

ART. V – *King David I, Earl Henry and Cumbria*

By G. W. S. BARROW

KING David died at Carlisle on Sunday 24 May 1153, almost exactly 29 years and one month after he had succeeded his brother Alexander I on the throne of Scotland. In an odd way, the wheel had come full circle. About the time of his inauguration at Scone in April 1124 David I issued a charter, still extant, recording his gift of the lordship of Annandale to his friend and staunch supporter Robert de Brus the elder.¹ From the standpoint of a tidy archivist, this precious document, not much bigger than a large postcard, ought to be among the archives of the Duchy of Lancaster.² The Elizabethan antiquary Sir Robert Cotton (who after the accession of James VI to the English throne did not hesitate to call himself Robert Bruce Cotton) purloined King David's charter, along with other choice items from the Bruce muniments, and added it to his own rich collection.³ Luckily, it survived the terrible fire which threatened to destroy the Cotton Library in 1731 and is listed as Cotton Charters xviii, 45 in the British Library's Department of Manuscripts. My reason for bringing in the earliest Annandale charter – apart from the fact that Annandale would certainly have been regarded by David I and his contemporaries as part of Cumbria – is that the king explicitly equates the liberties and customs to be enjoyed by Robert de Brus with those which (before 1120) used to be enjoyed by Ranulf "Meschin", earl of Chester, "in Carlisle and Cumberland". Although those liberties and customs almost certainly included some which originated in the relatively remote past, we may feel sure that most of them stemmed from the need of strong but absent Norman rulers, William II Rufus and Henry I, to establish a secure and defensible frontier against Galloway and even, though to a less extent, against Scotland.

When David of Scotland, either shortly before his accession or at the time he became king, granted parallel powers and rights to Robert de Brus, he too was thinking of defence against Galloway, just as he must have done when establishing Walter son of Alan as lord of Kyle and most of Renfrew and Strathgryfe.⁴ It is very unlikely that David's mind was occupied by defensive strategies against England – quite apart from the unsuitability of Annan or Lochmaben as anti-English "border holds", David surely never saw the Esk and Solway as the southern limits of his inheritance. They would lie much further south, in Westmorland or north Lancashire, or even as far south as the Ribble.

At the very beginning of his reign, therefore, King David had Cumberland and Carlisle in mind. For eleven years he bided his time until his patron and benefactor Henry I was dead. Early in 1136 the Scots took possession of Carlisle, and it would surely have been part of their strategy to secure Tynedale and the Alston silver mines. It could easily have been as early as the later 1130s that the lordship of Westmorland proper, the upper Eden valley with its chief place at Appleby, was given, presumably by David I, to Hugh de Morville, most faithful of all the king's Norman adherents.⁵ The king's nephew, William son of King Duncan II, became a powerful figure in Cumberland and the Pennine area through his marriage to Alice

de Rumilli heiress of Craven and Copeland. At the same time, men of substance from families of local origin, such as Adam and Henry sons of Swain, Cospatric son of Orm, or Alan son of Waltheof (nephew of King Duncan II) attended the king's court and witnessed royal charters.

At this point a brief digression may be in order, because of the appeal that will undoubtedly be exerted by Professor Charles Phythian-Adams's fascinating book *The Land of the Cumbrians*, which appeared not long ago.⁶ Professor Adams doubts whether the baronies of Burgh by Sands, Liddel and Levington (Kirkclinton) had a military or defensive purpose,⁷ and believes that Liddel in particular was created through co-operation between Ranulf le Meschin lord of Carlisle, who gave to one Turgis Brundos the part of Liddel barony south of the River Esk and Liddel Water, and David of Scotland who as ruler of Scottish Cumbria gave the same Turgis, to make up the rest of the barony, Kirkandrews on Esk and Canonbie.⁸ Referring to some passages I had written on the Border many years ago Professor Adams remarks that I had not had the advantage of seeing an article in *Transactions* by the redoubtable T. H. B. Graham.⁹ In fact I did see this article and rejected it as misleading. Apart from anything else, Graham wrote that "Ranulf Meschin's rule never extended beyond the rivers Liddel and Esk",¹⁰ and, more memorably, "Though occasionally subject to Scottish control, Cumberland was always part of England".¹¹ My position remains that when David I granted the lordship of Annandale to Robert de Brus the elder, the lordship of Eskdale to Robert Avenel and the lordship of Liddesdale to Ranulf de Soules – incidentally, like Hugh de Morville, all men from the Cotentin peninsula of western Normandy or the districts to the south of it – he and they had to accept a Border established by William II Rufus and confirmed by Henry I, and that Border put under English royal power, either directly or indirectly, a barony of Liddel which embraced Kirkandrews and Canonbie.¹²

The late R. L. Graeme Ritchie was fond of seeing Carlisle as David I's headquarters or capital – although he was careful to put the word "capital" within inverted commas.¹³ Dr Henry Summerson, most exact of scholars, is prepared to say that in King David's time "Carlisle became a sort of capital city, a centre of Scottish royal power".¹⁴ He believes that the king was frequently in residence there with his court, and certainly we have good evidence that David built – or rebuilt – the castle keep and that he was at Carlisle in 1136, 1138, 1141, 1148, 1149 and 1151.¹⁵ But as to its having been "a sort of capital city" or "headquarters" I would counsel caution. It is not just that the concept of a capital city was not entirely at home in the twelfth century. I am thinking rather of the fact of the 34 localities at which we know King David's sealed charters and briefs were dated, Carlisle provides only three occurrences, to which we may safely add a fourth for the king's confirmation of his son's foundation of Holm Cultram.¹⁶ Perth and Scone (taken together) provide 16, Edinburgh 14, Stirling 13, Dunfermline 12 and Roxburgh 10 occurrences.¹⁷ Some of these places were indeed "centres of royal power", and if we add Carlisle to their number then I have no quarrel with Messrs Ritchie and Summerson. Indeed, I have myself called Carlisle "a chief place of Scottish government".

Addressing the "Cumberland and Westmorland" on King David, Earl Henry and Cumbria, I am acutely aware that my title begs one very large question. You will expect me to focus primarily, if not exclusively, on the relations between, on the one

hand, the king of Scots and his son, and, on the other, Cumberland, Westmorland and Furness. The emphasis in this paper will certainly be on these territories, which have been firmly English since 1157. But for David I and his contemporaries Cumbria or Cumberland were names of ambiguous meaning. They might indicate pretty much what we understand by Cumberland, as in David's charter for Robert de Brus, or in his confirmation of Adam Swainson's grants to Wetheral priory,¹⁸ or particularly in his grant to Wetheral of one mark of silver annually, addressed "to all his responsible men of all Cumberland, French, English and Cumbrian".¹⁹ But when the king granted to Glasgow cathedral the eighth penny of all his pleas – that is, actions, especially criminal and delictual cases, involving fines and forfeitures – of the whole of Cumbria, in a brieve addressed to his officers of the whole of Cumberland,²⁰ we can be absolutely sure that the royal clerks had in mind the diocese of Glasgow rather than the diocese of Carlisle; although precisely which parts of the far-flung diocese of Glasgow were within the remit of this brieve cannot, as far as I can see, be determined. "Cumbria" and "Cumberland" of this document were surely equivalent to the "Cumbria" of the well-known Inquest of David of 1120-1 or 1123-4,²¹ that is the territory between the Solway-Esk border in the south and the earldom of Lennox in the north. As the writer of the preamble to the Inquest, no doubt a member of the clergy of Glasgow cathedral, put it, "David did not rule over the entire region (or kingdom) of Cumbria".²² Similarly, when King David, about 1128, granted to the abbot of the magnificent abbey of Tironensian monks, newly transferred from Selkirk in the diocese of Glasgow to Kelso in the diocese of St Andrews, the right to apply for chrism or holy oil to any bishop whether of Scotia (Scotland north of the Forth) or of Cumbria,²³ he could not have been thinking of Carlisle, which became a diocese only in 1133. He might have had Galloway or Whithorn in mind, although that seems unlikely. Cumbria in this concession obviously meant Glasgow. David's concession, in this form, was confirmed and repeated till 1166.²⁴ In the first half of the twelfth century, therefore, we must be careful how we use our Cumbria. I shall not rely on the adjectives "Scots" and "English", but rather "northern" and "southern".

If the Scots had been able to retain their lordship over southern Cumbria in 1092 we might comfortably imagine a different plan of royal government emerging, dictated by the needs of a ruler more often sojourning in the Tay-Forth area than in the south of England or even south of the Channel. I would see Annandale and the lowermost valley of the Eden forming a single province dependent on Carlisle. It seems likely that the old, strongly geographical districts – Gilsland, Allerdale below and above, Copeland, Furness, Kentdale, Westmorland proper etc. – would have preserved their separate identities for longer and not been swallowed up by two (or at most three) newfangled sheriffdoms. There are some features of southern Cumbria in the earlier twelfth century which suggest that despite the apparently drastic transformation brought about by Rufus and his brother between 1092 and 1133 the older regime lingered on. Waltheof son of Cospatrick was still lord of Allerdale, and left propertied descendants.²⁵ Gille son of Bued (Boide) was lord of Gilsland (presumably named after him or an ancestor);²⁶ he served as one of the small panel of substantial men who took an oath in support of David's Inquest into the patrimony of Glasgow.²⁷ Forn son of Sigulf lord of Greystoke, whose daughter Ede was mother of one of Henry I's numerous bastard sons, witnessed the "foundation charter" for Scone Priory (c. 1120) issued by King Alexander I and his

queen, Sibyl, who was one of Henry I's numerous bastard daughters.²⁸ Survivals from the pre-Norman period were, of course, a commonplace in both southern and northern Cumbria. They appear prolifically in scores or hundreds of place-names of Cumbric character which abound throughout the area from the Lower Clyde to north Lancashire. We are all familiar with the traditional sheep-counting numerals of Cumberland. Survivals also appear in numerous personal names to be found from the Tweeddale-Clydesdale watershed to Furness and Cartmel. Men who held some sort of office are especially interesting as evidence of continuity. Ogga and Leising, for example, who witnessed charters of King Edgar and King David I, are styled the "Cumbrian dempsters" (*Cumbrenses iudices*) in David's Inquest.²⁹ Leising might have been the eponymous holder of Lazonby.³⁰ If Ogga was father of Gillandris (Gilleandrais) "son of Oggu" who helped to perambulate an estate in East Lothian c. 1140³¹ it would be tempting to see a hereditary office of *iudex* or dempster of which perambulating marches was a characteristic duty. In Clydesdale and Kyle, in the middle years of the twelfth century, we find Donald son of Ewen perambulating marches at Drumpellier (in what became Monkland parish), between Prestwick and Symington, and at the eastern upland end of Mauchline parish.³² Donald witnessed important charters of the first of the Stewarts, Walter son of Alan, and his son Ewen did likewise.³³ This shadowy but obviously prominent couple bore names which, although formally Gaelic, were equivalent to Cumbric Dyfnwal and Ywain or Owain; it is worth remembering that the last Brittonic king of Cumbria was Ywain son of Dyfnwal who died in 1018.³⁴

It is of some interest that between Carlisle and Wetheral is Scotby, whose name means "settlement of Scots". This settlement is most likely to have originated in the period between 1018 and the reign of Malcolm III Canmore, and perhaps particularly in the period when Malcolm's father Duncan son of Crinan was lord of Cumbria. Scotby is of some interest because in the 1130s David I granted to Wetheral priory a mark of silver annually from Scotby mill, and confirmed to the monks the whole tithe of Scotby as had been given to them "long before" (*ab antiquo*).³⁵ Some twenty years later David's grandson Malcolm IV issued a charter at Scotby,³⁶ shortly before Henry of Anjou thrust him out of southern Cumbria for good.

But it doesn't do for a historian to speculate too deeply or widely about what might have happened but did not. By the time King David had taken possession of southern Cumbria in 1136 the political and social landscape had been altered permanently. The diocese of Carlisle was founded in 1133, and was accepted by the Scots. On the Scottish side of what was already a recognisable border the lordships of Annandale, Eskdale, Ewesdale and Liddesdale were firmly established, as were, on the English side, a number of smaller but important baronies and knights' fees such as Liddel, Levington (Kirkclinton), Scaleby, Wigton and Burgh by Sands.³⁷ The Alston silver mines, which ought strictly to have belonged to the liberty of Tynedale, were attached by Henry I to the sheriffdom of Carlisle,³⁸ a convenient arrangement that was maintained by King David and his son. Although the formal framework of the modern county of Cumberland cannot be discerned before the eighth or ninth decade of the twelfth century, it was surely there in essence by the time King David died.

There has, I think, been some misunderstanding on the part of historians as to

the position which the Scottish royals enjoyed – or behaved as though they enjoyed – in southern Cumbria from the turn of the years 1135-6. The contemporary English writers, Richard and John of Hexham and Henry of Huntingdon, agree that David I took Carlisle and four other strongholds.³⁹ These four he yielded by the treaty of February 1136, but Carlisle he retained.⁴⁰ Henry of Huntingdon and Richard of Hexham say that this was by King Stephen's gift.⁴¹ Each writer muddies the water, Henry by stating that David made no homage to Stephen,⁴² Richard by saying that Stephen gave Carlisle to David's son Henry as well as to David himself.⁴³ Finally, coins of King Stephen Type 1, in Stephen's name, were minted at Carlisle by the moneyers Erenbald and his son William, obviously not earlier than the year 1136.⁴⁴ From this evidence, historians have drawn the inference that David of Scotland, pretending to be acting on behalf of his niece the Empress Maud, took Carlisle and Cumbria and held them as King Stephen's vassal.

With all respect to the authorities who have put forward this view, I would hold it to be mistaken. The English chroniclers apart, there is no evidence that the king of Scots did anything else than seize southern Cumbria, including of course Carlisle, presumably on the grounds that they formed an integral part of his heritage. The reason why the Stephen Type 1 coins cannot be regarded as decisive is that before he took southern Cumbria David I had never issued any coins at all. The skilled moneyers he employed, Erenbald and William, minted Stephen coins at Carlisle and Durham, and at Newcastle upon Tyne,⁴⁵ which the Scots did not hold effectively before 1139. That they minted such coins at Carlisle, for a very brief period before designing and minting David coins at Carlisle, Roxburgh and Edinburgh,⁴⁶ can hardly be regarded as proof that David accepted Carlisle as part of Stephen's kingdom. The fact that one of Erenbald's coins struck at Edinburgh has a Stephen obverse found also on a Carlisle⁴⁷ coin seems to me to be explicable precisely on the assumption that the moneyers were a little slow to inaugurate the Scottish coinage, hitherto unheard of.

The apparently crushing Scottish defeat at Cowton Moor in August 1138, far from driving David and his son back beyond the present Border, led, through the diplomacy of Alberic bishop of Ostia and Stephen's queen Maud (also David's niece), to the second treaty of Durham (April 1139). By this the Scots won surprisingly large concessions – the earldom of Northumberland for Henry I of Scotland along with a de Varenne bride, the honour of Huntingdon fully restored, and possibly other estates in southern England.⁴⁸ Ailred of Rievaulx tells us that at the battle of the Standard Earl Henry personally commanded the men of Teviotdale and the Cumbrians.⁴⁹ If we were in doubt as to whether this meant only men from north Cumbria, Richard of Hexham states explicitly that the Cumbrians present included men from Carlisle and the surrounding district.⁵⁰ And surely the fact that after his defeat David, having initially escaped with difficulty to Roxburgh through woods and passes, eventually retired to Carlisle, is good evidence that that was the case.

Historical misunderstanding in modern times seems to me to be focused on two important points. The first point turns on the definition of the earldom of Northumberland, vacant from 1095 till the beginning of Stephen's reign, when it may have been given briefly to Henry of Scotland's half-brother, Simon II de Senlis.⁵¹ The statement in Dr Mark Blackburn's magisterial essay on Stephen's

coinage may be taken to represent received opinion: “Stephen granted Prince Henry the earldom of Northumbria (i.e. Northumberland, Durham, Cumberland, Westmorland and north Lancashire)”.⁵² Whatever territories were included in the eleventh-century earldom at its widest extent, it is absolutely certain that in 1139 the earldom acquired by Henry of Scotland was confined to the east side of the Pennines and ran from Tweed to Tees with of course the large exception of St Cuthbert’s Land (Haliweresfolk) and the far from negligible exception of Hexhamshire. It is a difficult question whether the lordship, the future liberty, of Tynedale was within or outwith the earldom – I am inclined to believe the latter.

The second point of misunderstanding has to do with the nature of Scottish royal government in the period from c. 1136 to 1152. I was unaware of the significance of this point before I had edited the written acts of David and Henry, even though a close study of Lawrie’s *Charters* should have revealed the truth. The fact is that from about the beginning of Stephen’s reign David and his son ruled jointly.⁵³ My guess of nearly 40 years ago was possibly correct: namely that when, at the Easter feast of 1136, Stephen placed the 22-year old Henry of Scotland in the seat of honour at his right hand, provoking the archbishop of Canterbury and the earl of Chester to leave the king’s presence in disgust, Henry may have already been *rex designatus*.⁵⁴ Geographically, joint kingship reached from the south of England to the Firth of Forth and even as far as Perth and St Andrews. Legally or constitutionally the remarkable feature of joint kingship was the fact that it overrode any distinction – which we might suppose to have been fundamental – between royal authority and subordinate feudal authority. From 1114 to 1136 David of Scotland was lord of the great Honour of Huntingdon. As soon as his son was granted the Honour in 1136 we should expect his father to have retired from the scene, especially as we know that David was unwilling to do homage to Stephen. But this did not happen: although Henry proceeded to confirm his father’s charters throughout the Honour, David continued to make transactions dealing with honorial property and various obligations into which the lord had entered. It is almost as though for David and Henry the Honour of Huntingdon was simply an extension of their kingdom of Scotland. Certainly from 1124 onward they used no title to distinguish their government of the widely scattered estates of the honour. Wherever and whenever they issued charters and writs David was simply “king of Scots”, Henry “son of the king of Scots”.⁵⁵

Something similar also happened in the earldom of Northumberland, although it was Henry alone who used the title of earl, on his seal and in his charters. Coins were struck in the earldom, at Newcastle, Bamburgh and Corbridge, in the names both of David and Earl Henry.⁵⁶ David and Henry issued briefs of protection and peace for Hexham and Tynemouth Priors;⁵⁷ David made gifts to the nuns of Holystone,⁵⁸ Earl Henry to the nuns of St Bartholomew, Newcastle;⁵⁹ both were benefactors of Hexham Priory and of laymen and women such as Richard Cumin and his wife Hextilda of Tynedale.⁶⁰

It can therefore occasion no surprise that Henry of Scotland appears in southern Cumbria just as he appears in northern Cumbria, emphatically not because he was earl of Northumberland but simply because he was son of the king of Scotland – although once he had obtained the earldom in 1139 he might well be styled “Earl Henry”. He gives the monks of Wetheral the toll on their own goods throughout all

his land,⁶¹ he gives Hexham Priory property in Carlisle.⁶² Even when the earl was transacting business furth of southern Cumbria we may have reminders of his links with the region. Charters, for example, which he dated at Bamburgh and Edinburgh were witnessed by Athelwulf bishop of Carlisle,⁶³ while another dated at Traquair was witnessed by Robert “son of Turet”, whom Dr Summerson has identified, surely correctly, as Robert son of Truite (Tructa) who served as sheriff of Carlisle from 1158 to 1175.⁶⁴

It was in May 1149, at Whitsuntide, that David I received Henry of Anjou, son of the Empress Maud, at Carlisle and bestowed upon him the belt and sword of knighthood.⁶⁵ It was an occasion for ceremony and display. The mercurial Ranulf earl of Chester was present, son of the Earl Ranulf whose Cumbrian customs had been taken as a model by David I 25 years earlier.⁶⁶ Roger earl of Hereford, not yet knighted even though his father Earl Miles had died five and a half years before, attended the Carlisle meeting and was duly belted knight.⁶⁷ The newly-elected archbishop of York, Henry Murdac, fiercely opposed by Stephen, was welcomed to Carlisle not only by his suffragan Athelwulf but also by the strongly pro-Cistercian king of Scots.⁶⁸

We know that David and Henry of Scotland were not concerned solely with ceremonial. They were determined to seize the opportunity and lay effective plans with Henry FitzEmpress and the earl of Chester to attack King Stephen, establish an Angevin monarchy in England, and ensure the permanent absorption within the Scottish kingdom of the country north of Tees and the Howgill Fells. Earl Ranulf's reward was to be the Honour of Lancaster which King David had certainly held in the early '40s. Unfortunately for this triangular alliance, none of its leaders possessed military skill, while Stephen, though no military genius, had quite a good grasp of tactics and was in command of a highly mobile mercenary army. Once he had thrown his forces into York the northern alliance collapsed: Henry of Anjou fled to Bristol, the earl of Chester retired in dudgeon – although later in the year he was to be active on the empress's behalf – while King David and his son, having got no further than Lancaster, withdrew to Carlisle.⁶⁹ This was to be the last occasion on which these joint rulers were engaged in English warfare. Their more rewarding role was reported a few years later by William, canon of Newburgh, who knew the Scots well. Having given a sober account of the calamities which befell southern England in the civil war, William adds “but the northern region, which as far as the River Tees had fallen under the control of King David of Scotland, was peaceful through that king's diligence”.⁷⁰

William of Newburgh and Roger of Howden both report, as a fact well known, that on the occasion of his being knighted in 1149 Henry of Anjou took an oath that if and when he became king of England he would not challenge the Scots' possession of Newcastle, Northumbria from Tees to Tweed, or the lands which had passed from English to Scottish control (which of course included southern Cumbria).⁷¹ This was the essence of King David's “Carlisle settlement” which, having lasted eight years, was repudiated by Henry II at Chester in the summer of 1157.

Barely more than half a year after the knighting ceremonies at Carlisle the Cistercian abbey of Holm Cultram was founded by a colony of monks (and, presumably, lay brothers also) from Melrose, presided over since 1148 by Earl

Henry's half-brother St Waltheof. The precise date of foundation may have been either 30 December 1149 or 1 January 1150. (Since 1 January was a Sunday, perhaps that date should be preferred).⁷² A Cumberland jury in 1278 declared that the "isle of Holm Cultram" had been royal demesne of "the elder King Henry" – which ought to mean Henry I, but must in fact mean Henry II. The jury added that the elder King Henry had founded Holm Abbey.⁷³ The question involved a royal charter shown in court by the abbot of Holm, and I am inclined to believe that either the abbot or the jury mistook the original of Earl Henry's charter (which no longer survives) for one of King Henry I, or perhaps thought that a confirmation of property and privileges by Henry II was really a foundation charter.⁷⁴

There seems no reason to doubt that Earl Henry was the founder, or that 1150 witnessed a "double act" by David I and his son of a kind wholly characteristic of their behaviour since the mid-1130s. I do not just mean by that that King David immediately confirmed the charter for the monks of Holm issued by the earl, an instrument which was more of an "enabling charter" than a "foundation charter" (though that is what it is commonly called).⁷⁵ I have in mind primarily the fact that in May 1150, prompted it is said by St Waltheof, King David led a band of Cistercians north across the Mounth and established them at Kinloss in Moray, two and a half miles north-east of the royal burgh of Forres – almost exactly on the anniversary of the "Carlisle settlement".⁷⁶ Thus David and his son were not only issuing charters in pairs, they were even founding monasteries in pairs.

The journey to Kinloss and the death of Earl Henry, of whom so much was expected, in June 1152, may have hastened King David's own death the following year, although he could by that time have been well into his seventies. He had dated a charter for St Bees at Lamplugh,⁷⁷ towards the end of his reign, but the king's known sojourns in southern Cumbria seem to have been confined to Carlisle. It was here, evidently in the castle he had helped to rebuild, that David died – having the Black Rood of St Margaret held before his eyes, reciting many psalms, and ascertaining from his clerk and almoner Nicholas (afterwards chamberlain and then chancellor of Malcolm IV) that the gifts he was in the habit of bestowing personally on the poor every day had been duly given on his behalf.⁷⁸

His body was carried to Dunfermline and buried in the abbey church beside those of his mother and brothers – not beside Earl Henry who was buried at Kelso. Had David's "Carlisle settlement" held good, we might have got used to the wedding smiddies at Shap, Brough under Stainmore or Barnard Castle. But these are hypotheticals into which the historian would do well not to venture. For us today it is enough to reflect that southern Cumbria, geographically not very different from the modern region of that name, enjoyed a place of major significance in the kingdom which David and Henry of Scotland laboured long and conscientiously to create.⁷⁹

Notes and References

¹ *Early Scottish Charters prior to A.D. 1153*, ed. A. C. Lawrie (Glasgow, 1905), no. 54 (= *The Charters of David I*, ed. G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge and Rochester, N.Y., forthcoming), no. 16).

² Gladstone, R., "The early Annandale charters and their strange resting place", *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 3rd ser., vi (1919), 137–46.

³ British Library, Cotton Charters xviii, 45. For Sir Robert Cotton's practice of transferring documents

- from public archives to his own collection, see *Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals*, ed. L. C. Loyd and D. M. Stenton (Oxford, 1950), p. xl; Sidney Lee in *Dictionary of National Biography*, iv (1908), 1235-7.
- ⁴ G. W. S. Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots* (1973), 339.
- ⁵ G. W. S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford, 1980), 71-2.
- ⁶ C. Phythian-Adams, *The Land of the Cumbrians* (Scolar Press, Aldershot, 1996).
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 34-6.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.
- ⁹ *Ibid.* See T. H. B. Graham, "Turgis Brundos", *CW2*, xxix, 49-56.
- ¹⁰ T. H. B. Graham, *op. cit.* 49.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² As Sir Charles Clay realised (*Early Yorkshire Charters*, ix, *The Stuteville Fee*, ed. C. T. Clay (1952), 195 and esp. n. 7), Graham was wrong to suppose (T. H. B. Graham, *op. cit.*, 51) that Turgis Brundos, *alias* "de Rossedale", was son of William "de Rossedale". The elder Turgis, enfeoffed in Liddell either by Henry I or Ranulf Meschin and probably dead by 1130, was succeeded by his son William Brundos, *alias* "de Rossedale", who in turn was succeeded by his son, the younger Turgis, who was active in the 1150s and '60s. William of Rosedale, as "son of Turgis", witnessed Bishop John of Glasgow's charter mentioned in f.n. 16 below, issued at Carlisle.
- ¹³ R. L. G. Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1954), 258, 296.
- ¹⁴ H. Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle: the City and the Borders from the late eleventh to the mid-sixteenth century* (Kendal, 1993), i, 41. The notion that Carlisle held a special appeal for David I is probably widespread. E.g., D. D. R. Owen writes of Carlisle as "the favourite residence of David I" in his *William the Lion: kingship and culture, 1143-1214* (E. Linton, E. Lothian, 1997), 126.
- ¹⁵ Summerson, *Medieval Carlisle*, i, 39, 41; A. O. Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers* (1908), 210, 221, 227; Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 140 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 113). This last document, dated at Carlisle and witnessed by Jordan the chancellor, must belong to 1141, the only year in which Jordan held that office.
- ¹⁶ Lawrie, *Charters*, nos. 123, 140, 245 (= *Charters of David I*, nos. 76, 113, 198). A fourth act of David I, probably issued at Carlisle, 1141 x 52, is in *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, *The Acts of Malcolm IV king of Scots, 1153-65* (Edinburgh, 1960), no. 39 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 145). King David and Earl Henry witnessed a charter of John bishop of Glasgow given at Carlisle, 1142 x 47 (Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 200).
- ¹⁷ These particulars are given in the Introduction to *The Charters of David I*.
- ¹⁸ Lawrie, *Charters*, nos. 54, 140 (= *Charters of David I*, nos. 16, 113).
- ¹⁹ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 123 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 76).
- ²⁰ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 126 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 58).
- ²¹ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 50 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 15).
- ²² Lawrie, *Charters*, 46.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, 156.
- ²⁴ *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, no. 131 (p. 193); ii, no. 63 (p. 166).
- ²⁵ *Register of the Priory of Wetherhal*, ed. J. E. Prescott (CWAAS Record Series, 1897), 5; *Calendar of Documents preserved in H.M. Public Record Office*, ed. J. Bain, ii (1884), no. 64.
- ²⁶ Lawrie, *Charters*, 304, reviews the evidence relating to Gille son of Bued from the *Register of Wetherhal*. His scepticism in respect of the identity of Gille lord of Gilsland and Gille the juror for the Inquest of David seems wholly unjustified.
- ²⁷ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 50 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 15).
- ²⁸ *Complete Peerage*, new edn. by V. Gibbs and others, xi (1949), Appendix D, 108, 118-9; Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 36 (p. 30).
- ²⁹ Lawrie, *Charters*, nos. 20, 153 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 147), and p. 46.
- ³⁰ G. Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North West* (Copenhagen, 1985), 35. Dr Fellows-Jensen acknowledges that Lazonby (found as Leisingebi in the mid-12th century) could have been formed from O. Scand. *Leysingi*, 'freed man', used as a by-name.
- ³¹ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 134 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 86; see also no. 87).
- ³² *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, no. 198; *Registrum Monasterii de Passelet* (Maitland Club, 1832; New Club, 1877), 6, 12, 409; *Liber S. Marie de Melros* (Bannatyne Club, 1837), i, no. *72.
- ³³ *Registrum de Passelet*, 7, 49, 112.

- ³⁴ *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community*, ed. A. Grant and K. J. Stringer (Edinburgh, 1993), 16-17. Dr Macquarrie lists six kings of Strathclyde or Cumbria called Dyfnwal and four called Ywain between the sixth and the eleventh century (*ibid.*, p. 6).
- ³⁵ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 123 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 76).
- ³⁶ *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, no. 140 (1157 or 1158).
- ³⁷ G. W. S. Barrow, "The pattern of lordship and feudal settlement in Cumbria", *Journal of Medieval History*, i (1975), 117-38; *VCH Cumberland*, i, 308, 318-9; ii, 240.
- ³⁸ *Pipe Roll 30 Henry I*, ed. J. Hunter (1833), 142 (reading for "Manarie" in line 10 "Minarie", as in line 7).
- ³⁹ A. O. Anderson, *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers*, 170 and n. 5, 172.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 173.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 172-3.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 172.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ M. Blackburn, "Coinage and Currency", chapter 5 of *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), 145-205, esp. 192-3.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 192.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 192-3.
- ⁴⁸ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 214.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 199.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 190.
- ⁵¹ Lawrie, *Charters*, 438-9 (cf. *Charters of David I*, no. 203). Dr Keith Stringer has argued that the apparent reference, in the charter preceding this last-cited document in the Newminster Abbey cartulary, to Simon II de Senlis, Earl Henry's half-brother, as "earl of Northumberland" (*comes Northumbr*) is due to a miscopying of a form for Northampton (see K. J. Stringer, "An alleged medieval earl of Northumberland", *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th ser., i (1973), 133-6). Most, if not all, of the recognised authorities have taken this view. I find it hard to accept the suggestion of a copying error, and cannot understand how Simon, if only earl of Northampton, came to grant a Warkworth saltpan to Newminster Abbey. Lawrie's surmise that "possibly [Simon de Senlis] was recognised as earl [of Northumberland] by King Stephen, whose cause he supported" does not seem unreasonable.
- ⁵² M. Blackburn, *op. cit.*, 192.
- ⁵³ This joint rule is analysed in the Introduction to *The Charters of David I* (forthcoming).
- ⁵⁴ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 173. The account given by the Hexham chroniclers is strikingly borne out by two surviving charters of King Stephen given at Westminster at Easter, 1136, one witnessed by Henry son of the king of Scotland as first among the laymen, the other by Henry as third witness after the earl Warenne and the earl of Chester (*Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, iii, ed. R. H. C. Davis and H. A. Cronne (Oxford, 1968), nos. 46, 944).
- ⁵⁵ This will best be seen in *The Charters of David I* (forthcoming).
- ⁵⁶ *The Anarchy of King Stephen*, ed. King, 192-3.
- ⁵⁷ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 119 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 66); *ibid.*, no. 236.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 245.
- ⁵⁹ *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, no. 32 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 170).
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 236, 238, 277.
- ⁶¹ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 124 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 199).
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, no. 238.
- ⁶³ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 147; *Regesta Regum Scottorum*, i, no. 28 (= *Charters of David I*, nos. 79, 164).
- ⁶⁴ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 195 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 201).
- ⁶⁵ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 221-2.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 222-3.
- ⁶⁷ R. H. C. Davis, *King Stephen, 1135-1154* (1967), 106-7.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 106.
- ⁶⁹ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 222-3; Davis, *King Stephen*, 107.
- ⁷⁰ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 221.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 221-2 and 222, n.1.
- ⁷² *The Chronicle of Melrose*, Facsimile edn, ed. A. O. and M. O. Anderson with index by W. C. Dickinson

(1936), 35. The reason why the exact date is uncertain is that it is not absolutely clear whether the scribe of the chronicle wrote 'in kl. ianuarii' (the reading preferred by some authorities) or "iii kl. ianuarii". D. Knowles and R. N. Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (1953; new edn. 1971), 113 prefer the latter reading, but give the year wrongly as 1150. The Melrose chronicle at this period begins the year at Christmas.

⁷³ *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, ed. Bain, ii, no. 146 (p. 36).

⁷⁴ *The Register and Records of Holm Cultram*, ed. F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (CWAAS, Record Series vii, 1929), no. 208 (p. 73) gives an abstract of Henry II's charter confirming the property and privileges of Holm Cultram Abbey. Perhaps this was later mistaken for the "foundation charter". *Ibid.*, 151, provides evidence that in the early sixteenth century Henry II was believed to have been the founder of this house.

⁷⁵ Lawrie, *Charters*, nos. 244, 245 (= *Charters of David I*, nos. 197, 198).

⁷⁶ *Chronicle of Melrose*, Facsimile edn., 35, where "xii kalendas Junii" written above "Kinlos" in line 5 is evidently intended to be the date of foundation. This date, 21 May, is accepted by I. B. Cowan in *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland* by I. B. Cowan and D. E. Easson (2nd edn, 1976), 76. For St Waltheof's influence on the foundation, see the *Vita Waltheni*, Acta Sanctorum 3 August (1867), chapter 49 (p. 262). No charter of David I for Kinloss has survived.

⁷⁷ Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 187 (= *Charters of David I*, no. 196). This may be taken as evidence of an otherwise unrecorded visit to St Bees by King David, doubtless by way of pilgrimage.

⁷⁸ Anderson, *Scottish Annals*, 234-5; *Pinkerton's Lives of the Scottish Saints*, ed. W. M. Metcalfe (Paisley, 1889), ii, 282-3.

⁷⁹ Dr Keith Stringer has published an extended, detailed and sympathetic estimate of this kingdom in *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England, 1000-1700*, ed. J. C. Appleby and P. Dalton (Stroud, 1997), 40-62.

