King's Research Portal

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Taylor, A. (2017). Recalling Anglo-Scottish Relations in 1291: Historical knowledge, monastic memory and the Edwardian inquests. In A. M. Spencer, & C. Watkins (Eds.), *Thirteenth Century England XVI: Proceedings of the Cambridge Conference, 2015* (pp. 173-206). (Thirteenth Century England). Boydell Press.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7722/j.ctt1wx911b>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Recalling Anglo-Scottish Relations in 1291:

Historical knowledge, monastic memory, and the Edwardian inquests.

Alice Taylor, King's College London

On 8 March 1291, Edward I sent out a writ from his privy seal addressed to Evesham Abbey. Not all the writ's text survives but its key point is clear:¹

We command and enjoin you [the abbot and convent], by the faith and love which binds you to us, to scrutinize your chronicles, and everything which you find there concerning those things which touch our kingdom and the governance of Scotland—whatever it may be—you must, without delay, send it to us under your seal. Just as we trust in you, so too should you not fail to do this.

Edward I had thus ordered the abbot and monks of Evesham Abbey to consult their historical archives to find evidence which touched 'our kingdom and the governance of Scotland'. Whatever they found, they should send back to the king, whose commissioners would examine the information to establish Edward's authority over Scotland. In the background was the need to prove the legality of Edward's lordship over the Scottish kingdom so as to establish him as judge over, rather than arbitrator

I am grateful to Dauvit Broun, David Carpenter, Julia Crick, John Gillingham, George Molyneaux, and Tessa Webber for reading this paper in draft form, and to David A. Woodman for his generous help with John of Worcester's *Chronica*.

¹ London, The National Archives [henceforth, TNA], E 39/100/160, printed in F. Palgrave (ed.), *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland and the Transactions between the Crowns of England and Scotland, preserved in Her Majesty's Exchequer* (London: Public Records Commission, 1837), p. 89. The writ survives as a copy in Evesham's return, for commentary, see E. L. G. Stones and G. G. Simpson, *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland, 1290–1296: An Edition of the Record Sources for the Great Cause*, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1978), I, pp. 138–41, at p. 139, and the corrections to Palgrave's text at *ibid.* note 2.

of, the claims of the 'competitors' to the kingship of the Scots.² The messenger who delivered this writ must have made the urgency clear: the abbey managed to send a return back to Edward on 12 March 1291, although they complained of the *brevitas temporis* in which they had to complete the task.³ The urgency was understandable: on 10 May 1291, the Great Cause opened at Norham, apparently with some sort of statement detailing the historical evidence behind Edward I's claim to *dominium* over the kingdom of the Scots.⁴ Evidence was required fast and, accordingly, was received quickly.

Evesham was not the only monastic house which received a writ of this kind. We have surviving copies of writs sent to Chester Priory and Sawtry Abbey which demanded the collection of historical evidence.⁵ This endeavour is known as the 'First Appeal to History' and was novel in the conscious application of already-existing historical accounts in the formulation of legal arguments. The enquiry was a large one. In addition to Evesham, Sawtry and Chester, we know that the monasteries and regular houses of Bath, Battle, Bridlington, Carlisle, Colchester, Coggeshall, Crowland, Dover, Evesham, Faversham, Gloucester, Huntingdon, Malmesbury, Newburgh, Norwich, Reading, Salisbury, Sawtry, St Albans (although its return does not survive), Holy Trinity Aldgate, Tewkesbury, Waltham, Worcester all returned information. E.L.G. Stones and Grant Simpson showed that Llanthony Priory did as well, along with St Mary's Abbey York, and one of the Canterbury houses. R.A. Griffiths argued

² See the game-changing work of A. A. M. Duncan, *The Kingship of the Scots, 842–1292: succession and independence* (Edinburgh University Press, 2002), pp. 205–19.

³ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 89.

⁴ Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 147–8; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp. 209–19; E. L. G. Stones, 'The appeal to history in Anglo-Scottish relations between 1291 and 1401', *Archives*, 9 (1969), 15–17.

⁵ For Chester, see J. Stevenson (ed.), *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland from the death of Alexander III to the accession of Robert Bruce, MCCLXXXVI–MCCCCVI*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Record Commission, 1870), I, p. 222, for Sawtry, see Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 123. For a reconstruction of the general form of the writs, see Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 222–4.

that Glastonbury's cartulary (which contains a text based on Caradog's *Vita* of Gildas) might also be identified as a house copy of an inquest return, while a list of historical events relating to Anglo-Scottish relations also survives in the Chronicle of Melrose Abbey.⁶ There are also three more returns in The National Archives whose provenance is unknown.⁷ In short, a maximum of thirty-two and a minimum of twenty-seven houses are known to have returned material, and the number originally consulted was almost certainly higher.⁸ In under two months, therefore, a major information-gathering endeavour was commenced and completed, which was supposed to bring the historical material from chronicles kept in the libraries of monasteries and regular houses directly to bear on a pressing political question.

Despite the interest in the process of inquiry itself, the 1291 inquests themselves have not received that enthusiastic a press from modern historians. Vivian Galbraith, in a

⁶ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 56–134. Palgrave did not include the return of the archdeacon of Chester, for which see TNA E39/100/156. For Llanthony *etc.*, see Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 143–4. For Glastonbury, see R.A. Griffiths, 'England, Scotland and the chronicles of English religious houses', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 6 (1979), 192–3, note 7. See also James P. Carley and J. Crick, 'Constructing Albion's Past: An Annotated Edition of *De Origine Gigantum*', in *Glastonbury Abbey and the Arthurian Tradition* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2001), 347–418, at pp. 367–8. The Melrose folio is a folio inserted into the Chronicle of Melrose (London, BL Faustina B. IX, fo. 54) which is a collection of historical material, which might be associated with the inquiry (or the presentation of historical material at Norham), or as preparation for Alexander III's meeting with Edward in 1278; see Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison (eds.), *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: a stratigraphic edition. Volume 1: introduction and facsimile*, Scottish History Society, 6th ser. 1 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), pp. 172–3. Dauvit Broun has shown that the monks of Melrose were very much aware of power of the written past, as they made two erasures in their chronicle, one of which for the year 924 (the obit for Edward the Elder, which calls him king over the Scots (the 'Scottorum' is erased), and other for 1072, Mael Coluim III's meeting at Abernethy with William the Conqueror, and the monks of Melrose erased the words *homo suus devenit*. Here, the Chronicle of Melrose was depending on a 'cognate' text of the *Historia post Bedam*, which used Simeon of Durham's *Historia Regum*, which itself used John of Worcester's *Chronica Chronicarum*; see Broun and Harrison (eds.), *Chronicle of Melrose*, I, p. 75 and note 24. For the suggestion (originally made by Marjorie Anderson) that Peterborough Abbey may have been consulted, see Dauvit Broun, *The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots*, Studies in Celtic History XVIII (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), p. 139. In what follows, I am concentrating only on the known inquests.

⁷ TNA, E39/100/154 (very damaged, but possible to identify at least some of the material and events included), /156A, 159 (very damaged but more usable than /154).

⁸ Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 143–4. Only monasteries and regular houses appear to have been asked to consult their archives in this way. The collection of the material, however, could be organised by diocese or archdeaconry. One return, for example, stated that it was answering for 'the religious places in the diocese of London', and included material from Waltham, Holy Trinity Priory Aldgate, Coggeshall Abbey, and Colchester Abbey; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 105–10; TNA, E 39/100/164.

1949 lecture, was duly unimpressed by the brevity of the returns, saying that they basically confined themselves to the 'usual authorities': in particular (although not exclusively), Florence (now John) of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon, and William of Malmesbury (although Roger of Howden was singled out as well).⁹ Antonia Gransden was slightly more sympathetic, writing that: 'in view of the short time the monks (and regular canons) had to examine the chronicles, it is not surprising that the returns do not show a high standard of research'.¹⁰ The general feeling of historiographical disappointment is caused by the perception that the monks and canons just didn't spend enough time doing their homework. They consulted the 'usual authorities', and each house came out with the same sorts of information, repeated verbatim from their sources. Indeed, this opinion seems also to echo those of the royal chancery at the time. The clerks who were going through the information also seem to have been rather unimpressed about the usefulness of the activity. They wrote notes on the dorse of some of the returns.¹¹ Of the twenty-six surviving returns (out of twenty-seven firmly *known* returns), a total of fourteen are unendorsed, and half of those which were endorsed (six out of twelve) were judged to contain 'nothing new'. (The Bath return,

⁹ V. H. Galbraith, *Historical Research in Medieval England* (London: Athlone Press, 1951), pp. 34–6.

¹⁰ Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550–c.1307* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd), p. 442; see also Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, p. 206.

¹¹ Many of the returns were endorsed by royal clerks who noted if any new information was found with them. Some are assessed as containing 'nothing'. Endorsed: Bath ('*nichil*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 58; Bridlington ('*ista sub compendio irrotulantur*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 67; Burton ('*examinatur*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 68; Crowland ('*examinetur et quicquid invenitur et invenitur in cronica de Bridlington*', '*cronica croiland*': *vide bene istam cronicam*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 84; Evesham French ('*nihil novum invenitur . cronice ... abbatia de Evesham*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 88; Evesham Latin ('*nihil novum invenitur de cronicis in abbatia de Evesham*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 92; Gloucester (*Examinatur et nihil novum invenitur - cronica - Gloucestr*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 98; Malmesbury ('*examinatur et quod novum est irrotulatur*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 115; Reading ('*examinatur et nihil novum invenitur*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 121; Tewkesbury ('*memorandum quod mittantur Cronica in quibus penultimis articulis etc. scribatur Abbati de Tewkesbury*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 129; Worcester ('*examinatur et quod novum invenitur irrotulatur*'), Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 134.

Not endorsed: Battle (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 59); Carlisle (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 76); Dover (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 85); Faversham (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 94); Huntingdon (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 104); London (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 110); Newburgh (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 119); Norwich (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 120); Salisbury (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 122); Sawtry (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 123: 21 April);

for example, was merely endorsed with 'nichil ad preponitum'—'nothing for the purpose', or, rather, 'nothing relevant'.¹²) Even the summary states explicitly that 'nothing new was found' in four out the nine returns it namechecked.

Finding little new in the inquest returns themselves, historians have either to sought to explain *why* such a novel idea produced such disappointing results or have examined the later use of these returns in Edward's subsequent appeals to history. On the first, attention has focused on the short time houses had to complete the research, the novelty of the request (and thus the confusion generated by it), and the fact that some houses seem to have not quite appreciated the urgency of the situation.¹³ The writ sent to Chester priory—the only writ which has survived in an official chancery copy—shows that the king was asking the priory *for the second time* to examine their chronicles and send their report back.¹⁴ Not all returns had been received in time. Edward I's commissioners produced a summary (*compendium*) the returns, in which they picked out the choicest pieces of information from the returns, also noting if the particular house had returned anything 'new'.¹⁵ The compendium survives in three copies now in The National Archives: one was clearly a draft, and the other two fair

¹² Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 58.

¹³ Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 138–44. One writ even informed Sawtry Abbey that, if the abbot and convent were under any doubt as to how to conduct their research, the king's serjeant, John Picard, could help them. Whatever Picard did, however, did not work, as the abbey's return seems singularly unhelpful to the king's need: it takes the form of a short genealogy of the kings of England and Scotland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and, at its end, informs the king that most of the abbey's information had come from a 'life of King David', probably referring to Aelred of Rievaulx's *Vita David*, and that the king could find this life 'in many abbeys in northern England, and Scotland, particularly Rievaulx Abbey'. TNA, E39/100/165; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 124. The return of the prior and convent of Carlisle was not returned until 20 May, ten days after the Great Cause had begun. TNA, E39/100/168; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 76.

¹⁴ The formula seems to convey slight annoyance: 'since we recently ordered you to examine your chronicles, registers and each and any of your private documents (*secreta*) carefully ... and, about these matters [i.e. Anglo-Scottish relations] you have not yet made us more certain, we ask you, as we have asked others, that you should search the aforesaid chronicles, registers, and other private documents, both the most recent and ancient', and send them back to the king 'without delay'. Stevenson (ed.), *Documents*, I, p. 222; Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 222–4.

¹⁵ TNA, E39/100/156B, /161, /166, printed in Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 134–7.

copies.¹⁶ It is most likely that it was produced *before* all the surviving returns had been received. Out of the 27 definitively known returns (of which 26 survive), the *compendium* mentions explicitly only nine returns—from Bridlington, Crowland, Chester, Reading, Malmesbury, Worcester, Gloucester, Tewkesbury, and St Albans. The returns from Bath, Battle, Burton, Carlisle, Dover, Evesham, Faversham, Huntingdon, London, Newburgh, Norwich, Salisbury and Sawtry are not mentioned.

Studies on the later use of these inquest returns have been equally negative. In their magisterial *Edward I and the Throne of Scotland*, E. L. G. Stones and Grant G. Simpson naturally examined the content of the inquests in some detail.¹⁷ The main question which interested Stones in particular was whether the inquest material was used in the historical prologue of the two Great Rolls, a prologue which tracked the history of Britain from Brutus to the reign of Henry III.¹⁸ Stones showed that these returns were not primarily used in this piece of work; instead, a more concerted effort to consult monastic and episcopal archives occurred in 1300, partly in response to the papal bull *Scimus fili*, which revealed that Pope Boniface VIII was more convinced by Scottish arguments for their autonomy (albeit under papal lordship) than English ones for their due subjection.¹⁹ In short, despite the ground-breaking work of Stones and Simpson, one finds it hard, at present, to avoid the impression that the apparently jejune and uncreative response of most houses in 1291 pales slightly against the deeply creative and aggressive use of the past in the responses to *Scimus fili*, the

¹⁶ For the draft, written in a number of different hands, see E39/100/156B.

¹⁷ Although see the overturning of their view of the purpose and authority of the rolls in Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp. 220–54.

¹⁸ Stones, 'Appeal to History', 15–21; Stones and Simpson, *Edward I*, I, pp. 146–62.

¹⁹ Stones, 'Appeal to History', 19–21; for a text of *Scimus Fili*, see E. L. G. Stones (ed.), *Anglo-Scottish Relations 1174–1328: some selected documents*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 1970), no. 28. For an important contribution to the arguments presented at the curia, see S. Tebbit, 'Papal pronouncements on legitimate lordship and the formulation of nationhood in early fourteenth-century Scottish writings', *Journal of Medieval History*, 40 (2014), 44–62.

historical prologue of the Great Roll, and, on the Scottish side, the *Instructiones* and *Processus* of Baldred Bisset and, of course, the Declaration of Arbroath.

However, the very reason why it has been so easy to dismiss the content of these returns is also what makes them so interesting. It is not enough to say that many of the returns used the same 'authorities'. It is, in fact, extraordinary that, with only a few exceptions, most houses not only drew on a similar range of texts, but also drew out very similar nuggets of information from them. This paper is fundamentally concerned with emphasising and then explaining the oddity of this occurrence. It should be a question of historiographical interest, not disappointment, that monastic and regular houses at the end of the thirteenth century chose to consult *historiae* and *gesta* which had been written more than 150 years ago and, from these sources, drew out similar passages in response to Edward I's request.²⁰ Put simply, how do we understand the *fact* that monastic and regular houses not only used similar source corpora in answer to Edward I's inquiry but also, seemingly independently, picked out such similar information from them? Developing this question illuminates the circulation of twelfth-century historical texts in the later thirteenth century in monasteries and religious houses, and their presence in these libraries. But, more than this, it offers a window into cultural memory in the very late thirteenth century. Common choices were made about how to present the distant past and what to include; although the monks were clearly uncertain about how to interpret Edward's writ, they were,

²⁰ In this my general subject echoes that of Bernard Guenée, in a short article in which he identified many of the sources underlying the inquests, and was particularly interested in whether there was geographical concentration in which sources were used (there was, to some degree), see: B. Guenée, 'L'enquête historique ordonnée par Édouard I^{er} roi d'Angleterre, en 1291', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 119 (1975), 580–1, although some of his source identifications seem to me to be incorrect; see also Matthew Fisher, 'Genealogy Rewritten: Inheriting the Legendary in Insular Historiography', in R. L. Radulescu and E. D. Kennedy (eds.), *Broken Lines: genealogical literature in medieval Britain and France* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 123–41.

apparently, certain about the kind of interpretation of the past they would record. Understanding these choices not as the result of a lackadaisical yet hard-pressed research environment but, instead, as entry points into cultural memory, and the role of text in shaping that memory, is the point of this article.

History in the returns

First, it is important to acknowledge that the returns are not alike in length and visual impact. Some are extremely short and scrappy. The return from Dover Priory (Figure 1), for example, refers to only three dated events: the coronation of Æthelstan in 924, followed immediately by the submission of Caustantín, king of *Alba*, to that king (in 927, although it is undated in Dover's return); the expedition by Siward, earl of Northumbria, to Scotland in 1054 to 'establish' Mael Coluim III as king of Scots, on the orders of Edward the Confessor; and the marriage of Henry I and Matilda, daughter of Mael Coluim and Margaret, in 1100.²¹ The return from Norwich stated that the monks had not been able to find much because they had recently suffered a serious fire and had been the victims of theft.²² They mention only four 'events'.²³ By contrast, the return from Newburgh (Figure 2), is a much finer affair, written in a set hand: the canons of Newburgh had used a version of the *miracula* of St John of Beverley for their return, reporting the saint's help to Æthelstan while on campaign in

²¹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 85; TNA, E 39/100/179.

²² Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 119–20; TNA, E 39/3/46.

²³ The 1139 peace between David I, Henry and Stephen; the 1157 surrender of the northern counties to Henry II; the submission of Mael Coluim, king of Scots, to Henry III in 1163, and the capture of William the Lion in 1174 (there wrongly dated to 1180). The source appears to be a combination of Ralph of Diss's *Imagines* and Roger of Howden's *Chronica*, sources also used by Bartholomew de Cotton's *Historia Anglicana*, produced at Norwich, for which see below, pp. 00–00 and note 75.

Scotland.²⁴ The return from Crowland (Figure 3) concentrates on the Scottish role in the Great Rebellion of 1173–4, which ended in the capture of William, king of Scots, in 1174, and his submission to Henry II, king of the English, in 1175. Crowland's return also includes a transcription of the Treaty of Falaise, and all the text originates from a copy of Roger of Howden's *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*.²⁵ Crowland's return is an extremely striking document, written in a single hand and sealed with two seals, one of which survives, and is the abbey's conventual seal.²⁶ Somebody, perhaps even the monks, seem to have been quite pleased with the work, writing 'look well on this chronicle' on the dorse of the return. Someone else, however, had a different view, for another judgement was once present on the dorse: 'it has been examined, and what has been found there was also found in [the chronicle] of Bridlington'.²⁷ The judgement of the commissioners who compiled the *compendium* was even more damning: 'in the Crowland history, nothing new is found'.²⁸

<insert Figures 1, 2 and 3 near here>

[Title] Figure 1: The return from Dover Priory (TNA, E 39/100/179)

[Title] Figure 2: The return from Newburgh Priory (TNA, E 39/100/164a)

[Title] Figure 3: The bottom half of the return from Crowland Abbey, featuring the seal tags (TNA, E 39/100/171)

²⁴ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 111–15; TNA, E 39/100/164a. At the end of its return, it states that it had found other material in 'other chronicles' and then proceeded to list the genealogy from William through Henry I and Matilda, through Empress Matilda to Henry II, Henry II to John, John to Henry III 'who bore Edward who now reigns'.

²⁵ TNA, E39/100/171; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 77–84. The relevant passages from the *Gesta Regis* are in W. Stubbs (ed.), *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis: the chronicle of the reigns of Henry II and Richard I AD 1169–1192*, Rolls Series, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867), I, pp. 47–9, 63–8, 72–3, 95–9.

²⁶ TNA, E39/100/171.

²⁷ These readings are provided in Palgrave's edition; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 84.

²⁸ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 135.

Despite the different interpretations each house made regarding the king's writ, comparison of their content reveals that many of them were recording the same 'events'. By 'event', I do not mean the actions themselves which occurred, I mean the written interpretations of those actions as they appear in particular narrative sources which are given mutually exclusive coherence through being recorded in a written source. Or, as any good university application form will tell you, an event is understood here as one of E.H. Carr's 'historical facts': a set of actions which have already gone through someone else's 'processing process'.²⁹ In this case, our actions have already gone through the processing process—or interpretations—of historians, chroniclers and chronographers working in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. What we are dealing with, then—or what lies behind the innocent *A.D.* (or, in some cases, *V.A./S.E.*) dates—are not simply accounts but instrumental interpretations, and thus the use of the word 'event' denotes an instrumental interpretation in what follows. Graph 1 shows the date of the 'event' recorded in a return, compared with the number of returns which mention that event.³⁰ All twenty-six surviving returns have been examined.³¹ The 'data set'—if it can really be called that—therefore consists of the twenty-six surviving returns, the provenance of twenty-three of which is known. It can be seen clearly that the most frequently-included 'event' was the submission of Mael Coluim mac Donnchada, king of Scots, to William the Conqueror at Abernethy in

²⁹ E.H. Carr, *What is History?*, 2nd edn (London: Penguin, 1987), pp. 7–30, at p. 16. There is of course a debate about the extent to which Carr thought the historian could objectively peer beyond the processing process (or, in other words, how epistemologically radical his thought was). For a view that sees him as a conservative thinker, see Alan Munslow's review of *What is History?*, online at <http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/41a> [accessed 3 February 2016]. However, there is also a sense that there are surprising links to be made between Carr's first chapter and the debates over ritual, and textual controls over their interpretation: see P. Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: between early medieval texts and social scientific theory* (Princeton University Press, 2001); P. Buc, 'Ritual and interpretation: the early medieval case', *Early Medieval Europe*, 9 (2000), 183–210.

³⁰ As stated in note 7, both E39/100/159 and E39/100/154 are badly damaged, and unprinted by Palgrave, so the data set only contains those 'events' which it has been possible to identify.

³¹ See below, note 0.

1072. This was mentioned in sixteen out of the twenty-six returns—over three-fifths of the total under consideration. Second was the death of the Mael Coluim, king of Scots, while on campaign in Northumbria in 1093. This was mentioned by twelve of the twenty-six returns, just under half.

<insert Graph 1 near here>

[Title:] Graph 1: Frequency of the 'events' appearing in the returns

The first point which is obvious immediately is the chronological focus of most of the returns. The tenth, eleventh and first half of the twelfth century feature far more frequently than the second half of the twelfth century or the thirteenth.³² The exception, of course, is in 1174, or the years surrounding it (1173–5), which attracted the attention of ten of the returns, as well it might, because 1174 was the year in which William the Lion, king of Scots, was captured by Henry II's forces at Alnwick in Northumberland, imprisoned in Falaise castle in Normandy, and made subject to the humiliating Treaty of Falaise which placed the kingdom of the Scots under the overlordship of Henry II (temporarily as it turned out).³³ But it is still of note that only ten returns recorded this event, which is surprising given its relevance to the subject of Edward's enquiry. This point will be returned to.

This general lack of enthusiasm or ability to include much from the reigns of Henry II and Henry III is even more marked when one considers that almost all the single events recorded from that period come from two returns, Carlisle and Huntingdon. The

³² Guenée, 'L'enquête historique', 581–2.

³³ The most recent treatment of these events is in R. Oram, *Domination and Lordship: Scotland 1070–1230* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011), pp. 132–40; see also Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp. 52–60.

return from St Mary's, Carlisle, is by far the most house-, region- and diocese-oriented of all of them.³⁴ Thus, in Carlisle's inquest under the year 1069, we learn that 'Cumbria' once included bishopric of Carlisle and the bishopric of Glasgow, and, moreover, extended far as the river of Dumbarton, which could mean either the River Leven or the Clyde, or their confluence. Under the year 1149, the return records that Henry, future king of England, came with his mother, Empress Matilda, to Carlisle and was received with 'great reverence'. The return also records that Henry II later took Carlisle from Mael Coluim IV, that William the Lion besieged Carlisle in 1174, that Alexander attacked Carlisle in 1216, and that its citizens opened their gates to him, because of the injuries John had done to them (John's death is marked in 1216).³⁵ It is also recorded that Alexander had to hand over Carlisle in 1217 to the young Henry III before he could gain absolution. Why Carlisle included all this, in particular its stress on its own diocesan superiority over Glasgow, must in part have been in response to the claims made in 1259–68 by John of Cheam, bishop of Glasgow, that his bishopric should stretch down to Stainmore, thus including the whole of the diocese of Carlisle within its limits.³⁶ This also may explain why Carlisle's return was at pains to stress that Carlisle had only been handed over to Alexander II because of John's great injuries against the city and, indeed, made its surrender the condition of Alexander's absolution.

³⁴ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 68–76.

³⁵ For an account of the Scottish contribution to the war of 1215–17, see K. J. Stringer, 'Kingship, Conflict and State-Making in the Reign of Alexander II: the war of 1215–15 and its context', in R. Oram (ed.), *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214–49* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 99–156.

³⁶ G. W. S. Barrow, 'The Anglo-Scottish Border', in his *The Kingdom of the Scots: government, church and society from the eleventh to the fourteenth century*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh University Press, 2003), pp. 112–29, at 115; D. Broun, *Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III* (Edinburgh University Press, 2007), pp. 165–71.

Carlisle was the only institution which appears to have used the inquest as an opportunity to further its own domestic cause but it was also, with the exception of Huntingdon, (which interpreted the writ in an exceptional way, as we shall see³⁷) the only return which continued consistent coverage into the thirteenth century. So, if the returns from Carlisle and Huntingdon are removed, the chronological focus is even clearer. This is represented in Graph 2. There are thirty-four events which are mentioned in returns before the Treaty of Durham in 1139, but a mere fourteen are mentioned afterwards. Only two events, the force led by Alexander II into northern England in 1243 and the marriage of Alexander II in 1221, post-date 1209. In addition, these fourteen events are mentioned a total of twenty-five times, and this includes eight mentions of William's capture at Alnwick and the imposition of the Treaty of Falaise in 1174. Excluding 1173–5, therefore, more houses than not concentrated on material which pre-dated 1139, which is simply odd, given that they were writing at more than a sesquicentenary removed.

<insert Graph 2 near here>

[Title:] Graph 2: Frequency of 'event' appearances (minus the returns from Carlisle and Huntingdon)

Written sources of the past

One way to start explaining this chronological imbalance is to identify the sources used by the compilers of the returns. As acknowledged by Galbraith, Guenée and

³⁷ See below, pp. 00–00.

Gransden, by far the most popular were John of Worcester's *Chronica Chronicarum*, Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. Some of these works are cited by name in the returns themselves. The end of the Faversham return records that it found some of its items in a '*historia Anglorum*', 'titled by the name, William, monk of Malmesbury'.³⁸ The return from Tewkesbury Abbey states that 'these things underwritten appear in the history of the English (*historia Anglorum*) woven together (*contexta*) by Henry the Archdeacon for Alexander, bishop of Lincoln'.³⁹ Worcester also used Henry of Huntingdon (and calls him 'Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon') and cited the book number from which they took their extracts.⁴⁰ Being Worcester, of course, they also knew of another chronicle, the chronicle of Marianus Scotus, which included the monk John's continuation of Marianus's universal chronicle.⁴¹ Although we know the chronicle now commonly as 'John of Worcester', it is worth reiterating that Worcester itself called the work 'the chronicle of Marianus Scotus'. John's nom de plume of Marianus was widely accepted, although a few noted that the work was a compilation. Gervase of Canterbury, in the prologue to his *Chronica*, described the 'chronicle of Marianus' as 'collected from different authors but yet called by the name of Marianus', and described it as starting from the beginning of the universe, and continuing past the birth of Christ to the year 1135, 'that is to the death of Henry, first king of the English, and the kingship of King Stephen'.⁴²

³⁸ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 94.

³⁹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 125.

⁴⁰ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 129. They called it *de gestis Anglorum*.

⁴¹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 131.

⁴² Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica*, in W. Stubbs (ed.), *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, Rolls Series, 2 vols. (London: Longmans & Co, 1879–80), I, p. 89.

Five returns used William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. Six returns used Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*.⁴³ Eleven returns used John of Worcester's *Chronica Chronicarum*.⁴⁴ Other sources were, of course, used. Two returns—those from Faversham and Waltham—quoted directly from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britannie*, mentioning, among other items, Brutus's division of *Britannia* into three between his sons, Locrinus, Kamber, and Albanactus.⁴⁵ Carlisle used some material cognate to information first attested not only in John of Worcester's *Chronica* but also Ralph of Diss's *Imagines Historiarum*, as well as inserting a number of house-specific entries, as described above.⁴⁶ Crowland Abbey

⁴³ The work of Cristian Ispir, building on that of Diana Greenway and Patrick McGurk, has shown that there existed a version of John of Worcester's *Chronicle*, which ended in 1131, which was then followed by a version of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia* covering the years 1131–54, which had been reorganised into annals (dated by both *AD* and *VA*), so that a continuous narrative from Creation to 1154 was created. This text circulated under the name '*Cronica Mariani*'; see Cristian Ispir, 'A critical edition of the Crowland Chronicle', unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London (2011), pp. 79–82. Greenway called this the 'Marianist' redaction of Henry of Huntingdon's *HA*, and stated that it was derived from version 6; Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. D. Greenway, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford University Press, 1996) [henceforth HH, *Historia*], pp. clvii–viii. Worcester, which appears to have been the only house which used both Henry of Huntingdon and John of Worcester in their return, was not using a manuscript witness to this compilation, as its return includes selections from the *HA* from the tenth and eleventh centuries and, as stated above, cited it by book.

⁴⁴ Only Bridlington seems to have accessed John through a later chronicle, see below, pp. 00–00. No house accessed it through either Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum* or Matthew Paris's *Chronica Majora*. See the comparison between Evesham's return, John of Worcester, and Wendover's text for the year 934, in Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 89–90; R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk (eds.), *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 3 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1995–), II, pp. 388–91 [henceforth JW]; on the advice of David Carpenter, I have used Roger of Wendover as through Matthew Paris's *Chronica Majora*, for which see H. R. Luard (ed.), *Matthæi Parisiensis Monachi Sancti Albani*, Rolls Series, 7 vols. (London: Longman & Co, 1872–83), I, p. 449. Paris's *Flores* was not used either (see below, note 0). It might be thought that those houses which used William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* could have accessed it through a later work, such as its abridgement by Gervase of Canterbury in his own *Gesta Regum*. However, textual collation shows this not to be the case, see the entry for Siward's 1054 expedition to Scotland in the return from Dover, William of Malmesbury's *GRA*, and Gervase of Canterbury's *Gesta Regum*; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 85; R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (eds.), *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Oxford Medieval Texts, 2 vols. (Oxford University Press, 1998–9) [henceforth WM, *GRA*], I, p. 348; Gervase, *Gesta Regum*, in Stubbs (ed.), *Historical Works*, II, pp. 57–8.

⁴⁵ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 92 (*Historia Britonum*), 105 (*in quodam libro qui dicitur Brut*). For Brutus's division between Locrinus, Kamber and Albanactus, see in M. Reeve (ed.) and N. Wright (trans.), *Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2009), pp. 30–1; J. Crick, *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth: IV dissemination and later reception* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991), p. 206 (for Faversham).

⁴⁶ See the example of how William's capture at Alnwick in 1174 fulfilled one of Merlin's prophecies, see Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 73; Ralph of Diss, *Imagines Historiarum*, in W. Stubbs (ed.), *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto*, Rolls Series, 2 vols. (London: Longman & Co, 1876), I,

used the annals from 1173–5 from Roger of Howden's *Gesta Regis* for their return, although they may well have known the work through the appearance of the annals for 1170–77 in a composite universal chronicle starting at Creation and ending in 1225, surviving in the manuscript BL Additional 35168, dated palaeographically saec. xiii.⁴⁷ Sawtry Abbey stated that it was using a copy of the *Vita David Regis Scotorum*, presumably referring to the *Lamentatio* by Aelred of Rievaulx, originally composed 1153/4.⁴⁸ But by far the texts most frequently used were the *Chronica* attributed to Marianus Scotus (John of Worcester), Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, and, to a slightly lesser degree, William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*.⁴⁹

If one breaks down the appearance of each individual 'event' according to historical text (see Graph 3), it can be seen that, for the pre-1139 events, John of Worcester's *Chronica* was used consistently for the period 900 onwards. Henry of Huntingdon was not used for the period before the mid-tenth century but, from then on, was used almost as consistently for the chronology as John's *Chronica*. William of Malmesbury's *Gesta* was used regularly to record tenth-century events, but rather less so for the eleventh or twelfth: the glut which appears towards the end of the eleventh century was because of his interest in recording (in a rather idiosyncratic way) the

pp. 383–4. It has not been possible to firmly identify Carlisle's source, although it does contain material also found in JW.

⁴⁷ London, BL Additional 35168. The fullest discussion of this manuscript is now Ispir, 'Crowland Chronicle', pp. 67–94. David Corner established that the text from Howden's *Gesta* in Additional 35168 came from BL Cotton Julius A.xi: D. Corner, 'The earliest surviving manuscripts of Roger of Howden's *Chronica*', *English Historical Review*, 98 (1983), 300. Ispir states that 'the textual variation makes it impossible to determine for certain whether MS Additional 35168 was indeed the exemplar from which the royal commissioners [*sic*] worked'; Ispir, 'Crowland Chronicle', p. 70. However, collation has revealed no significant textual variation, but certainly the abbey community picked and chose their content in a rather sophisticated way. The relevant passage would have been taken from BL Additional 35168, fos. 173r–181v.

⁴⁸ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 124.

⁴⁹ For an account of the relationships between early twelfth-century chroniclers, see M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and his contemporaries', in R. H. C. Davies and J. M. Wallace Hadrill (eds.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: essays presented to Richard William Southern* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 101–26.

important political turns of the 1090s in Scotland.⁵⁰ This decade witnessed: the death of Mael Coluim, Margaret and Edward, their eldest son, in 1093; the election of Mael Coluim's brother, Domnall, to the kingship later that year; the invasion of Donnchad, Mael Coluim's eldest son by another marriage in 1094; the killing of Donnchad, probably on the instigation of his uncle Domnall, again in 1094; and the eventual assumption of the kingship by Edgar, son of Mael Coluim III and Margaret, who also seems to have led English-backed forces into the kingdom, becoming king at the expense of his elder brothers, Edmund and Æthelred.⁵¹ The 1090s were indeed a busy decade. William of Malmesbury described these machinations to serve as a backdrop for his praise of the three early twelfth-century kings of Scots, Edgar (d.1107), Alexander I (d.1124), and David (d.1153).⁵² It is of note that some events were recorded in a number of returns regardless of which source was being used: the English king Edgar's meeting with the other kings in Britain in 973, Mael Coluim III's submission to William the Conqueror at Abernethy in 1072, and the turbulence over the kingship of the Scots which occurred during the 1090s.⁵³

<insert Graph 3 near here>

[Title:] Graph 3: 'Events' recorded in the returns, broken down by source (HH, JW, WM).

⁵⁰ WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 722–5. For example, WM stated that Domnall was done to death in 1094 by 'the acuity of the younger David, and William's men', which is surprising, given that David was probably only ten or eleven years old and, although no doubt a remarkably bright young man, probably did not yet exert that much influence on either Scottish politics or William Rufus. For this passage, and a slightly different translation, see WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 724–5. I hope to develop the relationship between William of Malmesbury and the future David I at another point but, for preliminary comments, see B. Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury, King Henry I, and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 31 (2008), 169, 172–4.

⁵¹ For the most recent assessment see A. Ross, *The Kings of Alba, c.1000–c.1130* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2011), pp. 159–81; Duncan, *Kingship of the Scots*, pp. 52–9; and for later reinterpretations of the events of the 1090s, see D. Broun, 'Contemporary Perspectives on Alexander II's Succession: the evidence of king-lists', in Oram (ed.), *Reign of Alexander*, pp. 79–98.

⁵² WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 722–5.

⁵³ See below, pp. 00–00.

The use of these texts reveals that more houses had copies of these works at the end of the thirteenth century than is currently possible to identify from either surviving manuscripts or published medieval and early modern book lists and library catalogues.⁵⁴ Worcester, Tewkesbury, Waltham, Reading, Salisbury, and Chester all used Henry's *Historia*. Yet, of the twenty-nine surviving manuscripts containing either complete or incomplete texts of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* transcribed during the twelfth, thirteenth and early fourteenth century, not one can be confidently attributed to any one of these houses which, in the 1291 returns, used Henry's *HA*.⁵⁵ Equally, although twenty-one more texts are listed in medieval and early modern book catalogues, not one of these twenty-one can confidently be attributed to any of the six houses.⁵⁶ An early thirteenth-century book list of the library at Bridlington, shows that the canons had a copy of Henry of Huntingdon (listed as the *chronica Henrici*), which no longer survives, as well as one of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *HRB* (*hystoria Britonum*), but the abbey used neither work for their return, instead using the universal chronicle of John of Worcester (known as the chronicle of Marianus Scotus in the returns), mediated, as we shall see, by Roger of Howden's *Chronica* (which used the

⁵⁴ For what follows, I have used N. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: a list of surviving books*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 15 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1964), the *Corpus of Medieval British Library Catalogues*, gen. ed. R. Sharpe, and the ongoing project of Richard Sharpe and James Willoughby to bring together the BA's *Corpus* and Ker's *Medieval Libraries*, online at <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>, as well as the introductions to the OMT editions of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (eds. Mynors, Thomson and Winterbottom), Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* (ed. Greenway), and John of Worcester's *Chronica* (eds. at present, Darlington and McGurk).

⁵⁵ HH, *Historia*, pp.cxviii–cxliv.

⁵⁶ The figure does not include either of the two surviving manuscripts which also appear in book lists (BL Arundel 48 (medieval provenance: Southwick) or Dublin, Archbishop Marsh's Library, Z.4.5.17 (medieval provenance: Rievaulx)). The figure of twenty-one comes from browsing *MLGB3*, and searching for 'Henry of Huntingdon', and scrolling down for 'Historia Anglorum' (mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk, accessed 5 February 2016).

Historia post Bedam, which itself used Simeon of Durham's *Historia de Regibus*, which in turn used John's *Chronica Chronicarum*).⁵⁷

The use of John of Worcester/Marianus Scotus is even more striking, but slightly more problematic. Eleven houses made use of a text of the *Chronica Chronicarum*: Evesham, Worcester (again), Bridlington, Gloucester, Huntingdon, the unidentified E39/100/154, 156a and /159, Coggeshall and Colchester. But only five full-text early manuscripts of John's work have survived.⁵⁸ Nor were any of the returns using either the *chronicula* (an abridgement of John's work surviving in a single manuscript written for the most part in John's hand) or the 'common root', a second abridgement which takes the form of a breviated world chronicle, which P.A. Hayward has recently argued was compiled by John himself, and is witnessed in the Winchcombe and Coventry annals.⁵⁹ Instead, most of our returns used what appears to be the *full* text of John's chronicle, which indicates a significant level of circulation and use long after its first few 'publications' beyond what is currently attested. One of them (Bridlington) goes chronologically beyond any of the attested end-dates of John's *Chronica*; comparison

⁵⁷ http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/A4/, A4.54 (*chronica Henrici*), A4.75 (*historia anglorum*, identified as Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*), A4.76 (*historia Britonum*), suggesting that Bridlington had a copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry of Huntingdon and Bede in the early thirteenth century. Given that they used Roger of Howden's *Chronica*, and the book list has been dated to the early thirteenth century, it is probable that the canons acquired a copy after the book list was made, see T. Webber and A. G. Watson (eds.), *Libraries of the Augustinian Canons*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 6 (London: British Library, 1998), pp. 8–22; Crick, *HRB*, IV, p. 206.

⁵⁸ JW, II, pp. xxxi–lix; III, pp. xvi–xviii.

⁵⁹ The *chronicula* survives in a single manuscript, now Dublin, Trinity College Dublin, MS 503, it is being edited by David A. Woodman as volume I of John of Worcester's *Chronicle*, published in Oxford Medieval Texts. I am very grateful to Dr Woodman for checking the *chronicula* and supplying me with its readings from his preliminary work, as I did not consult the manuscript myself. For the entries in which the *chronicula* does record similar material to that in the returns, such for 921 (under the Marian year 933) or 1093, the *chronicula* has rewritten, abridged or slightly altered the text in the main *Chronica*. Other 'events', such as Siward's campaign into Scotland in 1054 or Mael Coluim's submission at Abernethy in 1072, are completely absent in the *chronicula*. The 'common root' as evidenced in the Coventry and Winchcombe annals is identified and edited in P.A. Hayward (ed.), *The Winchcombe and Coventry Chronicles: hitherto unnoticed witnesses to the work of John of Worcester*, 2 vols. (Tempe, Az: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2010). Its readings are completely different from any in the returns.

of these later extracts reveal that its source was Roger of Howden's *Chronica* (which does, eventually lead us back to John's *Chronica*).⁶⁰ But it remains that the returns from Evesham, Worcester, Gloucester, the unidentified E39/100/154, /156a and /159, Coggeshall and Colchester all used extracts from John's *Chronica* for material no later than 1100; it is thus possible that they, unlike Bridlington, were not using any later source which itself had used the *Chronica Chronicarum*.⁶¹ (Worcester and Gloucester even explicitly say that they are using the chronicles of 'Marianus Scotus', and some, such as Gloucester, retain the Marianan *verior assertio* dating system, as transmitted by John's *Chronica*.⁶²) Although the extent of the circulation of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* has long been acknowledged, it is of note that out of the five houses which made use of the *Gesta* only Faversham's library is known to have once had a copy.⁶³ This no longer survives but it was recorded in a book list made by John Leland between 1536 and 1540.⁶⁴

Second, the returns reveal how these texts—John's *Chronica*, Henry's *Historia* and, to a lesser degree, William's *Gesta*—intersected with and shaped wider monastic

⁶⁰ See, for example, Bridlington's entry on the 1200 homage of William the Lion to John; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 66, to be compared with W. Stubbs (ed.), *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hovedene*, Rolls Series, 4 vols. (London: Longmans & Co, 1868–71), IV, p. 141. For Carlisle, see above, note 50. For Simeon, see most recently and, indeed, its relationship with *Historia post Bedam*, see David Rollason, 'Symeon of Durham's *Historia de Regibus Anglorum et Dacorum* as a Product of Twelfth-century Historical Workshops', in M. Brett and D. A. Woodman (ed.), *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past* (Farnham: Ashgate Press, 2014), pp. 95–112 (with a very helpful diagram at p. 107); and Brett, 'John of Worcester', pp. 119–20.

⁶¹ Although perhaps less so in the case in the case of Coggeshall, whose *Chronicon Anglicanum*, put together under the direction of Abbot Ralph, is thought to have used Howden's *Chronica*. Nonetheless, it is extremely striking that the only events Coggeshall recorded were pre-1100; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 108.

⁶² Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 94–7, 131.

⁶³ WM, *GRA*, I, pp. xiii–xxi; R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), p. 39; see also S.O. Sonnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), pp. 97–8.

⁶⁴ R. Sharpe, J. P. Carley, R. M. Thomson, G. G. Watson (eds.), *English Benedictine Libraries: the shorter catalogues*, Corpus of Medieval Library Catalogues, 4 (London: British Library, 1995), pp. 00–00; online at http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/B35/ [accessed 5 February 2016]

knowledge and, indeed, memory of the historical past in the late thirteenth century. The chronological focus on the tenth to early twelfth century was not a simple product of source-use, of reaching for the nearest chronicle and going through it methodically, it reflected instead significant knowledge of the content of these historical texts among monastic and regular communities which both shaped and was shaped by wider cultural memory of the political past. This is the point which will be developed for the remainder of this paper, and we will start again with the manner in which the later twelfth and thirteenth century is treated compared with the earlier period.

Written histories and cultural memory

After all, the content of these three texts—John's *Chronica*, Henry's *Historia* and William's *Gesta*—appear to have been better known than the content of any other major work, particularly those which covered the later period. As stated above, it is of note that most of the 'events' recorded in the returns were tenth-, eleventh- or early twelfth-century ones. There were, however, two 'events' from the second half of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries which were, exceptionally, recorded in more than two returns. First, the capture of William the Lion, king of Scots, by Henry II's forces at Alnwick in 1174, and the treaty imposed upon him as a result (the Treaty of Falaise), and, second, the near-military confrontation between John and William's forces which was only settled by a peace agreement made at Norham in late July and early August 1209.⁶⁵ Both resulted in important homages being performed or confirmed to the

⁶⁵ For 1173–5, see above, note 37. The 1209 treaty was recently discovered by David Carpenter and printed in his *Magna Carta: a new commentary* (London: Penguin, 2015), pp. 237–41, 473–5; for further discussion, see A. Taylor, 'The Scottish Clause in Magna Carta in Context: Homage,

English king. Ten returns mentioned the events of 1174 (sometimes including the public confirmation of the Treaty of Falaise at St Peter's York in 1175), while five mentioned the events of 1209. This frequency was exceptional in the post-1139 return-record; these two events were the only ones which were mentioned in more than two returns. It is easy to see why they attracted attention, given the brief in 1291. The Treaty of Falaise established that William the Lion (and the leading members of aristocracy) would perform homage to Henry II 'as his liege lord', thus placing his kingdom under the overlordship of the English king.⁶⁶ The 1209 peace of Norham (which William had to buy for 15,000 marks) has only recently been discovered but it too would have delighted Edward's commissioners: it confirmed the (lesser) homage William had performed to John in 1200 yet required Alexander, William's only son and heir, to perform homage to John, his 'lord', as William had done to Henry II, that is for the kingdom of Scots itself.⁶⁷ This treaty also described Alexander as John's 'man'. Both of these 'events', therefore, would have been of great interests to Edward I's commissioners, who were aiming to establish his legal and historical position as *superior dominus* of the kingdom of the Scots.

The ten returns which mention the Treaty of Falaise and the events surrounding it were from Bath, Bridlington, Burton, Carlisle, Crowland, E39/100/159, Huntingdon, Norwich, Reading, and Waltham. Some houses did not have a full picture of what had happened, despite recording it. The return from Bath Abbey stated that William had been captured while Henry II was doing penance for the murder of Thomas Becket but

overlordship and the consequences of peace in the early thirteenth century', in N. Vincent and S. Ambler (eds.), *Magna Carta: new interpretations* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, forthcoming).

⁶⁶ Stones (ed.), *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, no. 1, pp. 2–3.

⁶⁷ Carpenter, *Magna Carta*, pp. 238–9; for the position that the contents of the 1209 treaty were known to chroniclers writing in the Scottish kingdom (although they chose to disguise them), see Taylor, 'Scottish Clause', forthcoming.

that 'nothing was discovered about the release of the king of Scotland'.⁶⁸ Yet other houses had a good amount of material on it; indeed, Burton and Crowland include nothing else.⁶⁹ Four houses had either copied or summarised the Treaty of Falaise itself. Of these, three had clearly obtained their copy from either Roger of Howden's *Gesta* or his *Chronica*.⁷⁰ Roger of Howden's *Chronica* was the source for another of the returns, that of Holy Trinity Norwich, even though they did not include a copy or summary of the Treaty.⁷¹ Despite the claims the monks made in the priory's return (they had suffered a recent fire and so had no resources), it is demonstrable that they either held a copy or had access to a copy of the *Chronica*, as Bartholomew de Cotton used it in his *Historia Anglicana*, which, it is argued, he began to compile at Norwich in 1291.⁷² But what is interesting about this is that, although Howden was the predominant go-to source for the events of 1173–5, and expressly for the Treaty of Falaise, only one house—Bridlington—plundered his *Chronica* for information on

⁶⁸ No wonder the commissioners marked it as 'it contains nothing for the purpose' (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 58). TNA, E39/100/159, although damaged, seems to be saying that William gave Henry hostages for his castles, which is technically incorrect; they were given for upholding the treaty and settlement (of which the surrender of the castles was an aspect); see Stones (ed.), *Anglo-Scottish Relations*, no. 1, p. 7.

⁶⁹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 67–8. The Burton annals, compiled 'in a clerk's hand of the early fourteenth century', which survives in a single manuscript, London, BL Cotton Vespasian E. iii, contain a remarkable number of documents, including a copy of the 1225 Magna Carta (for which, see the research of David Carpenter, online at: http://magnacartaresearch.org/read/magna_carta_copies/II_The_chronicle_of_Burton_Abbey_Annals_Monastici_ed_H_R_Luard_5_vols_Rolls_Series_1864-9_i_225-32 [accessed 5 February 2016]). The treaty of Falaise is not, however, among them; indeed, there is hardly any material recorded for the 1170s; H. R. Luard (ed.), *Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, 5 vols. (London: Longman & Co, 1864–9), I, pp. xxvii, 187.

⁷⁰ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 63–5 (Bridlington, using the *Chronica*), 67–8 (Burton, using the *Chronica*?, but we cannot be sure), 77–84 (Crowland, using the *Gesta*), 106 (Waltham, using the *Chronica*).

⁷¹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 120.

⁷² This would mean that the compiler of the Norwich return was being rather disingenuous when he said that 'I have not been able to find anything further on this' (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 120). Bartholomew de Cotton's *Historia Anglicana* is a composite work, of which the first part is taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth, the second part is framed as a universal chronicle, and the third a tract on bishops and archbishop. The first part is now in a different manuscript: BL Royal 14 C.i, fos. 20–137; the universal chronicle section is in Cotton Nero C. v, fos. 162–285, now bound together with Marianus Scotus (which is of Gloucester provenance). As Antonia Gransden put it, Cotton used 'well-known sources', so William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon and Roger of Howden, among others (the full chronicle goes up to 1298), while the third part is a tract on bishops and archbishop; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, I, pp. 444–8, at p. 444.

Anglo-Scottish relations *other* than for this particular event.⁷³ So unlike the use of John of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon in particular, Roger of Howden's *Gesta* and *Chronica* were used primarily for their texts of the Treaty of Falaise or their accounts of 1173–5 but not for a wider search for information on Anglo-Scottish relations.⁷⁴ In short, Roger of Howden's *Chronica* was not consulted with anything like the same thoroughness or competence as were John of Worcester's *Chronica* or Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia*.

The material on 1209 reveals something rather different. Only five returns mention this event: those of Bridlington, Carlisle, the unidentified E39/100/159, Huntingdon, and Tewkesbury. Carlisle's merely records that 'venit Rex Johannes cum exercitu magno apud Norham'.⁷⁵ Bridlington, who had used Roger of Howden's *Chronica* throughout (and, through the *Historia post Bedam*, John of Worcester as well) had run out of material by this point, as Roger's *Chronica* ended in 1201. But its compilers nonetheless had included quite a long description of the events of 1209, despite their main source coming to an end. It recorded that, in June, King John had built a castle at Berwick, had gathered a huge army together 'to destroy the king of Scotland' because the latter was trying to marry his daughter to the count of Boulogne without John's consent. In a second entry, the Bridlington return also recorded that, in August, the

⁷³ The return from Norwich has another three events but these are taken from other sources. So the account of Mael Coluim IV's 1163 submission (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 120) is taken from Ralph of Diss's *Imagines Historiarum*, ed. Stubbs, I, p. 311.

⁷⁴ It is of note that written documents, detailing the form of public submission were becoming more important as constituent parts of politics and diplomacy in the later twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, for which see K. van Eickels, *Vom inszenierten Konsens zum systematisierten Konflikt. Die englisch-französischen Beziehungen und ihre Wahrnehmung an der Wende vom Hoch- zum Spätmittelalter*, (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke, 2002).

⁷⁵ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 66–7, 74, 103–4, 128. E39/100/159 is damaged but its account of 1209 seems to only have taken up a maximum of one and a half lines of the return. The only readable text is: *Mccix cui rex Willelmus Scottorum occurrens* (which takes up half of one line), so the whole entry would have not been very long at all.

two kings made peace but did not include any further detail because 'not enough is known to us'.⁷⁶

Bridlington's acknowledgement that they did not know enough about the events of 1209 to mention anything more is echoed in a different way by the return from Tewkesbury Abbey. Although Tewkesbury used Henry of Huntingdon for most of its return, it did include two further items, one of which was the events of 1209, an entry which is attested almost verbatim in the abbey's own annalistic chronicle.⁷⁷ Tewkesbury's return stated that 'discord arose between the king and the king of Scotland but after they were pacified, hostages were to be taken in perpetuity from Scotland for the goodwill of the king of England'.⁷⁸ Tewkesbury clearly knew more than this. Its return is the only one which has an endorsement which says quite a bit more than 'enrolled', 'nothing', or 'nothing is found for the purpose'. Tewkesbury's endorsement states that 'memorandum: that chronicles which contain the penultimate articles have been sent' and, as a separate note, 'the abbot of Tewkesbury has been written to'.⁷⁹ The penultimate article of Tewkesbury's return was, of course, its summary of the events of 1209. The commissioners had clearly noted it, and asked the abbot of Tewkesbury for more information, which they seem to have received. In the *compendium*, the summary of the returns produced by the commissioners, material listed under 'Tewkesbury' states that: 'it is reported in a certain sheet written after the chronicles of the Scots that, at Alnwick, Alexander, son of William, king of Scots, did

⁷⁶ TNA E39/100/158; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 66–7.

⁷⁷ Tewkesbury Annals, s.a. 1209, in *Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard, I, p. 59. This passage, however, was not the abbey's own composition; it is also attested in a longer version in the Annals of the priory of Worcester, compiled in the early fourteenth century, surviving in BL Caligula A.x, and edited in *Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard, IV, pp. 353–564, at p. 398. The relationship between Tewkesbury and Worcester is discussed in *ibid.*, p. xxxviii. It was not, however, original to that house, and a slightly longer version appears in Worcester's annals (which did not make it into Worcester's own return).

⁷⁸ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 128.

⁷⁹ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 129.

homage to John, king of England, for all his rights for which his father had done homage to King Henry, father of John, and then fifteen hostages were given at Norham to keep the peace'.⁸⁰ The treaty of Norham actually consists of four separate documents, and this short statement included in the *compendium* accurately summarises the content of two out of the four: Alexander did do homage and fifteen hostages were given to John.⁸¹ What this suggests, therefore, is that Tewkesbury actually had copies of at least some of the documents produced as part of the Treaty of Norham, or at least an accurate summary of its contents, but did not, at first, know that they had this, nor what the significance of the contents were. Like Bridlington, they had not originally included more on the subject because they did not know and they did not remember.

What this adds up to, therefore, is that Henry's *Historia* and John's *Chronica* appear to have been better known than any later historical works, even Roger of Howden's *Chronica* or, just possibly, Ralph of Diss's *Imagines* which were used by one each of the returns. (It is also worth noting the absence of Matthew Paris's *Flores Historiarum*, which had a very wide circulation from early fourteenth century onwards but which clearly had not made such an impact by 1291.⁸²) William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum* was also invoked more than Howden but given that his work was consulted less thoroughly than either John's *Chronica* or Henry's *Historia*, the contrast is less powerful than it is when comparing Howden with either of the latter texts. But the pertinent point here, therefore, is that the content of these two works was clearly well known in a number of religious communities at the end of the thirteenth century. This

⁸⁰ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 136.

⁸¹ Taylor, 'Scottish Clause', forthcoming.

⁸² R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 92–109. For the manuscripts, see *Flores Historiarum*, ed. H. R. Luard, Rolls Series, 3 vols. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1890), I, pp. xi–xxiv.

begs the question of how? This is a much larger subject, but it is possible to make a start here and look at extant manuscripts in order to show not only evidence of interaction with the content of the texts themselves, but also the expectation that such interaction would occur.

As stated above, the only manuscript that can be even tentatively associated as a manuscript used for a return (BL Additional 35168)—probably used by Crowland Abbey—does not contain a full text of either Henry's *Historia* or John's *Chronica*.⁸³ Indeed, Crowland Abbey used it solely for its material taken from Howden's *Gesta*. There is thus no surviving manuscript containing a full text of either Henry's *Historia* or John's *Chronica* which was used in the compilation of any of the returns. As a result, I am focussing in what follows on a manuscript of Henry of Huntingdon's *HA* whose provenance is known and which contains a full text of version 5 of the *HA*: London, British Library, MS Arundel 48.⁸⁴ The manuscript is dated palaeographically to either the very late twelfth or the first quarter of the thirteenth century and belonged to the Augustinian priory of St Mary at Southwick in Hampshire. Although no 1291 inquest return survives from Southwick, it is a useful case study because it is clear that the codex was either compiled at the priory or obtained by the priory by the mid-thirteenth century and thus acts as evidence for thirteenth-century use and understanding. The codex's thirteenth-century ownership is clear: it contains multiple but identical curses threatening anyone who either stole or defaced the volume.⁸⁵

Three of these threats were written in a hand which made marginal annotations to the

⁸³ See above, pp. 00-00.

⁸⁴ London, BL, MS Arundel 48. For the MS, see *The Libraries of King Henry VIII*, ed. J. P. Carley, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues (London: British Library, 2000), p. xlic. HH, *Historia*, p. cxix ("A"); C. Brett, 'John Leland and the Anglo-Norman historian', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 9 (1989), 68.

⁸⁵ BL MS Arundel 48, fos. 2v–3r, 10v, 58v–59r, 67r, 69v, 84v–85r, 161r. The marginal annotating hand produced the curses on fos. 10v, 69v, and 161r.

entire text of the *HA*, beginning in book 1 and ending in book 10. This hand is neat, illustrating broken arches and decorative serifs on its ascenders, and should not be dated past the mid-thirteenth century.⁸⁶ Thus, if not written at Southwick Priory (as is probable), the codex was certainly in its library by the mid-thirteenth century at the latest.

In total, the hand made sixty-three identifiable notes in the folio margins. The same hand also made small additions and corrections to the main text, showing a close engagement with the text while inserting his marginal summaries and pointers.⁸⁷ The majority of his notes, however, are summaries of the main text. All are extremely well placed. A few indicate other, sometimes conflicting, readings in other sources (for example, 'alibi xxiii', on fo. 11v). But the majority summarise the contents of the text. Many of these are prefaced by *nota* monograms, but there are also *nota* signs dotted throughout, with no explanatory text by them, which reveals that the scribe did not intend that his small summaries pointed his reader to the only things he thought reading in the *HA*. By far the most notes were made on Book V of Henry's *HA*: *de bellis dacorum* ('on the Danish wars', which covered the period from the mid-ninth century to the year 1000). Here scribe made eighteen annotations, ranging from 'this is the reason why the fury of the lord raged down upon the Britons' (fo. 69v) to 'how King Alfred was blessed by Pope Leo and promoted to the kingship' (fo. 70v) to 'how many abbeys King Edgar built' (fo. 80v). But although Book V of the *HA* contains the largest number of marginal notes, every book of the *HA* received the attention of this summarising scribe. Book VIII ('on exalted matters') contains eight annotations, ranging from 'on the death of King Attila' (fo. 127r) to 'estimation on the extent of the

⁸⁶ I am grateful to Tessa Webber for discussing this briefly with me but she is not responsible for any infelicities.

⁸⁷ For an example, see BL Arundel MS 48, fo. 73r.

world and its end' (fo. 118v), to 'the opinion of the Jews' (fo. 119r). Book VII, on the kingdom of the Normans, concentrated its efforts on detailing aspects of the so-called Gregorian Reform: 'on the council of Archbishop of Anselm in which the first prohibition was against priests' wives' (fo. 109v).

No annotation made by this hand in Arundel 48 directly refers to a passage also cited in one of the 1291 returns which used Henry's *Historia* (although there is a note in Book VI which refers to Cnut's journey to Rome, which is immediately followed in the main text by Cnut's projected expedition to Scotland in 1027, which does appear in the returns).⁸⁸ But this is not the point. What these annotations reveal, at Southwick, is a guide to the text, written by a scribe who clearly knew Henry's *Historia* extremely well, which were intended to act as a guide to others. In short, the scribe who annotated BL Arundel 48 by the mid-thirteenth century seems to have done so in the expectation that others would use his notes to engage with the wider contents of the text, and as such reveals that version 5 of Henry's *Historia* was not only actively used but was expected to be well known at the Augustinian priory of Southwick by the mid-thirteenth century.

Further work on the extant manuscripts of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia* and John of Worcester's *Chronica* would develop this position. Tessa Webber, for example, has recently shown how Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* was used as a source for hagiographical lections during matins, and how his work as a whole came to be understood as a collection of saints' cults among monastic communities.⁸⁹ More research on the surviving manuscripts would show how, if at all, John of Worcester's

⁸⁸ HH, *Historia*, pp. 366–7.

⁸⁹ T. Webber, 'Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* as a Source of Lections in Pre- and Post-Conquest England', in Woodman and Brett (eds.), *Long Twelfth-Century View*, pp. 47–74.

Chronica and Henry of Huntingdon's *HA* were also used for public reading. It is, however, worth considering why the content of these two works in particular was known. Here, an explanation may lie in genre. John of Worcester and his workshop, by expanding Marianus Scotus's world history, placed the history of the English at the heart not only of Christian time, but also debates over the correct computistical rendering of time, and the effect that had on the calculation of Easter.⁹⁰ As mentioned above, Gervase of Canterbury, at the end of the twelfth century, famously described Marianus's chronicle as 'assembled by various writers put written under his [that is, Marianus's] name, sets forth in a very clear and compendious fashion, the eras and years from the beginning of the world down to Christ, and from the Incarnation to the year 1135 of the Lord's Incarnation (that is, down to the death of King Henry I of England, and the beginning of Stephen's reign)'.⁹¹ Although Gervase in his work decided to follow Dionysius Exiguus's dating of the Christian era, rather than Marianus's *verior assertio* dates, it still remains that, to read Marianus (including John) was to engage in sacred chronology and eschatology, and thus understand how God's providence had worked out for the history of the English throughout the sixth age of the world.⁹²

Henry's *Historia* was not a universal chronicle; however, as Diana Greenway has written, he 'was not unaware of universal history'.⁹³ Indeed, he even used material from Marianus Scotus. Henry also used Bede's attempt at universal history, his

⁹⁰ P. Verbist, 'Reconstructing the Past: the chronicle of Marianus Scotus', *Peritia*, 16 (2002), 284–334. More generally, B. Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris: Aubier-Montaigne, 1980), pp. 147–65.

⁹¹ Gervase, *Chronica*, in Stubbs (ed.), *Historical Works*, I, p. 89.

⁹² This is a point most firmly stressed by P. A. Hayward, who argued that the 'common root' abridgement was compiled under John's auspices to aid the teaching of computus; *Winchcombe and Coventry*, ed. Hayward, I, pp. 37–48, 96–8; see also A. Lawrence-Mathers, 'John of Worcester and the science of history', *Journal of Medieval History*, 39 (2013), 255–74.

⁹³ HH, p. lxiii; for Henry's methods see also N. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: the writing of history in twelfth-century England* (Chicago: University Press, 1977), pp. 11–50.

Chronica Maiora, for his letter to Henry I.⁹⁴ Although Henry of Huntingdon himself was not a *chronicus*, his *Historia* certainly was used as major sources in other self-defined universal *chronica*. The section from 1132–54, for example, was edited to divide Henry's text (famous for its lack of dates) into yearly annals, then dated them according to *A.D.* and Marianus's *verior assertio* calculations, and added as a continuation to the John/Marianist compilation itself.⁹⁵ Robert of Torigni also used Henry's *Historia* as a major source for his own universal chronicle, which updated the *cronographia* of the universal chronicler, Siegbert of Gembloux.⁹⁶ Elisabeth van Houts has suggested that it was Henry's gift of a copy of his *Historia Anglorum* to Robert of Torigni that inspired the latter to write his universal chronicle, although this has recently been challenged by Benjamin Pohl.⁹⁷ Pohl's position instead is that Robert received a copy in c.1147; his emphasis on his early reception of Henry of Huntingdon in the prologue to his *Chronica* was a claim to the authority of his own work. Henry's *Historia* fitted well into other compilers' universal histories.

What made Henry's *Historia* so powerful to a monastic audience may have been his emphasis on sacred *memoria*, on memorizing and commemorating the dead, and for understanding God's divine judgement on people and nations, past, present and future. Henry, as John Gillingham has recently shown, was absolutely aware of his own place in time, addressing future millennia, exhorting them (and us) not to forget him and the

⁹⁴ For Bede's *CM*, see D. Scully, 'Bede's *Chronica Maiora*: Early Insular History in a Universal Context', in J. Graham-Campbell and M. Ryan (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*, Proceedings of the British Academy, 157 (2009), 47–74; A. Rabin, 'Historical recollections: rewriting the world in Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*', *Viator*, 36 (2005), 23–39.

⁹⁵ See Ispir, 'Crowland Chronicle', pp. 79–82.

⁹⁶ D. Bates, 'Robert of Torigni and the *Historia Anglorum*', in D. Roffe (ed.), *The English and their legacy, 900–1200* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012), pp. 175–84.

⁹⁷ E.M.C. van Houts, 'Le roi et son historien: Henri II Plantagenêt et Robert de Torigni, abbé du Mont-Saint-Michel', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 37 (1994), 116. B. Pohl, 'When Did Robert of Torigni First Receive Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* and Why Does it Matter?', *Haskins Society Journal*, 26 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), 143–67.

deeds he was transcribing.⁹⁸ Henry saw his work (and wanted others to see it) in the same vein as sacred history: 'consider how sacred history teaches morality, attributing justice to Abraham, courage to Moses ... so too in the histories of all *gentes et nationes*, which are the judgement of God, ... History brings the past before our eyes as if it were present and enables us to judge the future by envisioning the past'.⁹⁹ Taken together, John (in the guise of Marianus) and Henry provided not only the place of the *regnum Anglorum* in Christian time but also how God had judged it and its people, designed to enter monastic *memoria* to be used to understand the past, present and future.

What then can knowledge and use of these texts reveal about wider cultural memory of the past?¹⁰⁰ First, almost all returns which used John's *Chronica*, William's *Gesta* or Henry's *Historia* understood the tenth century as the heralding the start of meaningful Anglo-Scottish relations. Although those two houses which used material from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *HRB* mentioned an earlier division of Britain among Brutus's three sons, those houses which used either John of Worcester's *Chronica*, Henry's *Historia* or William's *Gesta* started their returns in the tenth century, despite all three works stretching back well before this, and containing pertinent material throughout.¹⁰¹ There was no recorded history thought to be relevant before this period. In this way, the English 'high-kingship' of Britain was, in 1291, predominantly thought to begin in the tenth century, just as Rees Davies identified in his Ford Lectures of

⁹⁸ J. Gillingham, 'Henry of Huntingdon in his time (1135) and place (between Lincoln and the royal court)', in K. Stopka (ed.), *The Gallus Anonymous and his chronicle in the context of twelfth-century historiography from the perspective of latest research* (Kraków: Polish Academy of Sciences, 2010), pp. 157–72.

⁹⁹ HH, *Historia*, pp. 4–5 (translation departing from Greenway's).

¹⁰⁰ My understanding of cultural memory is based on J. Assman, trans. J. Czaplicka, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), 128–31.

¹⁰¹ Bernard Guenée suggested that the reason why Geoffrey's *HRB* was not used was because of monastic scepticism as to its veracity, and that Faversham and Waltham's inclusion of it was can be explained by their geographical proximity to Edward's court (Guenée, 'L'enquête historique', 579).

1998.¹⁰² Not all three works concentrated on the whole of the tenth century. The use of John of Worcester in general began with the reign of Edward the Elder (beginning in the *Chronica* in 900/901 or, according to Marianist *VA* dating, 922/923) and the earliest use of William of Malmesbury occurs in his life of Æthelstan in book II. The earliest extract from Henry of Huntingdon is not until the succession of Eadred in 946 which is, perhaps, surprising, as Henry's *Historia* contains other choice information for the earlier parts of the century, such as the 934 force taken by Æthelstan into Scotland, which is described dramatically by Henry as conducted against the 'perfidious Danes and the infidel Scots', and resulting in Æthelstan's return to his own land 'with the triumphal laurel'.¹⁰³ But, despite this, the fact that all three works were cut off chronologically at broadly the same point (the tenth century) reveals that this was the point at which wider cultural memory suggested that meaningful historical contact between *Anglia* and *Scotia* began.¹⁰⁴

The above example from Henry of Huntingdon shows that not all possible 'events' which appeared in these sources were used in the returns. Nor did all houses record the same events, even if they were using the same sources. So, just to take an example, Faversham, which in part used William's *Gesta*, recorded only two events—the meeting of the kings in Britain with Edgar at Chester in 973 and Mael Coluim III's

¹⁰² R. R. Davies, *The First English Empire: power and identities in the British Isles, 1093–1343* (Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 8–9, and 4–30 in general. For a further development, see G. Molyneaux, 'Why were some tenth-century English kings presented as rulers of Britain?', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser. 21 (2011), 59–91. For cognate comments to Davies's, see Gillingham, 'Henry of Huntingdon in his time', p. 158; J. Gillingham, 'Henry of Huntingdon and the Twelfth-Century Revival of the English Nation', repr. in J. Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: imperialism, national identity and political values* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000), pp. 123–43; Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique*, p. 309; Guenée, 'L'enquête historique', pp. 582–4.

¹⁰³ HH, *Historia*, pp. 310–11.

¹⁰⁴ For a discussion on eleventh-century understandings of the location of *Anglia*, see G. Molyneaux, *The Formation of the English Kingdom in the Tenth Century* (Oxford, 2015), pp. 1–9; and for the meaning of *Scotia* from the late-tenth to early thirteenth-century, see D. Broun, 'Britain and the beginnings of Scotland', *Journal of the British Academy*, 3 (2015), 107–37.

submission to William the Conqueror (almost certainly referring to that in 1072¹⁰⁵)—whereas the return from Malmesbury Abbey recorded Æthelstan's campaigns into Scotland, Edgar's meeting at Chester with the other kings in Britain in 973, extracts from the rather complex struggle for the kingship of the Scots between 1094 and 1097, and the marriage of Matilda and Henry I in 1100.¹⁰⁶ The same is true in the way in which other houses used John of Worcester's *Chronica* and Henry's *Historia*. The lengthy return of Gloucester Abbey, for example, included John of Worcester's version of the 1054 campaign by Earl Siward into Scotland to remove MacBethad but not his account of Eadred's receipt of an oath 'from the Scots' in 946 which stipulated that they would be the English king's *fideles*.¹⁰⁷ In short, although many houses used and knew their sources, they did not use them in the same way, and by no means all relevant information was included, a product perhaps of time constraints or, indeed, different levels of application to the task.

But there were some 'events' from the tenth and eleventh century which appear so frequently in the returns as to suggest that we are not simply looking at differing levels of textual knowledge but at which events were more likely to have been remembered, which were part of a wider cultural memory of the Anglo-Scottish past. As can be seen from Graph 3, there are only seven events which appear in the returns regardless of which source was being used: those from 946, 973, 1072, 1093/4, 1097, 1100 and 1107. That is, those compiling the monastic returns were likely to include these events regardless of which source—William's *Gesta*, Henry's *Historia* and John's *Chronica*—they were using for their information. Of these, I have automatically excluded those three which appear in fewer than five returns because they are less emphatic evidence

¹⁰⁵ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 94; WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 464–5.

¹⁰⁶ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 111–15; WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 238–41, 714–17, 724–7.

¹⁰⁷ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 94–8; JW, II, pp. 398–401.

for wider remembrance (for example, the accession of Edgar to the kingship of the Scots in 1107 is mentioned in two returns using Henry of Huntingdon but only one return each from those communities using John of Worcester or William of Malmesbury). This leaves us with five events: the Chester meeting between Edgar and the other kings in Britain in 973, Mael Coluim's submission to William the Conqueror in 1072, the death of Mael Coluim III, king of Scots, and the accession of his brother, Domnall, in 1093, the ejection of Domnall and the installation of Mael Coluim's son, Donnchad, in 1094 (and Donnchad's quick demise at the hands of his uncle, Domnall), the installation of Edgar, another son of Mael Coluim III's in 1097, and the marriage of Henry I and Matilda, daughter of Mael Coluim III and Margaret, in 1100.¹⁰⁸

'Reinscription' (encompassing both the actions of rewriting and recopying from a 'present perspective') has recently been seen as one way in which to access wider trends of cultural memory, itself comprising of, among other things, reusable text-objects.¹⁰⁹ The 1291 returns make it clear that John of Worcester's *Chronica*, William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* constituted part of formal monastic cultural memory, which was invoked in answer to Edward's writ. Bath's return formally invoked the understood relationship between written text and memory: 'having examined our chronicles and other books for

¹⁰⁸ Not all of these 'events' are placed under these years in the chronicles. William of Malmesbury, for example, does not date Mael Coluim's submission at Abernethy; he merely records the fact of Mael Coluim's submission (WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 464–5). He also has the events of 1094–7 bungled up together in the same paragraph, again all undated (WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 722–5). Henry of Huntingdon places the accession and death of Donnchad II in 1094 under his accounts of the events of 1093; HH, *Historia*, pp. 418–19.

¹⁰⁹ B. Pohl, *Dudo of Saint-Quentin's Historia Normannorum: tradition, innovation and memory* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2015), p. 224, drawing on C. Belsey, 'Remembering as Re-Inscription—With a difference', in H. Grabes (ed.), *Literature, Literary History and Cultural Memory*, in *REAL: Yearbook on Research in English and American Literature*, 21 (2005), 3–17. J. Assmann trans. J. Czaplicka, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), 125–33: I am suggesting here that these frequently-mentioned events were part of collective and cultural memory. Compare J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *Social Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1988), pp. 8–11, 144–6.

memory of the state of the kingdom of England [and Scotland?] (*ad memoriam status regni*).¹¹⁰ But they also may reveal glimpses of a more informal part of wider communal memory in monasteries and regular houses themselves. That the events of 973, 1072, 1093–7 were likely to appear in returns regardless of which source was being used is indicative that these events had a firmer and more fixed place in wider cultural memory in the late thirteenth century than, perhaps, some of the other events recorded more sporadically in the returns—in short, they already knew what to look for, they only needed to find the words. Thus, when asked to consult their chronicles for evidence of Anglo-Scottish relations, more monastic minds than not thought of including Edgar's 973 meeting, Mael Coluim's submission to William the Conqueror, and the turmoil over the Scottish kingship between 1093–7 because these were the events that were more likely to have sprung to mind when asked for historical information on the Anglo-Scottish past.

Each of these three events were recorded and interpreted in different ways in the three texts. But the common theme throughout is the presentation of English dominance over Scotland.¹¹¹ So, when John of Worcester recorded Mael Coluim's submission to William the Conqueror in 1072 under his *VA* (or *SE*) year of 1094¹¹², we learn that: 'Mael Coluim met him in the place called Abernethy and became his man'. Henry of

¹¹⁰ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 56. Evesham's declaration is also noteworthy: 'so much is contained in the chronicles present in our monastery to perpetuate memory of the deed' (*ibid.*, p. 89).

¹¹¹ This interpretation is not a necessary consequence of reading John of Worcester's *Chronica*, as John's *Chronica* (and indeed Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*) were used (indirectly in the case of JW) in the Dunfermline compilation (probably compiled in the mid-thirteenth century) and proto-Fordun (probably compiled in the 1280s, and used by John of Fordun). For the former, see A. Taylor, 'Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland: the Dunfermline Compilation', *Historical Research*, 83 (2010), 221–52, and for the latter, see Broun, *Scottish Independence*, pp. 235–68.

¹¹² The *VA* dating of Marianus Scotus is maintained in, for example, the return from Gloucester (Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 94–8), although not, surprisingly, in the return from Worcester itself. For Marianus's *VA* dating, see C. Nothaft, 'An Eleventh-Century Chronologer at Work: Marianus Scottus and the Quest for the Missing Twenty-Two Years', *Speculum*, 88 (2013), 457–82.

Huntingdon wrote similarly that 'Mael Coluim, king of Scots, was made his man, and gave him hostages', while William of Malmesbury wrote that 'Mael Coluim gave himself to [William] before they came to blows'.¹¹³ None of them are exactly the same nor provide exactly the same interpretation yet the common theme in all is that Mael Coluim was made subordinate by giving himself up to William and/or becoming William's man in 1072.¹¹⁴ The same can be said for the events of 1093–4. Although the three accounts differ in their detail to the point of absurdity (William of Malmesbury, for example, part-credits the future David I—then probably no more than 11 years old—with installing his half-brother, Donnchad, in the kingship of the Scots, which may have had something to do with David's position as first known recipient of William's *Gesta*¹¹⁵), they remain the same in focus: the kings of Scots of the late eleventh and early twelfth century—Donnchad, Edgar, Alexander and, by default, David—owed their position to the intervention of English kings. The marriage of Matilda, daughter of Mael Coluim and Margaret, in 1100 was also well remembered perhaps either because of her position as representative of the Cerdicing line of Anglo-Saxon kings through her mother or because it represented the full beginning of the familial ties between the royal lines of the two kingdoms (or a combination of the two). But the wider context suggests this marriage too was understood in asymmetric terms: the marriage of Matilda to Henry symbolised then a hierarchical relationship, the female joined to the male, as Margaret was to be to the future Edward II in 1290, despite the acknowledged separateness of the two kingdoms in the Treaty of Birgham.

¹¹³ HH, *Historia*, pp. 398–9; WM, *GRA*, I, pp. 464–5.

¹¹⁴ Brett, 'John of Worcester', pp. 110–26

¹¹⁵ Palgrave, *Documents*, pp. 114–15. For the earliest version of WM's *Gesta*, see above, note 54.

What this suggests, therefore, is not only can we identify which episodes of past Anglo-Scottish relations were part of wider monastic cultural memory but also how, again, the texts themselves helped shape that memory. That most monastic houses in England *remembered* that the kings of Scots should be historically subordinate to the English ones (and that the remembered associations of the 973 meeting and events of the late eleventh century were key to this narrative) is further suggested by examination of one return which has thus far not appeared that frequently in this paper—that from St Mary's Priory, Huntingdon.¹¹⁶ The return from Huntingdon (Figure 4) is absolutely exceptional among the returns: it is a large and visually impressive document, written in a fine set hand, showing some cursive elements of style, and decorated with blue and red initials and sentence breaks. It is also far larger than any other return and it too was intended to be read carefully and repeatedly: down the left-hand margin are small summaries of the points made in the main text, written in blue and red ink, made even more striking by the decorative majuscules that mark them out from one another.

<insert Figure 4 near here>

[Title] Figure 4: The return from St Mary's Huntingdon (TNA, E 39/100/170).

The return from Huntingdon Priory is also completely unique in terms of its content, and, when compared against the content of the other returns, it begins to look openly rebellious. It begins by stating 'according to our chronicles, we report that the Scots have held Scotland which was once called *Alba* for 456 years', and that kings beginning with Cinaed mac Ailpín (d.858) down to the death of Mael Coluim III in

¹¹⁶ TNA, E39/100/170; Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 98–104. Another edition is W. F. Skene (ed.), *Chronicles of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots: early memorials of Scottish history* (Edinburgh: Record Commission, 1867), pp. 209–13; for commentary, see Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp. 138–9, 172.

1093, held the kingship 'by hereditary right'. It then includes a king-list, descending to Mael Coluim III and, again, provides a summary of the tortuous events of 1093–7.¹¹⁷ It mentions that Donnchad was established king with the aid of William Rufus but lessens the power of this statement by emphasising that Donnchad was illegitimate (there is no firm contemporary evidence that he was).¹¹⁸ Indeed, Donnchad's illegitimacy (and thus the illegitimacy of William Rufus's aid) is further highlighted by the stress the return places on the legitimacy of the three full brothers—Edgar, Alexander and David I, and then David's kingly descendants. It shares material with a narrative king-list written between 1198 and 1214 and inserted into the Chronicle of Melrose as fo. 14 but also develops it, emphasising even more firmly than the king-list that the kings of Scots of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were the legitimate heirs to the kingship of the Scots.¹¹⁹

What the Huntingdon return represents is, put simply, written resistance to a dominant historico-cultural narrative. As Assmann has written, key to cultural memory is a *normative* self-image, which 'engenders clear *systems of values* ... which structure the cultural supply of knowledge'.¹²⁰ The dominant narrative of the late thirteenth century was one structured on the assumption of asymmetry, of political hierarchy between the kingdoms of England and Scotland. Huntingdon's return participated in this normative asymmetry by consciously opposing it. This explains the care the priory took in the presentation of its material; the document was visually striking because the material

¹¹⁷ Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp. 138–9. There is a relationship with its content and that of John of Worcester, see, for example, the flight of Edmund Ironside's sons in JW, II, pp. 00–00, and Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, p. 100.

¹¹⁸ Palgrave (ed.), *Documents*, pp. 101–2; for Donnchad, see Broun, 'Contemporary Perspectives', pp. 87–97. William of Malmesbury stated that Donnchad was illegitimate, but this may well have had something to do with the close relationship between David I and the *GRA*, outlined above, note 0.

¹¹⁹ BL, Cotton Faustina B.ix, fo. 14; commented on in Broun, 'Contemporary Perspectives', pp. 91–5; and Broun and Harrison (eds.), *Chronicle of Melrose*, pp. 76–7, 171–2; Broun, *Irish Identity*, pp. 138–9.

¹²⁰ Assmann, 'Cultural Memory', 131.

was expected to make an impact. In this, the canons seem actually to have been quite brave; their return was definitely not what the king would have wanted but their motivations are probably explicable because of the longstanding connections between the priory and kings of the Scots who were its benefactors.¹²¹ Certainly, Huntingdon shared content not only with the Melrose king-list, but also a major historical project which had occurred at Dunfermline probably in the middle decades of the thirteenth century that seems in part to have been undertaken to secure the canonisation of Queen Margaret (d.1093, which was successful) and the rites of coronation and unction for the kings of Scots (an attempt which was unsuccessful).¹²² Either way, the writing was produced to increase the prestige of the Scottish royal line that, at that point, descended from Alexander III to Mael Coluim III via Mael Coluim's marriage to Margaret and the installation of three of their sons as successive kings of Scots—Edgar, Alexander and David. Huntingdon's return must be seen as not only part of this historical project but also as an explicit and exceptional counter to the written representations of cultural memory, which were being presented to Edward I by almost all other monastic houses for whom we have a surviving inquest return.

That there were competing historical narratives, visions and memories of this period does not minimise that, in the context of the 1291 inquest, Huntingdon's return seems to have self-consciously placed itself against a dominant historical narrative of remembrance that saw the tenth and eleventh centuries as the key period in which English dominance over Scotland was established, a narrative that had its roots in, primarily, interpretations of versions of the past presented in John of Worcester's *Chronica* and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia*, and, to a lesser degree, William of

¹²¹ G. Barrow (ed.), *The Charters of David I, 1124–53, and of his son, Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139–52* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), no. 72

¹²² For this work, see Taylor, 'Dunfermline compilation', 246–52.

Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. The importance of chronicles originally written mainly in the second quarter of the twelfth century is particularly interesting for two reasons. First, the use and knowledge of, particularly, full texts of John's version of Marianus's *Chronica* and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia* suggests a far more significant circulation for both texts than their current footprint in extant manuscripts, medieval and early modern catalogues, and use by later medieval chroniclers already shows. The knowledge of these texts, and how it was acquired in the context of monastic *lectio*, is a subject well worth developing. Second, far from simply being evidence of low levels of research, the predominance of these twelfth-century works provides crucial insight into monastic cultural memory. As Southern long ago remarked, remembering—recalling the past—gives identity in the present yet is also shaped by that present. William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon and—although to a lesser degree—John of Worcester have all been seen as part of the so-called 'revival of the English nation', a generation of historians who wrote *historia gentis* or *Gesta regum* for the English as fully incorporative of their conquest by the Normans/French, while absorbing the contemporary values associated with 'civilised' people.¹²³ Such histories were necessarily relational, and much has been written about the depiction within each work of the peoples on the periphery of *Anglia*—the Welsh/Britons, the Scottish, the Irish—as barbaric, in contrast to the 'civilised' English core.

But these were twelfth-century concerns. In the late thirteenth century, monastic houses were asked to consult their chronicles and records in order to discover material

¹²³ Gillingham, 'Henry of Huntingdon', although the whole collection of *The English in the Twelfth Century* is absolutely fundamental. See also the interesting arguments presented about reasons behind the decline in the perception of the Scot-as-barbarian in Cynthia J. Neville, 'The beginnings of royal pardon in Scotland', *Journal of Medieval History* 42 (2016), 1-29.

touching: 'the state of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, or either of them, or about the kings and magnates of those lands'; or 'the kingdoms of, kings or leading figures in England and Scotland'; or 'our kingdom and the government of Scotland'. Edward's writs seemingly contained no standard phrase. But the monasteries knew what to do anyway. Most minds went to the same twelfth-century chronicles, and within these chronicles, to particular events which were understood to display political dominance, of which the most common were: Mael Coluim's submission of 1072, Edgar's meeting with the other kings in Britain in 973, and the turbulence of the 1090s. Historical memory had been shaped by long-term knowledge of earlier historical texts, in particular John of Worcester's *Chronica* and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia*. That the past was more broadly remembered as containing evidence of political asymmetry between England and Scotland is suggested by Huntingdon's explicit engagement with but rejection of this position in their own beautifully-presented return. The overall direction of the returns produced by Edward I's enquiry in 1291 was thus determined by the political ambitions stirred up by the particular and totally peculiar situation of Scotland's kingless kingdom but their content seems to have been subtly ingrained into monastic *memoria* through engagement and broad knowledge of the content of these two texts which may have had a much longer development. In this way, the historical justification for Edward's overlordship of Scotland may have existed—dormant or otherwise—for far longer in the minds of monks and canons than it did in the arguments of his lawyers.