, 1952, 54-57
40 CKD, no. 44
culture, tradition was maintained. In the periphery, on the other hand, the period witnessed the establishment of an entirely new form of government: feudal kingship.

**Feudal Settlement on the Periphery: The Anglo-Norman Kingdom**

By illustrating its nature and extent, this section will prove that the Davidian feudal settlement was intended to pacify the periphery and bring its territories under firm royal control. While feudal settlement was undertaken in several areas during the 12th century, the focus here will be on the great baronies created to control the old kingdom of Strathclyde and the former Northumbrian lands in Lothian south of the River Tweed, as well as to contain the lordship of Galloway in the south-west. The loose nature of Scottish rule over these outlying regions prior to 1113 will be described in turn, making clear the need for improved mechanisms of control if these lands were to be brought firmly within the orbit of the king of Scots. What then follows is an analytical study of each area detailing the creation of new feudal lordship structures and relationships. Strathclyde and South Lothian will be dealt with together, as the feudal settlement in these regions followed a similar pattern. This involved the establishment of foreign aristocrats in very large fiefs, as part of an effort to emulate the great Gaelic provinces of the core. In Galloway on the other hand, the strategy consisted of using feudal mechanisms to contain the lordship’s independent rulers.

The first area to be considered is the territory which encompassed the former Britonnic kingdom of Strathclyde, situated to the south-west of Alba, just below the Lennox and above Galloway. There has been much scholarly debate on exactly when Strathclyde
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ceased to be a viable political entity, with some historians claiming that the kingdom had been eliminated in the Viking invasions of the 9th century, thereafter falling into the orbit of the kings of Alba and turned into an appendage for the heir apparent. However, the continuity of Strathclyde beyond the fall of Dumbarton to the Vikings in 870 is well attested to by medieval chroniclers. In his account of the 1018 Battle of Carham, Symeon of Durham notes that King Malcolm II’s allies included Owen the Bald, king of Strathclyde, while the Annals Cambriae record Owen’s death later that same year. Additionally, it seems that after the Viking raids Strathclyde actually expanded, eventually taking in an area that ran from the north shore of the Clyde, through eastern Cumbria, and encompassing parts of the English Lakes District in the south. The confusion over the fate of Strathclyde may originate in the cessation of political activity emanating from Dumbarton following the Viking siege. However, this is not indicative of the death of the kingdom, as its power-centre was merely transferred further west to Govan.

It also appears that the power of Strathclyde did not die with Owen in 1018. He may well have been its last king, but almost a century later the kings of Scotland had not yet established firm control over the Britonnic nobility of his former realm. Indeed, it seems that during the reign of Alexander I, Govan was still perceived as a political threat by the Scottish
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This feeling of insecurity is reflected in the geographic extent of the principality of Cumbria that was established for David. King Edgar had directed that on his death his youngest brother should be granted the southern portions of the Scottish realm, leaving the royal title and rule over *Scotia* to Alexander. Edgar’s intention may have been to create a more immediate mechanism of government for the southern peripheral regions, as they were too troublesome to be ruled by a king who based himself north of the Forth. That Strathclyde formed part of the unruly periphery is confirmed in the specific inclusion of the territory of the former kingdom within the bounds of David’s principality. David certainly acted fast to counteract whatever forces were at work in Govan, as he established a bishopric at the old Celtic monastic centre of Glasgow in 1114. This served to shift the focus of political power away from Govan, and also to provide the region with a new territorially-defined authority, as the new diocese encompassed the entirety of the former Brittonnic kingdom.

The second region to be examined is that of Lothian south of the Tweed. This territory had been part of the former Angle kingdom of Northumbria that had fallen prey to Viking incursions. While Scottish rulers had coveted the Northumbria lands south of the
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Forth since the 9th century, it was King Malcolm II who gained recognition of Scottish control of Lothian from Cnut of England following his victory at Carham in 1018, completing a process of conquest that had begun perhaps as early as 973. Over the succeeding decades, the Anglo-Saxon kings would push Scottish control slightly northwards, so that by 1066 their earls in Bamburgh could claim to have authority as far north as Dunbar, with the Scots king exercising no jurisdiction south of the River Forth.

The Norman Conquest of 1066 did not change this tug-of-war for the English North, as in the aftermath of the Battle of Hastings King Malcolm III took advantage of what was in essence an open opportunity to re-start Scotland’s south-ward expansion, and invaded. For the new king of England, William of Normandy, there was still a realm to subdue, rebels to defeat, and he had little interest in trying to secure territory in the far North from the Scots when his control in England only effectively extended to the Humber. Therefore, following the Norman victory Malcolm was able to complete his seizure of Cumbria, which he had begun in 1061, and then push south into Teviotdale completely unopposed. As will be discussed in the next chapter, Malcolm III also attempted to penetrate further south into Northumberland and Durham, but failed. After his death in 1093, however, South Lothian remained in the possession of the Scottish Crown. But even
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by the time of King Edgar’s death in 1107, the region had still not been well integrated into the kingdom, owing perhaps to the instability which resulted from the depositions of two Scottish kings, and the English invasions associated with them. As with Strathclyde, the task of establishing effective rule over Lothian south of the Tweed fell to Edgar’s youngest brother David.

The ways in which David and his grandsons went about dominating both Strathclyde and South Lothian were highly similar, and therefore shall be dealt with together here. While Geoffrey Barrow has argued that the feudal settlement in Lothian was based largely on enfoefments of many individual knights, in fact King David sought to establish royal control in Strathclyde and South Lothian by placing territorial authority into the hands of a select group of foreign aristocrats, and tying them to the Crown by creating two or three large fiefs in each area which were to be held under the terms of a written feudal charter. The individual knights who were settled in Lothian were either household servants or royal officials situated north of the Tweed, as outlined above, or were established very close to, or within, one of the baronies. For example, in 1150 King David granted Athelstaneford to Alexander St. Martin for the service of one knight. That manor, however, sat literally on the northern boundary of the earldom of Dunbar, and could have done little more to further Crown control than would have already been accomplished by the feudal earldom established almost two decades previously. Therefore the discussion will focus on the
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lordships of Cunninghame, Renfrewshire, and Kyle in Strathclyde, and on the lordship of Lauderdale and the earldom of Dunbar in South Lothian. As will become clear, these new feudal magnates did not base their power on a traditional right to rule, but rather on their role as the king’s agents in the periphery. In a sense, the Davidian kings tried to create with parchment in the south what they had in the core: effective sub-regal lordship.

Just how closely the feudalisation efforts in these two regions were linked, and also how exclusive a club the great baronage was, can be appreciated by considering the case of Hugh de Moreville. The de Morevilles never achieved the prominence in Scottish history that the Bruces, Stewarts, or Douglases have. But this is largely due to the extinction of the senior male line by the end of the 12th century, and the political defeat of their cadet branch, the Balliols, during the Wars of Independence period. In Davidian Scotland, however, the family was a fully-fledged member of the baronial elite. The de Morevilles were Normans of knightly rank, holding the village of Morville, just south of Cherbourg, on the Cotentin Peninsula, where David himself was granted a lordship by Henry I of England. The family were granted lands in Devon, Dorset, and Somerset by their relatives the de Reviers earls of Devon. After David attained the earldom of Huntington in 1113, Hugh de Moreville, who had married a daughter of the Hereford marcher lord Hugh de Beauchamp, entered the Scottish prince’s service, and was granted a number of manors within the Honours of Huntington and Northampton. Therefore, de Moreville originated from within the same

---

63 Barrow, 1980, 70
64 Ibid, 70-72
Anglo-Norman social circle as David, and would have shared the prince’s familiarity with the
form and function of feudal government.

When David became king of Scots in 1124, Hugh went with his master into
Scotland. The trust that existed between the two men is evident in de Moreville’s
appointment as Constable of Scotland sometime before November 1140 and in David’s
granting of Westmorland to him during the Scottish occupation of the English North.\footnote{CKD, no. 96; MacQueen, 79; Oram, 2011, 101. For more on Westmorland, and the Scottish occupation of
the northern English counties more generally, see Chapter 3.} In
establishing royal control over Strathclyde, David granted to this trusted lieutenant a large
feudal lordship, Cunninghame, encompassing Largs, Cunningham, and Strathirvine;
essentially the entire former kingdom north of Kyle, west of the Mearns, and south of
Strathgryfe.\footnote{Barrow, 1980, 51-2. Although the enfeoffment charter for the lordship of Cunningham does not survive, it
seems that de Moreville was established there by 1136, as he acted as witness to a charter in that year which
granted a portion of the royal taxes from Cunninghame to Glasgow Cathedral, \textit{CKD} no. 57.} Similarly, in South Lothian de Moreville was granted the lordship of
Lauderdale, which sat just north of Teviotdale, west of the Merse, and east of the royal forest
of Selkirk.\footnote{Barrow, 1980, 51, 62, 71} In effect, David had carved out provincial-sized fiefs from two regions that were
largely lacking in effective authority, and he settled them on a man who could be trusted,
and who relied entirely upon the Crown for his position and wealth.

The other great feudal lordships in Strathclyde and East Lothian were likewise
granted to Anglo-Normans who were close associates of David, and who were members of
the same cultural and social milieu as Hugh de Moreville. The baronial lordships of
Renfrewshire and Kyle in Strathclyde were granted to Walter ‘son of Alan’ in 1150, by the
same charter which invested him and his heirs with the hereditary office of royal steward.  

Like the de Morevilles, the Stewarts, to use the surname adopted by this family, originated in France. Walter’s father Alan began his political career as seneschal to the bishop of Dol in Brittany. He entered the service of Henry, youngest son of William the Conqueror, and was rewarded for his loyalty with a network of estates in England after Henry came to the throne in 1100. These formed an extensive patrimony and were inherited by his second son, William, whose descendants would rise to become the FitzAlan earls of Arundel.  

As Alan’s eldest son Jordan inherited his father’s ancestral lands in Brittany and Normandy, Walter, the youngest, was left landless, and sought his fortune by entering the service of David, king of Scots in 1136. Like the de Moreville lordship of Cunningham, the Stewart baronies in Strathclyde were designed to impose royal control through the use of loyal vassals. Renfrewshire encompassed all of Strathclyde south of the Lennox and north of Largs, specifically Strathgryfe, Mearns, and Renfrew itself. Kyle represented the southern portions of the early medieval Brittonic kingdom, sitting just north of the royal demesne which bordered Galloway, and north-west of Nithsdale.  

The final great lordship to be considered here is the earldom of Dunbar in South Lothian, situated immediately to the east of Lauderdale, its eastern extremes being coastal
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areas along the North Sea.\textsuperscript{72} The earls of Dunbar were not French nobles with estates in England, but rather were the descendents of Gospatric, an Anglo-Saxon earl of Northumbria, who was expelled from that office by William the Conqueror during his northern campaign in 1072.\textsuperscript{73} After spending time in Flanders, the former earl was received at the court of Malcolm III and granted the castle of Dunbar with associated lands for his maintenance.\textsuperscript{74} These lands eventually formed an earldom, with Gospatric’s son, Cospatric, being first referred to as earl in a land grant charter to Coldingham Priory dated on the third of May 1147.\textsuperscript{75} That Cospatric was a close associate of King David is evidenced by his membership on the royal council which met at Dunfermline on 11 June 1150, along with other key members of the administration; namely Hugh de Moreville, Walter Stewart, and Earl Duncan of Fife.\textsuperscript{76}

In the case of Galloway, a different strategy was employed by the Davidians. It too relied upon feudal settlements, but was focused on containment rather than on direct lordship. This alternative approach was undertaken by the Canmores because unlike Strathclyde and South Lothian, the lordship of Galloway was effectively an independent polity during the entirety of 12\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{77} Although the Davidian kings did attempt to overawe the lords of Galloway militarily, there was little penetration of royal authority
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beyond a smattering of knightly establishments that proved fleeting.\textsuperscript{78} Indeed, the Scottish campaigns into Galloway were almost always in response to that lordships’ own expansionistic endeavours.\textsuperscript{79} These campaigns could be long and costly however, as was seen in the three invasions undertaken by Malcolm IV into Galloway after 1160, when Fergus of Galloway sought to terminate the supremacy of the Scots king over the various \textit{ri} of North Britain.\textsuperscript{80} That conflict only ended when Fergus agreed to go into early retirement as a canon of Holyrood Abbey.\textsuperscript{81} Therefore, even if direct rule was not the objective, the consistency of the military threat mandated that the Scottish Crown control the Galwegian lords in some fashion.

To contain Galloway, the Davidians established large feudal baronies in the extreme south-west of the kingdom to impress royal authority there, and to provide the basis of a military response to Galwegian aggression. These were the lordships of Eskdale, Ewesdale, and Annandale, the latter and largest of which will be considered here. Annandale was situated to the west of Eskdale, to the south of Tweeddale, and to the east of Nithsdale, which was a vassal of Galloway.\textsuperscript{82} David granted this large territory to Robert de Brus, an Anglo-Norman aristocrat, who as lord of Brix on the Cotentin and lord of Cleveland in Yorkshire, was well acquainted with David and with feudal practice.\textsuperscript{83} Brus’s enfeoffment in
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Annandale occurred soon after David was sworn in as king of Scots at Scone on 23 April 1124.\(^{84}\) If the date of the original grant is indicative of the urgency with which David wanted to contain Galloway, the confirmation charter issued by King William I in 1172 which specifically called for the service of ten knights, makes clear the continued importance of the Bruce barony in ensuring Scotland’s security throughout the period.\(^{85}\) Indeed, it was Robert de Brus, 2\(^{nd}\) lord of Annandale, into whose mouth Aelred of Rievaulx put the words which neatly encapsulate the objective of the entire Davidian feudalisation. In trying to convince King David not to attack the English host at the 1138 Battle of the Standard, Lord Robert points out to David the benefits which the king enjoys from having Anglo-Norman knights in his service. He tells the king “from them (David’s enemies) we removed all hope of rebellion...subdued them entirely to the will of you and yours.”\(^{86}\)

**Wax and Stone: The Visual Element of Feudal Lordship**

Through an examination of the use of charters and castles in Davidian Scotland, this final section will consider how the nature of feudal lordship in the periphery differed from that of traditional lordship in the core. As discussed above, the Gaelic Mormaers and thanes north of the Forth enjoyed ancient rights of jurisdiction and command. Their rights were largely tied to dominance of kinship networks and hereditary succession, and the Crown’s authority was not required to legitimate the rule of these magnates over their provinces.\(^{87}\) In the case of the feudal baronage, however, a royal stamp of approval was necessary. As such, in
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the feudalised periphery land grants were intended by the Davidian kings to be practical symbols of a lord’s power, a parallel in some ways to the hereditary rights of lordship which the provincial Mormaers and their thanes enjoyed.88 The enfeofment charters were visually impressive devices, prepared in a fine-hand, and stamped with large red waxen seals. They were meant to be displayed by the barons in their great halls where they entertained guests, dispensed justice, and held audiences with their vassals.89

Another way in which feudal lordship in the periphery differed from traditional rule in the core was in the type of power centre utilized in each area. In the core continuity with the past can again be perceived. Evidence suggests that from the early tenth century the centres of Gaelic thanages consisted of a timber enclosure surrounding a great hall and a series of smaller structures. These were typically situated on elevated ground, but only in ten percent of excavations have the remains of a motte been found at thanage sites. Most, like Dunknock, the caput of the thane of Dunning in the province of Strathearn, were built on naturally occurring elevations in the landscape.90

The feudal baronage in the periphery, on the other hand, cemented their rule by constructing motte and bailey castles. While the governmental functions of a castle, as a site for entertaining guests, holding court, and collecting taxes, were similar to that of the thanage hall, it also gave an outward impression of martial strength. The motte and bailey castles were not sited on natural elevations and surrounded by a palisade of timber; they were
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instead placed atop artificial mounds of piled earth, and constructed of thick stone.\textsuperscript{91} This air of dominance was exactly the intention; however, as the studies of motte distribution in 12\textsuperscript{th} century Scotland indicate that the majority of castles were constructed in the south. Heavy concentrations of these fortifications have been identified in the former kingdom of Strathclyde, in the marches of Annandale surrounding Galloway, and within both Lauderdale and Dunbar in East Lothian.\textsuperscript{92} Additionally, it seems that there may have been several castles constructed during the 12\textsuperscript{th} century by the small number of Scottish fiefholders established within lordship of Galloway itself. Only the de Moreville motte at Borgue remains, but there is evidence that several Scottish castles were destroyed during the 1174 Galwegian uprising, which followed the capture of King William at Alnwick by English forces.\textsuperscript{93} It is important to note that the castle distribution pattern follows almost exactly the feudal settlement in the periphery. This is further evidence of both the potential for revolt against Scottish rule, and the need for feudal lordship in these outlying territories.

\textbf{Conclusion}

This chapter has proven that the feudal settlement was not intended as a wholesale reform of Scottish political life, but instead was undertaken by the Davidian kings in order to impose their rule on territories nominally subject them, but yet outside of the core kingdom of \textit{Alba}. By identifying the core and the periphery, as well as having expressed the differences between these two very divergent portions of the Scottish realm, the need for a segmented
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approach to governance by the Davidian kings has been made apparent. While David I and
his grandsons could rely on the loyalty of the core, they required new approaches to secure
rule over the periphery. Therefore, the institutions, practices, and leadership in the core were
left intact, but in the periphery new feudal lordship structures were put in place, backed up
by castles and the power of the written word. As such, the Davidian feudal settlement was
not an all encompassing political reform, but a mechanism through which royal control
could be extended into targeted regions. In chapter three, we will see these same feudal
mechanisms employed in the imposition of Scottish rule over the north of England, and in
the avoidance of English claims of overlordship.
Chapter 3 – The Lion Rampant

Introduction

While the second chapter considered the impetus for the Davidian feudalisation from an internal, Scottish perspective, this chapter will examine the external factors emanating from England. Throughout the 12th century, the fight between Scotland and England over the carcass of Northumbria continued. Indeed, King David I was not content with the gains made by his father, Malcolm III, and desired to undertake a Scottish conquest of the northern English counties. Also, the Davidian kings sought to invalidate the English Crown’s claims to overlordship of Scotland. As such, it will be argued that the same feudal mechanisms that had subdued the periphery were also intended by the Davidians for use in dealing with their powerful southern neighbour.

The chapter will begin with two background sections, one pre-1100 C.E, and the other covering the period of Henry I’s reign in England. Each will trace the development of the contest between the British Crowns for control of the northern counties, as well as the dispute arising from English claims of overlordship. Then the effective use of feudal mechanisms by King David I in his conquest of the English North during the Anarchy will be highlighted. Next, the effective employment of feudal language and practice by David’s grandsons, Malcolm IV and William I, in side-stepping English claims of overlordship during the Angevin supremacy will be discussed. Finally, the use of land-grant charters in Church patronage will be shown to have been a successful strategy undertaken by the Davidians to gain Papal support against York’s claims of ecclesiastical supremacy. Ultimately
the incorporation of northern England into the Scottish kingdom was short-lived, but the
Davidians were successful in eliminating English claims of feudal overlordship, as evidenced
by the 1189 Quitclaim of Canterbury and the 1192 Papal bull *cum universi*.

**Bones of Contention: The North and English Overlordship**

This first section will briefly identify the two issues over which the Scottish and
English Crowns would clash in this period: control of the northern English counties and the
issue of overlordship. These will be placed in their historical context, and shown to be
conflicts which would require the application of feudal mechanisms by the Davidian kings.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the main cause of Anglo-Scottish enmity had long been
the competition for control over the remnants of the defunct Anglo-Saxon kingdom of
Northumbria. Having gained South Lothian in the aftermath of 1066,¹ Malcolm III’s
campaign into Northumberland in 1070 was likely aimed at acquiring further portions of
the old Anglian realm. Symeon of Durham reported that the Scottish devastation of
Northumbria was extensive,² and such an exercise may very well have been intended by
Malcolm to impress upon the population that it was he alone, and not King William of
England, who was the arbiter of their safety.³ That territorial expansion was King Malcolm’s
objective is made evident by the English response to his third invasion in 1079. When the
two armies sent north under Odo of Bayeux and Prince Robert proved ineffectual, King
William sought to halt further Scottish expansion into his weak northern lands by

---

¹ See Chapter 2
² SA, 91
³ Oram, 2011, 14
constructing a series of castles, including Newcastle and Durham, as well as establishing border lordships at Richmond and Pontefract.\(^4\) In the same vein, Malcolm’s 1093 expedition was a response to William’s removal of the Scottish puppet ruler in Cumbria, which threatened a significant portion of the territorial acquisitions made by Malcolm in 1066. The aging Scots king promptly invaded England again, only this time he was killed at Alnwick.\(^5\)

The death of Malcolm III and its aftermath should have been instructive to future Scottish rulers, and there is every indication that the Davidian kings learned the two key lessons from the old warlord’s demise. In order to extend his rule over Northumbria, Malcolm had been required to repeatedly invade and devastate the very territory he was attempting to conquer in order to overawe its inhabitants, because he did not have the means to permanently establish his control.\(^6\) Therefore the first lesson was that successful expansion of the kingdom required a toolkit for imposing control over newly conquered lands. The Davidian feudalisation, as illustrated in the previous chapter, had given Scottish kings this toolkit.

Even with the means to impose their authority over portions of the North, the Davidian kings still had to deal with the fact that the Norman kings of England, having had great success in their conquest of Wales, were anxious to expand their authority over the whole of the British Isles, and this included a desire to control Scotland. With the death of


\(^5\) ASC, s.a 1092

\(^6\) Carpenter, 121
Malcolm and Prince Edward at Alnwick,\textsuperscript{7} there was a contest for the throne between Malcolm’s remaining sons and his brother Donald, who had emerged initially as king.\textsuperscript{8} Here was an opportunity for William II of England to become the arbiter of Scottish affairs and gain the position of overlord that Saxon kings such as Athelstan and Edgar the Peaceable had enjoyed.\textsuperscript{9} William had at his court Duncan, the son of Malcolm III and his first wife Ingiborg. Duncan had been serving as one of his household knights since 1072, and following his uncle’s seizure of power in Scotland, requested that William support his claim to his father’s throne. King William agreed, and after Duncan had sworn his loyalty to the English king, he was sent north with a force of mounted knights in 1094.

Although Duncan was slain by Donald’s men within the year, William tried again to place a son of Malcolm III on the Scottish throne. In 1097, Edgar, Malcolm’s fourth eldest son by Margaret of Wessex, was successfully established as king of Scots by an Anglo-Norman force under the command of his uncle Edgar Ætheling.\textsuperscript{10} Like Duncan, King Edgar was unequivocally William’s man. In a donation charter issued at Durham, the new Scots king is described as possessing Lothian, and the kingship of Scotland, by the “gift of William, his lord.”\textsuperscript{11} Therefore, by the time a stray arrow brought Henry Beauclerc to the English throne in 1100 C.E, the shape which relations between the two British Crowns would take in the future was clear. As such, the second lesson was that future Scottish rulers

\begin{footnotes}
\item[7] Edward was the eldest of the sons of Malcolm and Margaret, and it was his father’s intention that he should succeed to the Scottish throne, Carpenter, 123.
\item[8] *ASC*, s.a 1093
\item[9] *ASC*, s.a 927, 973, & 1097; *SA*, 119
\item[10] Oram, 2011, 43-5; Edgar would rule ten years as king of Scots, from 1097-1107.
\item[11] Ibid, 44; Carpenter, 132
\end{footnotes}
must avoid claims of English overlordship or become, like Kings Duncan II and Edgar, the liegeman of another monarch.

**Playing the Chess Master: Henry I and the House of Canmore**

Anglo-Scottish relations during the reign of King Henry I (r. 1100-1135) took on a deceptively cordial form, but the matter of English overlordship always rested just below the surface. Although the relationship between King Henry and the Scottish Crown was to be dominated by the association between Henry and David, the framework was laid out in 1100 with a wedding. It is possible to see the marriage of Henry to the princess Matilda, daughter of Malcolm III and Margaret of Wessex, as having been a union undertaken in the interests of domestic security.\(^\text{12}\) Henry was unmarried when he took the English throne and needed to quickly produce an heir to secure himself against the challenge from his elder brother Robert of Normandy, which was sure to come when the duke returned from crusade. A union with the Scottish royal house would ensure that Robert could not seek an alliance with the northern kingdom in any future contest. Similarly, being a Norman ruling realm that was ethnically English, Henry could have perceived a political benefit in taking as his queen a woman whose veins coursed with the blood of the ousted West-Saxon dynasty.\(^\text{13}\) Therefore, whether Henry Beauclerc intended this marriage to aid him in establishing a patron-client relationship between the English and Scottish Crowns is undeterminable. Nevertheless, that was precisely the outcome.

---

\(^{12}\) ASC, s.a. 1100  
\(^{13}\) Green, 1989, 58-9
King Henry certainly jumped at the first opportunity to further intertwine the Houses of Normandy and Canmore. In 1107, King Edgar died, and he was succeeded by his next youngest brother, Alexander. Henry offered the new Scots king the hand of one of his illegitimate daughters, Sybilla of Normandy, in marriage, which Alexander accepted.\(^\text{14}\) It is impossible to tell how King Alexander interpreted his relationship with Henry, but he clearly felt compelled to undertake a joint invasion of Wales with his father-in-law in 1114.\(^\text{15}\) It should be emphasised that there is no evidence that Alexander ever performed homage to Henry,\(^\text{16}\) but there was certainly nothing for the Scottish kingdom to gain from a Welsh campaign, and the expedition may be indicative of some alliance between the two kings, perhaps one which the marriage to Sybilla was meant to seal. Henry certainly never sent Alexander military aid when the Scots king went on campaign against the Moravians following their assassination of his cousin in 1116,\(^\text{17}\) and so there is the sense that Alexander was acquiescing to an inequitable arrangement.

Even during the reigns of Edgar and Alexander, however, relations between the Crown of England and the Scottish royal dynasty were defined by the long association between Henry Beauclerc and David Canmore. Judith Green has noted that their relationship was particularly close and unique among medieval British monarchs.\(^\text{18}\) The two men certainly knew one another before Henry’s ascension. David had been raised at the

\(^{14}\) *SA*, 128. The date of their marriage is unknown, but Sybilla and Alexander could have been married as early as 1107, or as late as 1114, Oram, 2004, 65.

\(^{15}\) *SA*, 141

\(^{16}\) Green, 1989, 59

\(^{17}\) *AU*, 1116.6

English court, and at the age of sixteen the Scottish prince was knighted by Henry, shortly after Beauclerc had seized the English Crown and married Matilda in 1100. As the brother-in-law of the English king, David was in a good position to benefit from his close proximity to the most powerful patron in Britain, and Henry was quite willing to support his young protégé. Indeed, when Alexander succeeded Edgar in 1107 he initially refused to grant his younger brother the inheritance of southern Scottish border lands that had been bequeathed to David by Edgar. David was given a force of mounted knights by Henry and headed north from the English court. He seems to have been in Scotland and northern England until 1113, and was successful in establishing himself in his principality. While the benefits provided to the Scottish kingdom by the existence of David’s principality in the southern periphery has been discussed in the previous chapter, King Henry of England also benefited from it. He had established a close associate in the northern borders of his realm, and by using force to install David had also made a statement about his intentions regarding English control over the disputed Northumbrian lands of the Scottish periphery.

The grandest statement that Henry made about his intended relationship with David came in 1113, when the Scottish prince returned to the English court. In that year Henry created David as earl of Huntington in his own right following David’s marriage to Maud, daughter of earl Waltheof of Northumbria and Judith of Lens, niece of William the Conqueror. Although this was certainly intended to be to the advantage of the English
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20 For a discussion of the intent and extent of the principality that was granted to David, see Chapter 2.
21 Green, 1996, 3
22 ASC, s.a 1114
Crown, it was nevertheless a very dangerous move for Henry to make. Although this tied David to Henry in feudal terms, it only did so for the earldom itself, and there was no guarantee that such a link would be able to control David should he succeed his childless brother as king of Scots. It is possible that Henry may have wanted to have David as an Earl because he was following his typical strategy of ensuring his family were the most powerful members of the Norman regime in England. Therefore one could view Henry’s action as being similar to his raising his illegitimate son Robert to the honour of Gloucester, and the marrying of his nephew Stephen of Blois to David’s niece, Maude of Boulogne, which gave Stephen a vast network of English estates centred on the honours of Lancaster and Eye.

Whatever Henry’s plan had been for his brother-in-law, it soon backfired. In 1121 David, now one of the richest magnates in England, and ruler of a virtually independent principality with vast martial resources at his disposal, began to display the territorial ambitions that would define his later reign as Scotland’s king. Although the historical record lacks the exact details, David appears to have made a move against Carlisle, after Henry had dismissed Ranulf Meschin, his chief royal official in Cumberland. Henry responded by coming north, holding a council of his great northern barons at Durham, and ordered improvements to Carlisle Castle. The English king was clearly nervous about David’s future intentions, and sought to secure his northern borders against the Scottish prince’s ambitions.

---

23 Green, 1996, 6,9  
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Moreover, David’s ascension to the Scottish throne in 1124, following the death of Alexander, shifted the dynamics of his relationship with Henry considerably.\textsuperscript{27} Indeed, by this point in his reign Henry needed David more than David needed him. William, Henry’s only son and heir, had died in the 1120 sinking of the White Ship. In 1127, Henry sought to secure his dynasty’s future and demanded that the English baronage swear to uphold the succession rights of his daughter, Matilda, the young widow of the German emperor Henry V. In the words of the \textit{Melrose Chronicle} David, as king of Scotland, ‘swore to give the kingdom to the Empress,’\textsuperscript{28} but to secure the backing of his former protégé Henry of England was forced to make concessions on the matter of York’s claims of supremacy over the Scottish Church.\textsuperscript{29} Thus, the relationship between the English Crown and the Canmores had changed considerably between Henry’s ascension in 1100, and his death in 1135. Whereas he had initially acted as patron to his queen’s younger brother David, the Scottish prince took advantage of Henry’s largesse, had grown wealthy and powerful, and began to assert himself militarily. As king of Scots from 1124, David had started to utilize his familiarity with feudal mechanisms to impose his rule of his kingdom’s periphery, as discussed in the previous chapter, but he would also take advantage of the chaos following the death of King Henry and use these same feudal structures in the conquest of northern England.

\textsuperscript{27} \textit{SA}, 157
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{ES II}, 170
\textsuperscript{29} See below for more on the matter of York’s claims of supremacy.
Slaying the Elephant: The Anarchy and the Scoto-Northumbrian Realm

Henry’s suspicions about David’s true intentions compelled him to strengthen his principle fortress in Cumberland, and his foresight proved prophetic following his death in 1135. Soon after the news of Stephen of Blois’s coup had reached the Scottish court, David launched an invasion of northern England and captured the castles at Carlisle, Wark, Alnwick, Norham, and Newcastle. Far from being an attempt to place his niece on the English throne, David’s campaigns during the Anarchy were ones of conquest, and this can be seen in the demands he made of Stephen when the new English king came north in 1136 to sue for peace. David wanted his possession of Carlisle and his control of Northumbria recognized by Stephen, and these were indeed confirmed to him in the truce agreement along with Stephen’s agreement to grant David’s son, Prince Henry, his father’s earldom of Huntington.

If David’s willingness to abandon Matilda’s cause in exchange for control of two northern counties was not indicative enough that his true ambition was the annexation of the entire English North, his seizure of Durham and his push into Yorkshire as far as Craven in 1138 certainly was. In fact, the Scots king intended to extend his control even further and was marching his army down Dere Street to seize York itself when he was defeated at Cowton Moor on 22 August 1138 in what has become known to history as the Battle of the
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30 When Henry I died in 1135 his nephew, Stephen of Blois, seized the English throne, and was crowned at Westminster on 26 December. Roger of Hoveden recorded that the Scottish invasion began only a few weeks after Christmas, SA, 170.
31 Green, 1989, 65
32 Carpenter, 166. At the outset of hostilities, Stephen had revoked the earldom and settled it upon David’s stepson, Simon de Senlis, along with the Honour of Northampton.
Standard. But while this English victory may have saved Stephen’s throne, it did nothing to dislodge David from the northern counties. In fact, after the Standard David sent an expedition under the command of his nephew William FitzDuncan to re-take Wark Castle, which had fallen to Stephen’s forces during the Yorkshire campaign. Faced with David’s unceasing aggression, as well as that of Matilda’s allies in England and Normandy, Stephen acquiesced to an acknowledgement of the Scottish occupation of the northern counties. In the negotiations which followed a truce brokered by the papal legate Alberic of Ostia, the besieged English king was forced to concede that Cumberland, Westmorland, and Northumbria were now within the orbit of the king of Scots, with the latter being granted as an earldom to Prince Henry. Just like in the truce agreement two years previously, David again showed his willingness to abandon his niece’s cause in return for control of northern England.

From the 1139 treaty onwards, King David undertook the establishment of Scottish control over the northern English counties by utilizing the same feudal mechanisms that he had employed in subduing the territories of the Scottish periphery. He began with a castle-building program, which besides the construction of new stone keeps at Lancaster, Bamburgh, and Warkworth, also saw the completion of Henry I’s planned improvements to Carlisle Castle. David further expanded this fortification to serve as his new centre of

33 Oram, 2011, 102; ES II, 198; MacQueen, 79
34 SA, 178
35 Carpenter, 166-7; SA, 214-5; ES II, 199-200; Paul C. Ferguson, Medieval Papal Representatives in Scotland: Legates, Nuncios, and Judges-Delegate, 1125-1286, (Edinburgh: Stair Society, 1997), 36-7
government; its geographic location in the heart of English Cumbria is indicative of the Scottish king’s territorial pretensions. Just as instructive were David’s settlements of key Scottish magnates into large northern English fiefs, in a pattern reminiscent of his feudalisations of Strathclyde and South Lothian. Hugh de Moreville, already lord of Lauderdale and Cunningham in Scotland, was granted Westmorland. Similarly, he married his nephew and general William FitzDuncan, already earl of Moray, to the heiress of the honours of Egremont and Skipton in Yorkshire, thereby installing a leading Scottish magnate into a buffer zone south of Northumbria.

David also used his familiarity with feudal practice and language to anchor the baronage of northern England, and in the Honour of Huntington, to the Scottish Crown directly. Although Prince Henry was technically ruling both Northumberland and Huntington as an English earl, the charters which he issued in this period use language which reveals the true nature of Scottish lordship in these territories. For example, in an 1140 enfeoffment charter granting Eustace FitzJohn several manors from the earldom’s own demesne in Northumbria worth five knight’s fees, Henry is referred to as the ‘son of the king of Scotland,’ with no mention of his comital title. Similarly, it was as the ‘son of the king of Scotland,’ and not as earl, that Henry granted to Thorney Abbey the right to hold a market at Yaxley in Huntingdonshire in 1141. Additionally, David used feudal mechanisms to tie several of the great Anglo-Norman barons to him personally. He used the grant of fiefs in

36 Carpenter, 183; Oram, 2011, 97, 100
37 Macqueen, 79; Barrow, 1980, 71-3
38 Oram, 2011, 101
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Scotland to buy the support of the de Umfravilles, lords of Redesdale and Prudhoe, lands
that fell across the lines of communication between Carlisle and Newcastle, as well as
Roxburgh and Durham.\footnote{Oram, 2011, 100; CKD, 20; RRS II, no. 292} David was also successful in using the grant of Stephen’s Honour
of Lancaster, which the Scots had captured during the English king’s imprisonment
following the 1141 Battle of Lincoln, to gain the support of Ranulf, the earl of Chester.\footnote{CKD, nos. 111 and 112; Carpenter, 178, 184}

On the 29\textsuperscript{th} of May 1153, in his great castle at Carlisle, King David I of Scotland
breathed his last. When he ascended to the throne in 1124 the Scottish kingdom had
consisted of a small territory north of the Forth, hugging the North Sea coast. By 1153,
however, David ruled over most of North Britain. His writ ran from Glasgow in the west to
Dunbar in the east and from Inverness in the north to the River Tees in the south. David
had become familiar with feudalism at the court of Henry I of England, and had proceeded
to use this knowledge in dominating the peripheral regions of Scotland when he became king
of Scots. With the death of his patron in 1135, King David turned these same feudal
mechanisms against England, and built a Scoto-Northumbrian realm that endured for nearly
two decades.

\textbf{In the Shadows of Giants: Navigating the Angevin Supremacy}

David’s great empire did not long survive him, but he bequeathed his fluency in the
language and symbols of feudal lordship to his grandsons Malcolm IV and William I, and it
was this legacy which allowed the last two Davidian kings to side-step claims of English
overlordship, and maintain the independence of their realm. Indeed, the de-construction of
the expanded Scottish kingdom occurred only four years after David’s death. In July 1157, King Henry II of England (r. 1154-1199) invited his sixteen year-old cousin, King Malcolm IV of Scotland (r. 1153-1165), to a meeting at Chester. No contemporary account or official document from the Chester summit survives, but it was there that the Davidian realm in northern England was disassembled. Malcolm was induced to return Cumberland, Westmorland, and Northumberland. Henry II also revoked the Canmore dynasty’s possession of the Honour of Northumbria, which had passed to Malcolm’s younger brother William on the death of their father in 1152. As compensation Henry II re-granted the earldom of Huntington to King Malcolm, and bestowed the lordship of Tynedale on Prince William.43

While the Chester summit resulted in the English Crown recovering control over the disputed northern counties, there is no indication that Henry II was able to successfully establish feudal overlordship over Scotland. The Melrose Chronicle reports only that Malcolm became Henry’s vassal ‘in the manner his grandfather had been vassal of the old king Henry.’44 As there is no evidence of King David ever having done homage for the kingdom of Scotland,45 it can only be assumed that the chroniclers of Melrose were making reference to Malcolm becoming Henry’s vassal for Huntington only. Even in this limited interpretation, King Malcolm seems not have regarded the receipt of his grandfather’s earldom as anything more than his rightful inheritance. Indeed, Malcolm was sure to have

43 Carpenter, 115-6; MacQueen, 79
44 ES II, 233-4
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his chancery emphasise this interpretation in feudal documentation. In a charter issued at Roxburgh later in 1157, which granted land in Huntingdonshire to Warden Abbey, Malcolm’s obtainment of the Honour is noted as having been his ‘right.’ Therefore instead allowing the Chester summit as being in any way symbolic of a formal, regal submission, the act of homage in regards to Huntington was portrayed by the Scottish Crown as nothing more than an instance of feudal inheritance.

Malcolm IV certainly did little to indicate that he considered himself to be a vassal of the English king. Although both he and Prince William accompanied Henry II on his 1159 Toulouse expedition, this was likely service done in regards to Huntington and Tyndale respectively, and not an Angevin expectation of military service due from the Scottish monarchy itself. It is also possible that King Malcolm, who had long sought knighthood, thought the campaign a superb opportunity to be knighted by another monarch. Henry did indeed knight Malcolm at Périgueux Cathedral, but the young Scots king, to symbolize the independence of the Scottish Crown, and to guard its prerogatives, himself knighted his brother William during the same ceremony. Similarly, Malcolm used his sisters to create marriage alliances between the Scottish royal house and Henry II’s enemies. The king’s youngest sister Margaret was married to Duke Conan IV of Brittany, who like Malcolm was an independent ruler who also held an English earldom, Richmond, in vassalage to Henry. Similarly, the marriage of his elder sister Ada to Count Florenz III of Holland in September

46 RRS I, no. 128
47 ES II, 240
48 Oram, 2011, 118; ES II, 243
of 1162 gave Scotland an ally who not only was free of any kind of feudal relationship with the Angevins, but also hostile towards Henry II.49

During the reign of Malcolm IV’s brother and successor, William I (r. 1165-1214), the claims of English overlordship came close to being realized, but the Davidian fluency in the language of feudal politics allowed King William to extract the Scottish kingdom from the clutches of the English Crown. Unlike Henry II’s cornering of Malcolm IV at Chester, however, William’s own territorial aggression triggered Henry’s second bid for the assertion of feudal supremacy. When war broke out between the English king and his sons in spring 1173, William was offered a restoration of all the northern counties if Scotland joined the Angevin princes and Louis of France in ousting Henry. William, who like his grandfather desired to control the English North, accepted. However, during the course of his subsequent invasion of England, King William was captured by Henry II’s forces while out riding with only a small escort near Alnwick in July.50

To buy his freedom, William was forced to agree to the Treaty of Falaise, a document intended to subordinate the kingdom of Scotland to the English Crown. Signed on 8 December 1173, the document declared that William and his barons, earls, and bishops had become the ‘liegemen’ of Henry.51 But, the extent to which the Falaise Treaty was actually a statement of formal feudal submission is highly questionable. The document itself moves on quickly from the statement of vassalage to detail procedures for the detention of

49 Oram, 2011, 123-4
50 Ibid, 133-4
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royal fugitives of one Crown found within the realm of the other. Such an inclusion is more akin to a diplomatic agreement than to a statement of regal submission.\footnote{Esther Pascua, “Peace among equals: war and treaties in twelfth-century Europe.” In \textit{War and Peace in Ancient and Medieval History}, eds. Philip de Souza and John France, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 202-3} Furthermore, Pierre Chaplais has noted that the Treaty of Falaise lacks any mention of the king of Scots or his barons being required to perform military service for the English Crown. In contrast, the 1163 treaty between Henry II and Count Thierry of Flanders specified that as Henry’s vassal the Flemish ruler would be required supply the king with a force of knights upon request.\footnote{Pierre Chaplais, \textit{English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages}, (London: Hambledon and London, 2003), 50-52}

Ultimately, William was able to buy his way out of the entanglement, and the manner in which he did so is suggestive of the extent to which the Davidian familiarity with feudal language could be employed in the neutralization of English overlordship. With the death of Henry II on the 6\textsuperscript{th} of July 1189, the throne of England passed to his eldest surviving son Richard, who was crowned in September. The new English king was more interested in undertaking a crusade to recapture Jerusalem from Saladin than in asserting any form of lordship over Scotland. As such, when King William visited England in December to perform homage to Richard for Tynedale,\footnote{Huntington had been inherited by David, William’s younger brother, on the death of Malcolm IV, \textit{CDS}, no. 205.} he used the opportunity to negotiate the 
Quitclaim of Canterbury. In exchange for King William’s contribution of 10,000 merks of silver towards the Third Crusade, Richard agreed to the nullification of the Treaty of Falaise.\footnote{Oram, 2011, 150-151; \textit{CDS}, no. 196} While it is impossible to determine exactly how the wording of the Quitclaim was
decided, its statement that the terms of William’s 1174 submission had been ‘extorted’ by Henry II suggests that at least some of the contents of the 1189 agreement may have been specifically requested by the feudally fluent Scottish king.\textsuperscript{56} While this section has demonstrated the successful use of feudal language and symbolic action by Kings Malcolm IV and William I in side-stepping secular English overlordship, the Davidian kings were simultaneously engaged in defending the independence of the Scottish realm from the aggressions of the English Church.

**Prestige is Power: Church Patronage, the Papacy, and *cum universi***

The claim of the English ecclesiastical establishment to supremacy over the Scottish Church was just as threatening to the Canmore dynasty as the attempts by the kings of England to assert overlordship over the Scottish Crown. One could even argue that it was more threatening, given that the final arbiter of this dispute, the Pope, was far away in Rome. Nevertheless, the Davidian kings, through their effective use of feudal land grant charters, built up diplomatic capital with the Papacy that was sufficient enough to neutralize this threat to the independence of the Scottish kingdom.

As with the disputes over the northern counties and regal overlordship, the issue of ecclesiastical supremacy was not new to Anglo-Scottish relations, but had been a matter of great concern from the earliest days of the Church in medieval Britain. In 601 C.E., Pope Gregory the Great wrote to his missionary in England, Augustine, with an organization plan for the English Church. It called for the establishment of two archbishoprics in England,

\textsuperscript{56} *CDS*, no. 196
Canterbury and York, with each having oversight of twelve suffragan bishops. Gregory’s plan, based on the notion that Britain could support 24 dioceses at the beginning of the 7th century, can be legitimately labelled as fantasy, but an archbishopric was nevertheless established at York in 735. An issue of legitimacy arose, however, as there was no northern province over which the new Archbishop of York might exercise jurisdiction. This dilemma was exploited by the Archbishops of Canterbury who claimed the status of primate of the English Church. Eventually, a solution to this impasse was found in 1072, with Canterbury agreeing that York would have metropolitan jurisdiction over Britain north of Lichfield.57

This compromise was incumbent upon the subjugation of Scotland’s bishops to the metropolitan authority of York, but the Scottish Church already had its own provincial identity, and primate. Although it would not be until 1472 that St. Andrews was elevated to archiepiscopal status,58 by 1093 the see was considered by outsiders as the primate of a Scottish ecclesiastical province, with the Annals of Ulster referring to the occupant of the see as the “bishop of Scotland.”59 When King Alexander I appointed him as bishop of St. Andrews in 1107, Turgot of Durham began to actively assert his primacy over the Scottish Church. The emergence of a metropolitan-type authority within Scotland threatened the power of the Archbishop of York, who was now faced with the possibility of ruling over a single suffragan province sandwiched between Canterbury and St. Andrews, each with multiple dioceses.60 But much more was at stake than simple matters of ecclesiastical
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hierarchy. The dispute over metropolitan authority in North Britain drew in the king of Scots because a kingdom or polity that did not have its own metropolitan could become subordinate to one that did. A contemporary British example of the use of ecclesiastical supremacy in the subjugation of a political entity was the failed struggle of the Welsh to have St. David’s made into an archbishopric in the face of Anglo-Norman aggression.⁶¹

At the beginning of the Davidian period, Scotland was in danger of falling, like Wales, into the orbit of the English Crown because of a lack of sympathy on the part of the Papacy on the issue of metropolitan authority. Indeed, on 29 November 1119 Pope Calixtus II wrote to the leadership of the Scottish Church to warn them against consecrating their own bishops, instructing that this must be done by the Archbishop of York as metropolitan of Scotland.⁶² It was the intention of King David I, however, to reverse the course of Papal opinion. This would be accomplished through a program of Church patronage which would promote the Canmores as a dynasty of pious rulers, and allow the Scottish Crown to influence decisions being made in Rome about ecclesiastical organization in Britain.

David focused his patronage activity on the establishment and support of reformed monastic orders. For example, shortly after receiving his principality in 1113 David travelled to France to visit the head of the Tironian Order, Bernard de Abbeville. On his return to Scotland, David established a Tironian monastery at Selkirk.⁶³ Likewise, the Augustinians were the recipients of royal largesse. In 1128, King David richly endowed the new
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Augustinian institution at Holyrood Abbey, and would found yet another house for the
order at Jedburgh in 1139. David also worked to ensure that his likely successor was known
by the Papacy as patron of reformed monastic orders. This can be seen in the charter
granting land to support the French mother house of the Arrouaisian order, under the name
of his young son and heir apparent, Prince Henry. Importantly, in an exemption sure to
capture the attention of Rome, no effort was made to require the monastic houses in
Scotland to provide knight service for their lands, as was the practice in England.

The patronage program paid dividends by vastly improving the relationship between
the Scottish Crown and the Papacy. David’s reputation as a great Church patron was
certainly well established at the Papal Court by 1139. In December of that year, Pope
Innocent II wrote to the king requesting an endowment of lands for the maintenance of
Westminster Abbey. David responded by granting the manor of Tottenham, a holding of his
Honour of Huntington, to Westminster. Innocent II was quick to praise King David for
this act of charity and piety. Similarly, after the founding of the Cistercian house at Melrose
Abbey in 1136, the order’s founder Bernard of Clairvaux addressed David in a letter as an
“outstanding king, worthy to be embraced in the love of Christ...I have long embraced you,
and long to behold your face, for I have been deeply moved by the shining reputation
attaching to your name.” After David’s death, Pope Urban III referred to the Scots king as
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having been “a catholic sovereign who enlarged the Christian faith.” This reputation for piety, which David had developed through the endowment of religious houses, would be of great use to both himself and his grandsons in countering the supremacy claims of the English Church.

As early as 1140, one can perceive a shift in the Papal attitude regarding the metropolitan dispute between Scotland and York. In that year, David was permitted by Pope Innocent II to appoint a new bishop of Glasgow without having to wait for a consecration from York. Perhaps Innocent remembered the king’s gracious gift of land to Westminster, because he then confirmed the appointment of David’s close associate, Henry Murdac, as Archbishop of York in 1151. By the reign of King Malcolm IV the Papacy moved from issuing authoritative edicts to allowing disputation on the matter of York’s supremacy. In 1159 Pope Hadrian IV invited the bishops of Scotland to come to Rome to make their case for the independence of the Scottish Church. The improved state of Scottish-Papal relations must have shaken the leadership in York, because from this point they seem to become increasingly desperate. Indeed, in 1176 Archbishop Roger had a forged letter composed, in which King William asks Pope Alexander III for the subjugation of the Scottish Church to the authority of York. Ultimately such tactics proved to be for naught, as on 13 March 1192, Pope Celestine III decisively ended York’s claims to supremacy by
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issuing the Papal bull *cum universi*, which proclaimed that the Scottish church, as the ‘special daughter’ of the Apostolic See, was subject to no intermediary other than the Pope himself.\textsuperscript{74}

**Conclusion**

At the close of the 12\textsuperscript{th} century, it was evident that the lessons bequeathed by the death of King Malcolm III had been well learned. As with the imposition of royal control over the periphery, the Davidians utilized the mechanisms of their feudalisation to oppose the power of the English Crown. First, King David I employed feudal lordship structures in imposing his rule over the English North during the Anarchy. Second, David and his grandsons consistently side-stepped claims of English overlordship by a policy of vagueness in the application and interpretation of feudal language and symbols. Finally, the monastic patronage program, carried out through the use of land-grant charters, allowed the Davidians to literally buy a reputation for piety, win the support of the Papacy, and eliminate the threat to the independence of the Scottish kingdom from the English Church.

\textsuperscript{74} *SP*, no. 156
Conclusion

This thesis has thoroughly described the nature and extent of the feudalisation carried out by the Davidian kings of Scotland in the 12th century. An examination of charter, chronicle, and landscape evidence has revealed that the feudal settlement did not apply to the Scottish kingdom as whole, but was in fact limited to the peripheral regions which had not yet been brought under firm royal control, and to those territories which were conquered by the Davidians themselves. It has been shown that government in these areas was characterized by the settlement of foreign knights into large feudal lordships. This new aristocracy ruled their lands from imposing castle keeps, and relied on the express consent of the king for their authority, as seen in the surviving enfeoffment charters. In the core, however, Gaelic lordship structures remained intact. The Davidians made no effort to eliminate the ancient shire structure within the core, nor did they aim to replace the powers of the Mormaers and thanes with feudal relationships. The limited enfeoffments which did occur in the core were intended to support individual members of the royal household, or more importantly, were land-grants made to endow monastic institutions.

Instead of undertaking the feudalisation out of a desire to reform the politics and society of Scotland, as has been suggested by some historians, King David I and his grandsons were intent upon the achievement of three goals. First, the periphery needed to be pacified if the Crown of Scotland was to secure its rule over North Britain. The former kingdom of Strathclyde, South Lothian, and the marches of Galloway are examples of territories where royal control was limited at best. A feudal settlement which only undertook
large enfoements in these peripheral regions is indicative that the Davidians sought to utilize feudal mechanisms in an attempt to create in these areas loyal lordship structures, which they enjoyed in the Gaelic heartland of their realm by traditional right. Second, David I and his grandsons, like many Scottish kings before them, desired the northern English counties. The death of Malcolm III was instructive, in that because he had lacked effective tools for the imposition of Scottish dominion over the English North, he had been required to invade again and again to compel obedience, and been killed while doing so in 1093. Therefore, the adoption of feudalism by the Scottish Crown was intended to affect a permanent Davidian conquest of the northern counties using the same lordship structures that were imposed on the periphery, as was seen in King David’s occupation of the North during the Anarchy.

Third, the Davidians had to ensure that they avoided claims of English overlordship that threatened the independence of their Crown. The Scottish royal dynasty’s new familiarity with feudal language and practice was invaluable in this effort, as it allowed first David, and then his grandsons, to side-step the assertions of overlordship undertaken by the Norman and Angevin kings of England in diplomatic encounters and written agreements. Additionally, the use of feudal charters in granting vast estates to reformed monastic orders enabled the Davidians to neutralize the claims of metropolitan supremacy put forward by the Archbishops of York by gaining the favour of the Papacy.

Much of the previous historical scholarship on the subject of the feudalisation has explained its impetus by characterizing the Davidians as members of a sanctified Scottish royal house, polished by Anglo-Norman culture; and so as rulers who naturally sought to
reform their own kingdom on the model of their southern neighbour. However, such interpretations rest on an uncritical reading of contemporary chroniclers and flatterers. By considering the domestic and external challenges facing the Scottish Crown at the outset of the 12th century, and by undertaking a close study of the charters, letters, and diplomatic agreements which compose the surviving evidence of actual Davidian policies, this thesis has identified that the impetus for the feudalisation emanated from the imperialistic ambitions of these kings to control North Britain, and not from a benign reform imperative which sought the construction of a new political community in Scotland.
Appendix A – Table of Events

(The following timeline covers relevant events which fall between 1058-1192)

1058 – Malcolm III becomes king of Scots following the defeat of the Moravian royal house.

1066 – Norman Conquest of England allows Malcolm III to seize Cumbria and Teviotdale.

1068 – Malcolm III receives Edgar Ætheling and other Anglo-Saxon exiles at his court.

1069 – Margaret of Wessex is married to Malcolm III.


1072 – Malcolm III invades England and later agrees to a peace agreement with King William which sends Prince Duncan to the English court as hostage. Gospatric of Northumbria is removed from his earldom by William. Canterbury and York agree to divide metropolitan authority in Britain between them.

1079 – Malcolm III invades England a third time.

1087 – William the Conqueror dies. Prince Duncan is knighted by the new English king, William II ‘Rufus.’

1092 – William II of England seizes Carlisle and removes the Scottish client regime.

1093 – Malcolm III and Prince Edward are killed in battle against English at Alnwick. Queen Margaret dies soon afterwards. Malcolm III’s brother claims throne as Donald III. Edgar leads his surviving siblings into exile at the English court.

1094 – English army assists in the removal of Donald III from power and Duncan is proclaimed king (Duncan II), but within the year Donald III kills Duncan and regains the throne.

1097 – English army under the command of Edgar Ætheling invades Scotland and removes Donald III. Edgar, son of Malcolm III by Margaret of Wessex is proclaimed king.

1100 – William II dies. His youngest brother Henry seizes the throne and marries Princess Matilda, daughter of Malcolm III and Margaret of Wessex. Matilda’s sister, Princess Mary, is married to Eustace III, count of Boulogne.

1107 – Edgar dies childless. His brother ascends the throne as Alexander I.
1113 – By this year David rules an appendage of southern Scottish border lands known as the principality of Cumbria. David marries Maud, dowager countess of Huntington-Northampton and is made earl of Huntington in his own right. Selkirk Abbey is founded by David.

1114 –Kings Alexander and Henry campaign together in Wales against Gruffydd ap Cynan, king of Gwynedd. The bishopric of Glasgow is established by Prince David.

1120 – William, the son and heir apparent of Henry I, dies in the Sinking of the White Ship.

1124 – Alexander I dies. David becomes king of Scots (David I). The principality of Cumbria is merged with the Scottish Crown.

1127 – David I swears that he will support the claim of his niece Matilda to the English throne. York’s claims to supremacy briefly suspended.

1128 – Holyrood Abbey established by David I. Dunfermline is raised to abbey status.

1135 – Henry I of England dies without male heir. The English throne is seized by his nephew Stephen of Blois.


1137 – 2nd Scottish invasion of Northumbria.

1138 – 3rd Scottish invasion of Northumbria. David despoils Durham. Scottish royal army is tactically defeated by Stephen’s forces at the Battle of the Standard. The papal legate Cardinal Alberic of Ostia is received by David at Carlisle, and is successful in negotiating a truce.


1140 – Papacy allows the appointment of a bishop of Glasgow without the consent of York.


1149 – David I knights his great-nephew, the future Henry II of England, at Carlisle Castle.
1151 – Henry Murdac, an associate of David I, is appointed as Archbishop of York.

1152 – Prince Henry, Earl of Huntington and Northumbria dies.

1153 – David I dies. His grandson becomes king of Scots as Malcolm IV.


1159 – Malcolm IV and his brother Prince William accompany Henry II on campaign in the south of France and both are knighted by the English king. Pope Hadrian IV invites the Scottish bishops to Rome to make a case for the independence of the Scottish Church.

1160 – Malcolm IV undertakes an invasion of Galloway and deposes Fergus, lord of Galloway.

1165 – Malcolm IV dies. His brother becomes king of Scots as William I.

1173 – William I allies with the sons of Henry II in their revolt and launches an invasion of Northumberland and Cumberland.


1192 – Pope Celestine III issues the papal bull *Cum Universi* which establishes that the Scottish Church is subordinate directly to the Holy See as Rome’s ‘special daughter.’
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### Appendix D – List of Rulers
(Kings of Scotland, Kings of England, and Popes, 1058-1192)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Papacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm III</td>
<td>Edward the Confessor</td>
<td>Nicholas II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1058-1093)</td>
<td>(r. 1042-1066)</td>
<td>(r. 1058-1061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harold Godwinson</td>
<td>Alexander II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1066)</td>
<td>(r. 1061-1073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William I</td>
<td>Gregory VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1066-1087)</td>
<td>(r. 1073-1085)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William II</td>
<td>Victor III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1087-1100)</td>
<td>(r. 1085-1087)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1087-1099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1093/4-1097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1094)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>Henry I</td>
<td>Paschal II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1097-1107)</td>
<td>(r. 1100-1135)</td>
<td>(r. 1099-1118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gelasius II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1107-1124)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1118-1119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Callixtus II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1119-1124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David I</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Honorius II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1124-1153)</td>
<td>(r. 1135-1154)</td>
<td>(r. 1124-1130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innocent II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(r. 1130-1143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Papacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm IV</td>
<td>Henry II</td>
<td>Anastasius IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1153-1165)</td>
<td>(r. 1154-1189)</td>
<td>(r. 1153-1154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William I</td>
<td>Richard I</td>
<td>Lucius III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r. 1165-1214)</td>
<td>(r. 1189-1199)</td>
<td>(r. 1181-1185)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Celestine II  
(r. 1143-1144)  
Lucius II  
(r. 1144-1145)  
Eugene III  
(r. 1145-1153)  
Adrian IV  
(r. 1154-1159)  
Alexander III  
(r. 1159-1181)  
Urban III  
(r. 1185-1187)  
Gregory VIII  
(r. 1187)  
Clement III  
(r. 1187-1191)  
Celestine III  
(r. 1191-1198)
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