

ART. V.—*On the use of the terms “Strathclyde” and “Cumbria”*. By P. A. WILSON.

*Read at Penrith, July 1966.*

DR. KIRBY, in his “Strathclyde and Cumbria” (CW2 lxii 77 ff.), has given us a most useful summary of references in the Annals and other early sources to events affecting the one-time Brittonic kingdom of the North during the last centuries of its independent or semi-independent existence. While it was evidently no part of his plan to discuss the meaning of the two geographical terms that he chose for his title, he nevertheless allows it to appear that on this question of terminology he holds a view which is at variance with what I take to be the established orthodoxy. The established orthodoxy, according to my understanding, is that “Strathclyde” and “Cumbria” were once alternative names for the same political entity. That they have since diverged in meaning is not open to doubt; today one stands for part of Scotland and the other for part of England. But must we thence conclude that they were never synonymous? In the hope of supplying an answer to this question, I endeavour in the following pages to review in some detail the early history of both names.

Dr Kirby’s view comes out clearly in the following passage in his text (p. 86):

“That the district south of the Solway had come to be regarded as part of Strathclyde is illustrated by the Annal for the year 945; the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* A records that in this year Edmund of Wessex ravaged Cumbria, but the *Annales Cambriae* that Strathclyde was wasted. It must be concluded that Cumbria was annexed to Strathclyde c. 900.”

Again in a footnote on the same page he says:

“What evidence there is appears to indicate that generally Cumbria must be taken to mean simply the land south of the Solway.”

The orthodox view is neatly exemplified in Sir Frank Stenton's comment on the same entries (*Anglo-Saxon England* (1943) 355):

"That 'Cumbraland' means the land of the Cymre, or Britons of Strathclyde, is proved by an entry in the *Annales Cambriae* recording that Strathclyde was laid waste by the Saxons at this time."

A much earlier statement of the orthodox view is to be found in W. F. Skene (*Chronicles of the Picts, &c.*, R.S. 100 (1867) lxxix):

"The kingdom of Cumbria, or Strathclyde, inhabited by a Welsh population, and governed by its own proper monarchs, extended from the Firth of Clyde far into England, and included Cumberland and part of Westmorland."

The question at issue here seems to me to be of no little importance to us in our Society, because if we were to accept the unorthodox view I do not know how we should explain the earliest surviving document relating to lands and jurisdiction in what is now Cumberland. (For Gospatrick's writ see *Place-Names of Cumberland*, ed. A. M. Armstrong *et al.* (EPNS xxii, 1952) xxvii ff. and authorities there cited). Gospatrick's writ survives only in a 13th-century copy; but no scholar has yet succeeded in producing any convincing grounds for thinking it spurious. Undated, but belonging in all likelihood to the middle years of the 11th century (probably between 1041 and 1055), it refers to an area corresponding to the eastern portion of the later barony of Allerdale as within "the lands which were Cumbrian", or *Cumbrish*, and which, it is therefore plainly implied, had by then ceased to be so. I do not know how to reconcile this with the thesis that "generally Cumbria must be taken to mean simply the land south of the Solway".

In an inquiry of this kind there is a danger which cannot be too strongly emphasized at the outset. There is a natural temptation to assume that geographical terms in everyday use have always had the meaning that

we attach to them today. The terms "England" and "Scotland" bear today a sufficiently precise meaning, which has undergone little change for at least 800 years. The former signifies that part of the island of Britain which lies to the east of the Welsh border and south of what Dr Kirby has aptly called the "Tweed-Solway line". The latter signifies that part of the island that lies north of the Tweed-Solway line, together with some smaller islands in the adjacent seas. But at the time when our inquiry begins, the Tweed-Solway line was without political or ethnic significance, and the terms "England" and "Scotland" were unknown to the language.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (iii (1933), E, 179), the word "England", used in the sense of the territory ruled by an English king, is first recorded in 1014 (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. D. Whitelock, 93). The *O.E.D.* is here following Freeman (*History of the Norman Conquest*, 2nd ed., i (1870) 78, note). An apparently earlier use is to be found in the D and E texts of the *Chronicle*, s.a. 786, where it is reported that Pope Hadrian sent a mission to "England" (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. cit., 35). But this section of the *Chronicle* is a translation, made some time in the 10th century at some northern monastery, probably Ripon, from the Latin of the lost Northumbrian annals. Of what Latin word the word "England" is here the translation we cannot know, possibly *Anglia*, possibly *Britannia*, and in any case used in the vague sense in which Bede speaks of the "English nation". Charles Plummer thought he had found the word "England" used in a law of king Athelstan (*Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ii (1899) 133, and *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, ed. B. Thorpe, Record Comm. (1840), folio ed., 95). But the real date of the law in question is about 1000 (see F. Liebermann, *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 1er band (1903) 388). In short, there is no need to dispute the verdict of Freeman and the *O.E.D.* that the word "England" be-

gins to be employed in something like its modern sense (though not necessarily with exactly the same geographical coverage) during the reign of king Cnut.

Readers of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* do not need to be reminded that in his day the Latin word "Scotia" signified Ireland, the Scots of Dalriada being distinguished where necessary as "Scotti qui Britanniam incolunt". Skene could find no recorded use of the term "Scotia" to signify any part of Britain before the middle of the 11th century, when Marianus Scotus (Marianus the Irishman), referring to the death of Malcolm II in 1034, terms him king of Scotia (*Celtic Scotland*, 2nd ed. (1886), i 398). In the Pictish Chronicle, probably compiled by the monks of Brechin between 977 and 995 (Skene, *Chronicles of the Picts, &c.*, R.S. 100 (1867) xxiii), the term "Scotti" is used to denote the people, and "Pictavia" to denote the territory, ruled by the successors of Kenneth mac Alpin.

In English the word "Scotland" is generally said to be first met with in the Old English version of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. This used to be attributed to king Alfred; but while it may have been that sovereign who commissioned the undertaking, the text as we have it is of the 10th century and written in the Mercian dialect. In it the expression *Scotta lande*, more often *Scotta ealande*, is used to translate the expressions *regio Scottorum, Hibernia, &c.*, of Bede; that is to say, it always means Ireland. In fact an earlier use in the same sense, and probably from the king's own pen, is to be found in his translation of Orosius (see *King Alfred's Orosius*, ed. H. Sweet, EETS, no. 79 (1883), 24 and 25).

The earliest use of the English word "Scotland" to signify any part of Britain is to be found in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A text, s.a. 934, when we are told that Athelstan ravaged "Scotland". The parallel reference in Simeon of Durham makes it clear that the

territory referred to is the ancient Pictavia, "Wertermore", the plain of the "Verturiones", known in Irish as "Fortrenn" (W. J. Watson, *Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (1926), 68 and 69, and Wainwright in *The Problem of the Picts*, ed. F. T. Wainwright (1955), 51). There is nothing to suggest that it refers to any part of modern Scotland south of the Firth of Forth.

The date at which the Tweed-Solway line became a political and ethnic boundary, separating "England" on one side from "Scotland" on the other, cannot now be determined with any certainty. The earliest entry in any Chronicle in which it is clearly recognized as such is to be found in William of Newburgh, s.a. 1157, in a passage which is rendered thus by Joseph Stevenson (*Church Historians of England*, vol. 4, pt. 2 (1856), 446):

"The king caused it to be intimated to the king of Scotland who held . . . the northern counties of England (that is to say Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmoreland . . .) that the king of England ought not to be defrauded of so large a portion of his dominions, nor could he suffer it tamely to be mutilated."

Stevenson's use of the term "counties" at this date is an unfortunate anachronism; William's term was *regiones*, not *comitatus* (see *Chronicles of the Reign of Stephen*, &c., ed. R. Howlett, R.S. 82, i (1886) 105). For how long before 1157 had these "regions" been regarded as part of the dominions of the king of England? By some historians the discussion of this problem has been vitiated by a too exclusive concentration on one aspect of it, the cession of Lothian, which is only part of it. The problem is really twofold: when did Lothian which had been "English" become "Scotch"? and when did the lands south of the Solway which had been "Cumbrish" become "English"? So far as I know it was the late Rev. F. W. Ragg, writing in CW2 v 78 f., who first propounded the hypothesis that the Tweed-Solway line was the result of a "swop" agreement between kings Cnut and Malcolm II, perhaps respectively

first king of England and first king of Scotland, in 1032. "The Scottish king," he writes, "may easily have held Lothian [previously an integral part of Northumbria], as well as Cumbria all the way to the Lune or Ribble, between the date of the defeat of Eadwulf [in 1018 at Carham on the Tweed] and the hour when King Knut felt himself free to lead his army into Scotland . . . Grasping the immense advantage which a boundary reaching across from sea to sea would possess over the long inland line from Edinburgh to the Lune or Ribble, he would take advantage of the circumstances . . . by allowing Malcolm to keep Lothian in exchange for Cumbria south of the Solway." (Twelve years later (CW2 xvii 201) Ragg had changed his mind without explanation given; Gospatrick's claim to the lands which were Cumbrian was as a "relative of the king of Scots", which by no means agrees with the terms of the writ.)

Ragg's opinion of 1905 was shared by the late T. H. B. Graham (CW2 xxvi 278); and has received the endorsement, albeit guarded, of Sir Frank Stenton. "Although," says the latter (*Inventory of the Historical Monuments of Westmorland, RCHM Westmorland*), "there is no record of the date", of the English re-conquest of the lands south of the Solway, "it should probably be associated with the revival of English power which marks the reign of Cnut."<sup>1</sup>

It would appear from the foregoing discussion that the words "England" and "Scotland" did not acquire their modern meanings before 1032. It is relevant to what follows to say something about the names for Wales. In the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the period with which we are concerned the Britons of modern Wales are the *Walas* or *Wealas*, occasionally the northern *Walas*; while those of Devon and Cornwall are the *West Walas*. In documents of Welsh provenance the forms

<sup>1</sup> But he thinks Lothian was granted to the Scottish king by Edgar in 975, *Anglo-Saxon England* (1943) 365.

*Britannia* and *Brittones* in Latin, and *Brython*, *Brytan-  
neit*, &c., in Welsh, are in regular use down to the first  
half of the 12th century, when the former give way to  
*Cambria*, *Cambrenses*, *Wallia*, *Wallenses*, &c., and the  
latter to *Cymry*, &c. This change was due to Geoffrey  
of Monmouth, whose celebrated romance the *Historia  
Regum Britanniae* made its appearance in 1136 (Acton  
Griscom, *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1929), 42). Accord-  
ing to Geoffrey, Brutus, king of Britain, had three sons,  
one of whom Kamber succeeded to that part of his  
dominions that lay beyond the Severn, which conse-  
quently acquired the name *Kambria*, and its people the  
name *Kambri*. This is the first known use of either of  
these terms; indeed there can be no doubt that they both  
owe their invention to Geoffrey's fertile imagination. So  
great and so instantaneous was the vogue of Geoffrey's  
romance that from the moment of its appearance the  
Britons abandoned for ever the name by which they had  
been known since long before Julius Caesar, substituting  
for it, in Latin the *Cambria* and *Cambrenses* coined by  
Geoffrey, and in their own language the word *Cymry*  
(which in those days stood for the people or the land in  
which they dwelt, indifferently) a word long in use in  
poetical and bardic speech, but never in any written or  
official text yet discovered.

Although we shall have more to say later about the  
name "Strathclyde", this may be the place to point out  
that, like the names "England", "Scotland" and  
"Cymry", it appears late on the scene. Indeed, had its  
use not been revived by 19th-century historians, it would  
be an exceedingly rare word. It is nowhere used in any  
early source of Scottish provenance. There is no evi-  
dence that the inhabitants of what latter day historians  
call the kingdom of Strathclyde ever used this name to  
denote the political unit to which they belonged. The  
kings whose lineage is set out by Dr Kirby on p. 78 of his  
paper are invariably referred to as kings of the Rock

of Clyde (the modern Dumbarton), the Irish and Welsh forms of which expression have been conveniently anglicized by Skene and later writers as "Alclyde". The terms "Strathclyde" and its equivalents are not found at all before 870. To speak of the "kingdom of Strathclyde", therefore, when referring to any earlier date than that, is to beg one of the questions which we are asking in this paper.

Having sketched in the background, we may now turn to a more particular examination of terms "Strathclyde" and "Cumbria" and the contexts in which they are used; but first a word about etymology.

So far as their etymology is concerned, neither gives any trouble. The former is the Welsh *Ystrad Clud*, the (broad and fertile) valley of the Clyde. The same form of place-name survives in modern Wales, e.g. in *Ystrad Tywi* in Carmarthenshire. In early times there were many such names in southern Scotland, for example *Estrahanent* and *Stranit*. Nearly all of them have given way to Anglo-Norwegian forms, such as Annandale and Nithsdale; and there is little doubt that Strathclyde, if ever in local use, would have been entirely superseded by the medieval and later Clydesdale, but for the antiquarian interest attaching to the older form. Likewise "Cumbria", &c., are from the Welsh *Cymry* (*Place-Names of Cumberland*, EPNS xx (1950), 1).

The word *Cymry* in turn presents no particular etymological difficulty. It has been discussed by many writers, of whom it is enough to mention Alfred Holder (*Alt-Celtische Sprachschatz*, 1er band (1896), 1071) and Sir John Edward Lloyd (*History of Wales*, 3rd ed. (1939), 164 and 191). They derive it from an earlier Celtic form, *Combrogos*, signifying "fellow countrymen". However, it should be noted that Professor Jackson says it must be from *Combrogī*, not *Combrogos* (*Welsh History Review*, special number (1963), 85). Yet, while the etymology may be straightforward, the usage

does present something of an historical problem. The term is unknown to the early Irish annalists, who invariably refer to the Britons, whether of modern Wales or of modern Scotland, as Britons; those of modern Scotland being sometimes distinguished as northern Britons, e.g. in the *Annals of Ulster*, s.a. 997. Ricemarch's *Life of St David*, written in the last decade of the 11th century, refers to the Britons of his day as *Brittones* (A. W. Wade-Evans, *Vitae Sanctorum Britanniae* (1944), 155). The Icelandic sagas do not know Wales by any other name than *Bretland*. The Cornish have never used this term in reference to themselves; nor have the Bretons. Apart from this it is an odd type of word for any nation to use of itself, a common noun instead of a proper noun.

Sir John Morris Jones thought he saw in this term a Welsh rendering of the Latin *cives* (*Y Cymmrodor*, xxviii (1918) 52). He cited in support of this hypothesis a well-known sentence of Gildas, *nunc cives nunc hostes vincebant*, a phrase echoed much later in another context by Nennius. Unfortunately for this hypothesis the text of the historical chapters, II to XXVI, of the *De Excidio* can no longer be produced as evidence of 6th-century usage among Latin-speaking Britons. By a minute examination of the Latinity of these chapters, and particularly the many rare dictionary words found in them, the learned Bollandist, Père Grosjean, has argued, conclusively to my mind, that these chapters are an 8th-century forgery of St Aldhelm of Malmesbury, afterwards bishop of Sherborne, or a clerk of his school (*Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, xxv (1955) 155 f.). This is historically by no means improbable; the *De Excidio*, as it has come down to us, would be part of the dossier prepared for use in Aldhelm's war of words against the British bishops of Dumnonia in connection with the Paschal question and other matters in which the British differed from the Roman usage (see H. P. R. Finberg in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., iii (1953) 106).

It may be argued that while the rare dictionary words of the *De Excidio* are a latter accretion, the matter, and even the wording of simple statements such as that quoted, may yet derive from Gildas or some early British source which the later redactor had before him. In fact we do not need to rely on Gildas for evidence that the Latin-speaking Britons of the sub-Roman age thought and spoke of themselves as *cives Romani*. The diction of St Patrick has been subjected to the most searching analysis by scholars of late Latin; it is the Latin of the 5th century. In his letter to the soldiers of Coroticus, the latter almost certainly king of Alclyde, the British saint can think of nothing more likely to shame the subjects of a British king than the imputation that their conduct is unworthy of a Roman citizen; addressing them he says: *non dico civibus meis neque civibus sanctorum Romanorum, sed civibus demoniorum ob mala opera ipsorum* (Newport J. D. White, *Libri Sancti Patricii* (SPCK, 1918), 26, and *The Writings of St Patrick* (SPCK, 1932), 28).

While Morris Jones's equation of Welsh *Cymry* and Latin *cives* cannot be ruled out, an alternative explanation of this use of a common noun in place of a proper noun for the Welsh people may seem more satisfactory in the light of the early usage. We first note that in the earliest Welsh poetry, dating from c. 600, and concerned preponderantly with the wars of the Britons of the North against the nascent Anglian kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia, the word *Cymry* is not once used; *Brython* is the name by which Urien of Rheged, Mynyddawg Mwynvawr and their followers are known to the poets who sing their exploits and their praises (see K. H. Jackson in *Antiquity*, xiii (1939) 25 f.). Nor is the word found in the early northern material embedded in Nennius' *Historia Brittonum*.

In CW2 li 86 Sir Ifor Williams says that in a fragment of an early Welsh poem in praise of Cadwallon, who

was killed in the battle of Heavenfield near Hexham in 633, "the Welsh are called *Cymry* — this is the earliest example known to me". The poem is preserved only in a late copy, but it would seem highly probable that it is of 7th-century composition. Though Cadwallon's victorious campaign carried him to the shores of the Firth of Forth, and though the great fortress of Edinburgh was at this date still in British hands, there is no reference to participation by the Britons of the North in the fighting. Nevertheless, it is tempting to infer that it was the wars of Cadwallon which gave rise to the use of the term *Cymry*, alike by the Britons of Wales and the Britons of the North, but not by the Britons of Devon and Cornwall who had been cut off from their compatriots half a century before after the Saxon victory at Dyrham in Gloucestershire.

Soon after 633 the Britons of Wales were effectively cut off from the Britons of the North. In 638 Edinburgh fell to the Angles. Somewhere around 635 (see K. H. Jackson in *Celt and Saxon*, ed. N. K. Chadwick (1963), 41 and 43), Oswy, who succeeded Oswald as king of Northumbria in 641, married *Rieinmelth*, grand-daughter of Run supposedly son of Urien of Rheged, who, as Wade-Evans was the first to point out (*D. & G. Trans.*, xxvii (1950), 82), in all probability brought as her inheritance to the Northumbrian royal house a great territory on both shores of the Solway stretching from the Rhinns of Galloway to the Duddon or the Lune. From this time on the Britons of the North were confined to the Clyde valley and the modern county of Ayrshire, and if they had already acquired the name *Cymry*, it would be in this area, not in the Anglian lands south of the Solway, that it would in time take on a political as well as an ethnic meaning.

The earliest use of the term in an English source is far later. It is the *Chronicle* entry cited by Dr Kirby relating to the year 945, when we are told that king Edmund

ravaged all Cumberland and granted it all to Malcolm king of Scots on condition that he should be his ally both on sea and on land (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. cit., 72). This entry was one of the very few original entries in the A text during the years 925 to 955, and was therefore written down not long after the event (see C. Plummer and J. Earle, *Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ii (1899) xxvii, and Alistair Campbell, *Battle of Brunanburh* (1938), 2 ff.).

While it is true that there is no entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* containing the place-name *Cumberland* earlier than 945, there is nonetheless evidence suggesting that there once existed a text dating from the reign of king Alfred in which some such form appeared. But before coming to that I will cite a reference of very different provenance. Lying in the Firth of Clyde, and today pertaining administratively to the county of Bute, are two islands called Great and Little Cumbrae. The etymology of this name is not discussed by Watson in his *Celtic Place-Names* for the reason, supposedly, that the termination is Norse, not Celtic. (But see George Henderson, *Norse Influence in Celtic Scotland* (1910), 202.) The earliest written form is in the 13th-century *Saga of Hacon Haconsson* (*Icelandic Sagas, Haconar Saga*, ed. G. Vigfusson, R.S. 88, ii (1887) 340 and 343; Eng. trans. in R.S. 88, iv (1894) 353 and 355). But we may be confident that the name was bestowed long before this. In the year 870 the Norwegians besieged, and finally reduced, the great fortress of Alclyde (see *Annals of Ulster*). During these operations the Norsemen cannot fail to have become sufficiently familiar with the two islands, of no little strategic importance, lying in the outerwaters of the Firth, and we can be confident that it was at this date, if not earlier, that they gave them the name, *Kumreyjar*, the Cumbric islands, by which they have since been known.

Five years after the fall of Alclyde, in 875, Halfdene

the Dane left Repton with part of the Danish army, took up winter quarters in the area of the Northumbrians and encamped by the River Tyne. This episode is recounted in a number of Chronicles. For the moment we are concerned only with the *Chronicle of Aethelweard*. This is a translation into Latin of a text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* very close to A, which of the Anglo-Saxon versions is regarded as the closest to that originally commissioned by king Alfred. The translation was made about 975 by a prominent Wessex ealdorman and scion of the West Saxon royal house. It goes on to recount that Halfdene ravaged the country all round and made war upon the Picts and the *Cumbri* (*The Chronicle of Aethelweard*, ed. A. Campbell (1962), 41). As we shall see in due course, Aethelweard's rendering here is not an exact translation of the A text. But its basis is an original of the time of king Alfred, and this evidence, taken in conjunction with the evidence of the place-name *Cumbræ*, affords a strong presumption that in the latter part of the 9th century a people calling themselves Cumbrians inhabited a wide area lying between what was then Northumbria and the Firth of Clyde.

Whether this name was applied to them by the Britons of Wales we cannot tell, for no evidence has survived. But if the same name was progressively coming into use among them as a name for themselves, it is manifest that it could not serve among Welsh speakers to distinguish the Britons of the North from those of Wales. Evidence of Welsh usage is in fact wanting for nearly three hundred years after the death of Cadwallon. To the year 930, or thereabouts, Sir Ifor Williams assigns a poem which he has edited, in Welsh, and printed in his *Armes Prydein o Lyfr Taliesin* (1955), and discussed, in English, in his *Lectures on Early Welsh Poetry* (1944) at pp. 52-54.

In this poem the Welsh are generally referred to as *Kymry* (l. 9 and *passim*), occasionally *Brython* (l. 90). The poem is interpreted as a call to arms, addressed to

the Britons of Dyfed, i.e. south-western Wales, to join with the Britons of the rest of Wales, with the Norsemen of Dublin, with the Irish of Ireland, the Isle of Man (or Anglesey) and Pictavia, with the men of Cornwall, and with the Clydesmen and other Men of the North (though no other Men of the North are mentioned by name), in a league against the men of Wessex. A date in Athelstan's reign, before the battle of *Brunanburh* in 937, obviously fits. The Clydesmen are so called, *Cludwys*. There is a reference to *Alclut*, but none to *Ystrad Clud*. However, we may well believe that if the fortress of *Alclut* was now a ruin, as I suspect it was, the name *Ystrad Clud* would commend itself to the Britons of 10th-century Wales as an appropriate name for the kingdom in which the *Cludwys* lived; and so we find in the annalistic entry, belonging to the year 945, already cited by Dr Kirby.

There are, in fact, evidences that the term *Ystrad Clud* was already in use by this time. We will take first the testimony of the Irish annals. The various texts have not been subjected to quite the same minute analysis as has been bestowed upon the Old English Chronicle. The most recent full-length discussion is that of O'Rahilly (T. F. O'Rahilly, *Early Irish History and Mythology* (1946), 235 ff.). We are only interested in the 9th- and 10th-century entries, and here we may say that the *Annals of Ulster* (vol. I, ed. W. M. Hennessy (1887), and vol. IV, ed. B. MacCarthy (1901)) supply a reasonably accurate and contemporary record of events (provided the dates are taken from the index in vol. IV and not from the text in vol. I); though we cannot be certain that the language has not been modified by later transcribers to conform with later linguistic usage. In these *Annals*, apart from earlier references to Alclyde with which we are not now concerned, we find, s.a. 869, *recte* 870, the siege of Alclyde by the Northmen; and this is the last reference to Alclyde that they contain. Two years later, s.a. 871, *recte* 872, the death is recorded

of the king of the Britons of Strathclyde, *rex Britanorum sratha Cluade*. Apart from a record in the *Three Fragments* which we shall consider in a moment, this, and the parallel reference in the *Chronicum Scotorum* (ed. W. M. Hennessy, R.S. 46 (1866)), are the only references in the early Irish annals to Strathclyde by that name. Thus, in recording the death of Domnall son of Owen on pilgrimage in 975, he is described as "king of the Britons", though we know from the *Brut y Tywysogion* that he was king of *Ystrat Clut* (*Brut y Tywysogyon*, Red Book of Hergest Version, ed. Thomas Jones (1955), 14 and 15). In recording the death of Domnall's son in 997, the expression used by the Irish annalists is "king of the north Britons".<sup>2</sup>

These entries leave one with the impression either that in Irish usage the term Strathclyde enjoyed only a brief vogue in the latter part of the 9th century and then went out of use, or, conceivably, that the entries containing that term were taken from a source that was not Irish. We will now proceed to examine the so-called *Three Fragments*, which, at the period with which we are concerned, have been thought by one critic to embody material taken from some lost Welsh chronicle. These annals survive only in a 17th-century MS., copied from an earlier MS. that no longer exists by Duaid Mac Firbis in 1643 (Dubhatach Mac Firbisigh, *Annals of Ireland Three Fragments*, ed. John O'Donovan (1860); see also A. G. van Hamel in *Revue Celtique*, xxxvi (1915-16) 1 ff., and F. T. Wainwright in *English Historical Review*, lxiii (1948) 145 ff.). The passages with which we shall be concerned relate to the dealings of Ethelflaed, Lady of the Mercians, d. 918, with the Norsemen of Dublin.

It was van Hamel who suggested that the *Three*

<sup>2</sup> There is a reference to the Britons of Strathclyde in the *Tripartite Life of St Patrick*, which assumed its present form about 900, see *Bethu Phatraic*, ed. K. Mulchrone, i (1939) 9. The "battle of Strathclyde" referred to by Watson, *Celtic Place-Names*, 192, "may be dismissed as fiction", according to O'Rahilly, *op. cit.*, 213.

*Fragments* at this date may incorporate material from a lost Welsh chronicle. His suggestion was challenged by Wainwright, though on grounds which I do not find conclusive. Van Hamel also argued that early references to English, mainly Northumbrian, affairs in the Irish annals were taken from Bede, and in this he seems clearly to have been wrong; the entries were derived from a lost Iona chronicle (O'Rahilly, *loc. cit.*). But the fact that information about Northumbria reached Ireland *via* Iona has no tendency to prove that information about North Wales and Mercia did not travel *via* North Wales. That there were close links between the *scriptoria* of north Wales and Ireland at this time is confirmed by evidence of a different kind (see the evidence assembled by Mrs Chadwick in *Studies in the History of the Early British Church*, ed. N. K. Chadwick (1958), 49 ff., 93 ff.).

The *Three Fragments* are of interest for several reasons. To those who live in north-western England, not least of these reasons is that they supply the only surviving literary evidence for the settlement in this area of Norsemen from Ireland, who affected so deeply the place-names, the monumental sculpture, and the dialect forms of the region.

Ethelflaed seems to have taken charge of the affairs of the Mercian kingdom while her husband, a sick man, was still alive, and she seems to have had her full share of the political gifts of her father king Alfred of Wessex and her brother Edward the Elder. The latter, though he wrested control of Mercia from Ethelflaed's daughter after her death in 918, made no attempt to interfere in Mercian affairs during her lifetime. Ethelflaed was the first English ruler to be faced by the double threat of the Danes on her eastern flank and the Norwegians on the western seaboard. She seems, though the evidence for this is indirect (e.g. the importance attached to her by Welsh chroniclers), to have perceived the necessity of maintaining good relations with her Welsh neighbours.

More important, she initiated the policy afterwards pursued, not without opposition, by her nephew Athelstan, who was brought up at her court, of alliance with the indigenous kingdoms of northern Britain against the external threat to which all were alike exposed.

According to the *Three Fragments* (p. 247), "Etheldrida [Ethelflaed], through her wisdom, made a treaty with the men of Alba [i.e. of the Scotto-Pictish kingdom beyond the Forth and Clyde] and the Britons, that, whenever the same race [i.e. the Norwegians] should come to attack her, they would rise up to assist her; and that should they come to them, she would assist them. While they were thus joined, the men of Alba and Britain attacked the towns of the Lochlanns [Norwegians], which they destroyed and pillaged. The king of the Lochlanns afterwards arrived, and plundered Srathcluaide, i.e. he plundered the country, but the enemy was not able to take Srath Cluaide."

Whatever inference may be drawn from this entry in regard to linguistic usage, and I think that must be left an open question, the entry is of the greatest interest in another connection. Looking at early English history through West Saxon spectacles, as we have most of us been taught to do, we may well ask: How can Ethelflaed, already in difficulties with the Northmen in the Wirral and around Chester, not to speak of the Danes around Leicester and Nottingham, have maintained touch with allies in the distant northern confines of the island of Britain? Wainwright, who gave more thought than any other of our contemporaries to the history (and archaeology) of Mercia, and whose work on the place-names of Lancashire in relation to Dark-Age history is well known, seems not to have asked this question.

I suggest that the answer is to be found in the pages of these *Transactions*, in an article from the pen of W. G. Collingwood. Collingwood suggested in his article on "The Giant's Thumb" (CW2 xx 53 ff.) that the

collapse of the Northumbrian power at the hands of Halfdene the Dane afforded an opportunity for the kingdom of the northern Britons, fortified by matrimonial alliance with the house of Kenneth mac Alpin, to extend its power southward from the upper waters of the Clyde to Ethelflaed's boundary on the Mersey. The stylistic evidence of the monuments of Lancashire, he considered, would support this hypothesis. The passage quoted from the *Three Fragments*, I think, affords independent corroboration of it. Indeed, it suggests to my mind that a southward expansion of the power of the Britons of the north would have been with the connivance, if not the active encouragement, of the Mercian ruler.

We may therefore agree with the point of substance in the passage from Dr Kirby quoted above (p. 57); there was indeed a southward expansion of northern British power *c.* 900. But the evidence for this is the historical evidence I have endeavoured to present, not the linguistic usage of the chroniclers whom he cites. The northern Britons at this time, I suggest, were known to themselves and to their nearest neighbours as the Cumbrians, and the southward extension of their power would properly be described as a southward extension of "Cumbrian" power. To the Britons of Wales (for purposes of distinction), and to the Irish (perhaps in consequence of Welsh influence), they were known as the Britons of Strathclyde. To that extent the terms "Strathclyde" and "Cumbria" were once synonymous; but with the southward extension of "Cumbrian" power, the former term would cease to conform with political facts, and, except among the Britons of Wales, would tend to go out of use.

The term Alclyde is never used after 870. The inference to be drawn from this, I think, is that that great citadel was utterly destroyed by the Northmen, and never afterwards rebuilt. Collingwood proposed the hypothesis that in the early 10th century the capital of

the revived Cumbrian kingdom was at Penrith. I know of no independent corroboration of this; though perhaps the later attachment of the Cumbrian name in common parlance to the lands south of the Solway may be regarded as such. If the centre of Cumbrian power was really at one time in this area, it is no wonder these lands should be thought of by Gospatrick and his 11th-century contemporaries as the "lands which were Cumbrian". As for Alclyde, when a name was next needed for this once famous fortress, the circumstances had so changed that the local inhabitants no longer thought of themselves as British, and they called it Dumbarton, the *dun* which had been, but no longer was, the *dun* of the Britons.

I have left to the last, among the early notices, that to which the highest authority would be attached by most historians. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A text, is written by one scribe down to the year 891. For the reigns of Alfred and Edward the Elder, it is a contemporary record of events, giving special prominence to the long drawn out contest between the West Saxon forces and their Danish adversaries. The movements of the Danish army, not only in Britain, but also on the Continent, are followed with the closest attention. Sir Frank Stenton has given it as his opinion that the record of events in king Alfred's reign was prepared for some great West Saxon noble, living in Somerset, and having an especial interest in Somerset affairs. Without denying the special interest in Somerset affairs, I find it hard to believe that the kernel of the document was not an official record prepared under royal auspices from official sources available in the first instance to the king himself. It is not to be thought that a ruler so much of whose life was spent campaigning against an exceptionally mobile enemy could have taken with him on his campaigns an elaborate mobile scriptorium. On the other hand it is very evident that he was served by an

extremely able intelligence service. With respect to Sir Frank Stenton, I cannot regard the bulk of the Chronicle entries during the king's reign as anything but a summary of intelligence reports, received by him in the field, and thereafter dispatched for filing in a central archive. That this was located at Cheddar (see *Medieval Archaeology*, vi and vii (1964) 53 ff.), and edited by clerks with a Somerset interest, we may well believe.

In the year 875 the king was of course following the movements of the great Danish host with the keenest interest. After leaving Repton it divided into two parts, one of which went to Cambridge, and the other to the banks of the Tyne, where, the A text of the Chronicle tells us, it ravaged among the Picts and the Strathclyde Welsh, *Straecléd Walas* (C. Plummer and J. Earle, *Two Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, i (1892) 74). It was either this entry, or a more or less contemporary original on which this entry was based, which Aethelweard a hundred years later rendered into Latin, but with the substitution of the term Cumbrians for the term Strathclyde Welsh. The A text of the Chronicle, or a text very close to it, was also rendered into Latin in a work which purports to have been written in the king's own reign (*Asser's Life of King Alfred*, ed. W. H. Stevenson (1904), ch. 47), whence it was copied by later Chroniclers, notably Florence of Worcester and (following him) Simeon of Durham. The rendering found in this source is *Stratcluttenses*; the fact that the *Stratcluttenses* were ethnically Welsh is not thought worthy of mention.

Now if my hypothesis be accepted that such entries in the Alfredian Chronicle were based on reports from the king's intelligence officers, shadowing the Danish armies as they moved from place to place, and if we are at liberty to doubt whether the Strathclyde Britons were ever known to themselves by this name (they were certainly never known to themselves as "Welsh"), the effect is to raise a strong probability that the original intelligence

report referred, not to Strathclyde Welsh, but to Cumbrians or *Cumbrish*, and that this was the basis of Aethelweard's Latin *Cumbri*. But in that case how should we account for the use of the term Strathclyde Welsh in the English text as it has come down to us?

I venture to put forward the suggestion that this remote kingdom, at that time confined to an area corresponding to the modern counties of Lanark and Renfrew, with, very doubtfully, some part of Dumbartonshire, was not known by name at Alfred's headquarters. When inquiry was made as to its identity, a Welshman in the king's entourage explained that the "Cumbrians" referred to in the report were indeed Welshmen too, distinguished from the Welsh of Wales, whence this Welshman came, as the Welsh of "Ystrad Clud". It is tempting to pursue this hypothesis further and to identify the king's informant with Asser, an ecclesiastic from southwestern Wales, whose reputation for learning first brought him to the king's notice, who assisted his royal patron in his labours on behalf of learning and literature, and who was afterwards rewarded with the bishopric of Sherborne.

Unfortunately for this hypothesis, the authenticity of Asser's *Life*, unquestioned for 60 years, has now been challenged anew (V. H. Galbraith, *Introduction to the Study of History* (1964), 85 ff.). This is not the place to discuss a knotty problem of historical scholarship. A brief summary of the questions at issue must suffice. The question of authenticity was discussed at length by Plummer (*Life and Times of King Alfred the Great* (1902) 14 ff. and 214) and Stevenson (*Asser's Life of King Alfred* (1904), xcv ff.). Their conclusions, which may perhaps still be taken to represent the orthodox view, are that the work, of which the only known MS. was lost in the fire of the Cottonian Library in 1724, consists of a contemporary running commentary on the text of the Chronicle, edited with one eye on a Welsh audience, and

interlarded with encomiastic and often semi-legendary anecdotes about the king himself, written in the manner characteristic of Celtic hagiography. That the work early achieved a reputation for authenticity is clear from the fact that it was used by Florence of Worcester as the basis of his Chronicle, and thus indirectly by Simeon of Durham.

Of Professor Galbraith's criticisms, the two most substantial to my mind are, first, that in the exordium the king is addressed as *Angelsaxonum Rex*, a style not elsewhere recorded before the latter part of Athelstan's reign, and, secondly, that the writer claims that the king (uncanonically) assigned to him the performance of episcopal duties in Exeter and the western part of the diocese of Sherborne, in advance of his own elevation to that bishopric. The first criticism cannot I think, by itself, be regarded as decisive on the question of authenticity. The second has been anticipated by J. Armitage Robinson (*Saxon Bishops of Wells* (1918) 4 and 5) and Dr Finberg (see his "Sherborne, Glastonbury and the Expansion of Wessex" in *Trans Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., iii (1953) 115 and 116). Neither of these authorities is so much as mentioned by Professor Galbraith. An apparent anachronism, not noted by Professor Galbraith, is the reference to an archbishop of St Davids, which smacks of the ecclesiastical politics of the 12th century. However, there are indications that the term "archbishop" was used in an honorific sense in the last centuries of the Celtic Church. The *Annales Cambriae*, s.a. 809, record the death of Elfoddw, "archbishop in the region of Gwynedd" (see *Studies in the Early British Church*, ed. N. K. Chadwick (1958), 44). Mrs Chadwick thinks that the contents of the early part of the *Annales* were put together during the reign of Rhodri Mawr, ruler of Gwynedd 844-877 (*ibid.*, 74 ff.). So it is not impossible that a Welshman at king Alfred's court, eager to further the king's policy of attaching the southern Welsh princes

to his cause, would have recourse to what seemed to him the language of diplomacy, notwithstanding that he well knew it to be uncanonical.

Amid much that must for the moment remain uncertain, we do at least know that during the king's reign close links were maintained with southern Wales, that owing to the dearth of men of learning in his own dominions the king sought them where he could find them, and that in the preface to his translation of St Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care* he acknowledged his indebtedness to Asser by name. Whoever was the author of the running commentary on the Chronicle, and therefore of the form *Stratcluttenses* (without any reference to ethnic affiliations of the *Stratcluttenses*), it still seems to me likely, notwithstanding the doubts of Professor Galbraith, that he was a Welshman, and a contemporary Welshman.<sup>3</sup> It also seems to me likely that it was due to some Welsh informant that the expression Strathclyde Welsh found its way into the official history of king Alfred's reign. There are no other references to the name Strathclyde in any source of English provenance, apart from the two we have just been discussing, and such as can be shown to be derivative from one or other of these two. I now turn to some later sources in which the term "Cumbria" and related forms are found used.

Snorri Sturlason's *Heimskringla* was written down in the 13th century (Snorri Sturlason, *Heimskringla*, ed. Erling Monsen (1932), introd.). In this history of the Norse kings it is related that at a date which is not specified, but which can be put at about 990, Olaf Trygvason harried many parts of the British Isles, including Wales (*Bretland* as always in the Icelandic Sagas) and *Kumbraland*. The context does not fix the exact location of *Kumbraland*; but it faces the Irish Sea,

<sup>3</sup> Professor Galbraith thinks the *Life* dates from the 12th century; but Mr Kenneth Sisam has shown that the lost MS. must have been written about the year 1000, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (1953), 148, n. 3.

whereas "Scotland", also mentioned, faces the North Sea. In corroboration as it were of his own statement, Snorri goes on to quote a poem by the celebrated Icelandic skald, Hallfred Ottarsson Vandraedskald, c. 965-1005, relating that Olaf "knocked down the dwellers of Bretland and struck down the Cumberlanders" (*ibid.*, 135 and 136; and Snorri Sturlason, *Heimskringla*, ed. F. Jonsson (1893-1900), i 307 and 308). Since Snorri, or Snorri's source, attributes the poem to the skald by name, it may fairly be said to be contemporary, or nearly contemporary, with the events which were the occasion of its composition.

Nearly contemporary with the poem of Hallfred Vandraedskald is the Chronicle entry, s.a. 1000, texts C, D and E, recording that in this year the king, Ethelred the Unready, went into Cumberland and ravaged nearly all of it (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. cit., 85). The latest reference in any English chronicle to a separate kingdom of the Cumbrians belongs to the year 1054, when, according to Florence of Worcester and following him Simeon of Durham, Siward, duke of the Northumbrians, at the behest of Edward the Confessor, defeated and deposed Macbeth, and appointed as king Malcolm, "son of the king of the Cumbrians". Malcolm's father was Duncan, who died 1040.

I now turn to some references which do not pretend to be contemporary with the state of affairs to which they relate. During the Edwardian wars the official records of the Scottish kingdom were removed by the English from the royal archives in Edinburgh and were subsequently lost. In the 14th century John of Fordoun sought to repair this loss, as far as might be, by compiling, from such sources as he could find both in England and in Scotland, his *Chronicle of the Scottish Nation* (see *Johannis de Fordun Chronica Gentis Scottorum*, ed. W. F. Skene, *Historians of Scotland*, 1 (1871), and Eng. trans. in iv (1872)). As A. O. Anderson justly re-

marked (*Early Sources of Scottish History* (1922), i, lviii), John of Fordoun is an historian rather than a chronicler. He sought to weave his materials into a connected and coherent narrative. So, like any other historian, he must be consulted in conjunction with his sources, where they can be identified; his statements have not the authority of more or less contemporary notes of events as they occurred.

Between Book 4, chapter 21, and Book 5, chapter 33, of this work, inclusive, I have counted 18 entries relating to "Cumbria", &c. These entries relate either to the succession to the kingdom or to relations with England. According to John of Fordoun, it became the established custom that the lordship of the Cumbrian region, *Cumbriae regionis dominium*, should automatically vest in the reigning king's next heir and successor. We know from Ailred of Rievaulx, who was employed in the household of David I (d. 1153), and was an intimate companion of David's son Henry, earl of Huntingdon, that king Edgar (d. 1107) made an arrangement that after his death his next brother, Alexander I, should succeed to the kingdom, and Alexander's younger brother David to certain territories south of the Firths of Forth and Clyde which cannot now be identified with certainty (On Ailred, David and Henry, see F. M. Powicke, *Ailred of Rievaulx and his biographer Walter Daniel* (1922), 34 ff.). There are indications that a similar arrangement had been made in earlier reigns; it would have obvious advantages in an area of such ethnic diversity.

Whatever may be thought of John of Fordoun's doctrine of the Cumbrian region as the appanage of the heir apparent, and it probably has some underlying basis of historical truth, the same cannot be said of his doctrine regarding "Cumbria" in relation to the crowns of Scotland and England. It is to be noted first that, either by deliberate choice and with intent to deceive, or from ignorance, he takes as his unstated premise that "Eng-

land" and "Scotland" have always been two distinct geographical entities separated by the Tweed-Solway line. He proceeds to take the Old English Chronicle entry for 945 (see pp. 57 and 67, above), and argue that from that time on Malcolm and his successors owed allegiance to the English kings for their Cumbrian territory, "and other possessions in England" (see *Historians of Scotland*, iv 154 and *passim*). There is no doubt that he intends the reader to infer that the Cumbrian territory in question lay south of the Tweed-Solway line, in fact was to be equated with the English county as it existed in his day, and that no king of Scots, owed, or ever had owed, allegiance for any of his possessions north of that line. This is obvious special pleading.

There are nine references to Cumbria in Jocelyn of Furness' *Life of St Kentigern (Lives of St Ninian and St Kentigern)*, ed. A. P. Forbes, *Historians of Scotland*, ii (1874); see also K. H. Jackson in *Studies in the Early British Church*, ed. N. K. Chadwick (1958), 273 ff.). Here, too, we shall be led to the conclusion that the author is arguing a case, though a case which, were we able to test it, might turn out to be valid.

Jocelyn was commissioned by Jocelyn, bishop of Glasgow, whose episcopate covered the years 1175-1199, to prepare a life of the patron saint of the diocese. The Celtic Churches of what is now Scotland suffered more severely from the raids of the Norsemen, and contemporary political disturbances, than those of Ireland or Wales. The best account of the confused ecclesiastical history of those times is still that given by Skene (*Celtic Scotland*, 2nd ed., ii (1887), chaps. 6-9). It is only too clear that the scriptorium, if such it can be called, of the church of Glasgow at the beginning of the 12th century contained pitifully few documentary records of use to the historian or the hagiographer. It is equally clear that there were traditions, handed down from more settled times, which the new 12th-century rulers of that church desired to perpetuate.

The diocese of St Kentigern's episcopate, Jocelyn tells us, was extended according to the limits of the Cambrian kingdom, *Cambrese regnum*. This is not a scribal error. Jocelyn throughout writes *Cambria* for *Cumbria*, and when he comes to narrate the tale of the saint's supposed return from St Asaph to Hoddam and afterwards to Glasgow, he says he arrived in *Cambria* from *Wallia*. He goes on to say that the Cambrian kingdom extended from sea to sea like the rampart built by the Emperor Severus, which, he says, separates *Scotia* from *Anglia*. This is a very odd statement of which I cannot offer an entirely satisfactory explanation. By the last quarter of the 12th century the names Scotland and England must have acquired the settled meanings they still retain of two contiguous territories separated only by a line; but that line must have been the Tweed-Solway line, not the line of either the Antonine or the Hadrianic Wall. The least implausible explanation of Jocelyn's phraseology that I can suggest is that in one of his sources, whether oral or documentary, the Antonine wall was conceived as the boundary between *Scotia* and *Anglia*. Could it be that we have here an echo of the situation in the reigns of Edmund and Malcolm II, when Northumbria was "English" because it had for centuries been Anglian, and "Cumbria" (i.e. the south-west of modern Scotland and the north-west of modern England) had become "English" by virtue of its having been "ravaged" by Edmund and then by him "granted" to Malcolm? Alternatively, it is possible that Jocelyn's source said that the kingdom and bishopric lay *inter Angliam et Scotiam*, a phrase used in another source we are going to consider in a moment, and that Jocelyn misunderstood the one source just as Gibson after him misunderstood the other (see p. 85, below).

We next ask why Jocelyn was led to state that the kingdom extended from sea to sea (which the diocese in later medieval times certainly did not do), and what

grounds he could have had for such a statement. I do not know the answer, and can offer only two suggestions. First, in the interval between the unsuccessful campaigns of Mynyddawg Mwynvawr, c. 600, and the capture of Edinburgh by the Angles in 638, it is not unlikely that central, or at any rate western, Lothian may have fallen under the rule of the kings of Alclyde. Secondly, we need not doubt that in the 12th century, when the boundaries of the Scottish medieval dioceses were being drawn, St Andrews and Glasgow were eager competitors for ecclesiastical jurisdiction in an area where the recession of Northumbrian political power had left a vacuum in diocesan arrangements. The statement that the Cumbrian kingdom had once extended from sea to sea would lend support to Glasgow's claim to the inclusion of some or all of Lothian within the jurisdiction of that church.

The Life by Jocelyn of Furness replaced an earlier Life by an anonymous author, commissioned a generation before by bishop Herbert, 1147-1164. Of this anonymous Life only a fragment has survived. It is fairly evident that in this text also the saint's mission was associated with the Cumbrian region, because we are informed in the Prologue that his miracles still appeared throughout Cambria, *per Cambriam* (*ibid.*, 122 and 244).

From these texts one or two conclusions about the traditions persisting among the clerics of the church of Glasgow in the 12th century stand out fairly clearly. The church had been the chief church, and its bishop had been the chief ecclesiastic, of a secular ruler (a common enough arrangement in the Celtic Church, cf. St David's in relation to the kingdom of Dyfed), whose realm, at some time or another, had borne the name Cumbria. This name, which was probably no longer in current use, was recognized as cognate with the Welsh name for Wales, and so was rendered in Latin in both *vitae* by Geoffrey of Monmouth's now well established *Cambria*.

In the Chartulary of the bishopric of Glasgow, now deposited in the University library, is a document known as the "Inquisitio David, principis Cumbrensis, de terris ad ecclesiam Glasguensem pertinentibus, facta A.D. 1116". It was printed for the Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs in the *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis* (1843). It was printed again by Sir Archibald Lawrie in his *Early Scottish Charters* (1905), no. L. There is an English translation by John Gibson (*History of Glasgow* (1777), 263 ff.); but this is marred by inaccuracies and should not be used without reference to the Latin text.

The MS. has not, so far as I know, been subjected to the critical analysis of modern scholarship. Though known as the *Inquisitio* of David, whose rule in parts at least of southern Scotland extended from 1107 to 1153, it is not, as Lawrie pointed out, the original, but a copy or summary, with a preface explaining that owing to the loss and destruction of documentary evidence it was found necessary to institute an inquiry, by the advice and assistance of the old and wise men of all Cumbria, concerning the lands pertaining to the church of Glasgow. Of its antiquity there cannot be much doubt because the inventory of church possessions contains many archaic place-names, a surprising number of them Brythonic, which have not unfortunately (with the exception of *Pentejacob*, the modern Eddleston in Peeblesshire) received at the hands of Celtic place-name experts the careful examination that they deserve.

Once again the church of Glasgow is equated with the bishopric of the Cumbrian kingdom, which we are told is situated between England and Scotland, *inter Angliam et Scotiam*. (Gibson, a victim of the Tweed-Solway misconception, renders this "partly in England and partly in Scotland", *op. cit.*, 263.) The inquiry, we are informed, was confined to those provinces of Cumbria which were under the dominion and subjection of David, its prince and leader; for he was not, at the time of

writing, superior of all the country of Cumbria. (King David's rule in the modern county of Cumberland did not begin until 1136.) The only other indication of date, except in the caption, is that it is expressed to have been made when Henry I was king of England and Alexander I king of Scots, and during the episcopacy of John bishop of Glasgow, which narrows it down to the years 1117 to 1124.

I cannot think that this document is a late forgery. The most likely date for a forged document relating to the extent and possessions of the see of Glasgow would be during the episcopacy of John of Cheam, succeeded 1258, who claimed that the Rerecross on Stainmore was the proper boundary of his see, supporting this claim on the basis of a *jus antiquum* which, if it ever existed, has not survived (*Chronicon de Lanercost*, ed. J. Stevenson (1839), 65). In the Inquisitio of David there is nothing but a vague phrase to support a claim to ecclesiastical jurisdiction south of the Tweed-Solway line. All the places named as ancient possessions of the see, so far as they can be identified, lie north of that line. I conclude that the document is a faithful summary of an original inquisition dating from the early years of David's rule in southern Scotland. From the use of the term Cumbria, not Cambria, it would seem that the copy, as well as the original, dates from before the episcopacy of bishop Herbert, beginning 1147. From all these pointers it is surely safe to infer that, whether or not there was still a political entity in southern Scotland known by the name of Cumbria, there certainly had been such an entity within the memory of persons then living, and the clerics of the church of Glasgow thought it likely to further the interests of that church to contend that it was still in existence to the extent that claims to ecclesiastical property could be based upon it.

Edgar, the second of the sons of Malcolm Canmore and St Margaret to reign over the Scottish kingdom,

who died in 1107, was succeeded as king by his next brother, Alexander I, who reigned for 17 years. Throughout these years his rule was confined to a part only, the northern part, of the territory over which Edgar had ruled. The remainder was subject to his younger brother David, who, on Alexander's death in 1124, succeeded to the whole of Edgar's realm, and to the title of king. It is a curious fact that no certain inference can be drawn from the surviving evidence to show where the line of partition was drawn between the respective jurisdictions of the two brothers, nor by what style the younger brother was known within the lands assigned to him. In 1116 he succeeded, in right of his wife Maud, widow of Simon de St, Liz, earl of Huntingdon and Northampton, to the great English earldom of Huntingdon. Of the numerous charters relating to his Scottish dominions and printed in Lawrie's *Early Scottish Charters*, none seems to be dated from the years 1107 to 1116. His name is found as witness to English charters during these years, where he appears always as David the Queen's brother, his sister Maud being queen to king Henry I of England (G. W. S. Barrow, "Scottish rulers and the religious orders, 1070-1153", in *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., iii (1953) 85). After 1116, and before his accession to the kingdom, he is *David comes*, i.e. earl of Huntingdon, &c. Professor Barrow has unearthed one piece of evidence, independent of the charters, bearing on the extent of his northern lordship, in Geoffrey the Fat's *Life of Bernard of Tiron*. David may not have been known to Bernard; but he did much to popularize the Tironensian order in Scotland, and his friend and one time tutor and constant counsellor, John bishop of Glasgow, chose Tiron as his first retreat when he quitted his diocese in disgust in 1133 rather than make profession of canonical obedience to Thurstin archbishop of York. Geoffrey refers to David as chief of the men of "Lothian and Northampton" (Barrow, *op. cit.*,

87). In two of his early charters he is again associated with Lothian; Lawrie's no. XXX is addressed to his thanes and drengs of Lothian and Teviotdale, and John the bishop, it may be noted, figures as a witness; while no. XXXIV is addressed to John the bishop and all his *fideles* of Lothian. But this evidence is not decisive, as it was a common practice for a charter to be addressed, not to all the king's subjects, but merely to those of the region in which the grantee, or the subject matter of the grant, was situated; for example, Lawrie's no. CLXXXVII, made at Lamplugh and granting Annaside to the priory of St Bees, which is addressed *David rex Scottorum . . . omnibus probis hominibus Couplandie*. What is certain is that no surviving charter of the years before his accession to the kingdom makes any reference to Cumbria or the Cumbrians, not even no. XLVI which relates to the building of the church of Glasgow.

From the years after his succession to the kingdom, this and kindred terms are found in four surviving charters. In the case of three out of the four there can be little doubt that the reference is to Cumberland south of the Solway. No. LIV is the grant of *Estrahanent* to Robert de Brus, which was expressed to be with all the rights which Ranulf Meschin ever had in *Carduil* (presumably a scribal error) and in his land of Cumberland. While the name of the lordship held by Ranulf Meschin may be open to question (G.E.C., iii, 30, note a), there is no doubt (i) that it included Carlisle, and (ii) that it included nothing north of the Tweed-Solway line. Hence in this context "Cumberland" must signify an area whose northern boundary was at the Solway end of that line. No. CXXIII, done at Carlisle and addressed *omnibus . . . Cumberlandiaie, Francis et Anglis et Cumbrensibus*, grants a mark of silver from his mill at Scotby to the monks of Wetheral; no. CXL, also done at Carlisle, and addressed *omnibus . . . Cumberlandiaie et Westmorlandiaie Francis et Anglis*, is a confirmation

of a grant by Adam, son of Swain, to the monks of Wetheral and to the church of St Mary at York.

The fourth in this list is one of a pair, nos. CXXV and CXXVI in Lawrie. Both are issued from Cadzow, near Hamilton in Lanarkshire, which, in one of the legends in Jocelyn's *Life of St Kentigern*, is represented as a principal residence of *Rederech*, king of *Cambria*, and his queen. Both have for their object to provide endowments for the church of Glasgow. The witnesses are virtually identical, and as Lawrie pointed out they are from north of the Solway. The first of the pair is addressed *omnibus . . . tam Gawensibus* [presumably a mistake for *Galwensibus*] *quam Anglicis et Scotis*, and is a grant of a tithe of beasts and pigs in the area comprised by the modern counties of Renfrew and Ayr. The second is addressed *omnibus . . . totius Cumberlandiae*, and is a grant of an eighth penny of the king's pleas *per totam Cumbriam*, throughout Cumbria. The form *Cumberlandia*, taken in isolation, would suggest Cumberland south of the Solway. On the other hand it is difficult, in the light of the terminology of the two lives of St Kentigern, let alone the *Inquisitio*, to imagine that the clerics of Glasgow, who presumably prepared the draft, could have meant to refer to anything but the whole of that kingdom which, in their understanding, had once been coextensive with the diocese. That the king intended it to include Cumberland south of the Solway seems highly unlikely because during the 17 years of his rule there he never attempted to undo the work of Henry I in creating the diocese of Carlisle, and seems to have been on the best of terms with Adelulf who was its bishop during most of these years.

On balance, though not without some hesitation, I incline to think that we have in this charter, no. CXXVI, the sole surviving reference by David, whether before or after his accession to the kingdom, to the ancient realm of the Cumbrians, over part at least of which he seems, though we cannot be quite certain, to have ruled

for a total of 46 years. Is it possible to think of any explanation of his studied avoidance of a style borne by many of his ancestors, down to and including his grandfather Duncan? I can offer no more than a conjecture. Perhaps there was rather more substance in the 14th-century theses of John of Fordoun than at first appeared. David, so far as I know, was scrupulous, so long as Henry I was alive, in the performance of homage for his great English possessions down in the Midlands. Is it possible that he took the view that were he to adopt the style of king or earl of the Cumbrians, he would be expected to do homage also for a part of his northern dominions, and that he preferred not to risk exposing himself to such a limitation on his sovereignty?

If for this, or some other, reason the use of the term Cumbrians in reference to the inhabitants of a large part of southern Scotland had been quietly allowed to lapse, by what name were they known to king David and his contemporaries? As already remarked, the term Strathclyde is nowhere found in any source from north of the Tweed-Solway line, not even, where we might have expected it, in defining the boundaries of Robert de Brus's great fief of Annandale. This was bounded on the west, we are told, by *Stranit*; but on the north the boundary is given as *Clud*, not *Straclud*, and geography forbids us, I think, to suppose that the draftsman intended the river merely and not the wider territory that the river drains. That *Clud* may have been a territorial name can be inferred from the use of the term *Cludwys*, Clydesmen, in the *Armes Prydein Vawr*. There is also an interesting entry in Simeon of Durham, which is not found in Florence of Worcester or any other English chronicler, and must therefore be of northern origin. It relates to the battle of Carham in 1018, and informs us that Eugenius the Bald, *rex Clutinensium*, was among those who fought there. (If the *n* were a scribal error for *u*, this would be a regular Latinization of the Welsh *Cludwys*; see M. G. Jenkins in *Bulletin of the Board of*

*Celtic Studies*, xix (1962), 8 ff.). Here again the *ystrad* is conspicuous by its absence.

But by king David's time even the term Clydesmen seems to have gone out of use. For example, in Lawrie's charter no. CCXVIII, which records the gift of the church of Lanark to the abbey of Dryburgh, surely this should be addressed, if not to his faithful Cumbrians, then to his faithful Clydesmen? Not at all; it is addressed *Francis, Anglis et Scottis et Galwensibus*. The evidence of this and other charters leaves little doubt in my mind that the Clydesmen were embraced within the term *Galwenses*. This seems a startling conclusion. But with the name "Galloway", as with the names "England" and "Scotland", we must be ever on the alert to avoid the snare of anachronism. At the beginning of the 12th century "Galloway" was not the name of a defined territory. The 12th-century bishops were bishops of Candida Casa, not of Galloway as were their successors in later medieval times. The form from which the medieval and modern territorial name derives was the name of a people, the *Gall-gael*, the foreigners, no doubt preponderantly Norsemen, who were Gaelic speakers (having supposedly acquired that speech in Ireland). The survival of the personal name *Galbraith* suggests that there were also British speakers who were recognized as in some sense "foreign"; perhaps they were natives who had adopted the mode of life, and even the religion, of the foreigners. I suspect that we tend to underrate the ethnic upset caused in south-western Scotland by the ravages of the Northmen. At any rate, I think we should recognize as a working hypothesis the possibility that David was not doing violence to the ethnic pattern of southern Scotland in his day when he classified the inhabitants as English, French, Scots, men of Teviotdale and Lothian, and *Galwenses*. The Clydesmen were not recognized as a separate group; nor were the Britons. A frequent witness of David's charters was one Hugh the Briton, and the use of such a surname precludes our supposing

that a great part of his subjects were still distinguishable as British. There remains the teasing problem of identifying the *Cumbrenses* who formed a contingent in the king's army at the Battle of the Standard in 1138 (see the "Relatio de Standardo" of St Ailred of Rievaulx in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, &c.*, ed. R. Howlett, R.S. 82, iii (1886) 181 ff.). Perhaps they were from Cumberland south of the Solway, though this area had come under the rule of David a mere two years before. Perhaps we must be content with the thought that the names of regiments in an army are not to be taken as an accurate guide to the geographical or ethnic origin of the officers and men serving in them.

Another rather unexpected conclusion seems to emerge from the evidence we have passed in review. We know that the name Westmorland survived, in popular use if not in any precise administrative sense, for two centuries before, in about 1177, it became the name of a newly created county covering an area much larger than the *Westmoringaland* of the 10th century. Cumberland, as the official name of an English administrative unit, is no older than Westmorland. Yet it would seem to have passed into popular speech, perhaps from the time of Gospatrick's writ, to such an extent that this, as well as the terms Westmorland and Copeland, were used in the official documents of king David's reign without any feeling of ambiguity. By this date, to all but a handful of ecclesiastics in Glasgow, "Cumberland" had indeed come to mean "simply the land south of the Solway". Indeed, I have the impression that, had this region continued under Scottish rule, we should have found it parcelled into three separate shires: Cumberland comprising that part of the modern county that belonged to the medieval diocese of Carlisle, Westmorland comprising that part of the medieval diocese that belongs to the modern county of the name, and Copeland comprising that part of modern Cumberland which lies to the south and west of the medieval diocesan boundary.