

THE IMPACT OF THE CRUSADING MOVEMENT IN SCOTLAND,

1095 - c.1560

THESIS

Presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of Edinburgh

by

ALAN DENIS MACQUARRIE

1932



ABSTRACT OF THESIS -- A. D. MACQUARIE

The involvement of Scots in the Crusades has never been studied in detail either by historians of Scotland or of the Crusades, but it is hoped that the present thesis will show such a detailed study to be worthwhile.

The present study is divided into three parts. Part One, "Scottish Participation in the Crusades", explores the participation of individuals or groups of Scots who took part in crusades from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries, and in the aftermath of the crusades. It consists of four narrative chapters (numbered 1 to 4), each covering approximately a century, with the final chapter stretching into the sixteenth century and down to the Reformation. Part Two, "Institutions with Crusading Origins or Connections", consists of two chapters. The first of these (Chapter 5) is a history of the development of the Military Orders of the Temple and the Hospital in Scotland, with particular reference to the relationship of the central organisations of these Orders with their branches in Scotland. Chapter 6 discusses two orders which had their origins in the crusading movement, the Canons of Bethlehem (who had a hospital at St Germain in Tranent) and the Trinitarians "for the Redemption of Captives" (who had a number of Scottish hospitals); again, the emphasis is on the relationship between the centre and the Scottish branches. Part Three, "Attitudes to the Crusades in Scotland", contains a single chapter. This explores Scottish historical writings, examining passages describing the crusades, to see if it is possible to determine what Scottish writers thought about the crusading movement.

These seven chapters are preceded by an Introduction, which sets out the main lines of argument pursued in this study, contains a discussion of the source material used, and explains the scope and limitations of the work. They are followed by two Appendices. Appendix I contains edited texts of selected documents, mostly hitherto unpublished, illustrative of points raised in the text. Appendix II is a calendar of material relating to Scotland preserved in the Archives of the Knights of St. John, now held in the National Library of Malta.

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is entirely my own work, and that no part of it has been previously published in the form in which it is here presented.

Alan Turing
11/5/82

PREFACE

The present work of research is entirely original and my own work. No part of it has been previously published in its present form, but short sections of chapters 1, 2 and 4 have been summarised in my article "The Crusades and the Scottish Gaidhealtachd in Fact and Legend" in The Middle Ages in the Highlands (Inverness, 1981), and the earlier part of chapter 3 formed the basis of "The Ideal of the Holy War in Scotland, 1296-1330", IR (1982).

Although the research here presented is my own, and I am alone responsible for its deficiencies and inaccuracies, it is a pleasant duty to acknowledge those who had helped me with information and criticism. In particular I must thank my supervisors, Professors G. Donaldson and G. W. S. Barrow, who have pointed me in many directions in which I would not otherwise have looked, and have striven very hard to keep inaccuracies and omissions to a minimum. To them both must go much of the credit for whatever merit there is in the present work.

Others who have helped me are too numerous to mention all by name, so I must be content to single out a few. At Edinburgh, I must acknowledge the advice of Mr. E. J. Cowan and Dr. J. W. M. Bannerman; and since moving to Glasgow, Dr. John Durkan and Dr. I. B. Cowan. Specific mention must also be made of Sir Steven Runciman, Dr. A. T. Luttrell, Dr. G. G. Simpson, the late Mgr. D. McRoberts, Mr. R. W. Munro and Mr. Geoffrey Stell, who have all given generously of their time and expertise on various points.

The staffs of institutions and repositories have been unfailingly helpful. In Scotland, I have been assisted by the staffs of Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen University Libraries, the National Library of Scotland, and the Scottish Record Office; in England, by the staffs of Cambridge University Library and the British Library. Further afield, I must acknowledge the help of the staffs of the Archives Nationales & Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; the Archives Départementales de l'Aube in Troyes; the Bibliothèque Municipale & Bibliothèque des Facultés Catholiques de l'Université in Lille; the Stadsarchief in Bruges; and the National Library of Malta in Valetta.

My parents have provided generous financial support while this work has been in progress, and moral support of incalculable value. The University of Edinburgh kindly cushioned me against the shock of gigantic fee increases in 1977 and 1978 with a generous waiver of the increase. The Ross Fund of Glasgow University provided a grant to enable me to visit Malta in the winter of 1981. Mrs. Joan Sutton, my mother-in-law, has kindly relieved me of the burden of typing this work, and has done an excellent job while remaining cheerful and forbearing throughout.

No one over the years has shown greater forbearance than my wife, Hazel. She has read the typescript in its entirety and made many helpful suggestions on improvements of style and phraseology, without which it would be a poorer piece of work. For that, but more for her cheerfulness and patience, she deserves my deepest thanks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Declaration	ii
Preface	iii
Table of Contents	v
<u>Introduction</u>	1
 <u>Part I: Scottish Participation in the Crusades.</u>	
Chapter 1: The First Century of the Crusades, 1095-1198	50
Chapter 2: Triumph and Failure, 1198-1291	95
Chapter 3: The Last of the Crusades, 1291-1410	165
Chapter 4: The Aftermath of the Crusading Movement, 1410-c.1560	217
 <u>Part II: Institutions with Crusading Origins and Connections in Scotland</u>	
Chapter 5: The Military Orders in Scotland, 1128-1564	270
Chapter 6: Other Institutions with Crusading Origins and Connections in Scotland	334
 <u>Part III: Attitudes to the Crusades in Scotland</u>	
Chapter 7: Attitudes to the Crusades in Scottish Historical Writings	372
 <u>Appendices</u>	
Appendix I: Selected Documents	409
Appendix II: Calendar of Material Relating to Scotland preserved in Malta	466
 <u>Bibliography</u>	 496

INTRODUCTION

1. The scope and limitations of the present study.

The author's interest in the subject of the present work was first stimulated some years ago upon reading a short note by Professor A. A. M. Duncan in the Scottish Historical Review, commenting on the description of Scottish participants in the first crusade by Guibert de Nogent.¹ In it Professor Duncan commented that to assess the role played by the Scots in that venture would require a close analysis of the sources. If that was so for one crusade, why not for all? It might appear at first sight that the subject is an unpromising one for research, due to the relative sparseness of medieval Scottish source material and the lack of any previous treatment of the subject. However, the fact that no-one has done it before, or thought of doing it, does not mean that a subject is not worth tackling; and it is hoped that the present study will be seen to have been worthwhile.

Scottish historians in the past have tended to regard the level of Scottish participation in the crusades as negligible. A. O. Anderson, for instance, found it impossible to believe that Scots joined the first crusade, and concluded that the Scotti who did so must have been Irish.² Hume Brown in his History of Scotland, which for many years was

1. A. A. M. Duncan, "The Dress of the Scots", SHR XXIX (1950) 210-12

2. A. O. Anderson, Early Sources of Scottish History 500-1286 (Edinburgh, 1922), I, 98

the standard text-book, was so ignorant of the history of the crusading movement that he associated St. Bernard of Clairvaux with the third crusade.³ His writings have now happily been superseded. The standard text-book on the high Middle Ages in Scotland is now Professor Duncan's Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom; but this devotes only some two pages to the subject of Scottish crusaders. We read there of a "marked lack of enthusiasm for the recovery of Jerusalem after its fall in 1187", and that "the number of known participants in the crusades is not large.... Their fewness suggests an isolation of Scotsmen from the cosmopolitan junketings of later thirteenth-century Europe".⁴ But Professor Duncan does take the subject sufficiently seriously to concede that the apparent lack of enthusiasm "was modified as the thirteenth century progressed and the spiritual benefits of the crusade were preached assiduously by the church".⁵

It appears, then, that received opinion is that Scottish participation in the crusades was slight, and there have been few attempts to contradict this view. Some historians, with an anachronistic view based on concepts of modern nationalism (which have little relevance for medieval kingdoms), have regarded the crusades unfavourably as "unpatriotic"; Herkless and Hannay, in their Archbishops of St. Andrews,

3. P. Hume Brown, History of Scotland (Cambridge, 1911-29), I, 74

4. A. A. M. Duncan, Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1975), 446-7

5. *ibid.*, 446

comment about Patrick Graham that "though an obedient servant of the pope, he was an unpatriotic Scot when he agreed, as Apostolic nuncio, to levy taxes for a crusade".⁶ Would these writers regard Robert I as an unpatriotic king for longing to go on crusade, or Sir James Douglas as unpatriotic for actually doing so? Even Douglas's modern biographer, despite his apparently boundless admiration for his hero, comments that his "romantic, wasteful death would prove catastrophic for Scotland".⁷ This attitude ignores the value of Douglas's crusade, in restoring to Scotland international respectability, and winning for himself and King Robert international prestige and renown.⁸ Modern historians tend to view the past in quantitative terms, while medieval people were concerned, as often as not, with the salvation of their souls and with performing what they believed to be the will of God. Crusading in itself does not convey any quantifiable benefits, such as wealth or national security; and so some historians (particularly those concerned with the development of nations) have found it difficult to understand.

Some modern historians have striven for a more balanced view based on a genuine attempt to understand the medieval mind. Professor Ranald Nicholson, for instance, wrote some years ago that "nineteenth-century historians, and some of

6. J. Herkless and R. K. Hannay, The Archbishops of St. Andrews (Edinburgh, 1907), I, 66-7

7. I. M. Davis, The Black Douglas (London, 1974), 164

8. Cf. Chapter 3 below, 192-4

the present century as well, were all too prone to see evidence of nationalism in the Scotland of Robert Bruce. Ignoring the climate of thought in the medieval world, they paid little heed to such concepts as cosmopolitan chivalry, which sometimes vied with nascent nationalism in fourteenth-century Europe".⁹ Professor G. W. S. Barrow has expressed a similar view in writing that "the age of Bruce saw nothing especially sacred in patriotism or nationalism in themselves".¹⁰

Such a balanced view of medieval Scottish attitudes must take in a European perspective. Few historians have done more to set Scotland within its European context than the late Mgr. David McRoberts. His pioneering essay, published in 1969, on "Scottish Pilgrims to the Holy Land" opened up to historians new and hitherto unimagined vistas.¹¹ Mgr. McRoberts asserted that "Life in medieval Scotland cannot be fully understood or appreciated without some assessment of its foreign contacts.... Curiously, no-one has attempted to gather together the records of pilgrim traffic.... Our sources show clearly that Scotsmen were as much addicted to pilgrimage as any other nation in Christendom". Mgr. McRoberts was concerned with pilgrimage rather than crusade, and commented that "in treating of the Holy Land pilgrims, it is not easy to distinguish between

9. R. Nicholson, "Magna Carta and the Declaration of Arbroath", University of Edinburgh Journal XXII (1965-6), 140-44 at 142

10. G. W. S. Barrow, Robert Bruce (2nd edn Edinburgh, 1976), 348-9

11. D. McRoberts, "Scottish Pilgrims to the Holy Land", IR XX (1969), 80-106

the pilgrim and the soldier, for the crusader was something of both";¹² and, in his concern to break new ground, he was necessarily summary in his treatment of some aspects of his subject, and was able only to survey the evidence rather than to examine it thoroughly. His essay contains only a little evidence from non-Scottish sources. It remains, however, a great achievement, and researchers who come after must be grateful to Mgr. McRoberts for his pathfinding work, and for taking seriously subjects which others would regard as unpromising.

If Scottish historians have little to say about members of their nation taking part in the crusades, historians of the crusading movement have equally little to say about Scottish participants therein. In Sir Steven Runciman's great History of the Crusades, Scotland is mentioned seven times in over 1400 pages.¹³ In the equally vast History of the Crusades, edited by K. M. Setton, references to Scotland and the Scots are equally infrequent.¹⁴ It is significant that the present study is entitled "the Impact of the Crusading Movement in Scotland"; it could not have been called "the impact of Scotland on the crusading movement", for that impact must have been slight. For the most part, Scottish participants would hardly have been missed had they

12. Ibid., 85.

13. S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades (Cambridge, 1951-54) indices s.v. Scotland, Scots.

14. K. M. Setton and others, A History of the Crusades (Madison, Wisconsin, 1969- in progress), passim

never set out from their homes for the east or the north. On only a few occasions can Scotland's political position be seen to have had an effect on the crusades, for instance when Henry II and Richard I had to delay their departure for the Holy Land because they had to come to a settlement with Scotland before the third crusade. One should not be surprised at Scotland's relative lack of resources and influence in cosmopolitan Europe as a whole. The crusades were in origin a Frankish venture, and most of the participants and beneficiaries of the crusades in the Mediterranean were French; few men of other nations (except the Italian merchants) benefited greatly by the crusades in the Holy Land. the "impact" which is our theme is not a two-way process; it is, nonetheless, an influence which exerted itself in and upon Scotland, and which was felt there. The present study will attempt to explore the extent of that impact, using a number of factors to measure it.

Part I, "Scottish Participation in the Crusades", examines in chronological sequence the crusades themselves, looking for Scottish participants, and exploring the reaction of kings, nobles, commoners and clerics to the preaching of the cross and demands for crusading taxation. Part II, "Institutions with Crusading Origins or Connections", looks at the developement of the military orders of the Knights Templars and Hospitallers in Scotland, the generosity which was shown to them by Scots, and their success in recruiting fighting men from Scotland. It also examines

other institutions which had origins in or connections with the crusading movement, such as the canons of Bethlehem, who had a hospital at St. Germain in East Lothian, and the Trinitarians, whose energies were devoted to the redemption of Christian captives of the Saracens. Part III, "Attitudes to the Crusades in Scotland", attempts, in a single chapter, to explore what news of the crusades reached Scotland, as it was incorporated in Scottish chronicles and in other writings, and to assess how interested or otherwise Scots were in the fortunes of the crusades.

Before discussing the sources used and summarising the arguments (sometimes tentative) which will be put forward in each of these three sections, it will be necessary first to define the limit and extent of the present study, to justify the inclusion of what might at first sight appear irrelevant or to explain omissions which might seem surprising.

In the narrowest definition, the crusades were a movement directed towards the recovery and defence of the Holy Land, and in particular the holy city of Jerusalem, summoned by the papacy and governed by a religious vow. In return for participation crusaders received certain benefits from the church, most notably the crusader's indulgence, but including also ecclesiastical protection for their property and dependants during their absence. Until the mid-thirteenth century, the crusade was closely ideologically linked with pilgrimage, with the difference that the pilgrim never carried arms, while the crusader travelled with the

intent of fighting. Latterly the crusade came increasingly to be used by the papacy (and by rulers who enjoyed papal favour) as a device against Christian enemies, whether schismatics like the Greeks, heretics like the Cathars, or catholic Christians who opposed papal policy like Frederick II. Crusades could be preached against catholic Christians whose designs were contrary to those of a dynasty which enjoyed papal favour; thus the Plantagenets were able to persuade the papacy to proclaim crusades against Simon de Montfort and Robert I of Scotland. If such "crusades" are to be taken into account (and it is difficult to know what else they are, if not crusades) clearly a wider definition is needed than the traditional one, which stresses activity in the Holy Land between 1095 and 1291, and ignores the rest of the movement. In his admirable little book What were the Crusades? Professor J. Riley-Smith proposes a definition which will take account of the wider ramifications of the crusading movement, including crusades in Spain, Prussia and elsewhere.¹⁵ Although there were crusades in these other areas before the loss of the Holy Land, they were less attractive to crusaders (except local ones) until after the loss of Acre. Thereafter, from a Scottish point of view, we can see a "fanning out" process of the crusading movement in the later middle ages; the Holy Land itself became an increasingly

15. J. Riley-Smith, What were the Crusades? (London 1977), esp. 74-6

remote and unrealisable goal, but other holy wars against the heathen in Spain, and particularly in Prussia, involved "the defence of Christendom" and were treated as crusades even though the specific geographical objective of a great pilgrimage centre was not a goal. Certainly no account of Scotland's involvement in the crusading movement would be complete if it did not discuss this phenomenon, and in particular the remarkable number of Scots who fought in the Baltic from the mid-fourteenth century until the Battle of Tannenberg (1410) put an end to the Teutonic Knights' policy of expansion.¹⁶

It would be wise, then, to follow Professor Riley-Smith's definition of a crusade: "a manifestation of the Christian Holy War, fought against the infidels in the East, in Spain and in Germany and against schismatics, heretics and Christian lay opponents of the Church for the recovery of property or in defence".¹⁷ This definition of the crusade also takes into account the aspects of the vow, the pilgrimage, and the grant of indulgence, and lays stress on papal control and summoning. As such, it is impossible to speak of crusades before 1095, when all these features come together for the first time. In Scotland, the impact of the crusading movement can still be traced up until the point when papal authority on any effective scale disappears, c. 1560; so the

16. Cf. E. Christiansen, The Northern Crusades (London, 1980)

17. Riley-Smith, What were the Crusades?, 74

mid-sixteenth century can be taken as the final terminus of this study, just as 1095 can be regarded as the starting-point. Brief notice will be taken of a few post-Reformation survivals of crusading fervour, but without any attempt to collect them systematically. Crusades in which there is no evidence of Scottish participation will often be passed over in silence; for instance, no Scots appear to have joined the Albigensian crusade or the crusade against Frederick II. It is uncertain whether this non-participation was due to distaste in Scotland for these projects, or lack of effective preaching.

2. Sources for the study of Scottish Interest and Involvement in the Crusading Movement.

One possible reason why the present study has never been previously undertaken is that the sources in which information is to be found are very widely scattered. Primary sources used for this study are in a bewildering number of languages: medieval Scots, English, Latin, Norse, Spanish, German, French, Flemish, Gaelic, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic are the most important of the languages which contain relevant material. Except in the case of the Semitic languages, as far as possible translations have been checked against the original text.

For the earliest period under discussion, and indeed for much of the twelfth century, we have little or no contemporary evidence coming out of Scotland itself, and have to rely on continental writings. Most of the chronicles

of the first crusade are collected in the great Recueil des Historiens des Croisades and in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica.¹⁸ Such English material as there is for this period, as for the much more abundant English material for later periods, is gathered in the "Rolls Series", or Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores.¹⁹ For Scotland itself, much material throughout the period from 1095 until the late thirteenth century is collected in A. O. Anderson, Early Sources of Scottish History and Scottish Annals from English Chronicles. Charter evidence can be gleaned from A. C. Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, while his Annals of the Reigns of Malcolm and William, Kings of Scots is a useful supplement to Anderson for the twelfth century.²⁰ Addenda to Lawrie's Charters are printed in the first volume of Regesta Regum Scottorum, edited by Professor Barrow; this and the second volume of the same series, by the same editor, provide much useful charter evidence, but both in the twelfth

18. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades (Paris, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, 1844-1906) (RHC): Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. G. H. Pertz and others (Hanover, 1826 - in progress) (MGH)

19. Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores (London, 1865-1898) (RS)

20. Anderson, Early Sources; A. O. Anderson, Scottish Annals from English Chronicles, 500-1286 (London, 1908) A. C. Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters prior to 1153 (Glasgow, 1905); A. C. Lawrie, Annals of the Reigns of Malcolm and William, Kings of Scotland, 1153-1214 (Glasgow, 1910)

century and later one is forced to rely on the editions of Scottish monastic cartularies by Scottish publishing societies, most notably the Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs.²¹ Charter evidence is much more inferential than chronicles: for example, the charter of the Stewart's knightly tenants in Innerwick, whereby they set their land in tack to Kelso Abbey for a period of thirty-three years from the day that kings Richard and Philip set out for the Holy Land (which thus dates itself 1189 x 1190) does not state that the knights were raising money to join the crusade themselves, but makes it sound very likely.²²

Few charters or other documents written or witnessed by Scots while absent on crusade survive, and they are scattered widely: William de Somerville witnessed a charter of John de Lascy at Damietta, 1218 x 1220, copied into the Pontefract Cartulary;²³ an original charter of Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale, in favour of the monks of Clairvaux, granted c. 1273 on his homeward journey from the crusade of 1270, survives in the Archives départementales

21. Regesta Regum Scottorum (RRS) ed. G. W. S. Barrow and others (Edinburgh, 1960- in progress); publications of the Bannatyne Club (Edinburgh, 1823-75); publications of the Maitland Club (Edinburgh, 1829-1859); publications of the Spalding Club (Aberdeen and Edinburgh, 1841-1935); publications of the Abbotsford Club (Edinburgh, 1836-66).

22. Kelso Liber, nos. 256, 260, 261; RRS II, 330

23. Charters of St. John of Pontefract, ed. R. Holmes (Leeds, 1899-1902), I, 36-7

de l'Aube;²⁴ a grant of 290 livres tournois from King Philip III of France to Ingram de Balliol (probably one of the Balliols of Redcastle in Angus) is preserved in the Archives nationales de France;²⁵ a document preserved in Florence, printed in G. Canestrini's Documenti per servire alla Storia della Milizia Italiana, is dated 1364 and witnessed by the Scottish brothers Walter and Norman Leslie, and provides confirmation of the statement in the Cupar MS of Bower's Scotichronicon that they joined the crusade against Alexandria in 1365.²⁶ Possibly Norman was the unnamed Scottish knight whose death is recorded by Guillaume de Machaut in his poem *La Prise d'Alexandrie*.²⁷ An imperfect and fragmentary copy survives of a receipt for a sum of Prutencialis monete, which one Scottish knight promises to repay to another at Dantzic c. 1390.²⁸

These are lucky survivals. Even more fortunate is the survival of Gaelic poems by Hiberno-Scottish bards who

-
- 24. Troyes, Archives départementales de l'Aube, 3 H 332; Appendix I, no. 2 ; printed in Migne, PL, CLXXXV, part ii, cols. 1759-60
 - 25. Paris, Archives Nationales J 475/77; Appendix I, no. 1
 - 26. G. Canestrini, Documenti per servire alla Storia della Milizia Italiana dal XIII Secolo al XVI (Florence, Archivio Storico Italiano XV, 1851), 57-60; Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 488n.
 - 27. Guillaume de Machaut, La Prise d'Alexandrie, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Geneva, Société de l'Orient Latin, Série historique, I, 1877), 86
 - 28. HMC Eleventh Report, Appendix IV, 210; cf. *ibid.*, 205, 211

were present at the siege of Damietta in 1219.²⁹ These are perhaps the only surviving literary works of Scots while on crusade, and as such deserve a more prominent place than that which they now occupy, edited in a rather obscure Irish journal; happily, the writings of Professor Derick Thomson have gone some way towards rescuing them from total neglect.³⁰ It is to be feared that there must lurk other material, similar to that described in the preceding paragraphs, which has not come to the writer's notice; but one cannot be everywhere at once.

Chronicle evidence, too, though often more explicit, is often equally widely scattered. The Scottish chronicles of Melrose and Holyrood Abbeys, and those by Fordun, Wyltoun, and Bower, exist in a variety of editions, not all of them satisfactory; the same can be said of the important neighbouring chronicles, the Chronicle of Man, the Lanercost Chronicle, and the Orkneyinga Saga.³¹ Good editions exist

29. G. Murphy, "Two Irish Poems from the Mediterranean in the Thirteenth Century", Elgse VII (1955), 71-7

30. D. Thomson, "The MacMuirich Bardic Family", TGSI, XLIII (1966), 276-304, at 279-80

31. Chronica de Mailros e Codico Unico, ed. J. Stevenson (Bannatyne Club, 1835); A Scottish Chronicle known as the Chronicle of Holyrood, ed. M. O. and A. O. Anderson (Scottish History Society, 3d.ser. XXX, 1938); John of Fordun, Chronica Gentis Scottorum, ed. W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1871-2); Andrew of Wyltoun, Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1872-9); Chronica Regum Manniae et Insularum, ed. P. A. Munch (Douglas, Manx Society, 1874); Chronicon de Lanercost ed. J. Stevenson (Bannatyne Club, 1839); Orkneyinga Saga, ed. and trans. A. B. Taylor (Edinburgh, 1938)

for such French chroniclers as Villehardouin, Joinville and Froissart, and the German evidence for the northern crusades is conveniently drawn together in the Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum;³² evidence from Greek sources has been sought in the Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae, and from Spanish sources in the Crónicas de los Reyes de Castilla published in the Biblioteca de Autores Españoles.³³

The same can be said of chronicle evidence as has been said of diplomatic evidence, that there probably lurks more in obscure works and editions than has been brought to light in this survey.

For Part II of the present work, concerned with institutions which had their origins in the crusading movement, the search for material is perhaps less difficult. There exists a vast amount of material about the landed endowments of the military orders in Scotland which has to be sought in a wide range of places. Neither the Templars or Hospitallers, so far as we know, kept a regesta of the charters they issued; these have to be gathered from originals and copies kept by beneficiaries. Some family collections

32. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, La Conquête de Constantinople, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 2nd. edn. 1874); John de Joinville, Histoire de Saint Louis, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, Société de l'Histoire de France, 1868); Jean Froissart, Les Chroniques, ed. J. A. C. Buchon (Paris, 1837-8); Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum, ed. T. Hirsch, M. Töppen, and E. Strehlke (Leipzig, 1861-74)

33. Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae (Bonn, 1828-97); Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (Madrid, 1848-in progress).

of charters contain quite a number of acta of members of the military orders, such as the Duntreath muniments and the Colstoun writs;³⁴ a group of original charters of the Hospitallers relating to lands in Temple (Midlothian), surviving now as part of the SRO's Register House Charters³⁵ probably also was originally part of a family collection, and there are other small groups and individual charters.

As well as issuing charters to others, the crusading orders were themselves the beneficiaries of grants of lands and privileges. If they kept registers of these, none have survived; but six folios of the Aberdeen Cathedral register³⁶ appear to be a fifteenth-century copy of a register or bundle of charters kept first by the Templars and later by the Hospitallers at Maryculter. As such it is not quite unique, since the Torphichen muniments constitute a Hospitaller archive with some Templar material.³⁷ This collection is very spare prior to the sixteenth century, with only seven documents being earlier than the preceptorship of brother George Dundas (1510-1532). To some extent this deficiency can be made up by examining the registers of institutions which issued documents to the military orders in Scotland: the Register of the Great Seal of Scotland and the Registrum

34. St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, K32/12-19; Broun-Lindsay of Colstoun Muniments, passim

35. SRO RH 6/114-123 passim and 161

36. NLS Adv. 16.1.10 ff. 6r-12v

37. SRO GD 119, passim

Supplicationum in the Vatican Archives have proved valuable sources in this respect, but by far the greatest amount of material (from the fourteenth century onwards) is found in the magisterial registers in the Archives of the Knights of St. John, now preserved in the National Library of Malta in Valletta. Over seventy bulls relating to Scotland were found in the registers from 1347 to 1569, and an awareness of them must be considered a significant advance in our knowledge about the workings of the Hospitallers in Scotland and their relations with Rhodes and Malta.³⁸

If the military orders were not assiduous in keeping registers, at least they kept rentals, of which one (drawn up in 1539-40) survives.³⁹ It mentions an antiquum rentale which has not survived, but there are also surviving post-reformation rentals of the regality of Torphichen. Other post-reformation sources can be used to piece together a picture of the Knights' properties: mention must be made of the 'Cartulary of Torphichen' from which James Maidment published abstracts in his Templaria;⁴⁰ the protocol books of Alexander Lawson, which contain sasines of temple-lands between 1570 and 1602;⁴¹ and such post-medieval sources as

38. National Library of Malta, Valletta, Archives of the Knights of St. John; cf. below, Appendix II

39. SRO GD 247/101/1A

40. James Maidment, Templaria (1828-9)

41. SRO NP 1/30, 53

the Retours.⁴²

For the canons of Bethlehem in Scotland, there is little material available before the fifteenth century. The present writer knows of no archive of the bishopric of Bethlehem or the hospital of Clamecy (dép. Nièvre) which became its late medieval headquarters; but it is surprising that previous monographs relating to the Bethlehemites in Scotland make no allusion to the archives of King's College Aberdeen, since that body took over their endowments, and their surviving records are to be found there.⁴³ None of these are pre-fifteenth century. The Trinitarians have been even less lucky, as they seem to have left hardly any records at all. Apart from the military orders, and in particular the Hospitallers, who are amply documented, sources for the study of institutions with crusading associations in Scotland are widely, and very thinly, scattered.

3. Summary of the arguments of the present study.

We can safely say that there was no Scottish presence at the Council of Clermont in November 1095, when Urban II preached the crusade for the first time. But we know that there was a great stir throughout the British Isles around Easter 1096, so that, in the words of William of Malmesbury, fields and cities were deserted as whole families marched

42. Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis retornatarum Abbreviatio (Records Commission, 1811-16)

43. Aberdeen University Archives, Charter Chest of King's College, Shuttles 22 and 28.

away to liberate Jerusalem; even the Scots gave up their familiaritatem pulicum. Groups of Scots were seen arriving at the seaports of northern France, with "bare legs, shaggy cloaks, a purse hanging from their shoulders", offering their faith and devotion to the Franks. The purse which they wore was probably not an early version of the sporran of modern highland dress, but related to the book-satchels worn by the illuminated evangelists in the tenth-century Book of Deer. These native Celtic Scots joined the army of Robert duke of Normandy (who had been in Scotland in 1085), and were still with the crusading army when it left Nicaea on the march across Asia Minor in the summer of 1097, when they were noticed by Fulcher of Chartres. These were not effective fighting men; Guibert de Nogent calls them "ferocious among themselves, unwarlike elsewhere", and comments on their ridiculous armaments. The name of only one of these exotic barbarians is known to us: Lagmann, king of Man and the Hebrides, took the cross, probably in 1096, in remorse for the cruelty he had shown to his rebellious brother. He and those who accompanied him were probably typical of the Scots noticed by Guibert and Fulcher, with outlandish dress and language; more so than were Edgar Atheling and Robert son of Godwin, who came to the east in 1102. Edgar Atheling was Malcolm III's brother-in-law, and late in 1097 had placed his nephew Edgar on the Scottish throne with an English army which had included Robert son of Godwine; Robert was rewarded with a grant of lands in Lothian, on which he built a castle. He

was less fortunate in the Holy Land, for he was captured by the Saracens at the battle of Ramleh (1102), and martyred for refusing to renounce the name of Christ. Neither he nor Edgar Atheling was typical of the Scottish aristocracy of the time, of whom the king of the Isles is probably a more representative example.⁴⁴

There are indications of Scottish interest in the wellbeing of the crusader states in the first half of the twelfth century. John bishop of Glasgow, tutor and friend of David lord or prince of Cumbria (king of Scots 1124-1153), visited Jerusalem in 1122, staying in the household of the patriarch Gormund. In 1128 Hugh de Paiens, first master of the Knights Templars, visited Scotland on a recruiting drive which had considerable success, even though the army which he assembled failed to capture Damascus in the following year. Hugh also introduced the Templars into Scotland. It was probably during or soon after his visit that King David granted them Balantrodoch (now Temple, Midlothian) to be their preceptory in Scotland; Ailred of Rievaulx says that David surrounded himself with Templars by day and night, making them the guardians of his morals. Ailred also states that David desired to lay down the sceptre and end his days fighting in the Holy Land, but was dissuaded by the advice of councillors

44. Chapter 1, pp.50-62

and the outcry among his people. Probably this means that David wished to join the second crusade (1147); those Scots who had fewer responsibilities at home than their king took ship with a fleet of Englishmen, Flemings, Normans, and Rhinelanders which besieged and captured Lisbon in the summer of 1147. The Scots on this venture retained the same image they had had in the 1090's: the English regarded them as barbarians (Quis enim Scottos barbaros esse neget?), but could not help admiring their constancy during the long siege. Philip de Harveng, Premonstratensian abbot of Bonne Esperance (Cambrai diocese) noted a group of Scots on pilgrimage sometime around the middle of the twelfth century, who may well have been connected with the second crusade; he noted that they wore a single garment which covered them at the front and back but was open at the sides, revealing that they wore nothing underneath. During the early 1150's, in the aftermath of the second crusade, the earl of Orkney, and a large retinue, which included the bishop of Orkney made an extended trip to the Holy Land and to the court of Emperor Manuel Comnenus at Constantinople, but the principal influences on his pilgrimage were Norse rather than Scottish; earl Rognvald was a true Jorsalafarar (i.e., "Jerusalem-farer") in the tradition of King Sigurd of Norway (who had visited the Holy Land in 1110) or of the Varangians of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Probably the pilgrims noted by Philip de Harveng or by the English eyewitness at the siege of Lisbon were more characteristic of the type of native Scottish crusaders

of the twelfth century.⁴⁵

Not until the reign of William I (1165-1214) are there signs of a change in the character of Scottish crusaders, and even then they are obscured by political events. William's relations with Henry II of England, though never good, had been improved by a partial reconciliation in 1185, when the earldom of Huntingdon was restored to the Scottish royal family. Suspicion still existed between them, so that when news came of the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin in 1187, Henry was anxious to come to a settlement with William which would leave him free to go to the rescue of the Holy City. William and his nobles refused to contribute to the "Saladin Tithe" when Henry demanded it of them in 1188; but this does not necessarily reflect "a marked lack of enthusiasm for the recovery of Jerusalem after its fall", as Professor Duncan thought, but rather an attempt by William and his nobles to obtain the best possible terms for the recovery of political freedom of manoeuvre, which had been curtailed since William's defeat and capture in 1174. In 1189 William was able to obtain much more advantageous terms from Henry's son and successor, Richard I, to the satisfaction of both parties; Richard was paid 10,000 marks toward the crusade in return for the restoration of royal castles in Scotland which he had garrisoned, and the status quo that had existed between the two kingdoms

45. Chapter 1. pp. 62-83

before 1174. As a result, his northern border was freed from any fear of invasion while he was absent in the Holy Land. The Scottish participants in the third crusade have a much more Anglo-Norman look than those in the earlier crusades; Robert de Quincy, a nobleman who had risen quickly to high office under William after 1165, went with Richard and was entrusted by him with the captaincy of the cavalry defending the principality of Antioch in 1191-2. It has been suggested above that some knights of Alan the Steward seem to have been raising money for the crusade when they set their lands in Innerwick in tack to Kelso Abbey in 1190; and this strengthens the otherwise doubtful evidence that the Steward himself may have joined the crusade. In the case of the king's brother, David earl of Huntingdon, it is unlikely that he went to the Holy Land. Also from Scotland came Osbert Olifard of Arbuthnott, a landowner of lower rank, who must have taken the cross immediately on learning of the fall of Jerusalem. This can hardly be called "a marked lack of enthusiasm"; it reflects, rather, a willingness to contribute manpower combined with a reluctance to make financial contributions demanded by the English crown at times when its motives were, to say the least, untrustworthy.⁴⁶

The change in the social background of a Scottish crusading contingent which this also reflects is part of a change in social composition on a wider scale. Going on crusade

46. Chapter 1, pp. 84-94

was a more expensive business than it had been earlier, and required more methodical planning rather than spontaneous enthusiasm. In Scotland, by the latter part of William I's reign an Anglo-Norman nobility was now firmly established and could contemplate joining their peers from England and France who had sought glory and salvation by going to the Holy Land. The number of native Celtic crusaders, which seems to have been greatest in the first half of the twelfth century, begins to decline, and by the later thirteenth century has virtually disappeared.

However, during the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216), some native Celts continued to take the cross. Ranald son of Somerled, who died c. 1207, is said to have "received a cross from Jerusalem" before his death, which probably means that he took the cross on his deathbed. Earlier a papal legate had preached the cross at Perth in 1202, and induced a local landowner, David Rufus of Forfar, to take the cross. The next preaching of the cross in Scotland, in 1213, attracted large numbers of poor folk to come forward as crusaders, but few of the rich and powerful men of the kingdom (i.e., few of the Anglo-Norman nobility?). The crusade against Damietta (1218-1221) was joined by Saher de Quincy, son of the Robert who had joined the third crusade, who took ship from Galloway in January 1219 and died before the walls of Damietta three days before it fell to the Christians in November 1219. He may have had with him on his ship a small group of Hiberno-Scottish Gaels, including

two Gaelic bards who have left poems describing their feelings as they crossed the Mediterranean from Acre to Damietta and back via Monte Gargano on the Adriatic coast.⁴⁷

Frederick II seems to have been accompanied to the Holy Land in 1228-9 by one Scot, the philosopher and translator Michael Scot; but this was not an international passagium generale, and it was not until the time of Louis IX of France that there was a return to large scale international crusading. Jerusalem fell to the Khwarismians in 1244, and in the same year Louis took the cross; in the following year the Christians suffered at Gaza their greatest defeat since Hattin (1187), and there were renewed fears for the safety of the Holy Land. A number of Scots set out to join King Louis's crusade, led by Patrick earl of Dunbar, who was sufficiently important that his death was noted by the French continuator of the History of William of Tyre. In 1248 a crusade-bound ship sailed from Inverness under the command of the Count of-St Pol (Flanders), and it has been suggested that some local Scots may have taken ship with him. The master of the Templars in Scotland was present at the crusaders' defeat in Egypt in 1249, and communicated news of the disaster to Matthew Paris at St Albans. When reinforcements prepared to set out to join Louis in 1250, they included a group of Scottish knights from East Lothian, who had connections with the faction led by Alan Durward.

47. Chapter 2, pp. 95-113

which controlled the Scottish regency at the time, and may also have had connections with the de Quincy family, who provided three generations of crusaders from Scotland and England. In view of Durward's own extensive travels, and the fact that the son of the crusader earl of Dunbar also seems to have been a member of his faction during the regency, it may be possible to detect in the Durward group a more outward-looking or cosmopolitan attitude, including an interest in the crusades, while the group led by Walter Comyn earl of Menteith were perhaps more insular or introverted.⁴⁸

The last of the great crusades, that of Louis IX and Lord Edward in 1270-2, was joined by an even more impressive array of Scots. Some of them certainly were Anglo-Scottish lords who had been on the victorious royalist side during the wars against Simon de Montfort; these men had been loyal to Lord Edward and may in some cases have taken the cross to avoid litigation over lands which they had-acquired from disinherited rebels. In some cases it is known that they sailed with Lord Edward when he left England in the late summer of 1270, or with his brother Edmund in the following spring. But there was also a substantial Scottish contingent, led by the earls of Atholl and Carrick, which had left Scotland earlier and was with Louis IX when he attacked Tunis in the high summer of 1270. The French king and a large part

48. Chapter 2, pp. 114-131

of his army, including the earl of Atholl, perished soon after the landing of heat and disease, and the attack on Tunis was abandoned without success in the autumn. At the same time, Lord Edward arrived with an English force; they wintered in Sicily and proceeded to Acre next spring with the earl of Carrick and other Scottish survivors, and with the Anglo-Scots who had come with Lord Edward. The earl of Carrick died of disease (possibly contracted at Tunis?) at Acre in the summer of 1271. The Scots and Anglo-Scots included Balliols, Bruces, Mowbrays, John de Vescy, Adam de Gordon, possibly David de Lindsay, and Alexander de Seton, whose esquire Nicholas was captured by Bedouins during Lord Edward's attack on Qaqun in Caesarea.⁴⁹

We know the names of more Scottish participants in the crusade of 1270-2 than in any earlier or later venture. It is worth asking whether the increase in documentation as the thirteenth century progresses presents a distorted picture of an increase in Scottish interest in the crusades as the cause of the crusader states became more futile, which is more apparent than real. To some extent this may be the case, but it also seems likely that if there had been Scots of the importance of those who took part in the later crusades involved earlier, their names would be known. But in the twelfth century the Scots who went on crusade were regarded as barbarians by

49. Chapter 2, pp. 133-159

those around them. In 1213, few of those who took the cross ranked among the rich and powerful men of the kingdom. On the other hand, the earl of Dunbar who died at Marseille in 1248 on his way to the Holy Land was one of the wealthiest and most munificent men of his age, while the Scots who set out for the east in 1270 were mostly men of wealth and influence. There is every appearance of a transformation having taken place, which may in part reflect the transition from a native Celtic aristocracy to an Anglo-Norman one, as Scotland became a mature, highly-developed European kingdom, ready to participate fully in the corporate ventures of Western Christendom. In this change in the character of Scottish crusaders, we can perhaps see a reflection in miniature of changes in the nature of Scottish society as a whole over these two centuries. On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that in the twelfth century, and as far back as the summoning of the first crusade itself, there had been Scots prepared to listen and respond to the appeal of the cross. Clearly, Scotland before the time of David I and his grandsons was not living through the introverted "Celtic twilight" which has sometimes been suggested, but was responsive, at least to some extent, to cosmopolitan influences.

It is possible that finance may have played a part in bringing about this apparent transformation. Later crusading armies were better and more expensively equipped than the miscellaneous rabble who followed in the wake of the first crusade, and it may have been difficult for those other than

feudal landowners to raise the necessary money for the journey and all that it entailed. There are only a few known examples of Scottish knights entering into transactions to raise money for this purpose. The best documented is that between the earl of Dunbar and Melrose abbey in 1248, when he sold his stud-farm in Lauderdale to the monks; it also seems likely that the knightly tenants of the Steward in Innerwick were raising money for the third crusade when they set their lands in tack to Kelso Abbey in c.1190; and it is also likely that when David Rufus of Forfar constituted the monks of Coupar Angus his heirs and granted them lands in 1201, when he was about to set out on the fourth crusade in response to the preaching of the legate John de Salerno, he was getting financial assistance towards his crusade.⁵⁰

Crusading finance was not simply a problem for the individual. From the time of the third crusade onwards, money for crusades was raised by taxation, and from the early thirteenth century the papacy imposed regular crusading taxes on the church and appointed collectors. There is evidence of reluctance to contribute to crusading finance in Scotland, especially when it was feared that the chief beneficiary might be the English crown. It was this reluctance which motivated William I to refuse to contribute to the "Saladin Tithe" requested by Henry II in 1188, and to hold out until he was

50. Chapter 2, pp. 96, 121-2; Chapter 1, p.90

offered better terms by Richard I in 1189.⁵¹ In 1213 we find the earliest instance of papally-appointed collectors of a Holy Land subsidy, when Innocent III imposed a tax on the whole church and appointed the bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow to collect it in Scotland. By the middle of the thirteenth century examples are found of Scottish collectors of the Holy Land twentieth being ordered to hand over moneys to non-Scottish crucesignati.⁵² The bishop of Dunblane was so ordered to make payments to two brothers-in-law of Simon de Montfort in 1247, and in the following year King Alexander II reacted angrily, extracting from Pope Innocent IV an assurance that he should suffer no prejudice by the visit of a Franciscan collector to Scotland, and persuading the pope to instruct the Scottish collectors (again the bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow) to distribute moneys to those who had taken the cross and were preparing to set out. In 1251 the Durward administration ruling in the name of Alexander III, reminded the pope that he had originally intended to distribute the crusading tax from Scotland among Scottish crusaders, but had then changed his mind and awarded it to Henry III; the pope was asked to reconsider this decision, and he agreed that the twentieth should in fact be distributed

51. Chapter 1, pp. 84-5

52. Chapter 2, pp. 127, 137-8

among Scottish crucesignati. It is probably significant that Henry III conspired to have Durward removed from power just two months after the pope had been persuaded to reverse his decision in Henry's favour.⁵³ During the majority of Alexander III, resistance to papal financial demands which might benefit the Plantagenets continued. The king forbade the export of 2000 marks raised by the legate Ottobon in 1268, and Ottobon complained that he had heard that Alexander had ordered his subjects not to co-operate with the legate or his messengers. Boece's story that Alexander promised to send men instead of money for the crusade may reflect the truth, for it is in agreement with Fordun's statement that the king and clergy refused to pay the Holy Land tenth in 1268 and appealed to the pope, while it is known that a substantial Scottish contingent set out on crusade in 1270, led by two earls, and joined the army of Louis IX rather than that of Lord Edward.⁵⁴ A wealth of documentation surrounds the visit to Scotland of Balamund de Vicci (collector 1275-1284), who attempted to revise the calculation on which papal taxation was based, but was forbidden to export the money which he raised by King Alexander, and was accused by the pope of having lent it out at interest because he could not get it out of the country. Alexander's reluctance

53. Chapter 2, pp. 127-8

54. Chapter 2, pp. 138ff.

was certainly due to the fact that the beneficiary of money raised from the Scottish church for the crusade would be Edward I; in 1284 the pope awarded the tenth from Scotland to Edward, on condition that he first obtained Alexander's consent, and then undertook to pay the expenses of any Scots who took the cross; and in 1286 the pope permitted Edward personally to select the crusaders from the kingdom of Scotland and to pay their expenses out of the Scottish tenth. It is not surprising that Alexander III should have been reluctant to allow Edward to finance his own faction in Scotland out of money raised from the Scottish church for the Holy Land, but it is surprising that the pope (Martin IV) should have considered such a preposterous scheme possible. After the death of Alexander III in 1286, and with Edward's increasing control over Scotland in the following years, it seems that Scottish moneys collected for the Holy Land were successfully being diverted for the benefit of the English crown; the last collector, John de Halton bishop of Carlisle (collector 1292-1301) seems to have been largely successful until the outbreak of the Anglo-Scottish war in 1296. Thereafter English control fluctuated until it was finally terminated in 1314.⁵⁵ The study of crusading finance in the later middle ages (and a more detailed examination of the crusading tax in the thirteenth century than has been possible here) belongs to a study devoted

55. Chapter 2, pp. 160-164; Chapter 3, pp. 167-9

to Scotland's relations with the medieval papacy, and not to the present work.

The fall of Acre in 1291 does not mark the end of the crusading movement, although it made the recovery of Jerusalem an increasingly unobtainable objective. In the fourteenth century the crusading movement tended to fan out and become directed into a number of different, narrower channels which did not have the attraction of the pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Many of these "crusades" became an outlet for the belligerence of a new class of professional soldier, the type of man immortalised by Chaucer in his portrait of the knight in the Canterbury Tales.⁵⁶ Sir James Douglas, who died fighting against the Moors in Spain in 1330 while carrying King Robert I's heart towards the Holy Land, was a relatively early example of this phenomenon; by that year he had been fighting more or less continuously for over twenty years, and possibly had little aptitude and little taste for any other kind of life. But his death, and King Robert's posthumous crusade, should not be seen as a quixotic gesture ending with a reckless, suicidal charge; Douglas died because of a tactical error, and in his death he brought enormous prestige to himself and to his late master.⁵⁷ Although consistently victorious in the war against England after 1314, the Scots had never been able to obtain international recognition

56. Chapter 3, pp. 204-7

57. Chapter 3, pp. 180-95

and respectability for their cause, and were the object of accusations by the Plantagenets that they disturbed the peace of Christendom and hindered the crusade. The Scottish clergy retaliated by stirring up men to join Bruce's cause with the contention that it was just as meritorious to fight against the English as it was to fight the heathen in the Holy Land; and in letters to the king of France in 1309 and to the pope in 1320 (the famous Declaration of Arbroath), the Scottish governing community asserted their readiness to go to the defence of the Holy Land if only the English would leave them in peace. In view of the Plantagenets' close association with the crusading movement from Richard I's time onwards, a concrete demonstration of Scottish crusading fervour was the best way to rebut English arguments; and, paradoxically for such a cosmopolitan activity, participation in a crusade was in a sense an assertion of Scotland's recovered nationhood, a demonstration of willingness to share with other European nations in the defence of Christendom.⁵⁸

This and other crusades of the fourteenth century represent a shift from the earlier pattern, especially with the rise of the professional soldier. Crusades were to some extent a means of keeping such men occupied during periods of peace between nations, and this is certainly an aspect which must be kept in view when considering Douglas's crusade, just two years after

58. Chapter 3, pp. 169-80

the peace of Edinburgh (1328). Similarly, when the Hundred Years' War came to a temporary halt in 1360 and the "free companies" were left to roam loose over the north of Italy, the pope tried to interest them in the king of Cyprus's projected crusade. When Peter of Cyprus launched his raid on Alexandria in 1365, his army included a number of Scottish knights, including the brothers Norman and Walter Lesley, who had the previous year been involved in the dealings of Sir John Hawkwood's "White Company" at Florence, and who some years before had taken service with the Teutonic Knights in Prussia.⁵⁹

There is a steady flow of Scottish knights to the Prussian crusade from the mid-fourteenth century until the Battle of Tannenberg (1410) put an end to the Teutonic Knights' expansionist designs in the North. In some cases, it appears that those who joined these campaigns were profiting by a truce in the intermittent war against England; for instance, Sir William Douglas of Nithsdale may have been taking advantage of the truce which followed the Battle of Otterburn (1388) to take a belligerent holiday in the Baltic in 1390-1. If he hoped to have a rest from fighting the English in Prussia, he was sadly deceived, for he was killed in a fight between English and Scottish knights on the bridge at Königsberg in 1391. After the crushing defeat of the Teutonic Knights at Tannenberg (which was witnessed by a

59. Chapter 3, pp. 196-204

mysterious personage described as le bastard d'Escoce, qui se appelloit comte de Hembe -- a possible addition to the seemingly interminable list of the illegitimate progeny of King Robert II), all trace of Scottish knights fighting in the Baltic disappears.⁶⁰

The mediterranean had not lost all its attraction for Scots in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The administrators of the Hospitallers' properties in Scotland in the later middle ages were, with a very few exceptions, Scots who had served at Rhodes, and there are examples of members of the household of a Scottish preceptor making careers for themselves in the service of the knights of Rhodes, such as "Duguetus le Scot", whose name probably represents the Aberdeenshire surname Duguid; he was rewarded with a pension from the responsions due to the grand master from the Scottish properties of the order. The brothers David and Alexander Lindsay joined the "Order of the Passion" founded by Philip de mezieres in 1395 as the nucleus of a new crusading army. A group of Scottish knights was fighting the Turks around Constantinople in the early 1450's, "who became so impoverished that they could not return to their own land without the alms of the faithful" and had to be repatriated by a papally-sponsored appeal. One Scot was serving under King Ferdinand at the final assault on Granada in 1492. Even in the early sixteenth century

60. Chapter 3, pp. 206-14

some Scots were found in the east on belligerent missions: John Chalmers and Walter Lindsay both fought heroically with the Hospitallers at the siege of Rhodes (1520), and both later joined the order; while Thomas Doughty, claiming to have been a captain against the Turks, founded the hermitage chapel of Loretto at Musselburgh and greatly impressed King James V. Sceptics of reformist sympathies were less impressed, and described his miracles and relics as fraudulent.⁶¹

It appears that as belligerent pilgrimage declined in the late middle ages, an interest in peaceful pilgrimage increased. There are plenty of examples of peaceful Scottish pilgrims to the Holy Land in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, many of whom have been catalogued by Mgr MacRoberts. None is more interesting than Anselm Adornes, who came from Bruges, befriended King James III, and ended up settling in Scotland and being murdered by the king's enemies. He appears to have been commissioned by James to make an extended pilgrimage to North Africa and the Holy Land in 1470, acting as the king's ambassador, and dedicated his itinerary to his friend and benefactor. James had previously read Mandeville's Travels, and perhaps thereby acquired an interest in distant lands; it is worth noting in passing that Mandeville was a book much admired by Columbus, who hoped that his circumnavigation of the globe would aid the recovery

61. Chapter 4, pp. 221-5, 266-7

of Jerusalem, and whose commission from Ferdinand of Aragon followed almost immediately after the final crusade against Granada.⁶²

James III's son and successor, James IV, chose not to devote his energies towards expansion in the New World, but towards a much more conservative scheme for the uniting of Christian princes in a new crusade against the Turks, under his own leadership. So much has been written about the tortuous diplomacy which led up to James's defeat and death at Flodden (1513), that one despairs of finding anything new to say about it; except that James IV's interest in the crusading movement, which has puzzled many narrowly nationalist Scottish historians, can only be understood within a tradition of interest in the crusading movement in Scotland, and that James, albeit conservative for his time, is not an isolated figure in terms of his own past.⁶³

The above arguments are contained in the first four, narrative, chapters of the present study. They are followed by two shorter sections, totalling three chapters in all, which explore different influences of the crusading movement. The first of these analyses the development of some institutions with origins in the crusading movement, exploring the extent to which they remained true to the

62. Chapter 4, pp. 228-47

63. Chapter 4, pp. 253-65

ideals of those who founded them and endowed them in Scotland. The last short chapter examines attitudes to the crusades as displayed by Scottish historical writers from the twelfth to the sixteenth century.

It is perhaps curious, in view of the level of Scottish involvement in the Baltic Crusade of the fourteenth century, that the Teutonic Knights seem to have had no landed presence at all in Scotland. How they went about recruiting Scots for the northern crusade is consequently difficult to say. Other orders with Holy Land and crusading connections did have shadowy associations with Scotland: there were lands belonging to the Hospital of St. Thomas of Acre in Kyle in the late thirteenth century, and presumably had been since much earlier;⁶⁴ and in the twelfth century the brethren of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem held the church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, which they subsequently lost.⁶⁵

There is much evidence of generosity towards the military orders in Scotland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The chief beneficiaries of this were certainly the Templars, who enjoyed royal favour from the time of their first visit to Scotland in 1128 until the arrest of the Templars in Scotland ordered by Edward II in 1309. By the

64. W. J. Dillon, "Three Ayrshire Charters", Ayrshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Collections, 2nd ser. VII (1961-66), 28-38

65. RRS II, 116-7

latter date they had acquired the lands of Balantrodoch (now Temple, Midlothian); Kirkliston and Maryculter, and a large number of smaller lands, such as a tenement in Falkirk by gift of the thane of Callendar and another on the North Inch of Perth by gift of Earl David (d.1219); they also held the churches of Temple, Inchinnan, Aboyne, and other churches in Mar. Some of these were royal gifts, others were from nobles like Walter Bisset, to whom the Templars owed their possessions on Deeside. By comparison, the Hospitallers may have held only the lands of Torphichen, granted them by David I, and Galtway, by gift of Fergus lord of Galloway, as estates of any real size; Malcolm IV (1153-1165) granted them a toft in all royal burghs, which may represent the beginnings of the very large number of small tenements (later known as "temple-lands") which they owned by the later middle ages. Their chapel at Torphichen achieved parochial status; in the 1190s they had the patronage of Glenmuick (Braemar), and in the 1280s they were given the church of Ochiltree, Ayrshire, both of which they subsequently lost to other religious orders. Both of the military orders were recipients of charters of privileges and immunities from successive Scottish kings.

Despite the generosity shown to them by crown and nobility, there is evidence to suggest that the Templars in particular aroused ill-feeling among their neighbours in Scotland. Their Scottish preceptories at Balantrodoch and Maryculter were staffed by English brothers and administered as appendages

of the priory of England; as such they contrast with such orders as the Cistercians and Augustinians, who developed a Scottish flavour within a generation or so of their establishment in Scotland. When the Templars in Scotland were arrested in 1309 their neighbours queued up to tell stories of their selfish aggrandizement and refusal of hospitality, though they had little of substance to say about accusations of heresy, sorcery and sodomy apart from sinister hints and hearsay. Half a century later Scottish lawcourts were still being treated to accounts of the cruelty and treachery of the Templars towards their own tenants; it is not surprising that not a word was spoken in their defence in Scotland.⁶⁶

Their consistent loyalty to Edward I, which probably did little to endear them to their neighbours, was shared by the Hospitallers. There is not the same wealth of evidence, in the shape of lurid accusations, to suggest that the Hospitallers were disliked by their neighbours, though it is hinted by the fact that in 1305 they applied to Edward I for permission to take refuge in the garrison stronghold of Linlithgow in time of crisis. Like the Templars, they seem to have used English brothers to administer their Scottish preceptory in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but in the fourteenth century the pattern changes. Accepting the

66. Chapter 5, pp. 271-284

realities of the situation, the Hospitallers came into King Robert I's peace late in 1314 and thereafter seem to have been able to gain control over the lands of the Templars; before King Robert's death (1329) a brother of the Hospital with a Scottish-sounding name (brother Ralph de Lindsay) was disposing of former Templar property in Scotland in favour of men whose families had fought on Bruce's side since early in the war. In the 1340's appears one brother Alexander de Seton, whose name is definitely Scottish, and who is probably to be identified with the leading supporter of Robert I of that name. From this time until the severance of the Hospitallers' influence in Scotland in 1564, all the brothers (and lay commendators in the period when there was no active brother) in Scotland who were in effective control of the Scottish preceptory were themselves Scots. During the Great Schism there is some evidence which suggests attempts to impose an English "anti-preceptor" on Scotland, probably with little success; while on the other hand attempts by Scottish brothers to get Scotland erected into a priory in its own right, independent of England, were also unsuccessful. Tension between English and Scottish brothers was seldom very serious; for instance, brother Patrick Scougal was unsuccessful in his application for the vacant preceptory of Torphichen, and subsequently applied for vacancies in England, to be met with opposition from English brothers on the grounds that he was Scottish and not English; brother George Dundas was prevented by King James IV from getting possession of his preceptory on

the grounds that he had obtained promotion with English help at Rhodes and was therefore untrustworthy; after years of litigation he was able to return to Scotland to take over his preceptory, to be greeted with a bill demanding payment for all the responsions due for the years when he was being excluded from office. Such exceptional examples serve to confirm the general picture of smooth and harmonious operation in the Hospitaller machine. Their highly developed administrative machinery, modelled on the papal chancery, allowed their central organs to exercise much closer supervision of the localities, and prevented their local preceptories from becoming decadent, as happened with so many other religious orders in the sixteenth century.⁶⁷

The Bethlehemites provide a useful contrast to the military orders. Their hospital at St Germain (Tranent, East Lothian), was probably founded by Robert de Quincy some years before his departure on the third crusade, perhaps c.1170; it retained its links with the bishopric of Bethlehem even after the bishops abandoned their links with the Holy Land and settled at their hospital of Clamecy (dép. Nièvre) in Central France. Indeed, into the 1430s St Germain remained subject to the bishops of Bethlehem, but contact seems to have been lost with the death of Bishop Dominic c. 1436; thereafter the hospital became secularised, and in

67. Chapter 5, p. 285ff.

the 1470s lurid stories were told about the decadence into which it had fallen as a result of the corruption of the Piot family, who had appropriated it to their own secular uses. In the 1490s it was finally wound up and its revenues appropriated to the foundation of William Elphinstone's new university at Aberdeen, while the last master and his many pensioners were compensated with benefices in the gift of the bishop of Aberdeen. In the sixteenth century, with the restoration of an external controlling influence, there is evidence of a return to hospitality for the elderly and divine service being maintained at St Germain's, which had disappeared after the bishops of Bethlehem lost their influence there.⁶⁸

The Trinitarians, who devoted a portion of their revenues to the redemption of captives held by the infidel, came to Scotland in the early thirteenth century. It is uncertain what to make of traditions that many of their early brothers active in North Africa came from the British Isles, including some Scots; without any better evidence than that which is available, it must remain an open question. But there were quite a few Scottish houses of Trinitarian friars, and some of them were founded by families with connections with the crusades. Some Trinitarian houses in Scotland seem to have become decadent in the early sixteenth century, while others

68. Chapter 6, pp. 336-356

retained their vitality. But no order so much as the Hospitallers, with their highly developed organisation, high prestige, and close links with Rhodes and later with Malta, remained loyal to the spirit of their founders, and retained the ideals which caused them to be respected among laymen.⁶⁹

The final aspect of the impact of the crusading movement in Scotland that is examined in the present study is that of reports and comments on the crusades in Scottish chronicles and histories. For the most part, these are enthusiastic and often remarkably accurate. Both the Melrose and Holyrood Chronicles have accounts of affairs in the Holy Land which are found in no other source, and which would therefore seem to indicate information reaching Scotland from independent sources, especially in the mid- to late-thirteenth century. The Melrose Chronicle in particular abounds with information about the crusades; although an anti-English bias is often apparent in this border chronicle, the writer is full of praise for Richard I and condemnation for Philip II of France during the third crusade; and despite an apparent pro-Montfortian bias, the writer is also full of praise for Lord Edward for his exploits in the Holy Land. Particularly interesting are the chronicler's observations about Islam when describing Louis IX's siege of Tunis:

"The people worship one God, but not three persons; and

69. Chapter 6, pp. 357-370

because they worshipped one God and did not observe the Jewish law, they begged the king to spare them". This is unusual among Scottish accounts of Islam in the middle ages, where Moslems are usually portrayed (with gross inaccuracy) as idolaters and polytheists. The Holyrood Chronicle, which by the late thirteenth century shows signs of having been in part at least a Coupar Angus document, contains an account of Holy Land affairs of the 1260s which seems to come from a Hospitaller source.

The chronicles of the later middle ages tend to look back on the early crusades as a golden age of unified Christian endeavour: "O quantum distant moderni principes ab illis qui tunc fuerunt!" writes Walter Bower of the first crusade. But his Scotichronicon does nothing to promote Christian unity, and always tends to minimise the role of the English in the crusades and to glorify the French -- a natural prejudice for a nationalistic Scot of the second quarter of the fifteenth century. This anti-English prejudice is even more marked in another continuation of John of Fordun's Chronica, the Liber Pluscardensis; in this, Richard I has become a faithless villain, betraying the trust of the noble King Philip of France: "by which unfaithfulness is shown and manifest the natural and innate quality of the English from the earliest time". If the writer of the Liber Pluscardensis (a veteran of the Hundred Years War) were to be believed, every disaster that fell on the crusaders could somehow be explained by the wickedness and treachery of the English.

Nowhere in the Scottish chronicles is there a suggestion of disillusion with the crusading ideal, unless it is the Scottorum Historia of Hector Boece, the friend of Erasmus and of the pacifist Bishop Elphinstone. It is of interest to remember that Erasmus sent him a copy of his essay criticising the ideal of warfare against the Turks, accompanied by a friendly dedicatory letter, when one considers that his annals record that Scottish crusaders "were all slain through heat and pest" so regularly that one is convinced that he really has very little sympathy for the subject.⁷⁰

In addition to discussion of all the above material, there are two appendices: the first contains editions of little-known or hitherto unpublished documents illustrative of aspects of the text; the second contains a calendar of material relating to Scotland contained in the archives of the Knights of St John now held in the National Library of Malta.⁷¹

It remains only to ask what has been shown by the present study. It has cast light on the activities of Scots overseas in the middle ages, and on their pious (or not-so-pious) motivations; it has demonstrated the extent to which they were influenced by the most important

70. Chapter 7, p. 372ff.

71. Appendices I & II, pp. 409ff.

single religio-military movement of unified Christendom; and it has explored the development of institutions within Scotland which owed their origins to that movement, and the degree to which they remained loyal to its ideals. Finally it reflects aspects of social and intellectual change over four and a half centuries, and as such has implications which go beyond its own narrow confines.

PART I

SCOTTISH PARTICIPATION IN THE CRUSADES

Chapter 1.

The First Century of the Crusades, 1095 - 1198

Although historians have looked for precursors of the Crusades,¹ the Crusading movement is generally acknowledged to have had its origin on 27 November 1095, when Pope Urban II exhorted the chivalry of Western Europe to go to the aid of the Holy Places of Christendom.² The Council of Clermont, to which this appeal was addressed, consisted mainly of clergy from France and Italy; from the British Isles, only one participant is known to have been present, a disciple of St. Anselm called Boso, who reported to the Archbishop what had passed at the Council.³ Possibly Urban's intentions were in fact quite limited in scope, and he had not expected the tremendous outburst of enthusiasm which followed his appeal.

But an outburst there certainly was, and it was not confined to those who first heard the call of Clermont or for whose ears it seems to have been intended. The twelfth-century chronicler Sigebert of Gembloux wrote:

Occidentales populi, dolentes loca sancta Hierosolimis
a gentilibus profanari et Turcos etiam terminos
christianorum iam multa ex parte invasisse, innumerabiles
una aspiratione moti, et multis signis sibi ostensis,
alii ab aliis animati, duces, comites, potentes, nobiles
et ignobiles, divites et pauperes, liberi et servi,

-
1. cf. S. Runciman, A History of the Crusades (Cambridge, 1954), I, 87-92, 98-100
 2. D. C. Munro, "The Speech of Pope Urban at Clermont", American Historical Review, XI (1906) 231-41
 3. R. Somerville, "The Council of Clermont and Latin Christian Society", Archivum Historiae Pontificiae, XII (1974), 55-90, esp. 71-2

episcopi, clerici, monachi, senes et juvenes, etiam pueri et puellae, omnes uno animo, nullum ullo angiarante, undique concurrant, ab Hispania, a Provintia, ab Aquitania, a Britannia, a Scotia, ab Anglia, a Normannia, a Francia, a Lotharingia, a Burgundia, a Germania, a Langobardia, ab Apulia, et ab aliis rēgnis; et virtute et sanctae crucis signati, et armati, ultum ire parant, injurias Dei in hostes christiani nominatis.⁴

A more closely contemporary chronicler, Ekkehard of Aura, had written c.1115 a similar account of the reaction in the West to Urban's appeal:

Qua sponsione arrectis animis omnium, designata sunt ad praesentem in Domini militiam circiter centum milia virorum ex Aquitania scilicet atque Normannia, Anglia, Scotia et Hibernia, Britannia, Galicia, Wasconia, Gallia, Flandria, Lotharingia, caeterisque gentibus christianis, quarum nunc minime occurrunt vocabula.⁵

The reader may be tempted to doubt whether such a list is to be taken seriously as evidence of the nations which Ekkehard knew to have been stirred by the pope's message. But Ekkehard insists that the news penetrated to the islands of the western ocean:

Insuper, quod dicta mirabile est, ipsum oceani limitem velocitate consueta supervolans, insulanorum etiam classibus maria ipsa in caelestis regis militiam redundare fecit. Nam, ut verissime comperimus, tam ignotos effudit Oceanus populos, quorum non dicam mores et habitus, sed ne loquelam quisquam hujus littoris

4. Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores (MGH Script), VI, 367

5. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux (RHC Occ), V, 16: MGH Script, VI, 213



habitor, vel de ipsis marinariis, agnosceret,
 rursumque alios, quibus nihil praeter panem et aquam
 in usu victus esset, itemque quosdam quibus argentum
 pro ferro in omnibus suis utensilibus esset.⁶

The lists of nationalities provided by these two historians are the basis of accounts in later German chronicles such as the Annalista Saxo,⁷ the Chronica de Origine Ducum Brabantiae,⁸ and Otto of Freising, who in the mid-twelfth century added at the end of Ekkehard's list

... caeterosque populos non solum terram sed et insulas
 maris ac ultimum oceanum inhabitantes.⁹

Clearly even if we had no evidence from the British Isles themselves, we would still have to take these chroniclers seriously. To them must be added the account of another contemporary and eyewitness of most of what he recorded, Guibert de Nogent. Guibert adopts a high, moralistic tone in his account of the first crusade, rebuking the Franks for believing that God had summoned them quasi specialiter before other nations, and encouraging them to cast their eyes about at those around them:

Videres Scottorum, apud se ferocium, alias imbellium,
 cuneos, crure intecto, hispida chlamide, ex humeris
 dependente sitarcia, de finibus uliginosis allabi; et
 quibus ridicula, quantum ad nos, forent arma copiosa,
 suae fidei ac devotionis nobis auxilia praesentare.
 Testor Dei me audisse nescio cujus barbarae gentis

6. Recueil des Historiens des Croisades: Historiens Occidentaux (RHC Occ), V, 16: MGH Script, VI, 213

7. MGH Script, VI, 729

8. MGH Script, XXV, 408

9. MGH Script, XX, 249

homines ad nostri portum maris appulsos, quorum sermo adeo habebatur incognitus, ut lingua vacante, digitorum super digitos transversione crucis signa praetenderent; hisque indiciis, quod nequibant vocibus, se fidei causa proficisci monstrarent.¹⁰

Professor A. A. M. Duncan has pointed out that elsewhere Guibert uses the word Scoti to indicate Scots rather than Irish,¹¹ even though it is true that the term had not yet come to have its later exclusive meaning of Scots. But Ekkehard distinguishes Scotia and Hibernia, and so we cannot doubt the participation of members of both nations on the first crusade.¹²

This conclusion is confirmed by an examination of contemporary chroniclers from the British Isles. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states in its annal for 1096:

At Easter there was a very great stir throughout all this nation, and in other nations too, because of Urban who was called Pope.... A countless number of people with their wives and children set out wishing to fight against the heathen.¹³

-
10. RHC Occ, IV, 125. The reference to "a purse (sitarcia) hanging from the shoulders" is interesting: this was not an early sporran, as Professor Duncan thought, but a leather pouch for holding holy books or relics, such as can be seen in Irish crosses or in the figures of evangelists in the Book of Deer, and so familiar in tenth century Scotland.
cf. K. Hughes, Celtic Britain in the Early Middle Ages, (Bury St. Edmunds, 1980), 28-32 & plates I, II, & IV.
 11. A. A. M. Duncan, "The Dress of the Scots", Scottish Historical Review (SHR), XXIX (1950), 210-12
 12. M. Dolley, Anglo-Norman Ireland (Dublin, 1972), 1, denies that there were any Irish at the capture of Jerusalem: A. O. Anderson, Early Sources of Scottish History 500-1286 (Edinburgh, 1922), 1, 98n., says the Scoti were probably Irish.
 13. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, ed. G. N. Garmonsway (Everyman, 1953), 232.

Writing some twenty-five years after the events, William of Malmesbury gives a chauvinistic description of the reaction among England's neighbours to the summons of Clermont and the pursuits which they abandoned to go to Jerusalem:

Tunc Walensis venationem saltuum, tunc Scottus
familiaritatem pulicum, tunc Danus continuationem potuum,
tunc Noricus cruditatem reliquit piscium.¹⁴

He goes on to describe how the fields were abandoned by farmers, and houses deserted by their inhabitants, while the populations of whole cities marched away to the East. The details are a little picturesque, but accord well enough with the account of other historians of the period. The first crusade was an international movement, which involved not only France and Italy (from which lands the principal leaders were drawn), but also remote parts of northern Europe and Scandinavia, and including Scotland.

It is questionable whether this should come as a surprise. Before the Viking invasions of the ninth century the Scots had been great travellers; Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis betrays an interest in the Holy Places of Christendom as far back as c.700 A.D.¹⁵ After the Viking period people from the British Isles frequently visited the Mediterranean. The Irish Annals record frequent pilgrimages to Rome,¹⁶ and Macbeth,

14. William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum, ed. W. Stubbs (RS, 1887-89), II, 399

15. Adamnan, De Locis Sanctis, in Migne, PL LXXXVIII, 779-814

16. Annals of Innisfallen, ed. S. Mac Airt (Dublin, 1951) subannis 1026, 1028, 1036, 1042, 1064

King of Scotland, himself was in Rome in 1050 spending money like seed.¹⁷ English travellers in the eleventh century sometimes went further afield. Swein Godwineson, brother of the later King Harold, went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1052, and died at Constantinople.¹⁸ In 1058 he was followed, "with greater ceremony than any before him", by Archbishop Ealdred of York, who presented a splendid gift to the Holy Sepulchre.¹⁹ Harold Hardrada, king of Norway (who died at Stamford Bridge in 1066), had taken military service at the Imperial court in Constantinople, visited the Holy Land, and seen action against the Saracens in Sicily.²⁰ After the Norman Conquest, the Varangian Guard at Constantinople came increasingly to include English as well as Scandinavians;²¹ the seal of a Byzantine recruiting officer of c.1080 has been unearthed at Winchester.²² It would be surprising in view of this not to find some Scottish involvement in the Mediterranean in the late eleventh century.

17. Anderson, Early Sources, I, 558

18. ASC ed. Garmonsway, 182

19. *ibid.*, 189

20. King Harald's Saga, ed. M. Magnusson and H. Pálsson (Penguin, 1966), 47ff.

21. K. N. Cigaar, "L'Emigration Anglaise à Byzance après 1066", Revue des Etudes Byzantines, XXXII (1974), 301-42
M. de Waha, "La Lettre d'Alexis I Comnène à Robert le Frison", Byzantion, XLVII (1977), 113-25

22. V. Laurent, "Byzance et Angleterre au lendemain de la Conquête Normande", Numismatic Circular, LXXI (1963), 93-96

What is less easy, however, is to discover what part the Scots did play in the first crusade. We want to know who they were, when they set out and by what route, under what commander they served, whether they reached Jerusalem, and whether they returned home. To most of these questions there is at least a partial answer. First, we know the name of one great Hiberno-Scottish ruler who joined the first crusade; he was Lagmann, King of Man and the Western Isles, who, struck with remorse after blinding and mutilating his rebellious brother,

sponte regnum dimisit, et signo crucis dominicae
insignatus, iter Jerosolimitanum arripuit, quo et
mortuus est. ²³

Clearly the King of the Isles was not one of Ekkehard's "bread and water" crusaders, though he may have been an outlandish barbarian to Guibert de Nogent. The chronology of the Manx Chronicle at this point is very confused; the event is put some twenty-three years after Godred's invasion of Man (sub anno 1056), allowing for a reign of sixteen years for Godred and seven years for Lagmann himself. But the mention of Lagmann's departure for Jerusalem is immediately followed by the record of the death of Malcolm III of Scotland (sub anno 1073, but which in fact happened in 1093). News of Lagmann's death is said in the Chronicle to have reached the proceres insularum in 1075, during the reign of "Murecardus Obrien rex Ybernie": but this must be Muirchertach Ua Briain,

23. Chronica Regum Manniae et Insularum: the Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. P. A. Munch (Manx Society, 1874), I, 54

King of Munster, who died in 1119,²⁴ and who was not a prominent figure in Irish politics (if politics is the right word) before the late 1080s,²⁵ Thus it is clear that the Manx Chronicle is muddled in its dating at this point, and the death of Lagmann must be put in the 1090s. He is said to have taken the cross, an action which was an innovation of the Council of Clermont. As we have seen, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that the news of Urban's summons created a stir in England at Easter (13 April) 1096. Lagmann and those who went with him probably crossed the channel in the summer of 1096 and joined the assembling forces of Robert Duke of Normandy, whose army was the last to set out and which included most of the people of northern Europe who took part:

Jam vero mense Septembri [1096], Robertus Normannorum comes, frater Willelmi regis... iter illud adoriri gestiens, habuit socios Robertum Flandrensem, Stephanum Blesensem sororis maritum.... Parebant cum eis Angli et Normanni et Occidentales Franci, et Flandritae et omnium populorum cunei qui ab Oceano Britannico usque ad Alpes Mediterraneo tractu jacent.²⁶

It is of interest to note that William of Malmesbury here uses the same word cuneus as Guibert de Nogent. This has the classical meaning of a wedge or phalanx of soldiers; but in Medieval Latin it can also mean a horde or rabble.

24. Annals of Innisfallen 278

25. *ibid.*, 232-278 *passim*

26. William of Malmesbury, GR, II, 402

This gives us a partial answer to the questions, who they were and under whom did they serve. How far did they get? They might not have been expected to survive the rigours of an unfamiliar climate, and Guibert comments that they were unwarlike outside their own country and carried a ridiculous abundance of arms - he felt that their faith and devotion were all the aid they offered.²⁷ Perhaps we should be surprised that they got to Constantinople, and set out again with the army in 1097 to cross Asia Minor; but Fulcher of Chartres, travelling with Stephen of Blois, noted them on the road between Nicaea and Antioch in the summer of 1097:

Sed quis unquam audivit tot tribus linguae in uno exercitu, quum ibi adessent Franci, Flandri, Frisi, Galli, Allobroges, Lotharingi, Alemanni, Baiuarii, Normanni, Angli, Scothi, Aquitani, Itali, Daci, Apuli, Iberi, Britones, Graeci, Armeni? Quod si vellet me aliquis Britannus vel Teutonicus interrogare, neutro respondere sapere possem.²⁸

Fulcher of Chartres was travelling in the company of Germans and Bretons; this would have enabled him to be familiar with the composition of the northern army. Certainly in 1097 the Bretons were still in company with Robert of Normandy and his companions,²⁹ though after the siege of Antioch the army tended to realign itself. Not all the Apulians remained in the north with Bohemond; some, like the author of the

27. A. A. M. Duncan, art. cit.

28. RHC Occ, III, 366

29. Orderic Vitalis, Ecclesiastical History, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1969-in progress), V, 58

Gesta Francorum, continued south towards Jerusalem.³⁰ Our Scots are lost sight of at Antioch, and no further glimpses can be caught of their southward progress. Only imagination can follow them to the siege of Jerusalem itself.

There is evidence which suggests, however, that some of these Scots returned home, unlike Lagmann, King of the Isles. It must be stressed that there was a strong connection between the Kingdom of Man and the kings of Munster at this time. When Lagmann's death became known in the Isles, the "proceres insularum" sent to Muircherdach Ua Briain asking him to send a regent until the boy-king Olaf, son of Godred, should be fully grown.³¹ The man sent by him was "Dompnaldus filius Tadc", probably a grandson of Brian Boroma and a leading member of the O'Brien kin-group. There was a close relationship between the O'Briens and the kings of Scotland at this time. In the annal for the year 1105 the Annals of Innisfallen have the following bizarre entry:

In the above year a camel (in camall), an animal of remarkable size, was brought from the king of Alba to Muirchertach Ua Briain.³²

Where could this animal mirae magnitudinis have come from? How had King Edgar (assuming he is the rîg Alban referred to) acquired it? It is more than possible that the arrival of this creature is to be connected in some way with the

30. Gesta Francorum, ed. R. Hill (London, 1962), introduction

31. Chron. Man, I, 54

32. Annals of Innisfallen, 262

return of the crusaders from Jerusalem; otherwise its presence in Scotland in 1105 is difficult to explain.

Another Scot seems to have brought back from the first crusade a rather less ambitious souvenir. "In 1823 the interesting discovery was made in the churchyard [of Monymusk] of a Moorish gold coin... identified as belonging to the Murabetin dynasty of Morocco and ^{it} bears the Arabic date 491 (A.D. 1097). It...is in beautiful condition, having clearly been in brief circulation before the moment of burial." ³³ Here is another pointer to contact between Scotland and the Arab Mediterranean world at the end of the eleventh century, though it could perhaps be argued that the coin originated in North Africa rather than Syria and could have come to Scotland by a more indirect route. On the other hand, the fact that it is virtually uncirculated seems to be evidence that it was buried within a few years of its being minted in 1097, and that must point to the first crusade.

The enormous success of the first crusade and the establishment of the Latin principalities on the Palestinian mainland led others to follow in the footsteps of the crusaders. Noteworthy among them was Edgar Atheling, brother-in-law of Malcolm III and a close associate of King Edgar. It was he who carried out the "Norman Conquest" of Scotland when he invaded the country "after Michaelmas" 1097 and put Edgar on the throne in place of Donald Bàn,

33. W. Douglas Simpson, "The Augustinian Priory and Parish Church of Monymusk, Aberdeenshire", Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland (PSAS), LIX (1924-5), 34-71, at 65

Malcolm III's brother.³⁴ Among those who came with the Atheling was Robert son of Godwine, to whom King Edgar granted lands in Lothian on which he began to build a castle.³⁵ Robert's building work was interrupted by Ranulf Flambard Bishop of Durham, who caused him to be imprisoned.³⁶ He was released in 1099, and subsequently went with Edgar Atheling to the Holy Land. Orderic Vitalis places Edgar's appearance in the East in the spring of 1098,³⁷ but this seems too soon after his trip to Scotland right at the end of 1097, and certainly is impossible for his companion Robert son of Godwine. According to Orderic, Edgar (presumably acting as a Varangian captain)³⁸ was in charge of the Emperor's fleet off Antioch in March 1098, and sailed on to the capture of Lattakieh soon after. William of Malmesbury's account is substantially different. He states that Edgar Atheling and Robert son of Godwine arrived together at the siege of Ramleh in May 1102, that Robert was captured by Saracens and carried off to Cairo (Babylon), where he was martyred by being pierced with arrows when he would not renounce the name of Christ.³⁹ This chronology is altogether more likely, despite Orderic Vitalis' positive assertion.

34. ASC ed. Garmonsway, 234

35. John de Fordun, Chronica Gentis Scottorum, ed. W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, Historians of Scotland, 1871-72), I, 224-5

36. R. L. G. Ritchie, The Normans in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1954) 95-97

37. Orderic Vitalis, V, 276

38. K. N. Cigaar, art. cit., 339

39. William of Malmesbury, GR, II, 310, 349

Edgar seems to have returned to England via the Imperial court at Constantinople and Germany, and was back in Normandy fighting on Duke Robert's side at the Battle of Tinchebrai (28 September 1106), where he was captured and released by Henry I without ransom.⁴⁰

Robert son of Godwine may have been a fairly isolated figure. Professor Duncan writes that there "is no indication that a wave of English refugees or colonists came to Scotland in the time of King Edgar. We may be more positive that there was no Anglo-French settlement".⁴¹ It has been suggested that Thor Longus, an Anglian landowner in Ednam (Merse), had a brother who was captured on the first crusade,⁴² but the evidence of a single ambiguous charter reference to his redemptio is hardly substantial enough to bear any weight. In the reign of Alexander I, however, there is evidence of contact with the Eastern Mediterranean; on a visit to the Cathedral of St. Andrews (probably what is now St. Regulus' Church) Alexander caused to be brought to the altar his comely Arab steed with costly saddle and bridle, covered with a fair mantle of fine velvet, together with his armour from Turkey, of a kind then commonly used by princes and finely wrought for their pleasure.⁴³ Perhaps, like his

40. Dictionary of National Biography, sub "Edgar Atheling".

41. A. A. M. Duncan, Scotland: the Making of the Kingdom (Edinburgh, 1975), 127

42. A. C. Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters (Glasgow 1905), 19, 259.

43. Andrew de Wyntoun, Orygynall Cronykil of Scotland, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, *Historians of Scotland*) II, 176

brother's camel, his oriental trappings may have been the gift of a returning crusader.

The first crusade came at a time of political flux within Scotland, with a series of stormy coups-d'état between 1093 and 1097, when the dynasty of Malcolm and Margaret became finally established with English assistance.⁴⁴ It is not to be wondered at that apart from King Lagmann from the Western Isles (which were probably very little affected by dynastic disputes in mainland Scotland), Scottish participants in the first crusade were not men of substance or importance; they were unwarlike outside their own land and barbarous in their mores, the assistance which they had to offer consisting mainly of their faith and devotion. But the Scottish Kingdom established by the two Edgars in 1097 was an emerging feudal state, like the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and one would not expect frequent contact between the two until there existed established patterns of settlement and lordship in both. The Scottish participants had not the wealth or resources of the Franks, nor, in all probability, did they share the same land-hunger which existed in northern France at the end of the eleventh century.⁴⁵ Not until both kingdoms had become established would we expect more regular intercourse.

44. cf. A. A. M. Duncan, "The Earliest Scottish Charters", SHR XXXVII (1958), 103-35

45. Runciman, History of the Crusades, I, 92

One of the earliest visitors to the Kingdom of Jerusalem after its establishment was Sigurd, king of Norway, who had previously been Earl of Orkney before his accession in 1103. He set out for Jerusalem in 1107 from Bergen, sailing across the North Sea, coasting Scotland and England, through the Channel and the Bay of Biscay, past the Straits of Gibraltar into the Mediterranean and so on to Acre.⁴⁶ He was greeted with great solemnity by King Baldwin I of Jerusalem, who conducted him personally to the Holy City, and persuaded the Norwegian fleet to provide a sea-blockade while the land-army of the Kingdom besieged Sidon. Sidon fell to the Christians on 4 December 1107.⁴⁷ Sigurd's voyage was so famous that he was subsequently known as Sigurd Jorsalafara (i.e., "Jerusalem-farer"), and later Norwegian and Orcadian pilgrimages to Jerusalem sought consciously to emulate his feats.⁴⁸

We cannot know whether on his journey past Scotland, news of King Sigurd's crusade and pilgrimage reached the attention of David, brother of King Alexander I. But we can be certain of David's relationship with John, bishop of Glasgow, who was the first Scot known to have visited the Kingdom of Jerusalem after the return of the crusaders.

46. *ibid.*, II, 92

47. *ibid.*, II, 92-3

48. Orkneyinga Saga, ed. A. B. Taylor (Edinburgh 1938), 299-300, 395

Bishop John was David's tutor and friend, and his appointment as bishop of Glasgow c.1117 indicates the value which David, ruler of Strathclyde and Cumbria before he became king in 1124, attached to him.⁴⁹ The bishop's career is remarkable, not only for the vigour and tenacity with which he resisted the claims of Archbishop Thurstan of York to authority over the Scottish church, but also for his very wide travels. In response to a letter from Pope Calixtus II, dated 15 January 1122, enjoining his immediate submission to Thurstan as metropolitan, John set out for Rome to state his case in person. His appeal before the Pope was unavailing; but instead of returning to Scotland straight away, he set off on a further journey to Jerusalem, where for several months he was the guest of the Patriarch Gormond.⁵⁰ He may have joined the Venetian fleet which set off down the Adriatic in August 1122, and arrived at Acre in May 1123 after besieging Corfu.⁵¹ John's motives in visiting the Holy Land were probably mixed. As well as an obvious desire to visit the Holy places, he may also have been interested in the ecclesiastical organisation of the new Kingdom, which, like Scotland, was still in a formative stage. Probably, however, his voyage displays a certain reluctance to return to Scotland where we would have had to face both Earl David and Archbishop Thurstan. Calixtus

49. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents (Oxford, 1873), II, 16

50. Symeon of Durham, Opera Omnia, ed. T. Arnold (RS 1882-85), II, 264

51. Runciman, History of the Crusades, II, 166-7

was insistent, however, and in 1123 ordered John to return immediately to his diocese and make his submission to Thurstan.⁵² Soon after John's return to Scotland Alexander I died, and in 1124 his pupil and patron Earl David became king, and displayed throughout his reign an interest in the Latin States in the Holy Land which may owe something to this early visit by the Bishop of Glasgow.

It is worth noting that Bishop John proved incorrigible, despite the legatine visits to Scotland of John of Crema in 1125⁵³ and Alberic of Ostia in 1138; when the latter reached Carlisle he found that John had again abandoned his see and was living in self-imposed exile as a monk of Tiron.⁵⁴ Later in the same year the bishop, recalled once more, seems to have set out on a further journey which took him north to Atholl and the Orkneys.⁵⁵ Perhaps his visit to Orkney in 1138-1139 influenced Earl Rognvald and Bishop William of Orkney when they decided to set out for the Holy Land in 1151.⁵⁶

If David's interest in the Holy Land was stirred by the report of Bishop John, it must have received further stimulus when Hugh de Paiens, first Master of the Knights Templars, visited England and Scotland on a recruiting drive in 1128. He had been attending the Council of Troyes, where

52. Haddan and Stubbs, Councils, II, 20-21

53. *ibid.*, 23

54. *ibid.*, 31

55. Orkneyinga Saga, 261-62, 388

56. Below, p.78

the rule of his new Order, drawn up by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and their white habit were established for the first time. Probably already some prestige attached to Hugh de Paiens and his company of poor knights. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle describes Hugh's visit to the British Isles in these words:

In this year [1128] Hugh of the Knights Templars came to the king [Henry I] in Normandy from Jerusalem; and the king received him with great ceremony, and sent him thereafter to England, where he was welcomed by all good men. He was given treasures by all, and in Scotland too; and by him much wealth, entirely in gold and silver, was sent to Jerusalem. He called for people to go out to Jerusalem. As a result more people went, either with him or after him, than ever before since the First Crusade, which was in the days of Pope Urban. ⁵⁷

That he had considerable success in his recruiting drive is confirmed by William of Tyre's account of his return to the Kingdom of Jerusalem:

Anno sequenti [1129] Hugo de Paganis, magister militiæ Templi primus, et quidem alii viri religiosi, qui a domino rege, et aliis regni principibus, ad Occidentales missi fuerunt principes, ut in nostrum subsidium populos excitarent, et ad obsidionem Damascenae urbis, potentes specialiter invitarent, reversi sunt, plurimaeque nobilium virorum turba, verborum illorum fidem secuti, in regnum venerant. ⁵⁸

Tughtakin, Emir of Damascus, had died on 11 February 1128,

57. ASC. 259

58. RHC Occ. I, pt I, 595-96

and it was hoped that the internal unrest which followed his death would provide the crusaders with an opportunity to capture the strongest and wealthiest city in Syria. The undertaking was so ambitious that it required not only the fresh recruits from the West, but also all the leading princes of the Latin states, including Tripoli, Antioch and Edessa, were called together to press home the attack.⁵⁹

The assault on Damascus was a complete failure. Henry of Huntingdon describes how an advance party of the Christian army was surprised and routed by the Damascenes, after which bad weather made further fighting impossible:

Eodem anno [1129] illis quos Hugo de Paiens... secum duxerat ad Jerusalem, male contigit. ... In vigilia namque Sancti Nicholai [5 December 1129] a paucis paganorum multi Christianorum devicti sunt... In obsidione igitur Damascena, cum magna pars Christianorum progressa esset ad victualia periquenda, mirati sunt pagani Christianos plures et fortissimos se muliebriter fugientes, et persequentes innumerōs occiderunt. Eos autem qui fuga salutem sui quaesierant, in montibus tempestate nivis et frigoribus Deus ipsa nocte persecutus est, ita quod vix aliquis evasit.⁶⁰

The storm made the plain of Damascus impassable, so the princes of Outremer decided to abandon the attack. The overseas recruits were thoroughly disheartened at their failure; the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle comments that they were "pitiably

59. *ibid*, 596

60. Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. T. Arnold (RS 1879), 251

duped to find it was nothing but lies".⁶¹ Many crusaders, especially in the early years of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, had vague eschatological notions about the voyage to Palestine, equating the Holy Land with God's promised land, and Jerusalem with the heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse. But Palestine is a land of wind and rain in winter, and its cities like all others were full of offal and prostitution; a feeling of disillusion crept into crusading literature at a fairly early date.

The spectacular success of the first crusade was never to be repeated; indeed, the fortunes of the Crusader States declined, until in 1144 Edessa fell to Imad-ad-Din Zanki (Zengi). The news came as a severe shock to the West, especially when the cause of the Crusader principalities was championed by such an influential and persuasive voice as that of St. Bernard. It was not difficult for Bernard to persuade Louis VII of France and Conrad II of Germany to organise a massive new crusade; but outside France and Germany it was less easy.

In the North, there was probably no ruler for whom St. Bernard had a greater admiration, or one whose ideals were more similar to his own, than David I of Scotland. We have seen that St. Bernard's protégé, Hugh de Paiens of the Templars, was well received in Scotland in 1128;

61. ASC, 259

and Ailred of Rievaulx also testifies to David's admiration for the Templars:

Omnino religiosorum virorum consilio se comisit, et de praeclara militia templi Jerosolimitani optimos fratres secum retinens, eos diebus et noctibus morum suorum fecit esse custodes.⁶²

David's strict observance of the canonical hours is attested also by John of Hexham:

Diviniis devotus officiis, singulis diebus omnes canonicas horas, etiam vigiliis defunctorum, audivit non praetermittens.⁶³

Certainly by the thirteenth century it had become customary for a Templar to act as almoner of the Scottish king's household,⁶⁴ and this may well have dated from David's time. St. Bernard wrote to him (probably) in 1136, expressing the hope that they may one day meet, as he had heard so much of the king's good reputation, and requesting his favour on the Cistercians of Fountains.⁶⁵ Among the many letters written by St. Bernard to promote the second crusade of 1147, none specifically addressed to David is known to survive; but Ailred of Rievaulx certainly suggests that David desired to go on crusade, but was dissuaded by the wishes of his subjects: so much did he detest the sin of pride

ut abrenunciasset regno, sceptrum deposuisset, et in locis dominicae passionis et resurrectionis eius ad

62. Fordun, Chronica, 225

63. Symeon of Durham, Opera, II, 330

64. "The Scottish King's Household", ed. M. Bateson, SHS Miscellany, II, 34-5

65. RRS I, 289-90

spiritualem se militiam contulisset, si non eum
sacerdotum et abbatum consilia, lachrimae pauperum,
viduarum gemitus, plebis desolatio, et totius regni
sui clamor et eiulatus revocasset, corpore, non mente
aut voluntate detentus.⁶⁶

This crusading longing belonged almost certainly to the
last years of David's life, when he had an adult son ready
to succeed him.^{66a} Hugh de Paiens may have impressed him
with his preaching in 1128, but David could hardly have
contemplated leaving his kingdom while Earl Henry was still
young. It was not uncommon for men to set off on crusade
in later life; for instance, Count Raymond IV of Toulouse
was about 55 when he set out, and vowed to end his days in
the Holy Land;⁶⁷ Saher de Quincy was probably aged between
60 and 70 when he set out on crusade in 1218.

Had cares of state allowed David I to join the second
crusade, as he wished, probably many members of the new
Anglo-Norman families who were settling in Scotland under
him would have joined him; but as it happened, participants
again tended to be drawn from the "barbaric" classes of
society. Those Scots who were less susceptible than their
king to "the advice of priests and abbots, the tears of the
poor, the groans of widows, and the sadness of the people"
responded to the call of the second crusade and headed
south to join an Anglo-Flemish fleet at Dartmouth in the

66. Fordun, Chronica, 222

66a. Earl Henry first appears as rex designatus around this
time; cf. Lawrie, ESC, nos. clxii-clxiv.

67. J. H. and L. L. Hill, Raymond IV, Count of Toulouse
(New York, 1962)

spring of 1147; the activities of this motley army are described by one of their number in the De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi.⁶⁸ It consisted of Englishmen and Normans, "cum Colonensibus, Flandrensibus, Bolonensibus, Britonibus, Scottis".⁶⁹ One manuscript group of Otto of Freising's Gesta Frederici I Imperatoris comments on this fleet:

Igitur non solum ex Romano Imperio, sed etiam ex vicinis regnis, id est occidentali Francia, Anglia, Scotia, Hibernia, Pannonia, innumeris populis ac nationibus hac expeditionis fama ad sumendam crucem commotis, repente sic totus pene occidens siluit, ut non solum bella novere, sed et arma quempiam in publico portare nefas haberetur.⁷⁰

The fleet was divided into three parts when it left Dartmouth; first, the Germans and Lotharingians under Arnold de Aerschot; second, the Flemings and Boulognais under Christian de Ghistelles; and third, the remainder under four constables. The Scots probably were with the fourth of these leaders, Saher de Archelle.⁷¹ At the end of June 1147 the fleet arrived before Lisbon and joined the King of Portugal in besieging the city, which seemed at the time

68. De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi, ed. C. W. David (New York, 1936) (hereafter Exp. Lyx.)

69. *ibid.* 102

70. Otto of Freising, Gesta Frederici Imperatoris, ed. Simson, (MGH, 1912), 63. The words underlined appear only in a few MSS.

71. Exp. Lyx., 52-56. Saher de Archelle is mentioned in B. A. Lees, Records of the Templars in England (British Academy, 1935), 24, 80, 99

to offer a quicker return than the voyage to Jerusalem promised. But the siege dragged on for months, and some of the English began to regret that they had not followed their original intention and sailed on through the Mediterranean. To dissuade them from deserting, one of the English captains, Hervey de Glanville, made an impassioned speech to remind them of their loyalty. He praised the courage of the Normans - "Normannorum genus quis nesciat usu continuitate virtutis laborum recusare nullem?" - and held up the Flemings and Rhinelanders as examples of steadfastness and tenacity. Then he shamed his audience with the comment:

Quis enim Scottos barbaros esse neget? Numquam tamen inter nos legem debite excesserunt amicitie.⁷²

Such a taunt must have stung the ears of the English; but one cannot help wondering what would have been the reaction of any of the barbarian Scots had they chanced to overhear the captain's speech.

It may have been a group of barbaric highland Scots, attempting to follow the overland route to the Holy Land at the time of the second crusade, who were noted by the Premonstratensian abbot Philip de Harveng of Bonne Esperance (diocese of Cambrai). His comments on Scottish dress bear interesting comparison with Guibert de Nogent's remarks, but he adds one interesting detail:

In nostris quoque temporibus in Scotia occidentali omnes feminalibus non utuntur, sed eis tantum milites

72. Exp. Lyx., 106

vel urbani quilibet induuntur; caetero vero turba tegumento contenta est omnium generali, quod ante et retro clausum vel integrum subtus apertum est in ora laterali. Quod quidem aliquando mihi clerici retulerunt, qui de illis egressi partibus, in has discendi gratia deveniunt; et nonnullo de illo populo, qui per nos transeuntes peregre proficiscuntur, feminalia non habere manifestissime cognoscuntur.⁷³

Here indeed is early speculation on what the Scotsman wears under his kilt. It is of interest to note the distinction which Philip draws between those dwelling in "western Scotland" with their outlandish dress and the "knights and townsmen" in other parts of the country. This distinction makes it certain that his Scotti were Scots rather than Irishmen, as such a distinction could not have been applied to Ireland in the mid twelfth century. Philip became abbot of Bonne Esperance in c.1157 and died early in 1183. The earliest Premonstratensian house in Scotland was (almost certainly) Dryburgh, founded in 1150,⁷⁴ and it may be that the clerics who aliquando informed Philip of the facts of Scottish dress may have been travelling in connection with that event; and the Scots travelling through Flanders peregre (i.e., on pilgrimage, an expression frequently used in connection with the second crusade) may well have been participating in that movement.

The royalty and chief nobility of Scotland did not accompany these lesser folk, a pattern seemingly similar

73. Migne PL, CCIII, col. 730

74. I. B. Cowan and D. E. Easson, Medieval Religious Houses, Scotland (London, 1976), 100-102

to that found in England during the first and second crusades. Apart from King David's frustrated zeal, the chief importance of the second crusade for the ruling classes was as a convenient formula for the dating of acta; their charters bear such dates as "illo anno in quo rex Franciae et multi Christiani perrexerunt ierusalem",⁷⁵ and "ad festum Sancti Michaelis proximum postquam Leowycus Rex Francie iter Jerosolimitanum aggressus est".⁷⁶

Perhaps the scribes who drew up acta with such dates would have liked to see their masters follow the king of France's example. The Melrose Chronicle, which by this time seems to have been kept fairly contemporaneously, records, with few details, the fall of Edessa sub anno 1145, the departure of the second crusade in 1147 and the capture of William de Warenne (the latter event took place in 1148), and the capture of Lisbon sub anno 1148.^{76a} William de Warenne was Earl Henry's brother-in-law; his daughter married a (natural) grandson of Count Fulk V of Anjou, who was King of Jerusalem from 1131 until his death in 1143, of whom it was been written that "With the accession of Fulk to the throne of Jerusalem England began to show some real interest in the wellbeing of the crusader states".⁷⁷ But it was probably French rather than English connections

75. Lawrie, ESC, 139-40

76. RRS I, 159

76a. Chron. Melrose, S. A. 1145-1149

77. H. E. Mayer, The Crusades (Oxford, 1972) 86-87

that made Earl Warenne decide to take the cross; he was present in the assembly at Vézelay on 31 March 1146 at which St. Bernard persuaded the nobility of France to follow the king's example by taking the cross, and William was among those who were swayed by the eloquence of Bernard's words.⁷⁸ Perhaps the interest of the monks of Melrose in the fortunes of the crusader states at this time was stimulated by Abbot Waltheof (or Waldeve), abbot from 1148 to 1159, whose father Simon de Senlis had gone to Jerusalem in the wake of the first crusade, and whose mother Maud had married as her second husband Earl David, thus bringing the honour of Huntingdon to the Scottish royal house.⁷⁹

With such close connections between the nobility of the kingdoms of England and Scotland, it is clear that Scots must have been well aware of overseas developments; though perhaps the lay nobility were no more enthusiastic about David's crusading ambitions than were his clerical and religious councillors. In England at this time the weakness of Stephen's authority and the partial breakdown of law and order made the Crusade more attractive for the protection offered to the property of those who took the cross. Taking the cross secured, temporarily at least, the acquisitions of those who had profited during the "Anarchy", while, with the return of relative stability by the later 1140's, the

78. Suger of St. Denis, *Vie de Louis VII*, ed. A. Molinier (Paris, 1887) 159: v.in general Runciman, op. cit., II, 252-54

79. Vita Waldeni, *AASS*, August, I, 248-76

second crusade provided an outlet for belligerence for those who had made fighting their livelihood in the late 1130's and early 1140's. The absence of a strong king meant that those who wished to go on crusade were perfectly free to do so. None of these factors prevailed in Scotland; David I, a strong king, was dissuaded from taking part, and his councillors seem to have shown no enthusiasm. Those Scots who went to Lisbon in 1147 were, like the Scottish participants on the first crusade, "barbarians".

The second crusade was a fiasco; Lisbon was captured for the Portuguese, but no advantage was procured for the Latin provinces of the Holy Land. Even St. Bernard's reputation was tarnished by failure.⁸⁰ But enthusiasm for crusading had not altogether evaporated, and resulted in an extraordinary venture by the men of Orkney in the years immediately following the failure of the second crusade.

It might seem to require some justification why the Orcadian Crusade of 1150-1153 should be discussed in a Scottish context at all. The Northern Isles were no more a part of the Scottish Kingdom in the twelfth century than were Man and the Hebrides, and it was not until two centuries after the acquisition of the Western Isles for Scotland that Orkney and Shetland were incorporated into the Kingdom of Scotland. But the kings of Scotland were

80. Runciman, *op. cit.*, II, 284-88

interested in the affairs of the Northern Isles, and Orcadian politics were to some extent affected by events in Scotland. There were Orkneymen in King David's army in the north of England in 1138.⁸¹ In the winter of 1138/39 John bishop of Glasgow seems to have been sent to Orkney and to have been well received by Earl Rognvald and Bishop William.⁸² It was seventeen years since he had himself visited the Holy Land, but meeting him may have contributed to Earl Rognvald's later enthusiasm. John's mission may have been part of David I's general policy of close relations with Orkney, as evidenced by his treatment of Swein Asleifsson when the latter visited him in Edinburgh in the mid-1140s.⁸³ A few years later Orcadians visited Malcolm IV at Aberdeen and were well received by him there.⁸⁴ It may be that already the Scottish crown was trying to extend its influence into the parts of the Scottish mainland controlled by the Earl of Orkney, and even into the islands themselves.

Be that as it may, the principal influences in deciding Rognvald to go to the Holy Land, and in governing his actions there and on the way, were distinctly Norse rather than Scottish. He was persuaded to undertake the

81. A. O. Anderson, Scottish Annals from English Chronicles, (London, 1908), 189

82. Orkneyinga Saga, ed. Taylor, 261-2

83. *ibid.*, 273

84. *ibid.*, 307

voyage by Eindredi Ungi (the Young), who had been a Varangian guardsman at Constantinople during the second crusade.⁸⁵ Many of Rognvald's feats, such as the tying of knots on the banks of the Jordan, were in conscious emulation of the deeds of King Sigurd Jorsalafara.⁸⁶ The whole adventure is told in considerable detail in the Orkneyinga Saga, and the following account is derived from that source, using the chronology worked out by A. B. Taylor in his edition of that saga.⁸⁷

In the summer of 1148, Earl Rognvald met Eindredi Ungi, who persuaded him of the virtue of travelling to the Holy Land, from which he had recently returned. He had previously been serving as a Varangian at the court of Manuel II Comnenus. In the autumn of 1150 the crusaders assembled in Norway and sailed to Orkney, where they decided to spend the winter. Possibly the "Jorsalafarir" inscriptions at Maeshowe in Orkney commemorate this visit.⁸⁸ In the summer of 1151 the crusaders left Orkney and sailed round Scotland, probably by the east coast,⁸⁹ through the Channel and the Bay of Biscay, arriving at Galicia in

85, *ibid*, 276

86. *ibid*, 299-300, 395

87. *ibid*, 285-304 and nn., 392-96: A. B. Taylor, "Studies in the Orkneyinga Saga", Proceedings of the Orkney Antiquarian Society, XI (1933), 48-9

88. PSAS V, 247-79: PSAS VI, 78-82

89. but cf. Snorre Sturlusson, Heimskringla, ed. E. Monsen (Cambridge 1932), 155

October. After a short stay in Galicia, they sailed on round Portugal and Spain, through the Straits of Gibraltar, and on to Narbonne. About this time the Earl and his friends (principally Erling Saki and Bishop William) parted company from Eindredi Ungi, who went straight to Constantinople. It has been suggested that he was a Varangian recruiting officer who was not interested in Rognvald's "gallivanting... all over the Mediterranean Sea",⁹⁰ but the Earl and his companions were overcome by the seductive beauty of Ermingarde, daughter of Aimery Count of Narbonne, and stayed in that city during the winter of 1151/52. Around Christmas they aided the Narbonnais in capturing the castle of a certain Godfrey, near Narbonne. In the early summer they sailed away again, along the north African coast, and in the process captured a Saracen "dromond" or galley; after a brief stop in Crete, they sailed on finally to Acre. In August 1152 they arrived at the Jordan, where the Earl swam across the river and tied knots on the east bank in commemoration of his achievement, thus emulating Sigurd Jorsalafara. In the autumn they sailed to Constantinople, where they wintered with Manuel Comnenus (emperor 1143-1180).⁹¹ Rognvald may have been reluctant to serve under Manuel if this would have involved subordination to Eindredi Ungi (with whom he now appears to have been on rather bad terms);

90. Sigfus Blöndal, The Varangians of Byzantium, (Cambridge, 1978), 154-7

91. On the identification of eastern Mediterranean placenames, cf. *ibid.*, and Ork. Saga, ed. Taylor, loc. cit.

so he, the bishop, and Erling Saki with their followers decided to return to Orkney the following spring. They abandoned their ships (or possibly sold them to Manuel),⁹² crossed in Greek ships from Durazzo to Apulia, and took horses to Rome. The summer of 1153 was occupied in the overland crossing from Italy to Denmark and finally to Norway, where they were in the autumn of 1153; they arrived home in Orkney before Christmas.

Apart from the crusade of King Sigurd, this is probably the best-known of Scandinavian Jorsalaferds; in detail it is very similar to King Sigurd's journey,⁹³ a similiarity which is certainly not accidental, but was probably typical of all such adventures in the middle and later twelfth century. The twelfth century was, according to Comte Riant, "la vrai période des Jorsalaferd"; expeditions which were not connected with a major crusade or passagium generale summoned by the pope, but were more individualistic outbursts of Christian belligerence - in some ways similar to the raiding expeditions of the Scandinavian peoples before their conversion.⁹⁴ The Jorðalaferd added another dimension to the concept of crusading as it would have been understood in Scotland in the twelfth century.

92. Blöndal, op.cit., 157

93. Heimskringla, 606ff.

94. P. Riant, Les Scandinaves en Terre Sainte, (Paris, 1865-9), I, 42

During the period between the second crusade and the fall of Jerusalem (1148-1187), Scots continued to visit the Holy Land, chiefly as pilgrims. Remarkably, though by no means incredibly, a German pilgrim who visited Jerusalem during this period noted Scots among the nations who maintained a pilgrim's chapel for the members of their nation who visited Jerusalem. Unfortunately, he does not give a description of "chapels and smaller churches which are maintained there by men of various nations and languages" because "it would take too long to tell".^{94a} At much the same time as this German was visiting Jerusalem (the 1160s), a Spanish Jew, Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, was visiting Alexandria; he mentions Scots among the nations whose merchants trade at Alexandria, adding that "each nation has an inn of its own".^{94b} If a pilgrim's chapel at Jerusalem can be believed, it is perhaps not too difficult a step to a hostel for merchants at Alexandria.

King David had died at Carlisle some months before Earl Rognvald returned to Orkney, and the king's successor was his youthful grandson Malcolm IV. Despite the brevity of his reign, Malcolm looked beyond the boundaries of his own realm no less than his grandfather had done. In 1159 he joined Henry II's expedition to the south of France,

94a. John of Würzburg, Description of the Holy Land, ed. C. W. Wilson, trans. A. Stewart (Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society, 1890), 69

94b. The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela, ed. & trans. M. N. Adler (London 1907), 76

and was knighted in the process;⁹⁵ it has been argued that his participation in this campaign may well have been voluntary and spontaneous.⁹⁶ Malcolm survived the political storm which followed his return from Toulouse, but it appears that within a few years his health had begun to deteriorate. It was probably during or following a bout of ill-health near the end of his life that he vowed to go on pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James the Greater at Compostella,⁹⁷ a vow which his early death prevented him from fulfilling.

Malcolm was noted for his piety, as was his youngest brother David; the latter's respect for church property, even during periods of war, was conspicuous.⁹⁸ Piety was a less notable trait in the middle brother, William, who succeeded Malcolm in 1165 and reigned for nearly half a century, and there is perhaps no other period in Scottish medieval history when the crusading ideal was so dormant. William's early years were occupied in a struggle, occasionally openly aggressive, against Henry II, the end result of which was William's capture and the humiliating terms of the "Treaty of Falaise" in 1174.⁹⁹ Thereafter his foreign policy was

95. Lawrie, Annals of the Reigns of Malcolm and William (Glasgow, 1910), 40-41, 54-56

96. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 225-6

97. RRS I, 276-7

98. Jordan Fantôme, in Chronicles of the Reign of Stephen, ed. R. Howlett (RS 1884-1889), III, 296-300

99. E. L. G. Stones, Anglo-Scottish Relations (Oxford, 1965) 2-11

effectively paralysed until after Henry's death. He and David were both present at a council in London in March 1185 at which the possibility of a new crusade was discussed, and both would have met the Patriarch Heraclius of Jerusalem, who was in England appealing for help against the increasing power of Salah-ad-Din Yusuf (Saladin).^{99a} Saladin had succeeded in uniting Syria and Egypt under his own leadership in an encircling movement against the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, and it was clear that his objective was the total destruction of the Kingdom; without a new crusade, said the Patriarch, the achievement of that objective was not far away. But the Patriarch's mission in 1185 was met with polite words and empty promises, and did nothing to improve the chronic manpower shortage of the crusader states. Not until it was too late, when Saladin had destroyed the army of the Kingdom at Hattin (4 July 1187) and captured Jerusalem (2 October 1187), did the chivalry of the West rouse itself to the defence of the Holy Land.

Richard Count of Poitou was the first of the princes to take the cross,¹⁰⁰ shortly followed by his father Henry II and Philip II of France.¹⁰¹ The two kings quickly patched up their differences and made joint plans for the crusade, which included the levying of the "Saladin tithe", a tenth on rents and moveables in all their dominions. Early in 1188

99a. Benedict of Peterborough, Gesta Regis Henrici, ed. W. Stubbs (RS 1867), I, 335-7

100. Chronicles of the Reign of Richard I, ed. W. Stubbs, (RS 1865), I, 32-3

101. *ibid.*; Benedict, II, 74-75

Henry crossed to England to supervise the collection of the tithe in England, and sent the bishop of Durham, Hugh du Puiset, to demand a contribution from King William. Roger Howden gives two slightly differing accounts of what happened when William and his clerical and lay nobles confronted Hugh at the Tweed between Birgham and Wark.¹⁰² In one, William offered 4000 marks for the restoration of his castles, while the bishop demanded payment of the tithe as well; William then protested that he could not prevail upon his bishops and barons to pay up, and they themselves point-blank refused to contribute.¹⁰³ In the other version, probably a later revision, Howden states that William offered a lump sum of 5000 marks for the restoration of his castles and the tithe together, and refused to negotiate further when this offer was rejected.¹⁰⁴ Professor Duncan has suggested that the earlier version may have been revised to make William appear firmer in his refusal;¹⁰⁵ it is uncertain, then, whether opposition to the Saladin tithe originated with the king or with the magnates. Certainly there was no rush in Scotland to take the cross on hearing of the fall of Jerusalem; but how far this was due to William's constant difficulties with Henry II, who was deeply involved in the project of the Third Crusade, is difficult to assess.

102. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 234-5

103. Benedict, II, 44

104. Roger of Howden, Chronica, ed. W. Stubbs (RS 1868-71) II, 338-9

105. Duncan, op. et loc.cit.

Not even the death of Henry II at Chinon on 6 July 1189 (after a renewal of war between himself and Philip, the latter aided by Prince Richard) inclined the Scots more towards the third crusade. William immediately entered into negotiations with Richard (now king) for the cancellation of the Treaty of Falaise,¹⁰⁶ and on 5 December 1189 both kings agreed to the "Quit-claim of Canterbury", whereby Richard restored all royal castles in Scotland and the status quo that had existed before 1174 in return for 10,000 marks.¹⁰⁷ This arrangement was admirably suited to the needs of both kings; Richard desperately needed money to finance his crusade (he is said to have said that he would have sold London itself if he could find a buyer rich enough)¹⁰⁸ while the sovereignty of Scotland was of no use to him while he was in Palestine. On the other hand, a peaceful Scottish frontier during his absence was obviously important to Richard, while William was willing to pay a fair price to redress the humiliating and paralyzing terms imposed on him at Falaise. The terms he was being offered in 1189 were more favourable than those offered by Henry II in return for his contribution to the Saladin tithe.

Professor Duncan has written that there was a "marked lack of enthusiasm in Scotland for the recovery of Jerusalem after its fall in 1187", but this judgment may not be the

106. Documents relating to these negotiations were in the Scottish treasury in 1282: cf. APS I, 108

107. Stones, Relations, 12-17: discussed in Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 235-37

108. DNB, sub "Richard I"

whole story.¹⁰⁹ The most important Scottish nobleman who took part in the third crusade was Robert de Quincy, who had risen to prominence early in the reign of William I and married Orabile, daughter of Ness, a major landowner in east and south-east Scotland. On lands which had come to him by right of his wife, in Tranent, he (probably) had been the founder of a hospital of Bethlehemite canons from the Church of the Nativity or (more likely) its daughter-house at Clamecy in Central France.¹¹⁰ It is unknown when or where he took the cross; perhaps he did so as soon as the news of the fall of Jerusalem became known. Neither is it known whether he was accompanied by any of his retainers from his Scottish lands at Leuchars and Tranent. A glance at the index of Regesta Regum Scottorum volume II shows him as a frequent witness to charters dateable before c.1190 and to charters probably of the mid-1190's and later; but between pages 300 and 369 of that book his name appears in witness-lists only three times, and none of these charters can be dated precisely to the early 1190's.¹¹¹ This dramatic disappearance from witness-lists to royal charters likely to belong to the early 1190's does not occur in the case of other Scottish noblemen who are thought perhaps to have joined the third crusade, notably Earl David and Alan the Steward. Another Scot who is definitely known to have taken the cross and set out on crusade is Osbert Olifard of Arbuthnott, who had been granted

109. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 446

110. v. chapter 6, part 1, below

111. RRS I, 525

Arbuthnott by King William and set it in ferme when he had taken the cross "tempore Hugonis episcopi".¹¹² Hugh was in effective possession of the bishopric of St. Andrews from 1183 to 1188,¹¹³ so it seems likely that Osbert took the cross immediately on learning of the fall of Jerusalem.¹¹⁴ He had been sheriff of Mearns in the time of Bishop Richard, and seems to be a rare instance of a minor landowner and royal official going on crusade in the twelfth century. It might be fair to guess that he attached himself to the company of Robert de Quincy on the trip to the East.

King Richard had sent the English fleet round by the Straits of Gibraltar before leaving England; he himself crossed into France and met Philip at Vézelay at the beginning of July 1190. He had most of his land army with him as he marched down the Rhone and joined up again with his navy at Marseille on 22 August.¹¹⁵ Thereafter the English progress through the Mediterranean was so leisurely that one would hardly imagine that King Richard had any sense of urgency or crisis; he wintered in Sicily and paused in spring for the casual annexation of the Imperial province of Cyprus. It was not until 8 June that he finally arrived before Acre, where the French troops had already joined in the siege. The siege was pressed with vigour, and Acre surrendered on 12 July; soon after King Philip retired to Tyre with Conrad of Monferrat,

112. Spalding Club Miscellany V, 210-11

113. J. Dowden, Bishops of Scotland (Glasgow, 1912) 10

114. cf. RRS II, 225: for "Bishop Richard" read "Bishop Hugh".

115. cf. Runciman, History of the Crusades, III, 36

one of the claimants to the throne of Jerusalem, and at the beginning of August he set out for home. He had left some Saracen prisoners in the hands of Conrad, and as soon as he had gone Richard demanded that they be given over to him; when on 7 August Conrad refused to surrender them, Richard arranged an embassy to go to Tyre, consisting mostly of followers of the king of France, Hugh Duke of Burgundy, Robert Bishop of Beauvais, Dreux d'Amiens, Guy de Dampierre, and William de Merlou.¹¹⁶

Et rex Angliae associavit cum eis ex parte sua Robertum de Quinci: et profecti sunt Tyram octava die mensis Augusti.¹¹⁷

Earlier Robert de Quincy had been entrusted with an even more responsible task, which clearly he had not yet taken up; the two kings had agreed to provide 100 knights and fifty sargeants each for the defence of Antioch until the following Easter (5 April 1192). On 29 July, just before Philip's departure, they detailed the troops who were to perform this duty, and Richard

constituit Robertum de Quinci constabularium et ducem illorum.¹¹⁸

Clearly this important Anglo-Scottish lord had achieved a place in the esteem of the English king, to be given command of the crusader army in the north for the remainder of the

116. Richard I Chronicles, I, 241

117. Benedict, II, 187

118. ibid. II, 185

crusade.

Robert de Quincy was back in Scotland by 1195,¹¹⁹ whereafter he appears fairly regularly as a witness to royal charters.

It is probable that some knightly tenants of Alan the Steward joined the third crusade. Robert de Kent, Robert Hunaud, and Ronald, son-in-law of Nicholas de Gâtentín, set their lands in Innerwick (East Lothian) in tack to Kelso Abbey by a chirograph which was to come into force at Martinmas following the departure of Kings Richard and Philip for the Holy Land, and was to be of thirty-three year's duration.^{119a} The chirograph does not explicitly state that these three knights of the Steward were raising the money to go on crusades, but the fact that they required it from the time of the departure of the crusading armies makes it very likely that this was their purpose.

Before leaving the third crusade, it is necessary to pay some attention to the question of two Scots who were stated by later medieval writers to have been present on the third crusade: Earl David and Alan the Steward. In the case of the Steward, the evidence which suggests that he might have gone is the statement of Walter Bower that John Barbour, in a work now lost,

ponit etiam quod dominus Alanus Stewart, filius...
Walteri, fuit in expeditione cum Gaudefrido Bolon

119. RRS II, 370, 373-4

119a. Kelso Liber, nos. 256, 260, 261: RRS II, 330

rege Jerusalem, quando Antiochena civitas fuit capta.¹²⁰

The humourless Bower points out, quite correctly, that Antioch fell to the crusaders in 1098, while Alan son of Walter died in 1233, (actually he died in 1203 or 1204). The origin of this story (on the basis of which the Scots Peerage states that "Alan son of Walter...is supposed to have accompanied Richard Coeur de Lion on the crusades")¹²¹ may be derived from the fact that the Stewarts' Breton ancestor Alan fitz Flaald, steward of Dol, had in fact been on the first crusade.¹²² The inference that some of his knights may have joined the crusade perhaps strengthens the possibility that Alan son of Walter did so too: but the evidence is inconclusive. It seems very possible that it was one of the Stewarts who granted the lands of Spittalhill (Symington, Kyle) to the Hospital of St. Thomas of Acre, founded during the third crusade. If the grant was made soon after the foundation of the hospital, the evidence points in the direction of Alan son of Walter, and perhaps suggests a connection between him and the third crusade.^{122a} Certainty seems impossible.

The same is probably true of the supposed crusade of Earl David. There is a wide range of evidence here, but on examination it amounts to very little. One manuscript of Fordun's Chronicle, believed by Skene to derive from an early uncorrected version of his work,¹²³ states that David was

120. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 542

121. Scots Peerage, I, 12

122. Orderic Vitalis, V, 58

122a. cf. Chapter 6, p.335 and nn. 1a and 2.

123. Fordun, Chronica, preface, xxix and passim

in fact William's elder brother, that he was away on crusade at the time of Malcolm's death, and that William was made king in his place because the nobles of the kingdom believed him to be dead.¹²⁴ This is clearly the source sceptically quoted by Wyntoun:

As sum men saide, in Sarzenes

He [David] trawylit, quhen Wilzam crownyt wes.¹²⁵

Fordun corrected his mistake, and Wyntoun clearly disbelieved it; but neither of them reckoned with the fabulous fabrications which Hector Boece was later to concoct. His account may have been partially influenced by the Livre des trois filz de Roys, a late-fifteenth century French romance which was published in Paris in 1504:¹²⁶ in this the sons of the kings of France, England, and Scotland (called respectively Philip, Auffroy and David) wear a series of disguises and have a series of adventures against the Turks led by Fierebras, a figure from Carolingian romance. The Livre may be of interest as a piece of propaganda for Christian unity during the reigns of Henry VII and James IV, but for the twelfth century it cannot be regarded as historical evidence. Nor, for that matter, can the fantasies of Boece, which send David off to the siege of Acre with 500 knights and make him instrumental in the capture of the city, through the agency of a Scot called Oliver living among the Moslems; on his return journey Boece

124. *ibid.* 257 and n., 259 and n., 315 and n.

125. Wyntoun, Cronykil, II, 313

126. There is a copy of the 1504 edition in the British Library.

subjects David to such a series of shipwrecks and imprisonments that it is a wonder he got back to Scotland alive.¹²⁷

Dr. Keith Stringer has written that "to suppose that the references to David's crusading activity are unfounded is perhaps more difficult than to suppose that they have an element of truth.... But it must be stressed that the whole issue remains in doubt".¹²⁸ Bishop Dowden had been in no such doubt, and called the crusade of Earl David "wholly fictitious".¹²⁹ Sir Archibald Lawrie more cautiously remarked that the evidence for David's being on crusade in 1164-5 is "slight and unconvincing".¹³⁰

It would be impossible to sustain the view that any of this evidence suggests that David really did join the third crusade. Neither the Itinerarium nor "Benedict" mention him in this connection; the Pipe Rolls for 1191 and 1192 are full of names of those (including Robert de Quincy) qui abierunt Jerusalem,¹³¹ but Earl David, whose name appears frequently, is never mentioned as an absentee on crusade. The Melrose Chronicle (which admittedly has curious omissions) is silent about any involvement of David's in the Holy War. In spite of the dangers of argumentum ex silentio, Bishop Dowden's judgment here is probably correct. The presence of Alan the Steward on the third crusade is perhaps more likely than that of Earl David.

127. Hector Boece, Chronicles of Scotland, trans. J. Bellenden (STS, 1941), II, 209-12

128. K. J. Stringer, "The Career and Estates of David Earl of Huntingdon" (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1971), 44-47

129. Lindores Cartulary, ed. J. Dowden (STS 1903) xxx-xxxiv.

130. Lawrie, Annals, 78-79

131. Pipe Rolls 1191-1192, 262, and cf. index s.v. Jerusalem

Which seems to leave us with a rather mixed performance from Scotland in the third crusade. Perhaps the lack of highly developed papal machinery for propagating crusades (such as is found in the thirteenth century) was a contributing factor; perhaps the close connection of the third crusade with England, and in particular with Henry II, was another factor. Whatever the reason, it was not until the thirteenth century that the Scottish nobility began to take an interest in the wellbeing of the Crusader States on a large scale.

Chapter 2.

Triumph and Failure, 1198-1291.

Scottish participation in the crusades of the thirteenth century presents a very different picture from that of the previous hundred years; and this is perhaps partly due to the transformation of the institution which was responsible for summoning, financing and directing crusades. In 1198 Innocent III was elected pope, and under his leadership the organisations of the Crusades took on a new and more sophisticated aspect. Whereas earlier the preaching of the cross had relied on the zeal of individuals, such as Peter the Hermit, St Bernard of Clairvaux, or Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury,¹ Innocent systematically appointed legates to preach the cross, and collectors to receive offerings towards the expedition. He was a great organiser; for instance, during his pontificate registration of papal bulls in the papal archives was first systematised. It may be that the apparent upsurge in interest in Scotland for the wellbeing of the Holy Land was due to the application of Innocent's administrative talents to the problem of providing effective preaching of the cross in remote parts.

Early in his pontificate he was already showing a deep concern for the Kingdom of Jerusalem. In August 1193 he proclaimed a new crusade.² Legates were active in France

1. On Baldwin's tour of Wales, cf. Giraldus Cambrensis, Opera, ed. T. S. Brewer, (R.S. , 1861-91), I, 74-9

2. Mayer, Crusades, 183 and n. 70

in 1199, and in November of that year the count of Champagne became the first great noble to take the cross.³ Innocent's original plan seems to have been for a passagium generale of the traditional, multinational, variety. He had legates active in the Rhineland in 1199; in 1202 he requested King John of England to send a hundred knights to the Holy Land,⁴ hoping that the king would show the same interest in the crusade as his brother and father had done. In December 1201 there was a papal legate active in Scotland, John de Salerno, who held a council at Perth in December,⁵ at which he ordered certain reforms of abuses and irregular practices. It is very likely that he also preached the cross, because at the same time David Rufus of Forfar, who met the legate at Perth, took the cross.⁶ Before setting out for Jerusalem Rufus named the monks of Coupar Angus as his heirs, and granted them his lands of Kincriche; he set out on the crusade early in 1202, and did not return. John de Salerno may also have had some success preaching the cross in Ireland, for the annals, s.a. 1204, note that John de Courcy, leader of the gall, or foreigners, of Ulster, took the cross.⁷

3. Ibid., 185: Runciman, History of the Crusades, III, 107

4. Runciman, op.cit., III, 109: CPL, I, 10

5. Kelso Liber, 327-8

6. Coupar Angus Charters, I, 24-6, 130-2

7. Annals of Loch Cé, ed. W. M. Hennessy (RS, 1871), I, 232-5

The genealogy of the Clanranald states that Ranald (or Reginald) son of Somerled "received a cross from Jerusalem" before his death c. 1207;⁸ this may refer to some kind of relic from the Holy Land, but is more likely to indicate that Ranald had taken the cross. The Book of Clanranald is chronologically faulty for the thirteenth century -- among other things it associates Ranald with the Battle of Largs (1263) and the Treaty of Perth (1266) and the cession of the Western Isles by Norway -- but its date for the death of Ranald, 1207, is probably roughly correct, so we can probably assume that he took the cross shortly before that date. He may have taken the crusader's vow on his deathbed, in order to obtain the plenary indulgence granted to a crucesignatus, while commuting the vow for a money payment. This practice was becoming common in the early thirteenth century,⁹ and it would be unwise to assume that Ranald ever set out for Jerusalem, or even intended to do so. But his taking the cross (if that is what the passage means) may be a reflection of the mission of Cardinal John de Salerno to Scotland and Ireland in 1201-2.

The fourth crusade in the end was composed mainly of

-
8. A. Cameron, Reliquiae Celticae, ed. A. Macbain and J. Kennedy (Inverness, 1892-4), II, 156-7
 9. In general v. M. Purcell, Papal Crusading Policy, 1244-1291 (Leiden, 1975), *passim*, on the commutation of vows for money payment: such commutations in 1218 are noted in "Annales de Waverleia" in Annales Monastici, ed. H. R. Luard (RS, 1864-9), II, 289. It is possible that Gilchrist earl of Mar commuted such a crusading vow; John de Salerno imposed a cess on him which he paid per hospitalarios: cf. Le Liber Censuum de l'Eglise Romaine, ed. P. Fabre (Paris, 1889), I, 232

the nobility of central France; at least, that is the impression given by its principal chronicler, Geoffrey de Villehardouin.¹⁰ Transport for the crusaders was organised by the Venetians, and it was their influence which deflected the Crusade from its proper goal of the Holy Land towards the Greek city of Constantinople. Despite the involvement of a sprinkling of men of other nations, the crusade was mainly a Franco-Venetian undertaking, less international in its composition than any earlier crusade, and less so than most of the later ones. The third crusade had been hindered by the jealousy and hostility between the English and French, and the pope may have felt that the elimination of such national rivalries among the crusaders would enhance the chances of success. If so, he was entirely mistaken. The crusaders first, to pay off their large debt to the Venetians, attacked the Christian city of Zara in Dalmatia and handed it over to Venice, and then attacked and captured Constantinople itself; the reasons for this are complex and open to controversy, but they were more connected with the internal politics of the Eastern Empire and with relations between Venice and the Franks than with the aspirations of the few crusaders from other parts of Europe. David Rufus

10. Geoffrey de Villehardouin, La Conquête de Constantinople, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, 2nd. edn 1874)

"may have finished up scaling the walls of Constantinople", as Professor Duncan remarks,¹¹ but for the non-French participants, who could hardly expect to carve out fiefs for themselves in the Eastern Empire, the deflection of the crusade must have been a disappointment after they had set out to liberate Jerusalem.

During the years immediately following the fall of Constantinople (1204) Innocent was too much taken up with other troubles to organise a fresh crusade. In 1209 the crusade against the heretical Albigenses began in deadly earnest, diverting resources which Innocent might otherwise have been able to direct against the Ayyubids in Syria. In 1212 there occurred the bizarre phenomenon known as the Children's Crusade, which embarrassed the Church as no serious efforts were made to control it or to disperse it. The Children's Crusade seems to have had little or no impact in the British Isles. It may have stirred Innocent to take in hand the project of a fresh crusade, because from 1213 until his death three years later he worked unceasingly towards the organisation of a fresh expedition to Palestine, an expedition which would be under direct papal supervision. The fourth crusade had been deflected by secular interests, and the Albigensian crusade looked likely to go the same way, while the

11. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 447

Children's Crusade never had the support of the pope or the Church; Innocent was determined that this should not happen again.

One of the lessons of the fourth crusade was that adequate financing was required from the start to avoid heavy debts to the Italian cities. For the first time we hear of the organisation of crusade finance over the whole Church. The bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow were appointed collectors of the Holy Land subsidy in 1213,¹² and were also empowered to preach the cross. According to Bower, their preaching was largely successful:

Unde quamplures et quasi innumerabiles per universam Scotiam... cruce signati sunt; pauci tamen de divitibus vel potentibus regni.¹³

This in a way follows the twelfth-century pattern, where we have seen the Scottish crusaders regarded as barbaric and unwarlike beyond the bounds of their own lands. Apart from Robert de Quincy, we cannot be certain that any of the great Anglo-Scottish nobility of the twelfth century had been on crusade, and the known participants were all men of lesser status. But the use of accredited papal legates to preach the cross, and the appointment of collectors and preachers to promote the crusade, were a new departure. In the British Isles the only previous crusade tax had been the "Saladin

12. CPL I, 38

13. Bower, Scotichronicon, I, 534: cf. Duncan, *op.cit.*, 287

Tithe" of 1188; despite his refusal to contribute to this directly, William I's payment for the Quitclaim of Canterbury can perhaps be seen as the earliest payment from Scotland towards the financing of a crusade. But this had been a tax organised by the English crown, and papal finance of the early thirteenth century was quite a different matter. This consisted usually of a portion of ecclesiastical revenues (often a twentieth or a tenth) supplemented by the offerings of the faithful and payments for the redemption of crusading vows of those who, for whatever reason, were unable to make the journey in person. This pattern was to continue throughout the thirteenth century.

Innocent's ambitions for a new and greater crusade became clearer in the spring of 1213. On 19 April he issued two bulls to be promulgated throughout Christendom, with copies addressed (among other places) to Scotland. One, the bull Quia maior, was addressed to all the faithful, and began with the words:

Quia maior nunc instat necessitas, quam nunquam
insisterit, ut Terrae Sanctae necessitatibus
succuratur...

The other, Vineam Domini, announced to the archbishops, bishops, abbots and priors in each province of the Western Church that a general council was to be held within two years:

Quia vero ante biennium, universale non posset

concilium congregari, disposuimus iterum per viros prudentes in singulis provinciis plenius explorare quae Apostolicae provisionis limam exposcunt, et praemittere viros idoneos ad Terrae Sanctae negotium procurandum.¹⁴

There can be no doubt of the impact of Innocent's fresh summons, which was thus recorded by the Melrose Chronicler:

Ipsi autem pastores interim omni sollicitudine verbum vite praedicarent et infirmos in fide confirmarent, confirmatos animarent, sed et sancte crucis signaculo consignarent in subsidium sancte terre repromissionis, quam tunc temporis Saraceni nimis improbe et indecenter tractaverunt.¹⁵

It was not until November of 1215 that the Fourth Lateran Council met to discuss ecclesiastical reforms and, perhaps more importantly from Innocent's point of view, the new crusade. The Melrose Chronicle contains very exact information about Innocent's projected crusade and the methods to be employed in its finance:

Auctoritate apostolica firmiter praeceptum est, ut ad subsidium sancte terre, omnes omnino in ecclesiis beneficiati, tam subditi quam praelati, vicesimam partem omnium ecclesiasticorum proventuum per subsequens triennium integre conferrant, per manus eorum quos ad hoc opus apostolica assignaret providentia, exceptis quibusdam religiosis et hiis qui personaliter in terram sanctam essent profecturi.¹⁶

14. P. Labbé and G. Cossart, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio (Venice, 1773), XXII, cols 956-62

15. Chronicle of Melrose, ed. Stevenson, 113

16. *Ibid.*, 120

The chronicler goes on to relate how the pope and cardinals promised to pay a tenth of their revenues in contrast to the twentieth they demanded from other ecclesiastics: Innocent himself made generous donations toward the crusade, which was to be assembled and ready to set out in Sicily on 1 June 1217. Among the two patriarchs and 412 bishops present at the Lateran Council was a Scottish contingent consisting of William Malvoisin, bishop of St Andrews, Walter, bishop of Glasgow, and Brice, bishop of Moray, along with Henry, abbot of Kelso, and representatives of the other Scottish bishops.¹⁷

Even before the Fourth Lateran Council met, there was a flurry of crusading interest in the British Isles. King John, beset with troubles on all sides, took the cross in 1215, accompanied by some of his leading nobility.¹⁸ Among these were some with Scottish connections: Saher de Quincy, son of Robert de Quincy who had been constable of Scotland, and successor to the substantial de Quincy estates in Scotland, was one of them; others were Ranulf, Earl of Chester, Earl David's brother-in-law, and John de Lacy, constable of Chester, one of whose female relatives (possibly a sister) had married Alan of Galloway.¹⁹ The return of

17. Ibid., 121

18. Dictionary of National Biography, XVI, 556-7: on John's taking of the cross with his supporters in the spring of 1215, cf. J. A. P. Jones, King John and Magna Carta, London 1971), 132-4

19. K. J. Stringer, "A New Wife for Alan of Galloway", TDGNHAS, XLIX (1972), 49-56

the clerics who had attended the Fourth Lateran Council would have provided a stimulus to them to prepare for the crusade in line with the details laid down by Innocent; but the renewal of the civil war in England and the events surrounding John's death (1216) meant that there would be delays in the fulfilment of their vows. Innocent III also died in 1216, with his great design still unrealised, and was succeeded by Honorius III. Honorius continued his enthusiasm for the new crusade, but in the end there were few crusaders ready to set out from Sicily in the summer of 1217. In England the civil war continued through the summer of 1217, so it was not until the following year that Saher de Quincy was able to set about the fulfilment of his vow. He went first of all to Galloway where he built a great ship to carry him and his followers to Jerusalem. The de Quincy family connection with Galloway dates from some years later, when Saher's son Roger married Helen, daughter of Alan of Galloway, in 1233.²⁰ Perhaps it was John de Lacy's relation to Alan of Galloway that made that principality an advantageous starting point for Saher de Quincy's crusade. Whatever the reason, Saher had the ship built during the winter of 1218-19 and sailed to Bristol

20. cf. G. G. Simpson, "An Anglo-Scottish Baron of the Thirteenth Century" (Edinburgh Ph.D., 1966) chapter I, on the ramifications of this family in the 13th century.

to have it fitted out in the early months of 1219.²¹ By this time the earl of Chester and most of the crusaders from the British Isles had already departed on 3 June, and Ranulf reached Damietta from Acre at the end of August 1218.²² Oliver of Paderborn (followed by Matthew Paris) says that Saher de Quincy arrived at the same time, but that is difficult to reconcile with the safeconduct issued to him by Hubert de Burgh in January 1219. Probably Saher did set out later (i.e., early in 1219), because the Waverley annalist seems to imply that he died not long after reaching Damietta, "*postquam in Terram Sanctam venerat*", on 3 November 1219.²³ Perhaps his companions named in the same source, Robert fitz Walter, William de Harcourt and William, earl of Arundel, all arrived at the same time, i.e., late summer or autumn of 1219, more than a year after Ranulf earl of Chester, the earl of Salisbury, and John de Lacy. Earl Ranulf conducted himself nobly during the lengthy siege of Damietta: on 29 August 1219 he and the earl of Salisbury came to the aid of the king of Jerusalem and the Military Orders in driving off an Egyptian attack which had come close to destroying the crusaders' camp; and at the time of the fall of Damietta he strongly favoured

21. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Henry III, 1216-25, 185; Bain, CDS I, no. 703, has 20 Dec. 1218, but 20 Jan. 1218/9 seems correct.

22. Matthew Paris, Chronica Maiora, ed. H. R. Luard (RS 1872-83) III, 40-1: Ann. Monast., II, 289

23. Ibid, II, 292: "Annales de Dunstaplia" in *ibid.*, III, 56

acceptance of the terms offered by Sultan al-Kamil, which would have restored Jerusalem to the Christians in exchange for Damietta.²⁴ The city fell on 5 November 1219, and the terms were rejected by the papal legate. Ranulf returned to England soon after, having spent two years with the army, and probably finding it increasingly difficult to co-operate with the unrealistic legate.²⁵

Saher de Quincy did not live to see the triumph of the capture of Damietta. He fell ill at the end of September, and lived only for four or five days thereafter. He had time to summon his children to his sickbed and request them to take his heart and entrails for burial at Garendon before he died on 3 November. The rest of his body was taken to Acre for burial.²⁶ These children were probably Roger, Saher's eldest surviving son (his elder brother Robert having died in 1217), who married Helen of Galloway and thus inherited one-third of that lordship as well as the rest of the de Quincy inheritance in Scotland and the earldom of Winchester, and Robert the younger, who married Helen, daughter of Llewelyn of North Wales, widow of John the Scot (d. 1236).²⁷ Some doubt is cast on their presence at Damietta by the fact that the Garendon Abbey cartulary,

24. Matthew Paris, *op.cit.*, III, 53

25. *Ibid.*, 56

26. Ann. Monast., II, 292

27. S. Painter, "The House of Quency, 1136-1264", Medievalia et Humanistica, XI (1957), 3-9; cf. his genealogical tree, which is slightly modified by Dr. Simpson in his thesis.

while recounting the dying request of Saher de Quincy in largely identical language to the Waverley annalist, has conuocatis seruientibus suis where the other has convocatis pueris suis.²⁸ The two statements are not contradictory, but nearly so: Dr. Simpson judges that "it therefore cannot be stated as a certainty that Roger de Quincy accompanied his father to the Holy Land".²⁹

When Saher de Quincy sailed from Galloway in January 1219, he may have had on board ship a curious group of highlanders. It is not certain that this group, probably coming from Lennox, did take ship with Saher de Quincy, but other facts about their voyage can be established. Two of these crusaders were the Gaelic bards Muiredhach Albanach O Dálaigh and Gille Brigde Albanach. The designation albanach does not invariably mean a Scotsman, but can mean one who makes his home in Scotland. In the case of Gille Brigde, he "seems to have been a native of Scotland, whose woods he loved by birthright".³⁰ Muiredhach Albanach, on the other hand, was active in Ireland before he was banished c. 1213;³¹ but in a later poem he wrote:

28. British Library, MS Lansdowne 415, f38r

29. Simpson, op.cit., 16

30. G. Murphy, "A vision concerning Rolf MacMahon", Éigse, IV, (1944), 79-111, at 94-5

31. Annals of the Four Masters, ed. J. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1856), III, 178-81

Let me go to my own land...
 to Scotland of the woods and the grass,
 of the feasts, the hills, and the isles;
 I will visit Ireland again. 31a.

After 1213 he came to Scotland and took service with Alwin (Ailin or Alún) earl of Lennox, who died c. 1217, and to whom Muiredhach addressed an elaborate praise-poem.³² It is probably no coincidence that he left Lennox soon after Alwin's death, for there would have been little employment for a bard during the minority of Alwin's son Amhlaimh. Some fifteen years after his exile, c. 1228, Muiredhach returned to Ireland, but he seems to have settled finally in Scotland, where his descendants became the hereditary bardic family of Mac Mhuiredhach or MacVurich.³³ The two poets seem to have had two other companions on the voyage, both of whom died on the return journey.³⁴ One of these was probably Aed mac Conchobhair Maenmuige, whose obit, "returning from the Jordan and from Jerusalem", is given s.a. 1224 by the Four Masters.³⁵ To him was addressed Muiredhach Albanach's poem A Mhuiredhaich, meil do sgin, which must have been

31a. O. Bergin, "Unpublished Irish Poems: xxviii - a Palmer's greeting", Studies, XIII (1924), 567-74, at 574

32. W. F. Skene, Celtic Scotland (Edinburgh, 1880), III, 117-9, 454-5

33. D. Thomson, "The MacMhuirich Bardic Family", TGSI, XLIII (1966), 276-304, at 279-80

34. G. Murphy, "Two Irish Poems from the Mediterranean in the Thirteenth Century", Éigse, VII (1955), 71-7

35. Annals of the Four Masters, III, 214-5

written shortly before their departure, and which includes the lines:

Protect us in the hot land
gentle lady Mary. 36

The fourth companion cannot have been Cathal Croibhdearg O Conchobhair, who also died in 1224, as he died in Ireland in the habit of a Franciscan.³⁷ He is traditionally thought to have been the companion mentioned in Muiredhach Albanach's poem An fóltsa dhuit, a Dhé athar, which also must have been written shortly before setting out. In it the poet describes how he has just been tonsured along with a companion:

For four years until this night
has this fresh mass of hair been on me;
I will now reap its bending crop;
this will be the requital of my deceitful poems. 38

Presumably the shearing was part of their initiation as pilgrims. Perhaps the poet had allowed his hair to grow since the time of his banishment, some four or five years before he set out on crusade.

Gille Brigde Albanach, in his poem A ghilli, gabhus an stiuir, describes the anxiety of the crusaders as they sail from Acre towards Damietta:

36. Measgra Dánta, ed. T. F. O'Rahilly (Dublin, 1927), no. 69, 179

37. Annals of the Four Masters, III, 210-15

38. Aithdioghluim Dána, ed. L. McKenna (Dublin, Irish Text Society, 1939-40), I, 174-6

Lad who takest the helm,
 you travel often to unknown lands;
 you have almost deserved anger;
 many havens have you visited.

Let us make a hard decision;
 these clouds are from the north-east;
 let us leave the bases of the rough mountains of Greece;
 let us strive to make Damietta.

These clouds from the east are dark
 as they drive us from Acre;
 come, Mary Magdalen,
 and wholly clear the air.

Distress of one night or of two
 would cause me no grief;
 the whole season in distress
 is a long stretch, great Mary.

Lady of the undulating hair,
 thou hast kept us all the autumn
 on the bright-edged Mediterranean;
 O modest one with the yellow locks.

Brigid of the bright bosom,
 though we have been sailing for a long time,
 our sailings here have been enough for me,
 maiden of Europe, beloved one.

Take care as you voyage
 to steer the helm aright;
 if the ship carries us off,
 on what beach, lad, will it land?

Lad who takest the helm.

39

We may guess that these crusaders sailed to Acre in the
 summer or early autumn of 1219. When they reached Acre they

39. Murphy's translations in Éigse, VII, have been slightly adapted.

would have learned that the main part of the crusade had passed on to Egypt, and set out after them, possibly coasting Cyprus ("the bases of the rough mountains of Greece") on the way. How long they remained with the army is impossible to say, though since the obit of Aed is not entered in the annals until 1224 they may have remained right up until the Christian evacuation of Damietta in September 1221, and thereafter have made their leisurely way back through the Mediterranean. Muiredhach Albanach's poem Fada is chabhair a Cruachain finds him on board ship off Monte Gargano on the Adriatic coast in homesick mood:

Help from Cruachan is far off,
across the wave-bordered Mediterranean;
the journeying of spring separates us
from these green-branched glens.

I give God thanks...
up against Monte Gargano;
between Monte Gargano and the fair-ditched lands of
the distance is not small. Cruachan

It would be as the reward of heaven tonight
if we could touch off Scotland of the lofty manors;
that we might see the haven...
or whiff the air of Ireland. 40

There is an unmistakable note of relief in the quatrain attributed to Muiredhach Albanach, which he spoke "at the head of Lochlong in Argyllshire when he sat down to rest himself when he returned thither from Rome":

As I sit upon the hillock of tears,
 without skin on either toe or sole;
 O King! -- Peter and Paul!
 Far is Rome from Lochlong.

41

A final glimpse of Muiredhach's achievement in "going round the world" comes in a poem written shortly after his return to Ireland c. 1228. In it he boasts:

I come...
 from over the bright-surfaced Mediterranean;
 I am going round the world.

42

An important Hiberno-Scottish poet like Muiredhach Albanach, many of whose poems have been preserved, is likely to have left these ample evidences of his participation in the crusade against Damietta; but in the case of others it is only scraps which testify to their participation. One such is William de Somerville, who owned lands in Clydesdale by 1200,⁴³ and earlier had witnessed several royal acts.⁴⁴ He was at Damietta along with John de Lacy, constable of Chester, probably in the company of Ranulf, earl of Chester, because he witnesses a charter of the constable's given apud Damietam,⁴⁵ 1218 x c. 1220. If any other Scottish landowners were with him on crusade, they have left no trace of it.

41. D. Mackintosh, Collection of Irish Proverbs (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1819), 190-1

42. Bergin in Studies, XIII, loc.cit.

43. Dryburgh Liber, 162-3: cf. RRS II, 42

44. RRS II, 329, 361, 387.

45. Chartulary of St. John of Pontefract, ed. R. Holmes (Leeds, 1899-1902), I, 36-7; cf. G. W. S. Barrow, The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History (1980), 108

Despite its initial successes, the fifth crusade achieved no long term benefits for the crusader principalities of Palestine; the papal legate Pelagius refused to negotiate even the favourable terms he was offered in 1219, and as time wore on the Egyptians grew stronger while the crusaders' army dwindled as crusaders completed their vows and departed for the West. In the end their position within Damietta became untenable, and in 1221 the city was evacuated without the sultan having to make any concessions at all. These events were noted with interest by the Melrose chronicler, who copied into his text a letter from Herman de Salza, grand master of the Teutonic Knights, to a cardinal describing the capture of the city, and noted its recovery by the pagans in 1221. Of this loss to the Christians, the writer comments:

Quibus tamen meritis, vel quo Dei iudicio hoc
evenerit, ignoratur.⁴⁶

But he cheers up when he records that during its brief period as an episcopal see, the bishopric of Damietta had a revenue of a thousand talents a year, with a chapter of forty canons each with a revenue of a hundred talents.⁴⁷

Successive wars had failed to win back the losses of 1187; and the dealings of the legate Pelagius demonstrated

46. Melrose Chronicle, 135-8

47. *Ibid.*, 138. cf. Chapter 7, p.

the dangers of refusing to negotiate with a powerful enemy when in a position of strength. The next serious attempt to recover Jerusalem was undertaken from a totally different approach by Emperor Frederick II. He did not strike a blow against the Moslems, whom he admired; but he achieved more by diplomacy than the fourth and fifth crusades put together. Innocent III had chosen to ignore the fact that Frederick had taken the cross in 1215 when he organised the fifth crusade, wanting to keep it under direct papal supervision, but the failure of Pelagius's leadership and Honorius III's milder temperament gave Frederick an opportunity to show his talents. He renewed his crusading vows at the time of his imperial coronation in 1220, and in the mid 1220s prepared an army to go to the East; but his repeated delays, which had not been punished by Honorius, were frowned on by his successor Gregory IX. He took the first opportunity to excommunicate the emperor in 1227, when the emperor was in fact gravely ill and incapable of travelling. Frederick, unperturbed, joined his army the following spring at Acre, and as a result of negotiations with Sultan al-Kamil secured the recovery for the crusaders of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Lydda, Toron and Sidon by the Peace of Jaffa (18 February 1229). Frederick entered Jerusalem in triumph on 17 March 1229 and crowned himself king of Jerusalem in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre the following day (the patriarch stayed away, as Frederick was still excommunicate). Despite his apparent success, the emperor was in difficulty;

the barons of Outremer doubted his right to the crown of Jerusalem, the military orders knew that Jerusalem was indefensible without adequate fortifications and control of the castles of Transjordan, and the pope and the Church regarded negotiations with the Infidel as nothing short of a sell-out. The Holy City itself was placed under interdict while the emperor was residing there; and his haughty manners towards the barons and bourgeoisie of Outremer and his obvious friendship for Moslems reportedly caused the citizens of Acre to pelt him with offal as he took ship for the West on 1 May 1229.⁴⁸

This narrative has been necessary to show that Frederick was indulging in a different kind of crusade, one fought by different personnel using different weapons. There was no summons for a passagium generale; the emperor's forces were small and drawn entirely from the empire and the kingdom of Sicily. But Frederick was nothing if not cosmopolitan, and his entourage did include one noteworthy Scot (certainly by name, and very likely by origin); he was Michael Scot, a translator and philosopher. His most recent biographer has no doubt about Michael Scot's Scottish birth, and lays stress on his service with Frederick, which other writers have tended to minimise.⁴⁹ He may have entered the imperial service

48. cf. Runciman, *op.cit.*, III, 177-92; Mayer, *op.cit.*, 219-30

49. L. Thorndike, Michael Scot (London, 1965), esp. 11-13, 32-9; cf. G. Donaldson, Who's Who in Scottish History (Oxford, 1973), 13-14

as early as 1220, as he was at Bologna when Frederick was passing through northern Italy on his way to Rome for his imperial coronation. Up until his excommunication in 1227, Frederick was trying to get ecclesiastical preferment for Michael; in 1224 he declined the archbishopric of Cashel in Munster ignorans ⁿ linguam terrae illius (which suggests that he was Scottish rather than Irish)⁵⁰ and in 1227 he had the right to hold two benefices in England and two in Scotland.⁵¹ A passage in Scot's Liber Introductorius strongly suggests that he had been with Frederick in the East:

Since such places [as Crete and Romania] are very hot, the vines yield an odoriferous and very potent wine, as is evident in that of Crete, Malvisia, Cyprus and Damascus, since there fogs never rise, nor dark clouds nor thunderstorms.⁵²

He states that he has this knowledge by personal experience. Michael Scot's expert knowledge of Arabic scholars, such as Averroes (Ibn-Rushid), Avicenna (Ibn-Sena) and al-Bitruqi, would have been a useful asset for Frederick in his subtle negotiations with al-Kamil. This was no ordinary crusade, and the one Scot who took part in it (albeit one whose link with his native land was by now tenuous) was no ordinary Scot.

Jerusalem was to remain in Christian hands for a further

50. CPL, I, 97-8; Theiner VM, 23

51. CPL I, 102

52. Thorndike, *op.cit.*, 35

fifteen years, and the kingdom was now restored to something approaching the size it had been before the Battle of Hattin, minus the castles of Transjordan. The position of Jerusalem was particularly vulnerable because of the loss of these strongholds, and also, although according to the terms of the Peace of Jaffa Frederick was allowed to refortify the city, this was not in fact done.⁵³ Consequently fresh reinforcements of crusaders from the West were constantly required to defend the precarious city and the kingdom, still menaced by the Ayyubids of Cairo and Damascus. The most noteworthy crusaders of the period between the recovery of Jerusalem and Louis IX's crusade of 1248 were Theobald count of Champagne and Richard earl of Cornwall. Earl Richard took the cross in 1235, and was joined a year later by some other nobles; among these were John the Scot, earl of Huntingdon and Chester, son of Earl David and nephew of Ranulf earl of Chester, and Gilbert Mareschal, who had married Alexander II's sister Margaret.⁵⁴ Had John lived long enough, he would presumably have joined Earl Richard's expedition to the Holy Land in 1240-41; but he died during the summer of 1237, it was rumoured (probably falsely) by poison.⁵⁵ His death deprived Earl Richard's crusade of one of its wealthiest leaders, who would probably have drawn upon his considerable

53. Runciman, *op.cit.*, III, 187, 190

54. Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum sive Historia Minor, ed. F. T. Madden (R.S., 1866-9), II, 391

55. *Ibid.*, II, 398

Scottish resources for his trip to the East had he lived long enough.

In Scotland itself, crusaders must have been quite a common phenomenon in the early thirteenth century. About a decade after the Fourth Lateran Council had confirmed to the Scottish Church the right to hold a provincial council without the convocation of a metropolitan, were drawn up the Statuta generalia Ecclesie Scotice, which included provision for the ecclesiastical protection extended to crucesignati:

Statuimus autem, auctoritate concilii Lateranensis, quod crucesignati riti ab ecclesia tuendi sunt, nisi propter suorum scelerum immanitatem ab ecclesiastica defensione fuerint sequestrandi; super hoc justum iudicium dioecesani modis omnibus expectetur.⁵⁶

The mention of a ritual for the taking of the cross is interesting. This had originally been a spontaneous action by the individual; but in the thirteenth century a rite was devised in which the cross was blessed by a priest before being sewn onto the clothes of the crusader.⁵⁷ The passage suggests that this ceremony had spread to Scotland by the mid-1220s. It was perhaps the parish priest who would bless

56. Aberdeen Registrum II, 15; Labbé and Cossart, Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio, XXII, col. 1230

57. J. A. Brundage, "Cruce Signari: The Rite for Taking the Cross in England", Traditio XXII (1966), 289 ff., esp. 290-91

the cross to be given to a future crusader; but the preaching of the cross was, from the 1230s onwards, carried out at local level mainly by the new orders of friars who were penetrating the British Isles at this time.⁵⁸ Matthew Paris records that despite the vigorous preaching of the friars, zeal for the cross declined in England after about 1240;⁵⁹ but Matthew Paris's uncomplimentary remarks about the mendicant orders have to be treated with caution.

The crusade of Richard earl of Cornwall secured the kingdom of Jerusalem in a stronger position than Frederick II had done; but the isolated position of Jerusalem, unfortified at the head of a narrow corridor of land connecting it to the coastal strip, made its ultimate loss inevitable. It remained in Christian hands for a few years after the expiry of Frederick's treaty, but finally in 1244 fell to the Khwarismian Turks, never to be recovered by the crusaders. Although the loss was to be expected, and the papacy had never shown any gratitude to the emperor for securing its recovery in the first place, popular feeling was aroused by the renewed loss, and the papacy was committed to press for a new crusade. Within a few months of the fall of Jerusalem the kingdom suffered further losses, with the disastrous battle of Gaza (17 October 1244) where the Frankish

58. For the arrival of the friars in Scotland, cf. I. B. Cowan and D. E. Easson, Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland, (London, 1976), 116 and 125

59. Matthew Paris, Historia Anglorum, III, 25, 280

army was destroyed by the Egyptian and Khwarismian army under the young emir Rukn ad-Din Baibars; this was the greatest Christian defeat since Hattin, and was followed the following year by the loss of Ascalon.⁶⁰ The interest which these events aroused in Scotland is shown by the fact that the Melrose chronicler copied into his chronicle two letters describing the fall of Jerusalem and battle of Gaza, one from the patriarch and nobility of the kingdom of Jerusalem to the pope, the other from (possibly) the archdeacon of Tyre to two monks in the West.⁶¹ Scottish consciousness of the plight of the Holy Land was stirred also by the papal chancery; when Innocent IV wrote to Dunfermline Abbey on 3 May 1245 awarding the abbot the right to wear the mitre and ring, the preamble to the bull began with the words:

Ut pulchra et decora filia Jerusalem fidelibus,
et terribilis infidelibus appareat, ut castrorum
acies ordinata...⁶²

In June of the same year met the Council of Lyons, at which Innocent confirmed the summoning of a new crusade. This

60. cf. Runciman, op.cit., III, 224-9

61. Chronicle of Melrose, ed. Stevenson, 156-63: cf. the facsimile edn, ed. M. O. and A. O. Anderson, 95. The Andersons read the writer's initial as E (index, s.n. E. Arch~Ciren~), and do not identify him. Ciren~ is probably a misspelling of tiren~, i.e., Tyre; but Peter de Sargines, archbishop of Tyre, was killed at the battle of Gaza. cf. Chapter 7, p.381

62. Dunfermline Liber, 128-9

council was attended by David de Bernham, bishop of St. Andrews, whose seal appears appended to the communiqué issued by the council on 17 July 1245.⁶³ It may have been he who brought back the copies of the letters about the state of the Holy Land which found their way into the Melrose Chronicle; but there can be no doubt of the keen interest taken by the Melrose writer in the fate of the kingdom of Jerusalem.⁶⁴

In December 1244, in thanksgiving for recovery from a serious illness, King Louis IX of France took the cross. In him the crusading movement found its greatest champion, a man whose moral qualities far outshone those of any other ruler of the thirteenth century, and whose influence outside his own realm depended not on force, but on the strength of his saintly character.⁶⁵ The nobility of France followed his example in taking the cross, and in turn nobles all over Europe did the same. In Scotland, the leading magnate who took the cross was Patrick earl of Dunbar. An interesting transaction which he entered into with the monks of Melrose indicates what an expensive undertaking the crusade was, not to be entered into lightly; Earl Patrick

63. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 294

64. Chronicle of Melrose, ed. Stevenson, 164-171 is a letter from the council and the pope promoting the crusade and denouncing Frederick II. cf. Chapter 7, p.382

65. The best account of Louis's character is John de Joinville, Histoire de Saint Louis, ed. N. de Wailly (Paris, Société de l'Histoire de France, 1868)

sold his equitium at Lauder to the monks for 100 marks sterling and a further twenty marks payable to his son Patrick when he should confirm the sale.⁶⁶ Shortly before his departure, his wife founded a hospital at Dunbar of brothers of the Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives - a useful precaution for a departing crusader.^{66a} Patrick seems to have been something of a larger-than-life figure; the Lanercost Chronicle records that he once burnt down his own kitchen to avoid disgrace when he discovered that the amount of food available was insufficient for the number of guests he was entertaining, and describes how he appointed a thief to an office in his household, and when the man tried to murder him he offered him money to go on a pilgrimage of expiation.⁶⁷ He spent Christmas 1247 with the king, and then set off to join the king of France. He probably followed the route across France and down the Rhone described by Joinville;⁶⁸ but when he reached Marseille in the summer of 1248 he fell ill and died before he could embark.⁶⁹ Matthew Paris has this to say about his death:

Obiit insuper comes Patricius, qui inter magnates
Scotiae potentissimus habebatur. Obiit autem cruce
signatus, in comitatu domini regis Francorum

66. Melrose Liber, 204-5

66a. Cf. Chapter 6, pp. 358-9

67. Chronicle of Lanercost, 54

68. Joinville, Histoire, 43-45

69. Chronicle of Lanercost, 54

peregrinans, qui creditur crucem assumpsisse, ut
Deo et beato Oswino reconciliaretur.⁷⁰

Probably in fact Patrick had more important personal reasons for taking the cross than the supposed injury he had done to St. Albans' appropriated parish church of St Oswine at Tynemouth. He was a figure of such importance that his death was noted by the continuator of William of Tyre:

Et morut a Marseille le cuens Patris.⁷¹

It is unrecorded whether his retinue (which must have been substantial, as he needed to sell his stud to raise money to pay for them) continued to the Holy Land after Earl Patrick's death. Companions he must have had, but none of their names survive in contemporary record; though Boece states that Earl Patrick took "David Lindsay of Glenesk and Walter Stewart of Dundonald with ane grete novmer of chosin men to support King Lowis in the said iornaye".⁷² John Stewart, Walter's brother, is said to have died at Damietta in 1249.^{72a}

The crusade itself followed a not-dissimilar pattern to that of 1218-1221. The king began by besieging Damietta in Egypt, and after its fall (6 June 1249) marched up the

70. Matthew Paris, Chronica Maiora, V, 41

71. "Estoire d'Eracles" in RHC Occ., II, 436

72. Hector Boece, The Chronicles of Scotland, trans. John Bellenden (Edinburgh, Scottish Text Society, 1941) II, 229. The titles "Lindsay of Glenesk" and "Stewart of Dundonald" seem anachronistic at this period.

72a. Scots Peerage, I, 12

Nile to defeat and capture at Mansurah (April 1250). A report of the enormous scale of the disaster was conveyed to Matthew Paris in St Albans by the master of the Templars in Scotland, who, it seems, had been in Egypt:

Secundum assertionem magistri Templi in Scotia
ad quadraginta milia librarum auri ascendit redemptio
regis Francorum capti a Sarracenis in Egipto.

Numerum autem occisorum sexaginta milia et viginti
milia de exercitu Francorum, anno Domini MCCL.

Hoc tamen diu latuit dominam Blanchiam matrem
ejusdem regis et totum barnagium Franciae, ne

desperantes redemptioni nullatenus consentirent. 73

The master of the Templars was probably not a Scot himself, but the report of the disaster reaching Scotland shook the population into activity. Richard de Clare, earl of Gloucester, took the cross in 1250, and was joined by Robert de Quincy, younger brother of Roger de Quincy who had succeed to the de Quincy estates in Scotland and added part of Galloway to his inheritance by marriage.⁷⁴ Robert de Quincy was married to the widow of John the Scot, Helen, daughter of Llewelyn prince of North Wales. Another group of Scottish crusaders prepared to set out in 1250; on 11 September Innocent IV gave mandate to the bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld to assign to Richard Giffard, setting out for the Holy Land with five knights, the sum of 400 marks from redemptions, legacies and grants, as the twentieth

73. Matthew Paris, *Chronica Maiora*, VI, 521

74. Ibid., V, 98-9

of church revenues which had been collected was now expended. At the same time he ordered that sums should also be assigned to other Scottish knights setting out on crusade at their own expense: Thomas Paynel, Adam de Lascelles, and Adam de Penkethan (= Pencaitland).⁷⁵ The request came ostensibly from Alexander III, but may in fact have been motivated by the regency in power at the time, led by Alan Durward. Sir Richard Giffard was brother of Hugh Giffard, son of John Giffard; John Giffard's confirmation to the monks of Newbattle of the lands of Cresswell (in Haddington)⁷⁶ is witnessed by John de Penkatil' (= Pencaitland), who may be the father of Adam de Penkethan.⁷⁷ In an earlier generation, c.1170, one Henry de Pencatl' appears as witness to a de Quincy document,⁷⁸ and in another document of Robert de Quincy's, dated 1170, Henry de Pencaitland and Hugh Giffard both appear as witnesses.⁷⁹ Thus (if we are right to connect Adam de Penkethan with the Pencaitland family) both he and Giffard, his "cousin", were members of East Lothian families who had been connected with the Countess Ada at Haddington (d.1173), and also appeared in a de Quincy connection. It is tempting

75. CPL, I, 261

76. cf. RRS II, 315-16

77. Newbattle Registrum, 64

78. SRO GD 241/254

79. G. W. S. Barrow, "A Twelfth-Century Newbattle document", SHR XXX (1951), 41-9

to link their departure on crusade in the summer of 1250 with that of Robert de Quincy, but there is no solid evidence for it. More certain is the connection of the Giffards with the faction led by Alan Durward; the request for papal collections to be given to Richard Giffard came from Alexander III at a time when Durward was in control, and Hugh Giffard was among those restored to favour as a result of Durward's coup d'état in 1255.⁸⁰ It is of interest to note that also among those who came back to the council in 1255 were Alexander the Steward, who is stated, on no certain evidence, to have "attended St Louis of France to the Holy War, and after the death of the earl of Dunbar, commanded the Scots pilgrims",⁸¹ and Patrick son of the crusader earl of Dunbar. Insofar as the Durward faction was outward-looking, non-isolationist (as we would expect from Durward's own wide travels), we would expect participants in the Crusade of St Louis to come from their party rather than from the seemingly more "insular" Comyn group.⁸²

The Scottish government seem to have been anxious that the crusading tax being levied in Scotland from 1247 onwards should be used only for the benefit of Scottish crusaders. On 30 May Innocent IV wrote to the bishop of St Andrews

80. CDS I, no. 2013

81. (Anon.) The Story of the Stewarts (Edinburgh, Stewart Society, 1901), 61

82. cf. D. E. R. Watt, "The Minority of King Alexander III of Scotland", TRHS 5th ser. XXI (1971) 1-24

requiring him to prevent any molestation of crucesignati in Scotland, stating that crusaders were to be free of the subvention ordered for the defence of the Latin Empire of Constantinople, which was tottering towards extinction.⁸³ On 23 October 1247 he appointed the bishop of Dunblane collector of a twentieth of church revenues, redemptions of vows, and offerings for the Holy Land, and ordered him to transmit 3000 livres tournois to two crusaders, Peter de Courtenai and Walter de Joigny.⁸⁴ These men had no discernible connection with Scotland, but were both married to sisters of Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester.⁸⁵ Such a situation can hardly have appealed to Alexander II, who had to be mollified in March of the following year by an assurance from Pope Innocent that he should suffer no prejudice by the recent visit to Scotland of William de Batinches, a friar minor, sent by the papal collector of the Holy Land subsidy in England, Scotland and Ireland.⁸⁶ On the same day (14 March 1248), the pope wrote to the bishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, ordering them to collect and distribute to those who set out personally redemptions of crusaders' vows, legacies and gifts for the Holy Land;⁸⁷

83. CPL I, 232

84. CPL I, 237, gives an abstract which omits the crusaders' names: Theiner, VM, 48, gives the text in full.

85. F. M. Powicke, King Henry III and the Lord Edward. (Oxford, 1947), I, 201, 207

86. CPL I, 243: Theiner, VM, 49

87. CPL I, 243: Theiner, VM, 50

this perhaps reflects pressure from Alexander II to ensure that the crusading collections should not be transmitted outside Scotland, but should be used to subsidise native crusaders. If so, it reflects a change in attitude from the twelfth century, when William I (despite his refusal to pay the Saladin Tithe) had made a substantial financial contribution towards Richard I's crusade. Alexander II's attitude seems to have been continued after his death by the Durward administration. On 4 September 1251 Innocent wrote another conciliatory letter to the crucesignati of the kingdom of Scotland, explaining that the king of Scots had reminded him that the pope was once of the opinion that redemptions of vows and offerings for the Holy Land from Scotland should be distributed among those of that kingdom who were willing to cross the sea for that purpose, while the pope had in fact recently granted the Scottish collection to the king of England and his subjects;-the king of Scots, therefore, has besought the pope to see to his subjects' interest, and he accordingly hereby confirms the earlier grant to the crusaders of Scotland, which should not be prejudiced by the subsequent grant to the king of England.⁸⁸ This probably reflects Durward's increasingly unco-operative attitude towards Henry III which led in the end to his removal from power in December 1251, to be replaced by an administration more favourable to Henry and reflecting

88. CDS I, no. 1806

the power of the Comyns in Scotland. It is uncertain whether this revolution altered the destination of crusading contributions from Scotland; by the end of 1251 most of the crusaders had already departed, and the twentieth was largely exhausted anyway.

All of this evidence points to large numbers of Scots taking the cross in the late 1240s and early 1250s. Some, of course, would commute their vows for a money payment,⁸⁹ but others, like Richard Giffard and his companions, set out themselves. It is in the light of these facts that we should consider stories relating to supposed Scottish crusaders of this period whose crusading activity is not supported by contemporary evidence. For example, Matthew Paris tells us that in 1248 Hugh de Châtillon, count of St-Pol, had a great ship constructed in Scotland, "ad Ylvernes, scilicet in Muref" (i.e., at Inverness in Moray), in which he could boldly cross the sea with men from Blois and Flanders and the Low Countries, to join the forces of Louis IX.⁹⁰ Professor Duncan has pointed out that there was "a substantial Flemish settlement in Inverness and the Moray Firth towns" by the mid thirteenth century.⁹¹ Mr. William Matheson has drawn attention to an interesting tradition relating to Coinneach mac Mathghamhna, who was alive during the mid 1260s:

89. CPL I, 232

90. Matthew Paris, Chronica Maiora, V, 93

91. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 585

as a young man he was banished by his father for repeating unpleasant predictions which he had learned from the singing of birds (which he understood), joined a ship bound for France, and came to the favour of the French king. The king gave him a ship in which he travelled to distant lands, always being able to understand the language that was spoken wherever he went. Finally, having grown rich, as a result of his unusual gift for languages, he returned to Kintail and was met by his father. The latter failed to recognise him and treated him with marks of great respect (which presumably no self-respecting highland chief would have shown towards his own son), and waited on him at table - thus fulfilling the birds' original prediction. As Mr. Matheson writes, "To suppose that Coinneach mac Mathghamhna took part in the Crusade of St Louis is of course a flight of fancy, but it may serve to illustrate how a historical personage could become the hero of a type of tale in existence long before his time".⁹² There is no reason to doubt that Coinneach did visit far-off lands and acquire a gift for languages in the mid thirteenth century; and we know of the count of St-Pol's crusading ship sailing from Inverness in 1248. To connect the two is tempting, but must remain speculation.

There is a picturesque tall story in an early seventeenth-century French book concerning the Scottish

92. W. Matheson, "Traditions of the Mackenzies", TGSI, XXXIX-XL (1942-50), 193-228, at 221-3

contingent on the crusade of 1248-54. It relates how, after the capture of Damietta and the subjugation of the surrounding area, King Louis drove out "le Roy des Arsacides (i.e., the Hashashin or Assassins), Prince Payen appelé le Vieil de la Montagne". The latter, bent on revenge, chose certain Assassins to go in disguise to the crusaders' camp; but as the conspirators plotted in a shady spot near the camp, they were spotted by a group of Scottish crusaders whose suspicions were aroused and who reported what they had seen to King Louis. He told the Scots to remain by his side while the Assassins came into his tent; and so the Scots were able to identify them and they were seized and made to confess before the plot could be carried out.⁹³ Although the tale gives every appearance of being just a romantic concoction of the early seventeenth century, it may have a faint basis in fact. Joinville describes an embassy sent by the prince of the Assassins (shaik-al-jabal, the "old man of the mountains" who dwelt in the desert hills east of Tripoli) to Louis IX in Acre in 1250, during which a dagger was shown to the king as a token of defiance, and a winding-sheet as a symbol of death.⁹⁴ Louis may well have been impressed by the Scots he encountered on the crusade; a few years after he returned to France, when he was lying ill at Fontainebleau, he summoned

93. Papers Relative to the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France (Edinburgh, Maitland Club, 1835), 74

94. Joinville, Histoire, 160-4

his son prince Louis (died 1260, aged 16) to his bedside:

"Biaus fiz", fist-il, "je te prie que tu te faces
amer au peuple de ton royaulme; car vraiment je
aimeroie mieax que uns Escoz venist d'Escosse et
gouvernast le peuple du royaulme bien et loialment,
que tu le gouvernasses mal appertement".⁹⁵

It is not clear whether the reference to Scots was intended to be complimentary or not; but at least the Scots were no longer being regarded as barbarians.

Despite the disaster at Damietta, the six years which Louis IX spent in the East (1248-1254) left the Latin states stronger and better able to resist Islamic attack than they had been for most of the thirteenth century, now consolidated within their narrower bounds. The late 1250s and early 1260s saw the attention of the papacy and the monarchies of Europe diverted elsewhere. First of all there was the "Sicilian business" in which Henry III, with papal support, sought to have one of his sons placed on-the throne of Sicily following the death of Frederick II, under the guise of a new crusade; this appeal was resisted equally by the Comyn government and by the compromise governments which succeeded it from 1255 onwards.⁹⁶ The arrival in Scotland of John of Acre, "son of the king of Jerusalem", in 1257, in company with his wife the queen dowager of Scotland, did

95. Ibid., 7

96. cf. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 564

nothing to promote crusading zeal in Scotland. John of Acre's father's claim to the kingdom of Jerusalem had never come to anything; he himself had relations with the royal families of France and Castille, and after his solitary visit to Scotland in 1257-8, he never came back to the land where his wife had her dowager estates.⁹⁷ After 1258 Henry III had his discontented barons in England to contend with, and the "Sicilian business" was abandoned. Throughout the early 1260s Alexander III was largely exercised with the problems of the Western Isles, which were not solved until the Isles were finally ceded to Scotland in 1266. While all this was going on, the terrible sultan Rukn-ad-Din Baibars "Bunduqdari" was steadily making more and more serious inroads into the Christian territories in Syria. In 1267, realising that his previous expedition had gained no more than a respite for the Crusader States, Louis IX took the cross for a second time; in the following year, Antioch, the first city to have been captured in the first crusade in 1098, fell to Baibars after a Christian occupation lasting 170 years.

Already in the West preparations for the new crusade were under way. Ivo, a Dominican friar at Ayr, was collecting money for the aid of the Holy Land in the early 1260s, but he, his successors as collector Master Leonard, and Master Sinicius, had trouble recovering a sum of thirty-six marks

97. Watt, art.cit., 18-19 and nn.107 and 108

which had been lodged with the canons of Whithorn in 1261.⁹⁸ In 1264 Cardinal Ottobon de Fieschi was sent to the British Isles to mediate between Henry III and his Montfortian enemies, and later to preach the cross.⁹⁹ According to Fordun, Ottobon demanded a subsidy of four marks from each parish, and six marks from each cathedral church in Scotland, for his expenses alone; had it been forthcoming, it would probably have amounted to much more than the 2000 marks whose export to England was forbidden by Alexander III in 1268.¹⁰⁰ Ottobon's legatine mission may not have had a great impact in Scotland, and may not have been the main reason for the large number of Scottish participants on the crusade in 1270. Indeed, as far back as 1263 Urban IV had licensed the bishop of St Andrews to preach the cross, and in November of the same year had issued instructions for the legal protection of those who had taken the cross in Scotland.¹⁰¹ The crusade which Ottobon was first sent to preach in the British Isles, by Clement IV's letters of 5 May 1265, was against the rebels fighting against Henry III;¹⁰² and the

98. CPL I, 384-5, 423

99. CPL I, 426-32 & passim: cf. J. Riley-Smith, What were the Crusades? (London, 1977), 45

100. B. Beebe, "The English Baronage and the Crusade of 1270", BIHR, XLVIII, 127-148, is a recent discussion of Ottobon's mission and its implications; Fordun, Chronica, 303-4, seems to contain a 13th-century Scottish version of the visit.

101. CPL I, 394

102. CPL I, 427

tenth collected in Scotland was to be assigned to the needs of the English royal household.¹⁰³ During the early months of his stay in England, Ottobon wrote to Alexander III notifying him of the purpose of his mission and apologising that he would be unable to visit Scotland in person;¹⁰⁴ this was probably during the early months of 1266. Soon after, he sent Master Maurice, his chaplain, to Scotland,

sperantes in Domino universalem statim post
reconciliacionem vestram potencie vestre conciliis
fore potissime promouendum.¹⁰⁵

Not until October 1266 did the pope begin seriously to think of turning Ottobon's mission into a crusading one, when he ordered the legate to preach the loss of Ashtod, Caesarea and Saphed, and the dangerous plight of the Holy Land.¹⁰⁶

Thereafter the legate's visit became increasingly directed towards the preaching of the crusade to the Holy Land.

Probably in the summer of 1267 Ottobon issued a powerful general letter exhorting the people to join the forthcoming passagium generale against "canes immundos, blasphemos crucis et sui nominis inimicos" who were infesting the land where Christ's blood had been shed.¹⁰⁷ He hoped that the

103. CPL I, 433: Theiner, VM, 99

104. "The letters of Cardinal Ottoboni", EHR XV (1900) 87-120, at n.90. This letter must have been written soon after Ottobon's arrival in England.

105. Ibid, 95-6

106. CPL I, 436

107. EHR XV, 113

aggressions of the belligerents could be diverted into a channel more suitable for the advancement of Christendom, which would prevent the effusion of Christian blood by Christians. Although Ottobon seems to have intended the crusade to be a peacemaking device, many of those who took the cross in England in the late 1260s seem to have had motives of their own; the majority of the Lord Edward's followers in 1270 had been on the royalist side in the civil wars, and were using the protection granted to crucesignati to avoid litigation over the lands of disinherited rebels which they had acquired during these years.¹⁰⁸

These motives cannot have prompted all of the impressive array of Scots whom we find taking the cross at this time, and caution us against seeing Scottish participation in the Crusading Movement as simply a northern reflection of English activities. It seems that Henry III was anxious for the crusading subsidy from Scotland, but less interested in Scottish manpower. Ottobon's new message did not appeal to Alexander III, and (probably) in the summer of 1267 Ottobon wrote to the king complaining that his messengers had not been well received, and that

Dicitur quoque contra nos edictum a vestra
celsitudine processisse, ut super hiis que pro
nobis et officio nostro agenda sunt nemo prefato
nuncio nostro obediat vel intendat.¹⁰⁹

108. Beebe, art. cit.

109. EHR XV, 117-8

Boece states that Alexander refused Ottobon's financial demands, promising to send men instead of money.¹¹⁰ In fact the truth may be less simple. Unfortunately the Melrose Chronicle has nothing to say about the mission of Ottobon and Scottish reaction to it. Probably the most reliable account of the Scottish reaction to his mission is that of Fordun, seemingly based on a thirteenth-century source; he states that Ottobon demanded the large procuration which Alexander arrested in 1266, and in 1268 demanded that the Scottish bishops, with two abbots and two priors, should attend his legatine council in London. In fact, the bishops sent only two of their own number with one abbot and one prior, and the Scottish clergy as a whole refused to abide by the new constitutions which the council laid down.¹¹¹ The papacy was clearly favourable towards the English crown and its association with the crusade in the late 1260s, but (especially after Alexander III's coolness towards Ottobon and his mission) that makes the level of Scottish participation in the crusade more difficult to explain. Scottish sources are lamentably thin for the period, and again Fordun is our best guide:

Papa Clemens clero Scotiae scripsit, ut decimum denarium omnium suorum proventuum ecclesiasticorum Angliae regi persolverunt. Quod rex et clerus uno ore et uno corde facere contempserunt. Anno tamen

110. Boece, History, (trans. Bellenden), II, 239-41

111. Fordun, Chronica, 303-4

sequenti [1269]rex Angliae Henricus iterum nuncios suos misit in Scotia ad petendum decimum denarium. Clerus vero, sicut prius, reclamavit, ad dominum papam appellavit, ac clericos ad curiam destinavit.¹¹²

Alexander III had already been asked for, and already refused, a tenth of church revenues towards Henry III's household needs in 1266, and it must have been wishful thinking to expect him to give in three years later. Henry III's sons, Edward and Edmund, took the cross not long after Ottobon's council at London in 1268.¹¹³ but it seems that enthusiasm for the crusade in Scotland was fired from quite a different source.

It has been mentioned that Louis IX had taken the cross for a second time even before the fall of Antioch, and it is likely that the news of this soon reached Scotland. No letter from him inviting the Scots to join his project has survived, but it is possible that there may have been one similar to the letter written by Philip IV to Robert I in 1309, inviting him to join a projected crusade.¹¹⁴ Of the Scots who set out in 1270, surprisingly few obtained letters of protection from Henry III; all of these were, in fact, Anglo-Scottish landowners who held lands of the English crown. Robert Bruce, lord of Annandale, and his son Robert Bruce, both had letters of protection, as had members of other

112. *ibid.*, 304

113. Rishanger, *Chronica* (RS, 1865), 58-9

114. *APS* I, 459

prominent Anglo-Scottish families, the Balliols and Mowbrays;¹¹⁵ but one searches in vain in the Patent Rolls for protections issued to the earl of Carrick, Alexander de Seton or David de Lindsay. These men owed no loyalty or homage to Lord Edward or his father, and did not seek English blessing on their enterprise. The earl of Atholl is said to have died at Carthage;¹¹⁶ Sir David de Lindsay is also said to have died in north Africa.¹¹⁷ Fordun, whose sources for the later thirteenth century seem to be reliable, states explicitly that the earls of Scotland, with many Scottish and English nobles, joined the French army:

Anno Domini MCCLXXI (recte 1270) Lodovicus rex Franciae, postquam insulam quandam maximam nomine Barbariam super Sarracenos debellatos aquisieret, cum filio suo primogenito, Lodovico nomine, in fata discessit, et cum eis populus multus Christianorum. Inter quos David comes Atholiae et Adam comes de Caryk, et alii quamplures nobiles Scotorum et Anglorum.¹¹⁸

Boece, although he can hardly be regarded as authoritative for the period, tells substantially the same story:

Attoure, he [Alexander III] send to King Lowis, as his ambassatouris affoir desyritt, ane thousand armytt men with the Erlis of Carrik and Athoill,

115. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Henry III, 1266-72, 411, 426, 465, 480

116. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 447. Melrose Chronicle, 216-7: Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 101, cf. 109-12

117. Scots Peerage, III, 8

118. Fordun, Chronica, 304

and mony vthir nobill capitanyis, quhilkis war
all slayne in Aphrik throw excessyve heit and
pest.¹¹⁹

Although "Master Hector" is not noted for his accuracy, there is no reason to doubt the basis of the story: that the earls and their followers, responding to a message from Louis IX, joined the French army and sailed to Tunis, where most of them were struck down by disease and the oppressive summer heat. The survivors, including the earl of Carrick, who is said to have died at Acre, joined Lord Edward's small force in Sicily in the autumn of 1270, and sailed on with him to Acre. Probably he already had with him all the Anglo-Scottish landowners who had letters of protection from Henry III; Balliols, Bruces, and Mowbrays were among them, but they also included John de Vescy, lord of Sprouston, who was a leader of the Scottish invasion of the Isle of Man in 1275.¹²⁰

For the crusade of 1270, the information is sufficient to allow a detailed analysis of the participants themselves and the part which each played in the crusade. Before doing so, it will be useful to give a chronological account of the whole crusade, and the part which Scots played in it.

Three years after taking the cross, Louis IX completed the preparations for his new crusade and sailed from Aigues-Mortes on 1 July. Although he had a substantial force with him, many of his most faithful followers, such as the

119. Boece, History, II, 229

120. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 582

Sire de Joinville, refused to join him a second time. Their main fear was aroused not by the dangers of an expedition to the Holy Land, but by the fact that the influence of Louis' brother Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, had persuaded the king of France to attack Tunis in North Africa rather than Egypt or Syria. The reasons for Charles' persuasion were complex, but related chiefly to his own attempts to extend his domination over the Sicilian archipelago to the north African coast. In the middle of July Louis and his fleet arrived off Carthage, and were almost immediately struck by disease and terrible heat. Louis himself died in the camp before Tunis on 25 August. The crusaders stayed in North Africa until 1 November, when under Charles of Anjou's leadership they withdrew, much depleted, to Sicily. By this time they had been joined by the Lord Edward, who had sailed from England in the summer of 1270, and arrived at Tunis after the death of Louis. He wintered in Sicily with King Charles, and in the following spring sailed on to Cyprus and Acre, arriving at the latter on 9 May 1271. His chief success was to negotiate an eleven-years truce with the Sultan Baibars (who followed up their agreement by hiring an Assassin to make an attempt on Edward's life), and he left Acre on 22 September 1272. Edward's army was not large enough to undertake any major military encounters with the sultan's forces; all he could do was to attempt to restore order within the Latin states (not easy, in view of constant disputes between the king of Cyprus and

his nobility) and hope that Baibars would honour his word. Luckily for the crusader states, the sultan died five years later.¹²¹

Within this framework of events, we have to fit the considerable Scottish presence. This consisted of two earls and a number of Scottish and Anglo-Scottish noblemen. It is well worth considering each one individually.

1. Earls

1. David de Strathbogie, Earl of Atholl.

The history of the earldom of Atholl in the thirteenth century is obscure and has given rise to confusion.¹²² David de Strathbogie first appears as earl of Atholl in 1264; he was "an Aberdeenshire baron descended from the earls of Fife; his title to the earldom is unknown".¹²³ In c.1267 he married Isabella, sister of Richard de Dover, an English landowner, and incurred the debts of her ancestors.¹²⁴ On 23 April 1270 he was given letters of protection for four years and freedom from all complaints and pleas of the English crown; presumably this was protection for the lands which he had acquired in England iure uxoris.¹²⁵ He must have set out for the Holy Land immediately thereafter, because the Melrose

121. This narrative is based mainly on Runciman, op.cit., III, 290-3, 333-8, and on Mayer, op.cit., 270-1.

122. A. A. M. Duncan, "The Earldom of Atholl in the Thirteenth Century", The Scottish Genealogist, VII (1960), 2-10

123. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 585, and cf. p.635

124. GDS I, nos. 2455, 2531

125. Ibid., no.2557

Chronicle states that he died in the company of Louis IX:

Subiecta itaque regione Barbarie regi Francie, cum
idem rex versus propria rediret, una cum rege
Navernie [i.e., of Navarre], mortui sunt ambo in
via; cum quibus obiit David comes Atholie in illa
peregrinacione.¹²⁶

Bower states that he died at Carthage on 6 August 1270.¹²⁷

He must therefore have been one of the first of the western
army to succumb to heat and disease; the army had arrived
off Carthage on 18 July, and it is possible that earl David
was already ailing by that time. Some time after his death
he was succeeded in the earldom of Atholl by his son, John
de Strathbogie.¹²⁸

2. Adam de Kilconquhar, earl of Carrick.

Like David de Strathbogie, this man was a descendant of
the earls of Fife. He came to the earldom of Carrick by
marriage, with Marjorie, eldest daughter of Niall (Nigel or
Neil), earl of Carrick; but his control of the earldom may
have extended only as far as his wife's demesne lands, for
the last Celtic earl had appointed his nephew Lachlan leader
of the men of Carrick and ceann cineil or head of his kin.¹²⁹

This does not mean that Adam was not accompanied by some at
least of the vassals of the earldom of Carrick, for he must
have had some followers. There is no record of his having

126. Melrose Chronicle, 216-7; the event is placed s.a.
1269, but clearly 1270 is meant.

127. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 101

128. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 635

129. RMS, I, 508-9

obtained letters of protection from Henry III; unlike the earl of Atholl, he would have had no English lands. We do not know what route he followed to the east; Fordun states that he was with Louis IX along with the earl of Atholl, and Boece (for what it is worth) also links him with David de Strathbogie as joint leader of the Scottish host.¹³⁰ The Melrose Chronicle states that he died at Acre, sub anno 1270. This may mean that he survived the assault on Tunis and withdrew with the army to Sicily at the end of October 1270; he would have wintered with Lord Edward at Messina and proceeded with him in the following spring to Cyprus and Palestine. Lord Edward arrived at Acre in May 1271:

Obiit Adam de Kilconcath, comes de Karryk, in
Acconia, cuius uxorem, comitissam de Karryk,
postea junior Robertus de Bruys accepit sibi in
sponsam.¹³¹

The death of the earl of Atholl is placed s.a. 1269 in the Melrose Chronicle, and that of the earl of Carrick s.a. 1270; in fact, they appear to have died in 1270 and 1271 respectively. Earl Adam left no children: his widow's second marriage to the younger Robert de Bruce will be discussed below, in the section concerning the younger Robert's participation in the crusade.

130. Fordun, Chronica, 305: Boece, History, II, 229

131. Melrose Chronicle, 219

2. Other Nobles

There is no obvious order in which these should be grouped. Anglo-Scottish nobles are discussed first, though this is an arbitrary arrangement.

3. Robert de Bruce, Lord of Annandale.

Robert de Bruce senior must have been one of the oldest men to depart on crusade; he may have been born c.1210, and so may have been about sixty when he set out. Although far from young, he was still vigorous, and his active career in politics continued up until his death in 1295. He had been active on the royalist side in the English civil war against Simon de Montfort and his allies.¹³² He did not decide to set out with the Lord Edward in the summer of 1270, as his son did; he may have hesitated, before deciding to join Lord Edmund, Edward's younger brother, who set out to join his brother with reinforcements in March 1271. On 19 October 1270 he obtained protection for himself, his lands and men for four years, as he was setting out with Edmund the king's son to the Holy Land.¹³³ He accompanied Edmund when he joined his brother in 1271, and probably stayed in Palestine until the autumn of 1272; probably he was still with the two English princes when they wintered in Sicily that year. In the spring of 1273 he set off back to Scotland, stopping

132. A useful resume of his career is to be found in G. Donaldson, Who's Who in Scottish History, (Oxford, 1973), 18-9

133. CDS I, no.2575

en route at Clairvaux to pay his respects at the shrine of St Malachi. Here he issued a charter granting to the monks of Clairvaux the lands of Esticroft as they had been held by Roger de Williamwode and Geoffrey Collan (Perhaps the names of two of Robert's tenants in Annandale who had perished during the crusade?), "ad sustinendum luminare coram beato Malachia". Although the charter is not dated, it is known that the abbot of Clairvaux applied for permission to have lights of the shrine of St Malachi in 1273, and this was the time of Robert's return from the Holy Land. The witnesses to the charter probably represented Robert's retinue on crusade.¹³⁴ Their number suggests that going on crusade in a manner befitting one's station was an expensive business.

4. Robert de Bruce, the Younger

The son's date of birth is unknown; probably he was born sometime in the 1240s, and was in his twenties when he joined the Lord Edward. He had letters of protection from Henry III dated 10 July 1270, just before the departure of the fleet.¹³⁵ His father followed him later, and he does not appear as a witness to his father's charter to Clairvaux

134. Troyes, Archives departementales de l'Aube, 3H332; Migne, PL, CLXXXV, pt.2, cols. 1759-60; Appendix I, no. 2

135. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1266-72, 480

of c.1273. He may, indeed, have returned to Scotland before his father. Fordun tells a curious story of his return to Scotland. Marjorie countess of Carrick, the young widow of Adam de Kilconquhar (wrongly called by Fordun Martha, Adam's daughter)¹³⁶ was out hunting near Turnberry with her escort, when she encountered young Bruce. He declined her invitation to join the hunt, but she insisted, and forced him to return with her to Turnberry, "*quamvis minime volentem*". After being held there with his men for about a fortnight, Robert agreed to marry the countess, without the king's consent having been sought or granted. When Alexander learnt of the clandestine marriage, he seized Turnberry and the rest of the countess's lands, and released them into Robert's hands only after he had paid a substantial fine. The firstborn of their union was born on 11 July 1274, and christened with his father's name of Robert.¹³⁷

It is difficult to know what to make of this rather picturesque story. It is possible that Robert Bruce the younger, who had newly returned from Acre, was bringing the countess news of her husband's death there. If so, that might help to explain Marjorie's undue haste in re-marrying; she had just learned of her husband's death from one of his companions-in-arms, described by Fordun as "*egregius miles juvenis speciosissimus*", and her reaction, after being deprived for

136. Melrose Chronicle, 219, states their relationship correctly without giving a date. This is probably the latest date entered in the chronicle as it survives.

137. Fordun, Chronica, 304-5

so long of her conjugal rights, is quite understandable. Robert's initial unwillingness may have been due to apprehension about the king's reaction to his ward's hasty remarriage. The whole story is a rather touching revelation of the tensions and frustrations experienced by the lonely partners of absent crusaders, and perhaps also suggests that there was a romantic or heroic aura about a young knight returned from the Holy Land which gave him irresistible attraction to a young widow.

5. Alexander de Balliol.

At least three, possibly more, members of the widely-ramified Balliol family took part in the crusade of 1270-72. Alexander was the son of John Balliol the elder, and elder brother of John Balliol who later became king of Scots. He was, therefore, of the senior line of the family, and heir to the Balliol estates of Barnard Castle and Galloway, and of Bailleul in Picardy. On 12 May 1270 he had protection from Henry III during his absence on crusade with the Lord Edward.¹³⁸ Earlier he had been loyal to Henry III and Lord Edward, and had had a grant of Thackthwaite, part of the barony of Multon, from Henry in consideration of his loyalty.¹³⁹ After his return from crusade in 1272 he succeeded to the senior estates of the family, and died in 1278.¹⁴⁰

138. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1266-72, 426: *ibid.*, 628, makes the identity certain.

139. J. Wilson, "A Balliol Charter of 1267", SHR V (1908), 252-3

140. For this and other information about the Balliol family I am indebted to the kind help of Mr. Geoffrey Stell.

6. Eustace de Balliol.

He was a brother of the senior John de Balliol (husband of Dervorguilla and father of the foregoing),¹⁴¹ and so an uncle of Alexander de Balliol above. He married the heiress of Kirkclinton, and had protection as a crusader with the Lord Edward on 20 February 1270.¹⁴² He died without issue in 1274.

7. Ingram de Balliol.

Probably he was the son of Eustace de Balliol, lord of Redcastle (Lunan Bay, Angus). His presence on the crusade was entirely in a French context. On a list of knights enrolled as members of the French king's household, entitled "Cy sont les chevaliers de l'hostel le roy pour la voye de Thunes", dated 1269, appears the name of "Messire Enguerrands de Bailloil".¹⁴³ He survived the disaster at Tunis, and withdrew with the remnant of the French army to Sicily in the autumn of 1270. He arrived in Messina at the end of August 1270, when he received a gift of 290 livres tournois from King Philip III of France.¹⁴⁴ Soon after, Lord Edward

141. Cal. Pat. Rolls. Henry III, 1266-72, 441

142. Ibid., 411

143. Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France, ed. M. Bouquet and others (Paris, in progress), XX, 305-8, at 308

144. Paris, Archives Nationales de France, J475 no.77; Appendix I, no.1. This bears the date "Saturday after the New Year, 1270"; it must in fact relate to the regnal year, as Philip became king at the end of August 1270.

probably sailed from Messina for Cyprus. There is no evidence that Ingram de Balliol followed him, though it is not impossible that King Philip's gift may have been for that purpose. Ingram succeeded his father Eustace in his Redcastle estates in the mid-1270s, and died in the late 1290s. It is not certain that Ingram de Balliol of Redcastle is to be identified with the Ingram de Balliol of Louis IX's household knights in 1270-71, but it is probable in view of the fact that the Redcastle branch of the Balliol family still had connections with the French crown as late as 1291.¹⁴⁵

8. Hugh de Balliol.

This member of the Balliol family is placed after his relatives because it is less certain that he was a participant in the crusade of 1270. Hugh was the eldest son of John de Balliol and Dervorguilla of Galloway, elder brother of Alexander (above) and nephew of Eustace (also above). In company with his uncle Eustace, he had licence to go overseas in December 1268.¹⁴⁶ The licence provided for an absence of only one year, so it is unlikely that they were planning to go to the Holy Land at such an early stage; possibly they were simply visiting the Balliol estates in Picardy. Eustace de Balliol had letters of protection to go on crusade in 1270, but no such letters exist for his nephew Hugh; the latter, however, died in 1271,¹⁴⁷ and a

145. Cal. Close Rolls, 1238-96, 170

146. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Henry III, 1266-72, 308

147. Ibid., 615

recent writer has commented that "it is probable that he also died on the crusade".¹⁴⁸ It is possible that he did not return to England after going overseas in 1269, and so was unable to procure the usual letters of protection in the year following. Circumstantial evidence - his previous record of royalist service during the Civil War and his association with his uncle, a known crusader, in the twelve months before the crusade - make it likely that Hugh was a crusader, and that his death in 1271 took place, like that of the earl of Carrick and others, in the Holy Land; but without more positive evidence, it is impossible to return a certain verdict.

9. John de Vescy.

The family of Vescy, lords of Alnwick in Northumberland, also had strong Scottish connections. In 1193 Eustace de Vescy had married Margaret, a (natural) daughter of William I:¹⁴⁹ in the first decade of the following century, he was at Traquair witnessing a charter of William's.¹⁵⁰ Earlier, Eustace's father William had been associated with William when the latter was earl of Northumberland.¹⁵¹ At a later date the family acquired the lordship of Sprouston, near Kelso, in Roxburghshire. John de Vescy, lord of Sprouston

148. W. P. Hedley, Northumberland Families, (Newcastle, 1963-70), I, 207

149. RRS II, 99

150. Ibid., 424: and cf. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 253-5

151. RRS II, 124

and Alnwick, obtained in the summer of 1270 protection as a crusader going to the Holy Land with Edward the king's son, and the right to lease manors held by him in capite of the English crown.¹⁵² He had earlier paid off his debts owed to a member of an eminent northern French crusading family, Guy de Châtillon count of St Pol.¹⁵³ After his return from the Holy Land, he was one of the leaders of the Scottish army which took control of the Isle of Man in 1275:¹⁵⁴ his associates as leaders of this expedition had connections with Galloway and the Isles, but none of them is known to have been on crusade.

Other persons with Anglo-Scottish surnames joined the crusade of 1270, but they are less easy to identify. Henry le Walays (i.e., Wallace) may be identifiable with the Henry Walays who was steward of the de Lacy manor of Pontefract in 1264, but Henry was also a common Christian name among the Wallace family who were tenants of the Stewarts in Renfrewshire.^{154a} Three members of the Mowbray family, called John, Ralph and William, had letters of protection from Henry III, but none of them can be identified as having landed interests in Scotland.^{154b}

152. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Henry III, 1266-72, 439, 480

153. CDS I, no.2456

154. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 582

154a. CDS I, nos. 2363, 2559; Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, 352-3; on the de Lacy connection with Scotland, cf. p.103 above

154b. CDS I, no. 2558

10. Adam de Gordon.

Gordon family tradition states that a member of this family joined the second crusade of Louis IX, but there is doubt about his identity. Ferrerius called him "William Gordon", but no person of this name appears on record.¹⁵⁵ The main line of the family were benefactors of Kelso Abbey, and their lineage is well attested in the Kelso cartulary.¹⁵⁶ At the time of the crusade of 1270, this line was represented by a female, Alicia de Gordon, who married one Adam de Gordon (whose lineage is unknown, though he may have been a relative), who predeceased her.¹⁵⁷ Some time in the second half of the thirteenth century, this Adam de Gordon granted his peat bog in Fawnes (Berwickshire) to Dryburgh Abbey; he died a few years later.¹⁵⁸ If Ferrerius' story of a Gordon crusader is to be taken seriously, then it could well have been Adam de Gordon who joined the crusade, and his grant to Dryburgh may have been made shortly before his departure. He is said to have died in Africa, which must mean that he died in the summer of 1270 at Tunis. There is no record evidence that Adam de Gordon joined the crusade, though he must have died around that time.

11. David de Lindsay.

He was a member of the king's council appointed to

155. Scots Peerage, IV, 510

156. Kelso Liber, 86-9

157. Ibid., 87-9

158. Dryburgh Liber, 140-1

safeguard English interests in 1255,¹⁵⁹ along with Bruce and Durward; as such, he can perhaps be seen as a member, with them and the earl of Dunbar, of the more outward-looking section of the Scottish nobility. The Scots Peerage states that "he joined the crusade of St Louis in 1268, and died in Egypt", giving as its authority Dugdale's Monasticon; unfortunately the Peerage gives no volume or page number.¹⁶⁰ Perhaps he took the cross in 1268 and set out with the Scottish earls two years later. It is unlikely that he died in Egypt, for those crusaders who survived the disaster at Tunis either returned home or proceeded to Acre with the Lord Edward; no crusaders went to Egypt. Possibly North Africa is meant, and the name of Egypt has been substituted for that of Tunis by confusion with Louis IX's earlier crusade.

Very little is known of David de Lindsay's career or his political connections. He witnessed a charter of Alexander Stewart to Balmerino Abbey in company with Guy de Normanville and Adam prior of Melrose;¹⁶¹ the piety of his family is suggested by the grant of an annual rent to Newbattle by his son William de Lindsay, in return for "pious works" for the souls of David de Lindsay and his wife Margaret.¹⁶² Boece mentions a David Lindsay of

159. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Henry III, 1247-1258, 421

160. Scots Peerage, III, 8

161. Balmerino and Lindores Cartularies (Bannatyne Club), 20-1

162. Newbattle Liber, 137-8

Glenesk on the crusade of 1248, possibly his father.^{162a}

12. Alexander de Seton

The family of Seton in East Lothian was established in Scotland during the middle of the twelfth century. The Christian name Alexander was common in this family, and there are well documented Alexanders in the generations preceeding and following that centred around 1270. The Alexander de Seton who joined the crusade in 1270 was the son of Saher de Seton¹⁶³ and probably the father of the Alexander de Seton who had a distinguished career during the Wars of Independence; the latter may be identifiable with the "Alexander de Seton, lord of that Ilk" who was preceptor of the Hospitallers in Scotland and died c.1346.¹⁶⁴ He may have had a connection with the de Vesci family,¹⁶⁵ which may in part account for his presence on the crusade. He is not known to have had any lands in England, and his name does not appear as one of those who had protection from Henry III to go on the crusade. He was at Acre in 1271, but it is not known whether he had previously been at Tunis with the earls of Atholl and Carrick, or whether he had sailed with the Lord Edward's fleet to Sicily in the late summer of 1270. It is probable that we would not know of his presence on the crusade at all, but for a cautionary tale recounted in the

162a. Boece, History, II, 229. There may be confusion between Lindsays of two different generations involved.

163. Melrose Liber, 199: cf. B. G. Seton, The House of Seton; a Story of Lost Causes (Edinburgh, 1939-41), I, 71-2

164. Fyvie Castle Muniments, no.2; appendix I, no. 12; cf. chapter 5 *infra*, pp. 295-6

165. Melrose Liber, 255

Melrose Chronicle. Edward's only military expedition in Palestine was a raid across Mount Carmel up to the walls of the fortress of Qaqun in the Plain of Sharon; but his troops were insufficient to besiege the fort, so having killed a few natives and captured their sheep and cattle, the army set off back to Acre. They all returned safely,

preter unum armigerum, nomine Nicholaum, qui erat armiger cuiusdam militis de Scotia oriundi, cui nomen erat Alexander de Setun. Ille autem armiger cui declinasset a comitatu Christianorum ad purgandum alvum, scutum domini sui portans ad dorsum in equo, mox captus est a paucis paganis habitantibus juxta iter per quod Christiani jam transierant minime visi a paganis, quos occidissent Christiani si illos vidissent; armigerum autem illum quem secum abduxerunt pagani ab illo die non viderunt Christiani.¹⁶⁶

Nothing is known of the parentage of the unfortunate squire Nicholas. It is rare to know anything about the retinue of a knight on crusade, and his is the only name of a squire which is known to us for the whole of the crusading period. The story suggests how unfamiliar Scots were with military conditions in Syria.

It is unlikely that Walter Stewart earl of Menteith joined the Scottish contingent on the crusade. The only grounds for the assertion that he did take part is that his effigy at Inchmahome Priory depicts him with his legs crossed; however, according to an authoritative writer on English figure sculpture, "it has long been supposed that

166. Melrose Chronicle, 217-8, where the fortress of Qaqun is called "Caconia". For the background, cf. Runciman, *op.cit.*, III, 337. Cf. Chapter 7, p. 386

the cross-legged memorial was provided by English sculptors exclusively for crusaders. But ... it is impossible to suppose the posture a crusading distinction of any kind".¹⁶⁷ Every knight for whom a recumbent effigy was carved between 1250 and 1350 can hardly have taken the cross. But on the basis of this supposition Walter Stewart's effigy is described as having the legs crossed "crusader fashion"¹⁶⁸ and "he is said to have gone to Egypt under Louis IX of France".¹⁶⁹ There is no real evidence to suggest that Earl Walter joined the crusade of 1270-1271.

Likewise it is difficult to credit the statement that "James, fifth hereditary high Steward ... is said to have joined the earls of Carrick, Athole, and other Scots lords in an expedition to Palestine".¹⁷⁰ For this assertion there seems to exist no evidence at all; even Boece does not mention him in connection with the crusade of 1270.

Despite these "red herrings", there is still enough evidence to convince us of a substantial Scottish contingent on the crusade, of which part seems to have been associated with the Lord Edward, and part with the crusade against Tunis. This makes Boece's story of a French invitation to

-
- 167. E. S. Prior and A. Gardner, An Account of Medieval Figure Sculpture in England (Cambridge, 1912), 594
 - 168. F. H. Groome, Ordnance Gazeteer of Scotland, (1882-5) s.n. "Inchmahome"
 - 169. Scots Peerage, VI, 130: cf. D. MacGibbon and T Ross, The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1896), II, 119-20
 - 170. The Story of the Stewarts (Edinburgh, Stewart Society, 1901), 64

the Scots to join them, similar to the one received in 1309, seem very likely. It also explains why there is not an exact correspondence between the grants of protection and safeconduct issued by the English government to Scots and the actual number of Scots who joined in the crusade. Only those with lands in England (i.e., the Anglo-Scots and the earl of Atholl, whose wife was English) required protection; but they were by no means the whole. The English expedition did not visit North Africa on its route to the Holy Land, yet there is evidence that there were Scots there. If the English expedition was a device used by the victorious royalists under the influence of Cardinal Ottobon, that cannot explain the presence of Scots who had no territorial interest in England or loyalty to Henry III; especially as Ottobon's legatine messengers were greeted with hostility in Scotland, and the legate himself never visited Scotland. In the case of one knight, Ingram de Balliol, a strong connection with the French crown seems certain. What seems to have happened is that a strong Scottish force, led by the two earls, responded to an invitation from Louis IX to join him in his second crusade. They followed him to Tunis where many of them perished, and the survivors withdrew with the main French force across the straits to Sicily in the autumn of 1270. There they were joined by the English expedition under the Lord Edward; this included a number of Anglo-Scottish landowners who had been on the royalist side in the Civil War in England. When they sailed on to Acre the following spring they were joined by part at least of the

Scottish remnant under the earl of Carrick, who died at Acre. On the return journey some of them seem to have gone their own way: the lord of Annandale visited Clairvaux, while soon after his son, who does not seem to have been with him there, was being kidnapped by the widowed countess of Carrick; the Lord Edward himself did not return to England until 1274, by which time many of the Scots must have already arrived home.

Certainly the affairs of the Holy Land caused great concern in Scotland before and during this crusade. The Chronicle of Holyrood (probably by this time a Coupar Angus document) contains an account of Baibars' invasion of Palestine in 1266 which seems to come from a Hospitaller source, containing information not found in any other medieval chronicle.¹⁷¹ The Melrose writer recounts Louis IX's assault on Tunis (with the surprised-sounding comment that the Christians discovered that Mohammedans were monotheists, and spared their lives for that reason!), and narrates in great detail Baibars' attempt to have the Lord Edward killed by an Assassin at Acre in 1271.¹⁷² Unfortunately the narrative breaks off in the middle, so the chronicler's reaction to the relative lack of success of the expedition does not survive.

171. A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood, ed. M. O. Anderson with A. O. Anderson (Edinburgh, S. H. S., 1938), 173-7 and notes. Cf. Chapter 7, pp. 391-2

172. Chronicle of Melrose, 219-21, Cf. Chapter 7, p. 387

This was the last of the great European crusades. Despite the attempts of popes Gregory X and Martin IV to preach a new crusade after the failure of Louis IX's second expedition, this was not achieved even by the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. Pope Gregory informed Alexander III and his bishops of the new council on 13 April 1273;¹⁷³ and a year later the council opened, though the number of the Scottish contingent is uncertain.¹⁷⁴ Despite the unfavourable reports of his advisers on the chances of a new crusade,¹⁷⁵ Gregory pressed ahead with the project and set about a new collection of an ecclesiastical tenth to finance it. Perhaps he was aware of the problems which had faced Ottobon as far as Scotland was concerned; this time Scotland was to have a papal collector of its own. Master Baiamund de Vicia, canon of Asti and chaplain to the cardinal of St Eustachius, was a minor papal bureaucrat whom the pope selected to collect the crusading tenth from the Scottish church for six years, in person and by sworn sub-collectors; the pope also enjoined him to write frequent reports on his progress.¹⁷⁶ Baiamund arrived in Scotland in 1275 and held a council at Perth at which he announced that the collection would be calculated not according to the antiqua taxatio, but according to the

173. CPL, I, 446

174. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 291

175. Runciman, *op. cit.*, III, 338-42

176. Theiner, VM, 104: CPL, I, 449

verus valor of the lands in question.¹⁷⁷ It is not clear what earlier taxation can have been meant, though there had been intermittent crusading levies from early in the thirteenth century. Baiamund's hard line did not last very long, for the Scottish clergy persuaded him to return to the curia to ask for a return to the old taxation:

Sed rediit in Scociam non expeditus.¹⁷⁸

Money was forthcoming in Scotland, but not in sufficient quantities to satisfy the papacy. Baiamund's accounts have survived, and they show discrepancies as well as an unwillingness to contribute.^{178a} Despairingly, Baiamund requested to be relieved of the task in April 1282; but the pope refused, and ordered him to proceed against defaulters.¹⁷⁹ It seems that in the interval King Alexander had intervened and placed an arrestment on the money to be exported through Italian bankers; and it came to the pope's notice that Baiamund had used the arrest as an excuse for lending the money at interest.¹⁸⁰ Already in 1282 Baiamund had been under suspicion, for a new collector, Geoffrey de Viçano, was sent to the British Isles, and in 1284 the pope instructed him to put pressure on Baiamund to hand over the money received.¹⁸¹

177. Fordun, Chronica, 306

178. Ibid.

178a. "Bagimond's Roll", ed. A. I. Dunlop, Scottish History Society, Miscellany, VI (Edinburgh, 1939), lff., has the text of the main part of the Roll with a historical introduction: other fragments are edited in SHS Misc., V (1933), and Ibid., X (1965)

179. CPL, I, 465

180. Ibid., 469

181. Ibid., 469

Alexander's reluctance to allow the money to be transmitted is understandable, as the only likely beneficiary would be Edward I; in May 1284 Martin IV granted the tenth from Scotland to Edward should Alexander's consent be forthcoming, in which case Edward would be responsible for financing Scottish crusaders.¹⁸² Alexander probably knew enough about Edward's dealings with Wales and in Gascony to know that a request for money in aid of the Holy Land could hardly be taken at face value. But on the death of Martin IV and succession of Honorius IV in 1286, Edward still had influence with Christ's vicar, who confirmed the grant of the tenth from Scotland, and also allowed Edward's request to select crusaders from Scotland personally, "as having practical experience of the country" -- in other words, Edward was allowed to use ecclesiastical revenue from Scotland, raised specifically for the relief of the Holy Land, to maintain a pro-English faction among the Scottish governing class.¹⁸³ It is hard to conceive that either the pope or the King of England can have imagined that Alexander would have allowed them to carry out such a preposterous arrangement; but Alexander died in the same year, and thereafter abuses of crusading finance continued to multiply, without a strong hand to prevent the export of money. As recently as July 1285 he had been able to

182. Ibid., 473-4

183. Ibid., 479-80

forbid the export of sums of money through Italian banking houses,¹⁸⁴ but thereafter the transfer of money may have gone ahead unhindered, to the benefit of Edward I.¹⁸⁵ When Nicholas IV became pope in 1288, he showed faith in Edward's intention of going again to the Holy Land; in January 1290 he ordered a new assessment of the verus valor, including Scotland with England, Wales and Ireland as due to pay the tenth to Edward,¹⁸⁶ and in the summer of the same year he reached agreement with Edward that the king should set out by the summer of 1293.¹⁸⁷

In March 1290/91 a general exhortation was sent to all the faithful, urging them to take the cross.¹⁸⁸ The pope had just learned of the death of the sultan Qalawun, who had died on 10 November 1290¹⁸⁹ and felt that the time was right to strike a blow against the enemies of the Kingdom of Jerusalem: the bishops of Scotland were commissioned to preach the cross with a view to a crusade leaving in the summer of 1293, and to grant indulgences accordingly.¹⁹⁰ Edward, having achieved his aims over the Welsh, may have been sincerely motivated to return to the Holy Land.

184. Ibid., 481

185. SHS Misc. VI, 1ff.

186. CPL, I, 509

187. Ibid., 527

188. Ibid., 533

189. Runciman, op.cit., III, 411-12

190. CPL, I, 533

Collectors for a new tenth were appointed, the Scottish collectors being the bishops of Carlisle (John de Halton) and Caithness (Alan de St Edmund, an Englishman who "figures largely as in favour with Edward I of England in the various transactions after the death of Alexander III");¹⁹¹ clearly Edward was still anxious to milk the Scottish church for his own purposes as far as possible, and in view of the weakness in Scottish central government following Alexander III's death, he was able to secure favourable appointees as collectors.¹⁹²

But if he had intended to sail to the Holy Land again, two events in 1290-1 prevented him from doing so. In October 1290, news reached the Scottish guardians of the death of the queen at Orkney, throwing Scottish affairs into greater confusion; and the bishop of St Andrews was writing to Edward asking for his help in resolving the situation.¹⁹³ In May 1291 Acre fell to the new sultan, al-Ashraf Khalil, shortly followed by the remnant of the Christian cities of the Palestinian mainland, Tyre and Beirut.¹⁹⁴ The kingdom of Jerusalem was effectively at an end, and there was no territorial base from which to attempt the recovery of the Holy City. In future, the recovery of the Holy Land would be a subject of much pious talk, but very little action.

191. John Dowden, The Bishops of Scotland (Glasgow, 1912), 238-9

192. CPL, I, 554

193. Ranald Nicholson, Scotland: The Later Middle Ages (Edinburgh, 1974), 35

194. Runciman, *op.cit.*, III, 412-23

Chapter 3.

The Last of the Crusades: 1291-1410

The fourteenth century is often thought of as "the Age of Chivalry", and this is reflected in a continuing interest in and appeal to the ideal of the crusade long after the reconquest of Jerusalem had ceased to be a practical possibility. Warfare in the east was still carried on by the Lusignan kings of Cyprus and by the Hospitallers in Rhodes; but the knights of western Europe had other outlets of sacred belligerence open to them which attracted increasing attention. The Teutonic Knights in Prussia began their campaign against heathen Lithuania in the late thirteenth century, and after the fall of Acre transferred all their military interests there.¹ And the Reconquista in Spain began to attract knights from northern Europe in increasing numbers from the late 1320s onwards as Alfonso IX renewed the war against Granada. The concept of the Holy War against the heathen continued, but its direction was no longer single; we can see a "fanning-out" process as the energies of fighting men were directed in a number of directions, all of which can still be termed crusades. At the same time, the fourteenth century contrasts with the high Middle Ages in that it was a period of large-scale protracted wars between European nations. The long reigns

1. cf. E. Christiansen, The Northern Crusades (London, 1980) esp. 132-3

of Louis IX and Henry III (who is described in one Scottish chronicle as rex Angliae pacificacissimus)² gave way to those of ambitious, aggressive successors. England in particular contributed to a breakdown of international stability with the bloody wars provoked by Edward I and Edward III. It might seem surprising that with so much war going on knights should have had time to embark on crusades at all; but the protracted wars of the fourteenth century gave rise to a new type of professionalism among soldiers, a class of fighting men who made warfare a career rather than a feudal obligation.³ These men had to be kept occupied in times of truce or peace, and the crusading ideal was a device often used to keep them busy when there were no domestic wars to be fought.

When news of the fall of Acre reached Scotland in the summer of 1291, the governing classes were preoccupied with the problem of the succession and were in no position to consider taking part in a new crusade. Despite his declared intention of returning to the Holy Land in 1293, Edward I soon became distracted with problems nearer to home. John Balliol, chosen king of Scotland by Edward in succession to Margaret, proved less amenable to Edward's pressure than had been hoped; and in the summer of 1294 Edward's relationship with Philip IV of France reached a crisis which made war seem

2. Fordun, Chronica, 305

3. cf. T. Jones, Chaucer's Knight (London, 1980) esp. chapter 2; parts of Mr. Jones's argument are a little overstated.

inevitable. The Franco-Scottish alliance of the following year and open war between England and Scotland in 1296 meant that the affairs of the Holy Land had to be again pushed into the background. Edward I was the favourite of the papacy and the champion of the crusade, at least until the pontificate of Boniface VIII; but that pope was hostile to Edward's designs on Scotland, and showed markedly less interest than most of his thirteenth-century predecessors in the recovery of Jerusalem.⁴ While he was pope (1295-1303), there was no chance that Edward would aid papal policy by going to the rescue of the Holy Land, even had he not been distracted by affairs in France and Scotland.

During the early 1290s, however, Edward was able to take advantage of papal favour and the lack of central authority within Scotland to exact the Holy Land tenth from Scotland and apply it to his own uses. The principal collector of the tenth from 1292 onwards was John de Halton, bishop of Carlisle, whose Register gives a detailed account of his proceedings in the collection.⁵ In August 1294 Halton was at Kelso, sending out demands to various religious houses for sums due for the aid of the Holy Land; Halton seems to have intended to use religious houses as agents of collection and bases where moneys could be stored, and

4. There are no letters relating to the recovery of the Holy Land in CPL, I, 558-611

5. The Register of John of Halton, Bishop of Carlisle, A.D. 1292-1324, ed. W. N. Thomson, with an Introduction by T. F. Tout (London, Canterbury and York Society, 1913)

it has been observed that he had, at least until 1296, a measure of success in doing this.⁶ At the very beginning of his pontificate, Boniface was still sufficiently favourable towards him to believe that Edward's reception of the cross was sincere, and confirmed to Halton that the grant of the tenth for Scotland made to Edward by Nicholas IV was still to be paid through Italian bankers.⁷ The bishop of Carlisle made another visit to Scotland in the summer of 1295,⁸ but thereafter he probably found it difficult to raise any revenue, particularly as hostility to the English deepened in 1297. His Register does not record any more visits to Scotland before Halton was relieved of the duties of collector in February 1300/1. At this time his procurators informed the collectors appointed to succeed him that the bishop had collected four years of the tenth from Scotland, presumably for the years 1291, 1292, 1293 and 1294. Although he had been able to continue collecting from the Isle of Man, and had gathered the full six years' tenth there, only the four years' fruits from Scotland had been collected.⁹ Years later, Halton recorded that Scottish religious houses still owed very large sums towards the tenth for six years

6. Ibid., 15-21: cf. D. E. Easson, "Scottish Abbeys and the War of Independence: a Footnote", Records of the Scottish Church History Society, XI (1951), 63-74

7. Reg. Halton, 62-3

8. He was at Jedburgh in July 1295: Reg. Halton, 13, 42-6

9. Reg. Halton, 150-63, shows his accounts on demitting office.

confirmed by Boniface.¹⁰

While Edward was taking advantage of the crusading tax as a useful source of additional income, he also found the crusading ideal useful for diplomatic purposes, portraying himself as the champion of the movement for the recovery of Jerusalem, being hindered from his purpose by the rebellious Scots. In March 1303 Edward wrote to the patriarch of Constantinople and to the khan of the Tartars, assuring them of his intention to return to the business of the Holy Land, "quod prae omnibus aliis negotiis hujus mundi cupimus prosperari".¹¹ The Plantagenets were a dynasty with a long history of crusading zeal; of Edward I's predecessors, Henry II, Richard I, John, and Henry III had all taken the cross, and Richard and Edward himself had actually been on crusade, while Henry II and John had died within a short time of taking the cross and before their vows had been fulfilled. Henry III had been allowed to commute his vow when Edward agreed to go in his place. Richard earl of Cornwall, Henry III's brother, had been in the Holy Land in 1240-1. With such a distinguished record, it was impossible for the papacy to ignore the demands of the Plantagenets in respect of Scotland, especially when Edward I was continuing to express his intention of returning to the Holy Land. Scottish propagandists who were opposed to

10. Ibid., 300

11. Rymer, Foedera, I, ii, 949

English ambitions towards Scotland had to bear in mind the impeccable record of Edward and his ancestors, which was for long periods able to turn papal hostility against Scotland.

The response of anti-English clergy was to go on the offensive. While Scotland was without clear leadership, and appeals to patriotic or nationalist feeling were not totally respectable per se, there was required an appeal to wider concepts with a general validity to the medieval mind. The need for such an appeal has been noted by historians; Dr Ranald Nicholson has commented that earlier writers "were all too prone to see evidence of nationalism in the Scotland of Robert Bruce. Ignoring the climate of thought in the medieval world they paid little heed to concepts such as cosmopolitan chivalry, which sometimes vied with nascent nationalism in fourteenth-century Europe".¹² Professor Barrow reflects a similar view when he writes that "the age of Bruce saw nothing especially sacred in patriotism or nationalism in themselves".¹³ In using the analogy of the Holy War, Bruce's propagandists found a concept with wider appeal.

Professor Barrow has written, quite rightly, that it would be "wrong to explain the Scottish clergy's part in the War of Independence by some natural clerical propensity for

12. R. Nicholson, "Magna Carta and the Declaration of Arbroath", University of Edinburgh Journal, XXII (1965-6), 142

13. G. W. S. Barrow, Robert Bruce (2nd edn Edinburgh, 1976) 348-9

patriotism or freedom",¹⁴ but on the other hand, it could be argued that the clergy were articulate and educated, able to appeal to high and low alike in terms which they could understand. Thus even before the rise of Bruce to prominence as a patriotic leader, a section of the clergy were using their influence against Edward I and his innovations in 1296:

Verum quemadmodum scriptum novimus causa ruinae populi sacerdotes mali, sic ruina regni Scotiae ex gremio processit propriae ecclesiae, quia dum illi eos seducerent qui ducere deberent, facti sunt eis in laqueum et iniquitatis offendiculum, et corruerunt in eis. Nam unanimiter et qui praelationis officio et qui praedictionis functi sunt, consiliis et exhortationibus tam publice quam occulte, aures et animos principum et plebium corruerunt, ut adversus regem et gentem, qui eos salubriter salvaverat, hostiliter animarentur; asserentes erronee abundantioris esse justitiae ipsos quam Sarracenos impetere.¹⁵ -

The Lanercost Chronicle, here quoted, is not alone in making this accusation against the Scottish clergy. Ten years later, when Robert Bruce renewed the war by having himself crowned king of Scotland, Edward sent letters to the pope complaining that the bishop of Glasgow was going about encouraging the people to join Bruce's rebellion,

14. G. W. S. Barrow, The Kingdom of the Scots (London, 1973) 254

15. Chron. Lanercost, 165-6

Et les asseure sur son péril qu'il porront à
 tant faire méryr de estre de la cord le dit
 Counte et de maintenir la guerre contre le Roy
 d'Engleterre qui est leur Seigneur lige come
 d'aler en la service Dieu en la Terre Seinte.¹⁶

The same accusation was brought against William Lamberton, bishop of St Andrews: he preached to the people that it was no less meritorious to fight for Robert Bruce against the English than to go to the Holy Land to fight against pagans and saracens.¹⁷ It must not be forgotten that this appeal was made to a generation which had witnessed the fall of Acre, and had not given up hope of its recovery. Bruce may well have seen himself as a champion of Christian ideals as he watched his men being ferried across Loch Lomond in the summer of 1306:

The King, the quhilis, meryly
 Red to thaim, that war him by,
 Romanys of worthi Ferambrace,
 That worthily our-cummyn was,
 Throw the ryght douchty Olyver.¹⁸

The "Roman de Fierebras", of which Barbour tells us that he recited a version to his captains,¹⁹ recounts how a small

16. Palgrave, Documents, 347-8

17. Ibid., 330

18. John Barbour, The Bruce, ed. W. M. Mackenzie (London, 1909) 46-7

19. cf. *ibid.*, 399, 506-11: v. also M. D. Legge, "Quelques Allusions littéraires", Melanges de Langue et de Litterature Médiévales offerts à Pierre le Gentil (Paris, 1973), 479-83, at 482, and L. Brandin, "La Destruction de Rome et Fierabras, MS Egerton 3028, Musée Britannique, Londres", Romania, LXIV (Paris, 1938), 18-100, at pp. 55-99; this is probably the text of the romance known to Barbour, or something very similar.

number of Charlemagne's Christian knights were bottled-up in a castle by the infinitely superior pagan forces of King Lavyne, the sultan of Babylon, and his son Ferambrace; they were in the end rescued by Charlemagne:

And wan the naylis, and the sper
And the croune that Jesu couth ber;
And off the croice a gret party
He [*i.e.*, Charlemagne] wan throw his chevalry.²⁰

The comparison between his own vastly outnumbered forces and the might of England would not have been lost on Bruce's audience.

The tide began to turn in Bruce's favour during the next few years. Towards the end of 1308 Philip IV of France, who already had designs on the wealth of the Templars, wrote to a number of European sovereigns notifying them of his intention of organising a new crusade. A London annalist was clearly aware of the contents of Philip's letter to Scotland:

Hoc anno [*1308*] papa fecit praedicare per totam Christianitatem profectionem fidelium in subsidium regum Cypri et Armeniae contra Sarracenos. Et ad excitandum super hoc animos hominum concessit indulgentias culparum et poenarum quales a saeculo non erant auditae. Illo quoque tempore rex Franciae Philippus scripsit litteratoriae Edwardo regi Angliae, ut ad parliamentum suum veniret. Similiter scripsit tyranno Scotiae Roberto de Bruys, non intitulus ei nomen regis, sed amico karissimo et comite de Karric dixit salutem. Neuter tamen eorum ad Galliam transfretavit.²¹

20. Barbour, *Bruce*, 46-7

21. *Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series, 1881-3), I, 226

The annalist does not state explicitly that Philip's letters directly concerned the crusade, but they seem to imply that he was anxious to mediate between Edward and Robert, which, taken together with Clement V's pursuit of a new crusade with unheardof indulgences being offered, would fit well with an invitation to join a crusade. Oliver des Roches, Philip IV's envoy to Robert Bruce and the bishop of St Andrews (Lamberton), had a safe-conduct to go to Scotland issued by Edward II on 4 March 1309, and he may well have been bearing the letter described by the London annalist.²² A fortnight later, on 17 March, the barons of Scotland issued a courteous reply to the king of France's invitation that they and their lord King Robert should join his proposed crusade. The surviving Scottish copy is damaged, but its message is fairly clear, and it ends with a promise of help for the Holy Land when the war with England is over:

Si ergo ... Regnum Scocie in pristinam redierit
libertatem, guerrarum tempestatibus suffocatis,
securitate pacis concessa [... ?vest]ri propositum
desiderii in obsequium divinus et vestram iuvamen
non solum Dominum nostrum Regem predictum, verum
etiam incolas regni sui, suis pro viribus, habere
poterit vestra regia celsitudo.²³

Although King Philip's letter does not survive, it seems possible that it was the letter described by the London writer,

22. Rymer, Foedera, II, i, 68

23. APS, I, 459

carried by Oliver des Roches his messenger, and to which this surviving letter is the Scottish reply. Or Philip may have sent two versions of the one letter, one in which Robert was addressed as king, and another (for English consumption) in which he was styled friend and earl of Carrick. The Scottish reply was intended to rebut English accusations that it was the Scots who were disturbing the peace of Christendom and hindering the crusade; the king and his people were willing to go "with all their might" (which I take to be the meaning of suis pro viribus), if only the English would leave them in peace.

Continuing Scottish successes through the following years did not remove the need for the Scots to play the part of the innocent victims who would much rather be fighting against the heathen than against the English. English accusations continued, and reached receptive ears in the person of Pope John XXII (1316-34), who was anxious to organise a new crusade; the pope was delighted to learn that Edward II had taken the cross in the summer of 1317, and urged him to make peace with Bruce so that he could go to the aid of the Holy Land.²⁴ In 1320 John excommunicated Bruce's principal episcopal supporters and the king himself for their continued obduracy.²⁵ It is in the light of these actions, at a time when "Pope John XXII's fulminations

24. CPL, II, 138, 130

25. CPL, II, 191, 199

against Bruce and his supporters were at their loudest and most menacing",²⁶ that we must consider the striking assertion of crusading fervour in the famous document known as the "Declaration of Arbroath".

This is best known as an assertion of a determined desire for national liberty; but there is another side to the document which is often ignored, namely its cosmopolitan and international aspect. It ends with a vigorous assertion that the Scots are willing to join the Crusade, that most non-national of ideals, if the English will leave them in peace. It would be wrong to see "cosmopolitan chivalry" (to use Professor Nicholson's phrase) as being incompatible with a desire for national independence, but equally it would be wrong to view national consciousness as something which had not existed before the wars from 1296 onwards gave "freedom" a new importance. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Scotland was a feudal kingdom where great men could, and often did, own land on both sides of the border, and could abandon the defence of their own country to fight for the Holy Places of Christendom. The wars of the fourteenth century were to change that, but it would be wrong to argue that a "cosmopolitan" ideal of the unity of Christendom was changed overnight into the particular, patriotic loyalties of nation-states; national loyalty existed before 1296, and

26. Barrow, Robert Bruce, 424

cosmopolitan idealism continued long afterwards. So the appeal both to national and to international values in the Declaration of Arbroath should not be seen as a contradiction or a puzzle, nor should the cosmopolitan appeal be ignored or played down in favour of nationalism; the two should rather be seen as complementary. The assertion that the Scots wished to fight for the cross is, in a sense, an assertion of nationhood; it is an assertion that they wished to be like their European neighbours, and play their rightful part in the defence of Christendom -- if only they would be left free to do so.

The Declaration is at pains to convince the pope that English assertions of crusading zeal were little more than humbug. He is warned not to believe "*Anglorum relatibus*", and is informed of the real reason why "*Christianorum terminos arctari indies*":

Excitet igitur Christianos principes, qui non causam ut causam ponentes, se fingunt in subsidium Terrae Sanctae propter guerras quas habent cum proximis ire non posse; cuius impedimenti causa est verior quod in minoribus proximis debellandis utilitas propior et resistentia debilior aestimantur.

In conclusion, the Declaration asserts the Scots' own willingness to do what their selfish neighbours would not:

Sed quam laeto corde dictus Dominus Rex noster et nos, si Rex Anglorum nos in pace demitteret, illuc iremus (i.e., to the Holy Land), Qui nil ignorat satis novit. Quod

Christi Vicario totique Christianitati ostendimus
et testamur.²⁷

It is impossible not to remember the earlier assertions that fighting against the English was an equally sacred cause. In all of this propaganda we can see an underlying medieval logic, leading from domestic war to Holy War; those who fought for freedom, a sacred cause, "quam nemo bonus nisi simul cum vita amittit", understood better than their selfish neighbours the danger posed to Christendom by its enemies and the need for a new crusade. As their position grew stronger militarily and diplomatically, the Scots were able to assert their zeal for the defence of Christendom more and more strongly.

Towards the end of the year 1323 Thomas Randolph, earl of Moray, arrived in Avignon to negotiate with Pope John XXII; he requested that Bruce be styled as king in papal letters, and asked for the pope's assistance in securing a lasting peace with England.²⁸ He was also anxious to impress on the pope his own crusading fervour, as John explained in a letter to Edward II:

Primo, namque petiit dictus comes, quod, cum ipsum votum de transfretando in Terrae Sanctae subsidium emisisset, nec illud commode, sine sedis [apostolicae] licentia, complere valeret, sibi licentiam huiusmodi,

-
27. The text of the Declaration of Arbroath is edited in APS, I, and by Fergusson; the text here is taken from A Source Book of Scottish History, ed. W. C. Dickinson, G. Donaldson, and I. Milne (2nd edn. Edinburgh, 1958) 151-4
28. Rymer, Foedera, II, ii, 541. There is an abstract in CPL, II, but this is unclear and in places misleading.

necnon et indulgentiam, quae per ipsam sedem dari consuevit in dictae Terrae subsidium transfretantibus, pro quibus principaliter nostram adierat, ut assereret, praesentiam concedere dignaremur. Ad quod sibi duximus respondendum quod, cum ex huiusmodi particulari peregrinatione negotium dictae Terrae non speraremus probabiliter adiuvari, nec ad praesens saluti suae peregrinationem praedictam censeremus proficere, cum tam ipse quam alii partium Scotiae regnicolae, suis demeritis exicentibus, poenis et sententiis nostrorum processorum irretiti, a communione fidelium et merito bonorum operum se reddidissent indignos, non erant per nos petitioni suae huiusmodi annuendum. ²⁹

Although he did not immediately achieve his prime objective, Randolph must have impressed the pope considerably, for he wrote apologetically to Edward II to tell him that he had conceded to Bruce the royal style in letters;³⁰ and on 31 August 1324 he wrote to Randolph, "in whose labours to foster peace between England and Scotland the pope hopes and trusts", granting him an indult to visit the Holy Sepulchre, notwithstanding the sentences which stand against him, together with a crusader's indulgence, the latter to be valid only upon his reconciliation with the Church.³¹

The Scots were probably right in dismissing English pretensions as humbug; but it remains to be seen whether their own professions of crusading fervour were the same.

29. Rymer, Foedera, II, ii, 541.

30. cf. Barrow, Robert Bruce, 354

31. CPL, II, 239

Thomas Randolph never fulfilled his vow to visit the Holy Sepulchre, and there is no evidence that he commuted his vow. But as the remarkable reign of Robert I drew to a close, there was a final expression of crusading zeal on the part of the dying king himself which is as striking in its own way as any of Robert's achievements, as a genuine outpouring of piety and chivalrous spirit.

As he lay ill at Cardross, probably with leprosy, Robert sensed that his end was near; he sent letters to all his lords, summoning them to his deathbed, where he made his will. This involved (says Barbour) conspicuous generosity

Till religioun of seir statis,
and regret for the amount of Christian blood that had been shed in the long wars that he had waged:

I thank God that has me sent
Spas in this liff for till repent. _
For throu me and my warraying
Of blude thar has beyne gret spilling.³²

According to Barbour, he regarded his infirmity as a punishment for this crime; and so he had long ago resolved in his heart,

Off my synnys till savit be
Till travell apoun Goddis fayis.

(i.e., to strive against the enemies of God). Now, being struck down by sickness,

32. Barbour, Bruce, 365ff.

That the body may on na wis
 Fulfill that the hert can devis,
 I wald the hert war thidder sent.

The story as told by Jean le Bel, who had previously fought against Bruce's army, is almost identical. Le Bel states that Bruce summoned James Douglas to his deathbed and said to him:

J'ay voé que ... je iroye guerrier les anemis de
 nostre Seigneur, et les contraires de la foy
 créstienne oultre mer (Outremer = the Holy Land),
 once his wars were over and his country at peace. But now
 that his body cannot do as his heart desires,

Je weil envoyer le cuer pour le corps, pour moy
 et pour le voeu acquitter.... Emportez mon cuer
 au saint sepulchre, là où nostre Seigneur fut
 enselevi.³³

The only difference is that Barbour states that Bruce made this speech to all the nobles present, and asked them to choose one of their number

On Goddis fayis myne hert to bere,
 and that they chose Douglas; according to Le Bel, Bruce made a direct request to Douglas that he would undertake the task. The difference is a small one, and perhaps adds to the authenticity of the story, as it is clear that the two writers agree so closely yet still seem to be independent of each other. They both agree that Douglas and the king were both pleased with the arrangement; and Froissart

33. Jehan le Bel, Les Vrayes Chroniques, ed. L. Polain (Brussels, 1863), I, 79ff.

(following le Bel) attributes these words to King Robert:

Or soit Dieu gracié; car je mourrai plus à paix
dorénavant, quand je sçais que le plus suffisant
et le plus preux de mon royaume achévera pour moi
ce que je ne puis onques achever.³⁴

But what do we know of the character of Sir James Douglas himself? A recent biographer³⁵ has portrayed Douglas as a model of chivalry, always gallant and courteous. But it would be perhaps more realistic to see him as a man of his time and occupied in the rough business of the time -- bloody fighting. Barbour had obvious reasons for polishing up his character into "the good Sir James" who appears in his verses; but there is evidence which suggests that he also possessed elements of a rough soldier. By the time of the king's death in 1329, Douglas had been fighting almost continuously from his teens, and had probably become so inured to fighting through a quarter of a century that he had little skill or experience at anything else. On occasions he could be blunt and contemptuous of the rules of chivalrous conduct; during the border campaign of 1327, when the English invited the Scots army to descend from their strong position and do battle on open ground, Douglas is said to have sent back the message that he had come to England to burn and slay, and that if the English had any objection it was up to them to do something about it.³⁶

34. Jean Froissart, Les Chroniques, ed. J. A. C. Buchon (Paris, 1837-8), I, 35ff.

35. I. M. Davis, The Black Douglas, (London, 1974), passim

36. Le Bel, Chroniques, I, 63

His conduct after the battle of Bannockburn, when he pursued the fleeing Edward II with such vigour that

He leit thame nocht haf sic laseir
As anys wattyr for to ma,³⁷

is perhaps fairly typical; and it is probably significant that it was to Douglas that the king's dying commission was entrusted, rather than to, say, Randolph, who was an accomplished diplomat and statesman. Without wishing to deny his obvious qualities, it is important to view Douglas realistically as a man of his age and one accustomed to warfare. It is easy to understand why he was pleased to undertake the king's request, as it gave him an opportunity to continue his career overseas.

What was it that King Robert asked Douglas to do? Douglas's biographer, I. M. Davis, has stated that "there was for Douglas no question of advancing a crusade on the soil of the Holy Land";³⁸ but this statement must be seriously doubted. According to Barbour Bruce simply called for a brave knight

On Goddis fayis myne hert to bere,
without directing him to any specific location. But Douglas's objective is clearly stated in the safe-conduct issued to him by Edward III's government on 1 September 1329:

Cum nobilis vir, Jacobus dominus de Douglas in
Scotia, versus Terram Sanctam, in auxilium

37. Barbour, Bruce, 243

38. Davis, *op.cit.*, 155

Christianorum contra Sarracenos, cum corde domini
R. regis Scotiae, nuper defuncti, sit profecturus...³⁹

The safe-conduct was accompanied by a letter of recommendation to Alfonso XI king of Castile, asking him to receive Douglas favourably should he pass through his domains on his journey; clearly Douglas intended to stop in Castile on his way to the Holy Land, and it seems that he had heard of the young Alfonso's intention of renewing the war against Granada.

But these letters make it quite clear that his intention was a military expedition in the East. Barbour perhaps suppresses mention of the Holy Land as his objective because his hero never got there, but le Bel says that Bruce himself spoke of a longing to fight "oultre mer", a term used to mean the Holy Land. Only the English writer Geoffrey le Baker mentions Granada as his objective:

"Vovi" inquit [Robertus le Bruys] "Deo, quod contra inimicos Christi forem corporaliter militaturus, quod, quia vivo non potero, te ... exoro, ut cor meum contra inimicos nominis Christi deportes ad fronterium Granardianum".⁴⁰

But this must surely be an ex post facto explanation of how he came to be there. Part of the confusion surrounding Douglas's objective arises from the letter which Robert is reputed to have sent to his son from Cardross while he lay dying, asking his protection for the monks of Melrose, where he had bequeathed his heart for burial.⁴¹ Professor

39. Rymer, Foedera, II, ii, 770

40. Geoffrey le Baker, Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke, ed. E. M. Thompson (Oxford, 1889), 41-2

41. Melrose Liber, II, 329

Duncan has convincingly shown that this letter is a forgery concocted at Melrose some seventy years later,⁴² which cannot in any sense be regarded as evidence of where Robert I wanted his heart to be buried. There is no reason whatever to doubt Bower's statement:

Dum itaque inclitus rex, in extremis agens,
legationem faceret; inter cetera legavit cor
suum mitti Hierosolyma, et recondi apud
sepulchrum Domini.⁴³

Recondi must mean "to be shut up, stored away"; clearly the king intended the Holy Sepulchre to be the final restingplace of his heart, confirming the words of the only contemporary documents, the safe-conduct and letter of recommendation issued by Edward III in 1329.

Davis seems to find it incredible that Douglas can have intended to fight his way to the Holy Sepulchre.⁴⁴ But it seems that this was his first intention. It is over-ingenious to argue that Douglas intended to fight a few battles along the way in Spain, but then planned a peaceful pilgrimage with the king's heart to the Holy Sepulchre. Le Bel is quite explicit that his pause off the Flemish coast was intended to gather fighting recruits to go to the Holy Land; Douglas, he says, inquired if anyone

de par deçà la mer s'appareilloit pour aller devers
la sainte terre de Jérusalem.⁴⁵

42. A. A. M. Duncan, "The Acta of Robert I", SHR, XXXII (1953), 1-39, at 18-22

43. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 300

44. Davis, op.cit., 155ff., passim

45. Le Bel, Chroniques, I, 83

On the way through the Mediterranean Douglas would certainly have had to stop in Cyprus, where he could have taken service with the Lusignan king of Cyprus. There he could have learned in detail of the situation in the Holy Land, and made a final decision about the practicability of his plan. But there is no reason to doubt that he originally intended to fight in the Holy Land.

Throughout the autumn and winter of 1329-30 Douglas made his preparations for the journey. He was planning for a long absence, for his safeconduct from Edward III was for seven years duration from 1 September 1329.⁴⁶ He assembled a body of knights and men at arms as his companions, some of whose names are known to us. Le Bel says that his train included a knight banneret, six other knights, twenty esquires, and other retinue.⁴⁷ Barbour mentions the knights William de Sinclair, Robert Logan, William Logan, and William Keith among his companions; Le Baker mentions a certain Thomas de Lavingtone (probably Livingston) who was possibly one of the esquires and later became a Carmelite friar.⁴⁸ Possibly Simon Lockhart of Lee was one of the knights; tradition associates the "Lee Penny" with a fourteenth-century crusade in which one of the Lockharts of Lee participated, and Simon Lockhart was a supporter of Bruce's cause from 1306

46. Rymer, Foedera, II, ii, 770

47. Le Bel, Chroniques, I, 83

48. Barbour, Bruce, 373-4: Le Baker, Chronicon, 41

onwards.⁴⁹ Before his departure, Douglas celebrated his family's saint's day, the feast of St Bride (1 February 1330) at Douglas Park, and made a pious endowment to the monks of Newbattle, in whose abbey there was an altar of St Bride; they were in return to celebrate a sung mass annually on that feast at that altar, and afterwards serve a meal for thirteen poor folk in honour of Sir James.⁵⁰ From there, he and his retinue went to Berwick⁵¹ in spring, to await "la bonne saison pour mouvoir qui vouloit passer outre mer", and set sail, probably in March or April.

The first port of call for which we have information was Sluys (l'Escluse) in Flanders. Douglas waited there seeking news of the prospect of a crusade, and encouraging anyone who might wish to join him on his voyage to Jerusalem (clearly, he was recruiting volunteers). Le Bel was vastly impressed by the lordly hospitality he offered on board his ship, "comme ce fust le roy d'Escoce" in person; Douglas

49. This charm-stone is described in PSAS, IV, 222: a version of the legend surrounding it is recounted in F. M. MacNeill, The Silver Bough, I, Scottish Folk-lore and Folk-belief, (Glasgow, 1957), 94

50. Newbattle Registrum, 100

51. Barbour (p.369) states that he sailed from Berwick: Le Bel does not name the place from which he sailed, but Froissart, whose account is almost wholly dependant on Le Bel, states that Douglas sailed from Montrose (Monrois, I, p.37). Froissart clearly had a source for this statement, independant of Le Bel; but he was writing long afterwards, and it is hard to see why Douglas and his companions should have gone north to Montrose when Berwick would have been a more natural starting point. v. Le Bel, I, 83. I presume that mouvoir here means "to persuade, encourage".

feasted all his visitors from silver vessels, with a choice of wines and spices.⁵² In all this there was a propaganda value; it was as if the victorious King Robert himself were making a triumphant procession across Europe on his way to the Holy War.

According to Le Bel, it was at Sluys that Douglas heard of the renewal of war between Castile and Granada; but we know from his safe-conduct that Douglas was intending to visit Castile en route anyway. He had little choice, for there was no other way for a Scottish ship to get to the Holy Land except by the Spanish coast and the Straits of Gibraltar. Barbour says that he sailed between Cornwall and Brittany,

... and left the Grunye of Spanhye
On north half hym.⁵³

Grunye is probably to be identified with Corunna in Galicia; but it is unlikely that Douglas would have sailed straight across the Bay of Biscay without following the coast. This consideration lends credence to the Spanish oral tradition which states that Douglas made a landing at Santander on the north coast of Spain; in 1879 Joseph Bain was shown a grey stone on the heights above Santander, called the rock of "El Dugla", a brave Scot who came to Spain centuries earlier to fight against the Saracens.⁵⁴

52. Le Bel, Chroniques, I, 83

53. Barbour, Bruce, 369

54. CDS, III, p.xxxvii

Le Bel states that Douglas landed in Spain at "Valence la Grande", (i.e., Valencia); Barbour is more likely to be correct in saying that his arrival was at Seville on the Guadalquivir.⁵⁵ Alfonso XI of Castile was projecting a renewal of the war against Granada in the summer of 1330, and to this end concluded a truce with the king of Portugal and moved to Cordoba (higher up the Guadalquivir) where he assembled his forces.⁵⁶ It was decided that the campaign would be directed against the Moorish stronghold of Teba de Hardales; and it was felt that the campaign had good chance of success because of the internal condition of the Moorish kingdom. The king of Granada, Muhammad IV ibn Ismail, was a minor, and the affairs of the kingdom were left largely in the control of a Moroccan mercenary leader, 'Uthman ibn Abū'l Ula (called in the Spanish sources Don Osmin); it was rumoured in Castile that Muhammad never ventured out for fear that he would be assassinated as his father had been, and

55. Le Bel, Chroniques, I, 84: Barbour, Bruce, 369

56. "Crónica del Rey Don Alfonso el Onceno", Crónicas de los Reyes de Castilla, I, (Madrid, Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, vol. LXVI, 1919), 173-392, at 224ff.: the chronology of the Crónica is confused. It dates the assault on Teba to "the twentieth year of the reign of King Don Alfonso... A.D. 1329". But Alfonso succeeded in September 1312. Juan de Mariana, Historia General de España, ed. H. M. Gutierrez de la Peña (Barcelona, 1839), III, 451-3, gives an account which is drawn from the Crónica and gives the date of the assault as August 1330. As 'Uthman ibn Abū'l Ula died the following year, 1331, this is certainly the correct date.

'Uthman was able to act virtually as king himself.⁵⁷ In the midst of these warlike preparations, Douglas and his troops arrived at Seville, and were soon summoned (presumably to Cordoba) to the presence of King Alfonso. The king offered to take them on as mercenaries, but Douglas refused, saying that he was "in-till his pilgrimage/ On Goddis fais"; however, as he knew that the Castilians were fighting the Moors, he would join him voluntarily.⁵⁸ Douglas was introduced to men skilled in the warfare of the region, and also met numbers of English and other foreign knights who were flocking to King Alfonso's banner. One of the foreign knights, who had heard of Douglas's exploits in the Anglo-Scottish wars, expressed surprise that his face was so free of scars, despite all the battles he had fought; clearly Sir James was something of an international celebrity.⁵⁹

Alfonso with his army and the foreign knights, marched into Granada and laid siege to Teba, probably in early August 1330. 'Uthman with a relieving force advanced as far as the Guada Teba and encamped some way from the town across the river. There were a series of skirmishes, in the course

57. Crónica, loc. cit.: cf. D. W. Lomax, The Reconquest of Spain (London, 1978), 165-7: J. N. Hillgarth, The Spanish Kingdoms (Oxford, 1976), I, 428-9: 'Uthman's career is mentioned also in C. E. Dufourcq, L'Espagne Catalane et le Maghrib au XIII^e et XIV^e Siècles (Paris, 1966), 384-7 & nn.458, 469

58. Barbour, Bruce, 369-70

59. Ibid., 370-1

of one of which the besieged sallied forth and burned one of the Castillian siege-engines; and some of the Christian forces left the camp. The army was being weakened by desertions and by 'Uthman's skirmishing tactics, and a more decisive engagement was required to break the deadlock. The Spanish Crónica del Rey Don Alfonso el Onceno (which nowhere mentions Douglas or his forces) thus describes the battle: 'Uthman divided his forces in two, sending half his army to the Guada Teba to engage the besieging forces, while keeping the rest in ambush ready to make an assault on the Christian camp and the siege works. Alfonso was warned of the ruse by his scouts, and also divided his forces, remaining in the camp himself while part of his army went to drive off the attack at the river. The Moors at the river were driven back all the way to their own camp, while 'Uthman with his own part of the army advanced on the siege works, only to find them heavily guarded by the king and his troops. 'Uthman turned back to the aid of his own retreating men, and fell upon the Christian knights who were pressing them; so Alfonso detached 2000 knights to rescue the Christians, and the day was won for Castile. The siege was renewed with vigour; and although 'Uthman appealed to the besieged not to surrender, Teba capitulated at the end of August 1330.⁶⁰

60. Crónica, loc.cit.; and cf. the closely related but less detailed account in El Poema de Alfonso XI, ed. Yo Ten Cate (Madrid, *Revista de Filología Española*, anejo LXV, 1956), 97-101

This battle agrees remarkably well with Scottish and other accounts of the fight in which Douglas lost his life. Fordun gives the date of his death as 25 August 1330, and Bower adds that he lost his life apud Castrum Tibris -- at the castle of Teba.⁶¹ Barbour states that Douglas was placed at the head of the foreign knights serving Alfonso, and that after routing the Saracens, he and the ten or so men who were with him turned back towards the Christian camp; one of his knights, Sir William Sinclair, was surrounded by Saracens, and as Douglas rode up to the rescue, he was himself caught up and surrounded by the enemy.⁶² Douglas, Sinclair, and Robert and Walter Logan were all slain; they were caught by the troops of 'Uthman retreating from the unsuccessful assault on the siege-camp to the rescue of the other half of his army which had been routed by Douglas and the Spaniards. Fordun also states that the Moorish army was divided, and that after routing one part of it, Douglas caught sight of alio soldano whose troops joined battle and killed him.⁶³ But it was not a reckless suicide charge which cost Douglas his life (the story of throwing the king's heart into the midst of his foes is a later invention -- Barbour states that the casket containing the heart was found beside Douglas's

61. Fordun, Chronica, 353: Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 301-2

62. Barbour, Bruce, 372-3

63. Fordun, Chronica, loc.cit.

body);⁶⁴ it was a simple tactical error which cost dearly.

He and his men advanced too far from the rest of the attackers, and were isolated and easily cut down when 'Uthman and his division came up; the help that Alfonso sent came too late.⁶⁵ Le Bel states that

ce fut grand dommaige et grand deffault pour les
Espaignolz,⁶⁶

but it is more likely that his unfamiliarity with the tactics and warfare of the Reconquista was what caused Douglas's death. Most importantly, it was not suicide.

The Scottish crusade of 1330 had come to a premature and tragic end in its first major battle. Douglas and three of his knights were dead, while another knight, Sir William Keith, had been wounded earlier. Douglas's body and the king's heart were recovered from the field; the former was disembowelled and boiled, so that the flesh could be buried in consecrated ground in Spain while the bones were brought back for burial in the church at Douglas. King Robert's heart also abandoned the road to Jerusalem, and found its last resting place in Melrose Abbey; there was no-one left to take it to its intended destination.

We have argued that the crusade of Sir James Douglas in 1330 was a logical culmination of the ideals and propaganda

64. Barbour, Bruce, loc.cit.

65. Barbour says "He had nocht with him atour ten":
Le Bel says that the Scots outran the Spaniards, and so became separated. Le Baker, quoting an eyewitness, states that Douglas's body bore five wounds.

66. Le Bel, Chroniques, loc. cit.

of the anti-English side in the first war of independence, which deserves attention as an attempt to put ideology into practice and to give respectability to the Scottish cause after so much adverse publicity. Despite its failure as a crusade against the Holy Land, it did have some success in restoring Scotland to papal favour; in August 1331 John XXII wrote to the bishop of Moray mandating him to release from excommunication all those who removed the heart of King Robert from his body, and carried it with Sir James Douglas against the infidels in Spain.⁶⁷ There was nothing foolhardy or suicidal in what Douglas did, and it would be to miss the point of his actions to see his death as wasteful or unnecessary; it is only because he died at a very early stage on his crusade that misunderstandings about the nature of the venture have arisen. Douglas gained nothing but praise and admiration from his enemies because of his heroic death fighting for the faith; Le Bel had fought against him, and Le Baker was fervently anti-Scottish, but both unite with Scottish writers in praising the acts of his last year.

There is, however, another more practical aspect of the crusade of 1330 which is worth exploring. Scotland and England had been at war since 1296, and in the course of over thirty years a new generation (of whom Douglas was one) had grown up in an atmosphere of intermittent war and constant hostility and vigilance. What was a man like

67. CPL II, 345; Theiner, VM, 251

Douglas to do in a time of peace, when his whole life had been devoted to fighting? This crusade can be seen in part as a device for pacification, a way of getting the incorrigible belligerents out of the country to do their fighting elsewhere when the country was looking forward (in this case, mistakenly) to a long period of peace. There are earlier and later examples of crusades following hard on the cessation of more domestic warfare: the English participation in the second crusade (1147) can be seen thus in relation to the unsettled years of Stephen's reign, and the crusade of the Lord Edward in 1270, coming in the aftermath of the Montfortian rebellion, is an even more obvious example of this phenomenon. The crusade against Alexandria in 1365, which we will shortly consider, can be seen in a similar relationship to the Treaty of Brétigny (1360) which brought the Hundred Years' War to a temporary halt. The difference between these treaties with their subsequent crusades, and the Scottish crusade which followed the Treaty of Edinburgh (1328), is that contrary to all expectations that treaty did not lead to a permanent peace.

Indeed, largely due to the expansionist designs of Edward III, all hopes of a new crusade against the Holy Land were to be disappointed for a further generation. In 1332, two years following Douglas's death in Spain, there was a renewal of war between Scotland and England in the guise of Edward Balliol and the "disinherited". Meanwhile relations between England and France were deteriorating; Scotland and

France were allies, and "in 1336 the French galleys which had been assembled at Marseilles for a proposed crusade were transferred to the Channel ports".⁶⁸ After high hopes and early successes during the early 1330s, Edward's chances of lasting success in Scotland declined, with Scottish recovery and increasing tension between England and France. In 1338, perhaps partly at least to save face after his recent reverses in Scotland, Edward III led an army across the Channel and into France to pursue his claim to the French throne, and so began the "Hundred Years' War". Throughout the 1340s and '50s there was warfare on both fronts, though in Scotland this was curtailed by David II's capture at Neville's Cross in 1346; not until the Treaty of Brétigny in 1360, three years after King David's release from captivity, was there a general pacification in France and a genuine chance to launch a new crusade against the Holy Land.

The principal motivating force behind the new crusade came from the young King Peter I (de Lusignan) of Cyprus. From the time of his accession in 1359 until his murder ten years later at the hands of his own knights, Peter strove ceaselessly to recover the mainland part of the kingdom of Jerusalem; his dynasty had never abandoned the title of kings of Jerusalem, but only Peter himself tried to make that title effective. His character has received different interpretations, but there can be no doubt about his burning

68. Nicholson, Scotland: the Later Middle Ages, 135-6

desire for the recovery of the Holy Land.⁶⁹ From 1362 to 1364 he travelled widely in Western Europe seeking recruits in Italy, France, England, Germany, the lands to the east of the Empire, and elsewhere. In the autumn of 1363 Peter visited Edward III in London, at the same time that David II was making a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham in Norfolk:⁷⁰

quand il entendit sur son chemin que le roi de Chypre étoit à Londres, il se hâta durement et se péna moult de le trouver; et vint ledit roi d'Escosse si à point à Londres que encore n'étoit-il point parti. Si se recueillirent et conjovirent grandement ces deux rois ensemble; et leur donna de rechef le roi d'Angleterre à souper deux fois au palais de Westmonstier. Et prit là le roi de Chypre congé au roi d'Angleterre.⁷¹

David's anxiety to meet the king of Cyprus is understandable, as he is known to have himself been interested in the ideals of chivalry and Christian warfare. Bower states in his eulogy on King David that he always had an ambition to go on crusade which was prevented by his untimely death:

Ipse autem rex toto annisu, ad domandum Paganorum feritatem, Terram Sanctam petiturus, cum militari potentia spectabili, [positis regni custodibus],

69. cf. A. S. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1938), 330ff: A History of the Crusades, ed. K. M. Setton (Madison, Wisconsin, 1969-in progress), III, 353ff: Runciman, A History of the Crusades, III, 441ff: for an exaggeratedly hostile view of Peter's career, cf. Terry Jones, Chaucer's Knight (London, 1980), passim

70. Rymer, Foedera, III, pt ii, 723

71. Froissart, Chroniques, I, 467

decrevit se transferre, et in Terra Repromissionis vitam praesentem terminare. Nam, ad pium ejus propositum attestandum, multum et ultra modum milites suos et armigeros, qui eo tempore quamplures fuerant, hujusmodi laboribus deditos et conscriptos faverat et dilexerat, ac eisdem propterea largas possessiones et donativa militaria contulit et concessit.⁷²

Although Bower states that it was death which prevented him fulfilling his desire, the financial demands of Edward III towards David's ransom must also have been a contributing factor. The brief vernacular chronicle known as the Brevis Chronica confirms David's crusading ambitions in terms similar to Bower's:

Eftir his hame cuming [in 1357] he began and guvernit the realme richt weill and nobilly, and purposit to have gane to the Haly Land to fecht aganis the Turkis; but he deyt in the meynetyme⁷³

Bower's statement that many of David's knights and squires were recruited for the crusade, and that David showered favours and generosity on them, is of particular interest. It will be possible to point to specific instances of this crusading desire and the king's resulting favour. What seems almost beyond doubt is that this crusading fervour among the king and his milites et armigeros was due largely to the influence of King Peter of Cyprus, and to have been

72. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 380. The words in square brackets appear only in the Coupar Angus group of MSS of Bower.

73. Wyntoun, Orygynale Cronykil, ed. Laing, III, 337

directed towards his crusading schemes of the mid-1360s.

Among the Scottish knights who joined the crusade of King Peter were the brothers Norman and Walter Leslie. They had previously been on the Baltic crusade in Prussia in 1356 in company with Sir Walter Moigne and others,⁷⁴ and so were perhaps receptive to the crusading ideal. On 25 November 1363 (which must have been quite soon after King David's meeting with Peter of Cyprus), a safeconduct was issued for Walter de Leslie and eight horsemen going through England or across the sea;⁷⁵ and in the summer following the two brothers were together in Florence. They acted as witnesses to a compact between the signory of Florence and the English "White Company", a band of mercenaries who had been made unemployed by the Treaty of Brétigny and had spent the following years fighting and plundering in Italy.⁷⁶ The Company agreed to serve the community of Florence against Pisa, having previously been employed by the Pisans against Florence; there is nothing to link the two Scots with this disreputable band in any way, and it is most likely that they were used as neutral parties or go-betweens in the negotiations which led to the compact.⁷⁷ Attempts by the

74. Rotuli Scotiae, I, 797

75. Ibid., 875

76. On the Italian background, v. J. Temple-Leader and G. Marcotti, Sir John Hawkwood (l'Acuto): Story of a Condottiere, trans. Leader Scott (London, 1899), esp. 30-1

77. For the text of the agreement, v. G. Canestrini, Documenti per Servire alla Storia della Milizia Italiana dal XIII secolo al XVI (Florence, Archivio Storico Italiano, XV, 1851), 57-60: "presentibus domino Gualterio Leseli de Schotia, et Normanno de Leseli de Schotia fratre suo".

papacy to reduce the menace of the "free companies" which plagued Italy after the cessation of hostilities between England and France, by persuading the mercenaries to join King Peter's crusade, met with little success.⁷⁸ It is likely that the Leslie brothers were in Italy for that purpose anyway, and their encounter with the White Company was purely incidental.

Other Scots joined King Peter's crusade. William de Ramsay and David de Berday, each accompanied by six men and horses, had safeconduct to go to the Holy Land on 5 December 1363, ten days after the safeconduct issued to the Leslies.^{78a} A safeconduct was issued to Walter Moigne and Laurence Gelybrand, going to the Holy Land with twelve horsemen and four servants, late in 1365; Moigne had previously served in Prussia in company with the Leslie brothers, and earlier had been captured alongside his king fighting at Neville's Cross.⁷⁹ The date of issue of the safeconduct in Rotuli Scotiae is too late to allow the knights time to reach Alexandria by the date of its fall (10 October 1365), but it may have been issued earlier and wrongly dated, or else the party may have set off intending to join the Cypriot

78. Temple-Leader and Marcotti, op.cit., 51:
Canestrini, Documenti, 85-6

78a. Rotuli Scotiae, I, 877

79. Ibid., I, 678, 797, 901

forces after the start of the campaign.⁸⁰

The writer who provides the most detailed account of the campaign against Alexandria, the poet-historian William de Machaut, was aware of the presence of a Scottish element in the crusading army. Peter's fleet set sail from Rhodes on 4 October 1365 and five days later arrived off Alexandria, totally surprising the defenders; the following day a vigorous assault was launched on the walls of the city, which met with stout resistance at first. One group attacked the Customs Gate, and was repulsed by a shower of stones from the walls:

Un chevalier y ot d'Escosse
 Qui ne fu pas mors de la bosse,
 Car il cuidoit le feu bouter
 En la porte, et sans arrester;
 D'une grosse pierre de fais
 Fu mors, et tués et deffais.⁸¹

(There was a knight from Scotland, who was not killed by the lumps [of stone], as he kindled up a fire in the gateway without stopping; he was killed, slain and undone by a great stone).

Although the Scots knight's death dismayed those around him,

80. The date given in *ibid.*, 901, is 15 October 1365, five days after the fall of Alexandria: but the date given in Rymer, *Foedera*, III, pt ii, p.783, is 20 March 1365/6. Unless they set out before the issue of the safeconduct, they must have been very late starters.

81. Guillaume de Machaut, *La Prise d'Alexandrie*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie, (Geneva, Société de l'Orient Latin, Série historique, I, 1877), 86

Car il y en avoit assez
Et de bleciez et de lassez. ⁸²

(Because they had enough there both of wounded and of
those left behind, i.e., dead)

the attack was pressed on until the defences crumbled, and
the attackers poured into the city. Alexandria had fallen
to the crusaders less than twenty-four hours after their
arrival before its walls.

However, the continuance of the campaign was to be
less glorious than this bright start. First of all, the
victors pillaged and massacred throughout the city; and
the following day, gathering their booty, they retreated
to their ships, led by the English, who had had enough of
fighting. Peter tried in vain to restrain them, and to
persuade them to stay and defend the newly-won city against
the Egyptian army which was soon to be advancing from Cairo;
he reminded the retreating troops that the emperor of
Constantinople and the Hospitallers of Rhodes had promised
to send reinforcements, and when that failed, he appealed
to the soldiers' honour:

Et que feront ceuls de Venise,
Ceuls de Gennes, ceuls d'Alemaigne,
De France, d'Escosse, d'Espaigne,
Ceuls de Behaigne et de Hongrie?
Certainement je ne doubt mie
Que cil ne doivent acourir
Qui vuelent à honneur venir. ⁸³

82. Ibid.

83. Ibid., 105

Machaut seems to imply that these were the nationalities who were prepared to stand firm while the rest, notably the English and Cypriots, wished to evacuate with the booty as quickly as possible. It is perhaps a pleasing reflection that after more than 250 years of crusading warfare the Scots were still noted for their steadfastness. It is also of interest to note that the Scot who met his death beneath a hail of stones at the customs-house gate at Alexandria was not the only one of his nation present at that conflict, and that some of his compatriots sailed away with Peter I the following day, helpless in the face of mass desertion and an advancing Egyptian army. No attempt was made to hold Alexandria, and the Egyptians were able to reoccupy the city almost as the last of the crusaders were boarding their galleys and sailing for Cyprus. Peter's great crusade was over almost as soon as it began, with nothing achieved but plunder and butchery.

It is possible (though by no means certain) that the Scottish knight killed in the assault on the customs-house gate was none other than Norman Leslie. The Coupar MS of the Scotichronicon mentions the presence of the brothers Leslie at the storming of Alexandria in passing, under the annal for 1427, while describing James I's visit to Inverness in that year:

In quo [parlamento] arrestari fecit Alexandrum de Insulis, et matrem suam comitissam de Ross, filiam et heredem domini Walteri Lesly comitis ejusdem, ducis de Leygaroch in Francia post mortem

fratris sui domini Normanni Lesly, qui manu forti
coeperunt civitatem Alexandrinam tempore ultimi
regis David.⁸⁴

Norman Leslie was dead by the year following the capture of Alexandria, since on 11 February 1366/7 King David confirmed a charter granted by his widow.⁸⁵ But it is equally possible that it was another Scottish knight who perished beneath the walls of Alexandria, and that Norman died soon after.

The second half of the fourteenth century was a period in which "chivalrous" knights carried out exploits of war against the heathen in a more independent spirit than had been the case in the age of the great passagia generalia of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. These knights would travel about the Christian world, and mostly about its frontiers, attaching themselves to the cause of an institution (such as the Hospitallers or the Teutonic Knights) or a kingdom (such as that of Castille or Cyprus) for limited periods of time, usually at times when wars between nations were in a period of temporary abeyance; they were to all intents and purposes mercenaries or soldiers of fortune. There is a splendid epitome of the career of such a soldier in the General Prologue to Chaucer's Canterbury Tales:

84. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 488n.

85. Aberdeen Registrum, I, 167: for a résumé of his career, cf. Scots Peerage, VII, 270-1

At Alisaundre he was whan it was wonne.
 Ful ofte tyme he hadde the bord bigonne
 Aboven alle nacions in Pruce;
 In Lettow hadde he reysed and in Ruce,
 No Cristen man so ofte of his degree.
 In Gernade at the seege eek hadde he be
 Of Algezir, and riden in Belmarye.
 At Lyeys was he and at Satalye,
 Whan they were wonne; and in the Grete See
 At many a noble armee hadde he be.
 At mortal batailles hadde he been fiftene,
 And foughten for oure feith at Tramyssene
 In listes thries, and ay slayn his foo.
 This ilke worthy knyght hadde been also
 Sometyme with the lord of Palatye
 Agayn another hethen in Turkye. ⁸⁶

(He was at Alexandria when it was captured [1365]. He had often sat at the head of the table of honour above knights from all other lands in Prussia; he had been on expeditions in Lithuania and Russia [possibly on one of the Swedish-Livonian raids against Novgorod],⁸⁷ more often than any Christian man of his rank. He had been at the siege of Algeciras in Granada [1342-44], and ridden in the lands of the Banu-Marin [of Morocco]. He was at Ayas and Antalya when they were conquered [both in Asia Minor, captured by Peter I of Cyprus in 1367 and 1361 respectively]; and had been at many noble expeditions in the Mediterranean. He had been involved in mortal combat on fifteen occasions, and fought for our faith in the lists three times at Tlemçen, and each time killed his adversary. This worthy knight had also served with the lord of Palatia [a Turkish emirate] against another heathen in Turkey).

86. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. F. N. Robinson (Oxford, 1957), 17

87. Christiansen, Northern Crusades, 171-91

There have been a number of interpretations of Chaucer's intent in painting the picture of his knight, which need not concern us here.⁸⁸ But it is worth noting that there were Scots of the fourteenth century who had careers similar to the one described by Chaucer, if not so bloody or varied. We do not know of any Scots who joined Alfonso XI for the siege of Algeciras, though there was considerable English participation;⁸⁹ nor do we know of Scots serving in North Africa or Turkey. We have plenty of evidence, however, for Scots serving in Prussia with the Teutonic Knights against Lithuania, and the level of Scottish interest in the Northern Crusade in the later fourteenth century is one of the most striking features of the period.

During the later fourteenth century, up until their decisive defeat at Tannenberg (15 July 1410), the Teutonic Knights pursued an expansionist policy on the south Baltic shore; although its aim was indistinguishable from any secularist expansionism (their aim was to unite their Prussian and Livonian territories by the conquest of Samogitia in Northern Lithuania), the Knights were able to wage the campaign as a crusade, because Lithuania was a pagan duchy.⁹⁰

88. Jones, Chaucer's Knight, is the most recent and hostile interpretation of this character. Cf. Chaucer, Works, ed. Robinson, 652, and the articles cited there, esp. A. S. Cook, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight", Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, XX (1916), 161-240; J. M. Manly, "A Knight ther was", Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association XXXVIII (1907), 89-107

89. P. E. Russell, English Intervention in Spain and Portugal in the Time of Edward III and Richard II (Oxford, 1955)

90. Christiansen, Northern Crusade, passim, esp. 251-3

Consequently, they were able to enlist support and recruits throughout the Christian world, and especially in northern Europe; the battlefields of the Baltic shore became a training ground for the youthful chivalry of the age.⁹¹

Many of the most distinguished soldiers of the day, including Marshal Boucicaut of France and Henry, earl of Derby (later King Henry IV of England), served in Prussia; William de Machaut, historian of the capture of Alexandria joined King John of Bohemia on a crusade in Prussia, and urged young knights to seek renown in the Baltic wars.⁹²

In Scotland, where there was a resumption of hostilities with England during the 1330s and 40s, it was not until the second half of the century that interest in the Prussian crusade began in earnest. It is possible that the Black Death, with the social disruption resulting from it, distracted men from the crusading ideal; but on the other hand, the mortality of the late 1340s left its survivors more prosperous than they had been before the plague, when the same wealth was distributed among a greater number of people, and (with the thought of death on all sides, and the chance of evading death by meritorious works available) gave nobles resources with which to undertake crusades and

91. Jones, Chaucer's Knight, 49-55

92. W. Calin, A Poet at the Fountain: Essays on the Narrative Verse of Guillaume de Machaut (Lexington, Kentucky, 1974), 211; cf. A. Prioult, "Un poète voyageur: Guillaume de Machaut et la reise de Jean l'Aveugle, roi de Bohême, en 1328-9", Lettres Romanes, IV (1950), 3-29

motives for doing so. Further, during David II's later years there was a large measure of rapprochement with England, which opened up foreign battlefields to Scottish soldiers. Thus in 1356 the brothers Norman and Walter Leslie, with Walter Moigne and Thomas Bisset, had a safe-conduct to go to Prussia with twelve horsemen, passing through England on the way.⁹³ Walter Leslie had returned to Great Britain by the following October,⁹⁴ when he was again seeking safeconduct to cross the sea (to an unspecified destination) with horsemen and servants.⁹⁵ In February 1362, David II requested a safeconduct from the English king for David de Berclay, squire, going with twelve men and twelve horses through England to Prussia.⁹⁶ After his return to Scotland from Prussia, David de Berclay may have joined the crusade against Alexandria, as he had a safeconduct to go with six men and six horses to the Holy Land in December 1363; this was shortly after David II's meeting with King Peter of Cyprus, and less than a fortnight after the issue of a safeconduct to Walter Leslie which, as we have seen, took him to Alexandria.⁹⁷ The death of David II

93. Rotuli Scotiae, I, 797

94. *Ibid.*, I, 814

95. *Ibid.*

96. *Ibid.*, I, 869

97. *Ibid.*, I, 877: a similar safeconduct was issued on the same day to William de Ramsay, going with six knights and six horses to the Holy Land; it seems likely that he too was joining the king of Cyprus's expedition.

in 1371 did not stop the flow of Scots to the northern crusade, despite the troubled state of the kingdom under the first two Stewart kings. In November 1378 Adam de Hepburn had a safeconduct to go with ten knights and ten horses to Prussia.⁹⁸ Of course, where we rely on the evidence of English safeconducts, we have no way of knowing the full number of Scots adventurers who joined the crusade in the North; the names which survive may be only a small fraction of the total.

During the 1380s, there was a renewal of Anglo-Scottish fighting, which included French intervention on the Scottish side, and ended after the Scottish victory at Otterburn (5 August 1388); Richard II was also faced by serious opposition in England which contributed towards pacification on the borders.⁹⁹ Knights from both England and Scotland took the opportunity of a new truce to set out for Prussia to earn glory and spoils in the fighting there. Thus when Henry earl of Derby wintered at Königsberg in 1390-91, he found a Scottish knight there, with whom he got on so well that he gave him a new year's gift of cloth.¹⁰⁰

98. Ibid., II, 13

99. Nicholson, Scotland: the Later Middle Ages, 193-9. Probably the beginning of the Great Schism in 1378 was partly responsible for the renewal of Anglo-Scottish hostility.

100. Expeditions to Prussia and the Holy Land made by Henry Earl of Derby in the Years 1390-1 and 1392-3, ed. L. T. Smith (London, Camden Society, new series LII, 1894), 111

Perhaps they had both been on the reysa, or expedition against Duke Jogailo of Lithuania which had besieged Vilnius (Wilna) without success in the late summer of 1390.¹⁰¹ Relations between Scots and Englishmen serving with the Teutonic Knights at Königsberg were not always so cordial. In 1391, after the departure of the earl of Derby (April 1391) and around the time of the summer reysa of Frederick, margrave of Meissen, the Prussian chronicler Wigand von Marburg recounts a sorry tale:

Interimque fit dissencio ex parte Anglicorum et Schotorum. Nam Dominus Wilhelmus de Duclos Schotus interfectus fuit in ponte juxta summum, (sic) qui cum uno pede ad foramen corruerat et viriliter se defendit, ut eciam unum de familia sua cum eo occideret.¹⁰²

This was Sir William Douglas of Nithsdale. His murder was also recorded by another contemporary Prussian annalist, John von Posilge:

Also a lord from Scotland, the lord of Douglas, was slain by the English at Königsberg, so that there was conflict between the French and the English, so that the table of honour was not held at Königsberg; and in this way the master [of the Teutonic Knights] and the visitors arose, and went forth upon a reysa.¹⁰³

101. Ibid., introduction: Christiansen, Northern Crusades, 158

102. "Die Chronik von Wigand von Marburg", Scriptores Rerum Prussicarum, ed. T. Hirsch, M. Toppen, and E. Strehlke, (Leipzig, 1861-74), I, 644

103. "Johanns von Posilge Chronik des Landes Preussen", Scrip. Rerum Pruss., II, 172

The reysa in question was probably the summer campaign of 1391, in which the margrave of Meissen took part. Among the French knights staying at Königsberg who were offended at the incident was the famous knight John Boucicaut, marshal of France; according to Boucicaut's anonymous biographer,

Comme plusieurs estrangers fussent arrivéz en la dict ville de Konigsberg... un vaillant chevalier d'Escosse, appellé messire Guillaume de Duglas, fut là occis en trahison de certains Anglois. ¹⁰⁴

Although he was not personally acquainted with Sir William Douglas, Boucicaut (who probably had reasons of his own for disliking the English wherever he met them) took up the quarrel,

nonobstant qu'il y eust grand foisin (= abundance) de gentilshommes du pays d'Escosse, who were all so terrified of the English that they raised no complaint. ¹⁰⁵ Boucicaut challenged the English to fight him over the offence, but received the reply that it was none of his business; the perpetrators expressed themselves willing to fight the Scots over the rights and wrongs of the matter, but would have nothing to do with an interfering Frenchman. According to Boucicaut's biographer, it was while things stood thus that the grand master died and was succeeded by a new grand master who immediately led out the reysa into Lithuania; in fact the master Conrad Zöllner

104. Le Livre des Faicts du bon Messire Jean le Maingre dit Boucicaut, in Collection Complète des Memoires Relatifs à l'Histoire de France, ed. M. Petitot, tomes VI-VII (Paris, 1819), VI, 431ff.

105. Ibid.

von Rothenstein died in 1390, and was succeeded in 1391 by Conrad von Wallenrod; the summer expedition into Lithuania usually set out in mid-August.¹⁰⁶ In defence of William Douglas's companions, it is likely that Boucicaut's very partisan biographer has exaggerated their timidity in order to glorify his own hero. The French account agrees with the Prussian historians that it was the summer campaign (almost certainly of 1391) which finally put an end to the dissension between the English and Scottish volunteers. The outline of the story is fairly clear; accounts in Scottish chroniclers disagree only in detail. Bower states that Douglas was chosen admiral over 240 ships going to fight the pagans, and that he was himself honoured at the head of the mensa honoris of the grand master; the number of ships certainly, and the place at the head of the table probably, are exaggerations, and Bower is probably also wrong to state that the murder took place super pontem de Danskin in Spruza, since the other sources all agree that the place was Königsberg (the natural starting-point for a raid into Lithuania) rather than Danzig. Bower adds some circumstantial details about the quarrel between Douglas and the English knight, whose name he gives as Clifford; this man has not been identified certainly, as this noble English house had considerable ramifications.¹⁰⁷ Boece's account of the story is based upon Bower's.¹⁰⁸

106. Christiansen, Northern Crusade, p.xiv, 164

107. Bower, Scotichronicon, II, 416

108. Boece, History, (trans. Bellenden), II, 354

Although Bower's figure of 240 ships must be an exaggeration, there is good reason to believe the statement in the life of Boucicaut that there were plenty of Scottish knights in Prussia in the early 1390s. As well as the reference to a Scottish knight who had a gift from the earl of Derby, there also exists a receipt, in fragmentary form and imperfectly dated, whereby Sir James Douglas (possibly one of the Douglasses of Dalkeith) acknowledges himself bound for a certain sum of Prutencialis monete to Sir Robert Stewart (of Durisdeer), which he promised to repay at Danzig next Easter, failing which he would not bear arms without Sir Robert's permission.¹⁰⁹ Although the precise date of the document is uncertain, Sir Robert Stewart's floruit was about this time, and it is possible that the two knights were among those who accompanied Sir William Douglas of Nithsdale to Prussia. Nor were these the last Scots to fight with the Teutonic Knights. c.1400, Sir John de Abernethy, with two servants and harness, had permission to go to Sprucia for one year.¹¹⁰ And at the disastrous battle of Tannenberg in 1410, where the expansionist ambitions of the Knights were finally extinguished, there was present at least one Scot: "le bastard d'Escoce, qui se appelloit conte de Hembe", survived the battle and carried back a report of the massive losses the Knights had suffered to Ingram de Monstrelet,

109. HMC Eleventh Report, Appendix IV, 210: cf. *ibid.*, 205, 211

110. CDS IV, no. 593

who reported them in his chronicle.¹¹¹ The "conte de Hembe's" report stated that the grand master (Ulrich von Jungingen) and the Knights and others de divers nations, totalling 300,000 Christians, invaded Lithuania and defeated the "king" and his army, killing the admiral of Lithuania and the constable of Sarmach (= Samogitia?), and 26,000 others. But the king of Poland (Jogailo, who had some years before been baptized and become King Wladislaw IV of Poland as well as grand-duke of Lithuania) reassembled an army and inflicted a defeat on the Knights, killing 60,000 including the grand master; but their victory was not without cost, as they lost 10,000 Poles and six-score thousand Saracens (i.e., Lithuanians). Obviously neither army approached the size described by the "conte de Hembe"; but Tannenberg was such a grave defeat for the Teutonic Knights that they were never again able to pursue an expansionist policy in the Baltic. The number of foreign recruits dwindled immediately, and in fact there is no record of any Scots visiting Prussia for many years after 1410; the Northern Crusade was effectively at an end. Besides, with Jogailo's marriage into the Polish royal family and conversion to Christianity,¹¹² it was increasingly difficult for the Teutonic Knights to present their war against Lithuania as a crusade after 1386.

Who was "le bastard d'Escoce, qui se appeloit conte

111. La Chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet, ed. L. Douët-d'Arcq (Paris, Société de l'Histoire de France, 1857-62), II, 75-7

112. Christiansen, Northern Crusades, 158-60, 219-222

de Hembe"? Clearly he must have had some connection with France for his report of the battle of Tannenberg to be included in a French Chronicle; probably he was fighting with the Scots on the French side in the Hundred Years' War. But the name of his county is confusing, and it has probably undergone corruption; perhaps in origin it was a Scottish place-name which the French found difficult. Also, the early fifteenth century was not a period in which the title "bastard of Scotland" was the exclusive property of a single person. Robert II had left some two dozen illegitimate children in a remarkably philoprogenitive career. The "conte de Hembe" may well have been one of them, but it is uncertain which one.

Thus one of the major outlets of crusading aggression was closed to Scotland. It had been popular while it lasted, offering the same spiritual rewards as the pilgrimage to the Holy Land without involving the same amount of travel. The Holy Land had not altogether lost its attraction, though; Sir Alan de Wyntoun, a relative of the chronicler Wyntoun, had died in the Holy Land after 1347,¹¹³ while Sir Patrick Dunbar, father of George Dunbar, earl of March had gone ad partes Jerosolimitani (sic) in 1356, and died in Crete.¹¹⁴

113. Wyntoun, Cronykil, II, 479

114. Fordun, Chronica, ann. clxxvii, 375-7, Sir Patrick Hepburn of Hailes, one of whose relatives had gone to Prussia in 1373, had a safeconduct to go to the Holy Land with twelve men and horses in 1381: Rymer, Foedera, III, pt ii, 131: Scots Peerage, II, 137

But after the failure of the crusade against Alexandria in 1365 interest in the Holy Land waned. There is no record of any Scottish participants in either the Barbary crusade of 1390 or on Boucicaut's disastrous crusade which ended at Nicopolis in 1396.¹¹⁵ Two Scottish brothers, Alexander and David de Lindsay, enrolled in the "Order of the Passion", a new crusading order founded by Philip de Mézières, who had been chancellor to Peter I of Cyprus and an enthusiastic supporter of his crusading ambitions.¹¹⁶ The Order of the Passion was founded in 1395 to be the core of a new crusading army; but although Philip de Mézières had visions and schemes of international crusading armies launching many-pronged attacks on their heathen enemies (schemes in which he envisaged Scottish participation), these remained crusades on paper only.¹¹⁷ The crusader of the fourteenth century had increasingly become an individual seeking personal satisfaction who attached himself to an institution encamped on one of the frontiers of Christendom; the days of the passagium generale had faded as society became increasingly complex and the number of distractions grew. Periodically, however, in the century that followed men of exceptional vision were to look back to the great days of the crusades, and attempt to revive the spirit of the past.

115. cf. J. Delaville le Roulx, La France en Orient au XIV^e Siècle: Expéditions du Marechal Boucicaut (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. XLIV, 1886); A. S. Atiya, The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages (London, 1938).

116. N. Jorga, Philippe de Mézières (Paris, 1896), 491

117. Ibid., 471, 503

Chapter 4.

The Aftermath of the Crusading Movement, 1410-6.1560

The Battle of Tannenberg in 1410 effectively brought the Northern Crusade to an end; and in the fifteenth century, a taste for "chivalry" was much less marked than it had been in the previous century. There were few of the great personalities, men like King Peter I of Cyprus, Philip de Mézières, or Marshal Boucicaut, to attempt to revive the crusading spirit of earlier generations. The Great Schism in the western Church, by splitting the Church, had effectively deprived the crusading movement of leadership.¹ Even the Hospitallers at Rhodes, trying to hold their island possessions at the eastern extreme of the western church, were caught up in the controversy and weakened by it.² Early fifteenth-century Scotland was in no position to aid the crusading movement; there had been an increase in internal unrest since the death of David II in 1371, and although the Albany governors were perhaps able to restore some measure of order, there was a constant threat of renewed war with England. From 1418, there was an increase in Scottish participation on the French side in the Hundred Years' War which was to continue all through the reign of James I.³ Some of the fiercest fighting

1. Clement VII Letters (SHS), 178 & n.

2. A. T. Luttrell, The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West, (London, Variorum, 1978): J. Delaville le Roulx, Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes (Paris, 1913)

3. Nicholson, Scotland: the Later Middle Ages, 249ff. passim

in the whole of that long struggle happened during the years from 1415 onwards, when Henry V renewed the war and won his spectacular victory at Agincourt.

In such a climate, there was no prospect of a united Christian crusade to recover the Holy Land, or even to push back the Turks from what they had already gained. Concern for the Holy Land was usually confined to pious hopes for an improvement in the situation in the west (which could hardly have been less conducive to a crusade), or to a peaceful pilgrimage to the Holy Land. This latter was becoming more and more common in the later Middle Ages; possibly a ratio could be demonstrated whereby, as the aggressive crusade became more and more impracticable, the peaceful pilgrimage became more and more fashionable.

One of the first Scots to go on such a peaceful pilgrimage in the fifteenth century was the distinguished soldier of the Hundred Years' War, Sir John Stewart of Darnley. According to the early sixteenth-century Extracta e variis Cronicis Scocie, he founded a collegiate church of the Virgin at Orléans, and thereafter went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem.⁴ He was killed in defence of Orléans against the English in 1429.⁵

He was followed some ten years later, by the heart of King James I himself. Possibly James modelled himself on his famous predecessor Robert I, whose cult was at a

4. Chron. Extracta, 235

5. Nicholson, *op.cit.*, 289

high point during his reign; or perhaps the decision to send his heart on pilgrimage to Jerusalem was taken after his death. Whatever the reason, this pilgrimage was much less spectacular than the crusade of his predecessor, and attracted much less notice; not even the contemporary chronicles, Bower's Scotichronicon and the Liber Pluscardensis note the fact. The names of the bearers of the king's heart to the Holy Sepulchre are not even certainly known, and the fact itself would not be known but for its chance mention in the exchequer records of James II. There it is recorded that an unnamed knight of St John of Jerusalem came from Rhodes, bearing the heart of the late king James, which he returned to the Carthusian monastery at Perth for burial, and received two payments of twenty pounds in 1444 and ninety pounds in 1445 for his expenses.^{5a} Dr. Annie Dunlop has suggested that the bearer was possibly Sir Alexander Seton of Gordon, who went on pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre and died in the east before 30 September 1440. He lodged precious metals and jewels with a Florentine merchant at Bruges on his outward journey, presumably as surety for a loan; it seems that when he died he bequeathed his goods to the Hospitallers, and the grand master of Rhodes had recourse to litigation through his Venetian procurator at Bruges for their recovery.⁶ This does not

5a. ER, V, 156, 179

6. L. Gilliodts-Van Severen, Mémoriaux de la ville de Bruges (Bruges, 1913), no.7; cf. A. I. Dunlop, The Life and Times of James Kennedy, Bishop of St Andrews (Edinburgh 1950), 31, 390, where the reference is incorrectly given.

make certain that Seton was the bearer of the king's heart; though it is very possible, as he set out for the Holy Land shortly after James's death and at the time of his own had some connection with the Knights of Rhodes, while one of the knights returned the king's heart to Scotland. Seton is known to have been a loyal supporter of James I.⁷

Alternatively, the bearer may have been Sir Herbert Herries of Carlaverock, who had safe-conduct to go to the Holy Land on 14 March 1438/9.⁸ Possibly he and Seton of Gordon went in the same company. Herries was one of the embassy who had conducted James I back to Scotland in 1424⁹ and in the following year he was one of the jurors at the trial of Murdoch duke of Albany.¹⁰ He had been knighted by the king at his coronation,¹¹ and so one might expect a career of loyalty to James I.

All these visitors to the Holy Land in the early fifteenth century were peaceful pilgrims, and one would perhaps expect a transition increasingly from belligerent pilgrimage (of the kind which continued sporadically in the fourteenth century) to peaceful pilgrimage. But that is only part of the story. Some Scots were found fighting

7. ER V, 156, 179; Dunlop, op. et loc. cit.

8. Rot. Scot. II, 313

9. Ibid., II, 244-6

10. William Fraser, The Book of Carlaverock (Edinburgh, 1873), 128-9

11. Ibid., 129

against the Turkish menace well into the middle years of the century. The Campbell family history known as the Black Book of Taymouth asserts that Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorchy (1400-1480) was "maid knight in the Isle of Rhodos", and family tradition points to a charmstone which Sir Colin "woir when he fought in battell at the Rhodes agaynst the Turks, he being one of the knychtis of the Rhodes".¹² Sir Colin was known as Colin dubh na Roimh because he "wes thre sundrie tymis in Rome".¹³ The tradition is so firmly rooted that it can hardly be disbelieved that Sir Colin was widely travelled in the Mediterranean, visiting Rome and fighting at Rhodes; but there is reason to doubt whether he was a knight of St John. His name never appears in the records of the Knights now preserved in Malta; he never seems to have sought promotion to any of the material benefits which the Order held in Scotland, though members of the order who had served at Rhodes were entitled to do so. His name does not appear, as a witness or in any other capacity, in any document connected with the preceptory of Torphichen or any other property of the Hospitallers in Scotland. Argumentum ex silentio can never be conclusive, but the complete absence of Sir Colin's name from these sources calls for explanation.

A further curiosity is that he was three times married.

12. The Black Book of Taymouth, ed. C. Innes (Bannatyne Club, 1855), pp.ii, 15

13. Ibid.

(possibly more),¹⁴ while the Hospitallers were a celibate religious order. He can hardly have joined the order as a widower, as his three certain marriages were all contracted after 1448, by which time Sir Colin was forty-eight and hardly likely to be embarking on a chivalrous career in the Mediterranean; if, as seems more likely, Sir Colin's service at Rhodes came before he was married, he must have apostasised from the order in order to marry. This is unlikely in view of the honourable place he occupies in Campbell family tradition. So one is led to the conclusion that Sir Colin fought with the knights of Rhodes in his youth (before 1448), but was not himself received into full membership of the order; the assertion that he was a knight of Rhodes may spring from a misunderstanding of the nature of Hospitaller knighthood in later family tradition, or from some honour that was conferred on him during his service, other than reception into the knightly fraternity.

There is a contemporary example of a Scot in exactly this position, who fought as a layman at Rhodes and was rewarded for his service by the grand master John de Lastic. In 1442 he was granted a pension out of the payment which the preceptor of Torphichen made annually to the common treasury at Rhodes; the magisterial bull conferring the pension on him was copied into the cartulary of St Giles Church, Edinburgh, where his name appears as "Diguerus

14. Scots Peerage, ed. J. Balfour Paul (Edinburgh 1909-1914), II, 174-5

le Scot".¹⁵ In the magisterial registers in Malta for 1454 there appears a confirmation of this pension in favour of "Duguethus le Scot".¹⁶ It has been pointed out that this name looks very like the Aberdeenshire surname of Duguid, a family which has branches in Auchenhove (Lumphanan) and Udny.¹⁷ Probably we should read his name as "Duguid the Scot", a name formed like "Duns Scotus", where a man is identified by his surname followed by a term denoting his nationality. The preceptor of Torphichen at the time was brother Andrew de Meldrum, who returned from Rhodes to Scotland in 1433.¹⁸ Udny, where the surname Duguid is common, is only five miles east of Old Meldrum; the Meldrum family had first become tenants of the Hospitallers for their properties in Ellon in 1345,¹⁹ and in the fifteenth century members of the family became knights of the order, and Andrew de Meldrum rose to be preceptor of Torphichen. It seems likely that "Duguethus le Scot" was a member of his household from a neighbouring part of Aberdeenshire who stayed on in Rhodes after Andrew returned to Scotland in 1433, making a career for himself but never becoming a

-
15. SRO GD 45/13/123, f.22r. edited in St Giles Edinburgh Liber, 66-7; the name is there printed as "Dignerus", but "Diguerus", misreading an original "Diguetus" or "Duguetus", seems to be the MS reading. Appendix I, no. 18
 16. National Library of Malta, Cod.365, f. 120r. Appendix II, no. 33
 17. G. F. Black, The Surnames of Scotland (New York 1946), s.n. Duguid; F. H. Groome, Ordnance Gazetteer of Scotland (1881-1885), s.n. Auchenhove.
 18. cf. Chapter 5, pp.312-3; safe-conducts issued to Meldrum appear in CDS IV, nos. 1058, 1066, 1075, 1104, 1137; one of his few surviving acta appears in Brechin Registrum, 89-90
 19. Fyvie Castle Muniments, no.2: Appendix I, no. 12

brother of the order, though achieving sufficient distinction to be granted a pension when he retired from active service and returned to Scotland in 1442. In the confirmation of his pension in 1454, he is described as servant of the grand master, who served the order for many years by land and sea, with manly striving against the infidels.²⁰

His career, perhaps, helps us to understand better what was Sir Colin Campbell's relationship with the order of St John. Both fought with the knights at Rhodes without ever becoming members of the order (perhaps through inability to prove the necessary degree of nobility required for admission); Duguethus was granted a pension of twenty gold écus annually, while Sir Colin was eques auratus apud Rhodos,²¹ which may indicate some kind of financial reward for his service as well as an honour. The two cases are very closely contemporary. It seems likely that the career of "Duguethus le Scot" helps to explain some of the apparent contradictions in the career of Sir Colin Campbell of Glenorchy.

Nor were these two alone among Scots who fought in the East as the Turkish menace pushed ever nearer to, and finally overran, the walls of Constantinople. A papal letter of 1455 mentions Alexander Preston canon of Glasgow who "went lately with a notable company to the Holy Land to fight against the infidels, and whose father and many others of

20. Malta Cod. 365, f. 120r. Appendix II, no. 33

21. Taymouth Book, facing p.10

his kinsmen have fought against the infidels in the lands of the infidels and been made knights";²² later it was said that he "has been fighting for about a year with twelve archers and more fighting men against the infidels".²³ In 1461 the pope made an appeal in favour of two Scots, Richard Murray and Peter Hunter, because they "for more than six years fought in Turkey for defence of the Catholic faith against the Turks, exposing their bodies to bloodshed, and have consumed all their goods in the said defence, so that they have become so poor that they cannot return to their native parts without the alms of the faithful".²⁴ Relaxations of penance were offered to any who gave alms towards their repatriation.

There may have been Scots fighting within the walls of Constantinople as well. The Genoese captain Giustiniani, who commanded a mercenary company in Constantinople at the time of the siege (1453), had with him a siege engineer skilled in countermining, whose name is given as "Joannes Grandus" (i.e., John Grant), and who is called a German in the Greek sources. But Sir Steven Runciman points out that Grant is hardly a German name, and suggests that he may have been a Scottish Grant who had served as a mercenary in Germany before enlisting with Giustiniani.²⁵

22. CPL XI, 158-9

23. *Ibid.*, 519

24. *Ibid.*, 590

25. Steven Runciman, The Fall of Constantinople (Cambridge, 1965), 84; George Phrantzes, Χρονικόν, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, 1838), 244

Perhaps with the return of more stable conditions in the second half of the fifteenth century there was also a revival of interest in the defence of Christendom, made keener by the inexorable advance of the Turks. The papacy still called for contributions to go to the aid of the Holy Land and the kingdom of Cyprus,²⁶ and during the pontificate of Pius II (1458-1464) it made a last genuine effort to organise a crusade against the Turks under papal leadership. Long before becoming pope, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini had visited Scotland, and in his writings has left one of the earliest and most vivid accounts of life in Scotland seen through a traveller's eyes.²⁷ When he became pope, he was remarkable for the sincerity with which he pursued his ambition for a new crusade. Having taken the cross himself, he died at Ancona in the summer of 1464, when about to set out; and it is significant that the crusading armies which disbanded on the news of his death were the last forces which seriously attempted to set out on a papally summoned passagium. Apart from the pope's own small force at Ancona, there was also a small Burgundian army which marched to Marseille under the leadership of Anthony, grand bastard of Burgundy. When they learnt of the pope's death, they first postponed their departure and then returned to their homes.²⁸

26. CPL XI, 36-7, 40, 401-2; *ibid.*, XII, 417-8, 493-4. 635: cf. Dunlop, Kennedy, 190-3, 206, 252, 335, 368.

27. Quoted in part in Dickinson and Donaldson, A Source-Book of Scottish History, II, 2

28. Richard Vaughan, Philip the Good (London 1970), 370-2

But it would be wrong to regard the Burgundian initiative in this last abortive crusade as other than sincere. Since the participation of duke John the Fearless at Nicopolis in 1396, Burgundy had been regarded as the natural leader of the crusading movement.²⁹ The dukes had built up over the years a wide network of alliances embracing much of Europe and even extending beyond. Duke Philip the Good and many of his courtiers, organised into the prestigious order of the Golden Fleece, took crusading vows at the elaborate 'feast of the pheasant' in 1454, on receiving news of the fall of Constantinople; they wrote to Louis XI of France expressing their intention and asking for his co-operation.³⁰ In the end, relations between France and Burgundy remained in such a climate of suspicion that only the modest expedition under the bastard Anthony in 1464 set out (even it got no further than Marseille); and in the next year Burgundian troops marched into France. There had been a chance, while Pius II lived and Philip the Good was not preoccupied elsewhere, that a new crusade might materialise. That chance was lost.

Even the death of Pius II, followed less than three years later by that of his friend and supporter Philip the Good, did not altogether end Burgundian interest in the revival of the crusades. Philip's son and successor, Charles

29. Ibid., 143-5, 216-8, 268-72, 359-72; Daniel Waley, Later Medieval Europe: from St Louis to Luther (London 1964) 181

30. Vaughan, op.cit., 143-5, 359-60

the Bold, shared his father's ambition for territorial expansion, but lacked his grasp of the realities of political and military power. He continued his father's anti-French policy, and this inevitably led him into difficulties with France's staunch ally, Scotland. It is curious that the resolution of difficulties between Burgundy and Scotland in the late 1460s helped to revive interest in Scotland for the wellbeing of Eastern Christendom, an interest which was to achieve dramatic proportions in the next generation.

The Scottish parliament, in the face of worsening relations between France and Burgundy, in January 1466/7 forbade Scottish merchants to trade at Flemish ports.³¹ Over the next eighteen months the effect of this embargo was felt so much that in September 1468 the town of Bruges resolved to send its own legation to Scotland in an attempt to get the ban lifted. One of the leaders of the embassy was a prominent citizen descended from the great Adorno family of Genoa, Anselm Adornes.³² The mission was successful, in that it opened the way for negotiations between Scotland and Bruges for trading links; but much more interesting is the personal success of Adornes himself. Not only was he able to befriend the Boyds, who were still in power, but he also seems to have won the admiration of the young king James

31. APS II, 87

32. Le Comte de Limburg Stirum, "Anselme Adornes, ou un Voyageur Brugeois au XV^e siècle", Messenger des Sciences historiques, XLIX (1881), 1-43, at 9-10

III. On 15 January 1468/9, having been knighted by the king's own hand, Adornes was created a member of the king's council.³³ James, young and impressionable, was probably at this time reading the Travels of Sir John Mandeville, which he had had copied in the king's chapel in 1467;³⁴ and Adornes was already probably planning the expedition which in the next two years was to take him to North Africe, the Holy Land, and the lands around the Eastern Mediterranean. Certainly it is unlikely that his travels were a sudden impulse of the spring of 1470; and the fact that James III later speaks of Anselm having exalted the kingdom of Scotland at the holy see and the courts of Christian princes as well as among barbarous nations of Saracens and Turks, suggests that he had discussed Anselm's project before his departure and given him vague powers to represent Scotland in these lands.³⁵ It was probably during his first visit to Scotland in the winter of 1468-9 that Adornes was granted the barony (or part of it) of Cortachy in Angus. That grant is not mentioned in the privy seal writ appointing him to the king's council, which does, however, mention that the king had girded him with the belt of knighthood with his own hand;³⁶ it is possible that the grant of Cortachy was made on a

33. Bruges, Stadsarchief, fonds de Limburg Stirum, 15 January 1469; Appendix I, no.3

34. ER VII, 500; cf. Mandeville's Travels, ed. M. C. Seymour (Oxford 1967)

35. Bruges. Stadsarchief, Cartulaire Rodenboek, f.270r-v; Appendix I, no.6

36. Bruges, Stadsarchief, fonds de Limburg Stirum, 15 January 1469; Appendix I, no.3

brief visit by Anselm to Scotland in the autumn of 1469, when after a visit to Bruges by Alexander Napier of Merchiston following on Adorne's first visit to Scotland, the Brugeois sent Napier back to James asking for a second embassy with full powers to conclude an agreement.³⁷

Napier's second visit to Bruges early in 1470 resulted in an agreement favourable to the Scots.

On 19 February 1470, Anselm Adornes left Bruges on his Mediterranean voyage, which was to last for more than a year. He has left a splendid account of his travels in the Itinerarium written down by his son John, which Anselm dedicated in 1471 to James III of Scotland. The Itinerarium has only very recently been published in full for the first time,³⁸ and its contents are so little known in Scotland that it is worth describing the journey in some detail.

The itinerary begins with an introduction addressed to James III. The author, John Adornes, eldest son of Anselm, condemns those who have no interest in countries other than their own, or who regard other lands as

37. Comte de Limburg Stirum, op. cit., 13

38. Itinéraire d'Anselme Adorno en Terre Sainte (1470-1471), ed. Jacques Heers and G. de Groer (Paris, CNRS, 1973); the portion of the text dealing with North Africa had been previously published in R. Brunschvig, Deux Récits de Voyage inédits en Afrique du Nord au XV^e siècle; Abdalbasit B. Halil et Adorne (Paris, Institut d'Etudes orientales de la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger, 1936)

as inferior to their own through their ignorance; such errors are not made by well-travelled men with experience of other lands. Several classical savants are cited as examples of well-travelled and experienced men, and also Marco Polo; the author enumerates all the lands which he visited in the course of his twenty-five year sojourn in the Orient, making clear that he had read Marco Polo and greatly admired him. He goes on to explain that Anselm Adornes had developed a thirst for knowledge of foreign lands, and especially of the holy places of Christendom. This desire had daily increased until the day when James III had honoured him with the belt of knighthood, when he could present himself as a true knight, as one in a thousand. His voyage was undertaken to enhance the glory of the king of Scotland, which, while already considerable, has now been further augmented; Adornes missed no opportunity to expound on James's power, virtue and nobility among the barbarous and distant nations he had visited. Now, they admire James more than any other western prince, and his subjects more than any other nation. At the end of his travels Adornes requested his eldest son John to write down an account of his journey and to dedicate it to the king of Scotland; he at first hesitated to do so because of his limited abilities, but finally, trusting in James's clemency, he composed his account of his father's travels in order to make the king aware of the ways and

lands of the infidel.³⁹ The dedicatory introduction nowhere mentions the crusading spirit; its emphasis throughout is on how men can improve themselves by increasing their knowledge and understanding of foreign lands, condemning chauvinist bigotry and promoting tolerance.

The dedication is followed by a table of contents or sketch itinerary. Between this and the first chapter is a brief note explaining to James that it was decided to start the book with a description of Rome, omitting the lands traversed in between, as James's own subjects go often to Venice, Pisa and Milan for commercial purposes, and often to the court of Rome, which is included because of its sanctity and importance.⁴⁰

39. Itinéraire, 26-32. The printed text has been checked against the only surviving early MS, Lille, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 330: "Itinerarium Anselmi Adornes Militis in Asiam et Africam descriptum a filio ejusdem Johanne de Brugis, post Annum 1470, et dedicatum Regi Scotiae". There also exists a 19th-century copy of another MS; Lille, Bibliothèque des Facultés catholiques de Lille, MS 1 M 24. A third MS was in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris in the 19th century, but has now disappeared: "Anselmi Adurni, Equitis Hierosolymitani Ordinis Scottici et Cypriae, Jacobi III Scotorum Regis et Caroli Burgundici Ducis Consiliarii, Baronis in Cortuhy et Ellikins, Domini in Ronsele et Ghendbrugge, Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum et Sinaiticum, 1470": cf. Biographie Nationale de Belgique, s.n. Adornes

40. Itinéraire, 32-42

The remainder of the manuscript, covering 168 closely-written folios with double columns, is an exact and detailed account of the journey, describing the places visited; the way of life of their inhabitants, and the character of their rulers. A careful note is taken of the date of departure and arrival and the length of time engaged on any stage of the journey. Particular stress is laid on the sites of the Holy Land, which reflects Anselm's piety; his father had had a traditional devotion to the Holy Sepulchre, reflected in the building of the Adorne's church of Jerusalem at Bruges. This conservative piety must be set alongside the enlightened tolerance of the introduction, and which pervades the book; although Adorne's description of Islam is reasonably accurate, he is in no doubt that the faith of Muhammad is illa perfida secta, even though it embraces all of Libya, most of Asia, and (most recently) a substantial part of south-eastern Europe.⁴¹ His interest in Islam is more concerned with superficial aspects of cult than with doctrinal differences, though he shows some interest in the law of Muhammad. In the course of his long dissertation de Fide paganorum ac moribus ipsorum, which covers folios 11-23r of the manuscript, Adornes even attempts to reproduce the Arabic alphabet, slipping up by adding that the Arabs do not write, as we do,

⁴¹. Ibid., 66ff

from right to left, but rather from left to right (sic).^{41a} Certain individuals attracted particular attention from Adornes in his narrative, not least 'Uthman king of Tunis, whose mother is (correctly) stated to have been a Christian child by origin, from Valencia in Spain; hence, according to Adornes, 'Uthman's high regard for Christians.⁴² He also devotes a lengthy chapter to Soltano /Chayra/ viribus moneta atque Mamalucis /eius/ (fos. 67-72r), in which he comments on the quality of Egyptian coinage, and attempts, with limited success, to draw a picture of an Arabic gold coin, (f.72r). But the description of the holy places of the Holy Land, starting with the monastery of St Catherine of Mount Sinai on f.81r and ending with Adornes's departure from Beirut on f.137v, occupies one-third of the whole book, and was clearly for the Adornes family the climax of their journey and the main reason for travelling in the first place.

Anselm Adornes, accompanied by his son John (who kept the diary of their travels), set out from Bruges on 19 February 1470. He cannot have been long returned from his visit to Scotland in the autumn of 1469; waiting for him on his return he found, staying in his house in Bruges, Thomas Boyd earl of Arran and his wife Mary, sister of James III. They were fleeing from the wrath of the king,

41a. Ibid., 94

42. Ibid., 126

who had recently staged a coup-d'état against the Boyd ascendancy. This makes it more likely that Adornes's intention to go on pilgrimage was a long-standing one and that his plans were carefully laid, so that even the arrival of the Boyds at his house during his absence in Scotland did not delay him from setting out on his journey. Not surprisingly, Adornes makes no mention of having shown hospitality to the Boyds in his book dedicated to James III.

Anselm reached Rome on 18 April 1470, where he seems to have been empowered to act for James III before the curia.⁴³ Then he turned north to Genoa, which he reached on 2 May. Here he lodged in the house of the Dorias, one of the chief commercial families of Genoa, but was also fêted by members of the Adorno family, from whom the Adornes family of Bruges were descended.⁴⁴ They embarked on a great Genoese galley on 7 May, calling at Corsica (12 May) and Sardinia (18 May), before arriving at Cape Carthage on the 25th. On 5 June 1470, Anselm Adornes presented himself to the customs officers of Tunis as miles Regis Scottorum, and received the king's safeconduct. John Adornes provides a Latin translation of the Arabic document, which his father treasured long afterwards.⁴⁵ In it, again, it appears that Adornes stressed his

43. cf. Bruges, Stadsarchief, Cartulaire Rodenboek, f.270r-v; Appendix I, no.6

44. Comte de Limburg Stirum, op.cit.; Biographie Nationale, loc.cit.

45. Lille MS 330, 43; Itinéraire, 138; Appendix I, no.4

connection with James III; the letter almost seems to imply that he was the king's ambassador. Charles the Bold is not even mentioned, though Anselm is de Flandria. Was Adornes James's ambassador? Was it even, perhaps, James III who encouraged him to set out on his voyage, equipping him with his own belt of knighthood and letters of recommendation to the king of Tunis (among others)? These are questions which will require serious consideration.

On 15 June, Adornes and his son boarded another Genoese ship (not that of Lodovico de Inghiberti which had brought them), whose master was Cosimo de Nigrono, and set out for Alexandria. The ship was full of Moslems making the pilgrimage to Mecca, as well as Jews and Christians; according to John Adornes, the sabbath was celebrated three times weekly, on Friday by the Moslems, on Saturday by the Jews, and on Sunday by the Christians.⁴⁶ Whatever pious bigotry the Adornes may have felt (and one suspects that it can hardly have been very extreme), they would have been forced to keep silent about it in the narrow cosmopolitan confines of a Genoese galley in the south-eastern quarter of the Mediterranean. The ship waited at Carthage for two days for favourable winds, then sailed for Alexandria, calling at the Aragonese islands of Pantalleria (23 June) and Malta (3 July). On the 12th the ship was delayed off

46. Ibid., 140

Crete by contrary winds, so that they did not arrive at Alexandria until 17 July. At Alexandria they noted that the city was less attractive inside than its external appearance had promised, chiefly because of the ruin and destruction wrought 'by a certain king of Cyprus' (per regem quemdam Cypri) -- a distinctly uncomplimentary reference to the raid of King Peter I in 1365.⁴⁷ The fact that Adornes was the knight of the king of Scotland bearing a safeconduct from the king of Tunis made little impression on the emir of Alexandria, who had him placed under watch and forbade him to leave the city until he had paid a large sum of money. Overall, Adornes did not form a happy picture of Alexandria, and was glad to set out (by mule) for Cairo on 2 August.⁴⁸

The party travelled up the Nile (which, according to John Adornes, rises in India and descends through Ethiopia on its way to Egypt) arriving at Cairo and its suburb of 'New Babylon' on 7 August. Like any modern tourist in Cairo, Adornes made a point of visiting the pyramids, which he attributed (according to a tradition current in the Middle Ages) to the pharaoh who enslaved the Israelites in Egypt.⁴⁹ He rightly considered, however, that the Mamaluk sultan of

47. Ibid., 162

48. Ibid., 174

49. Ibid., 190

Cairo was the most powerful Arab ruler of his time, controlling as well as Cairo and Alexandria in Egypt, the great cities of Damascus and Tripoli in Syria, but noting that even he feared the Ottoman Turks. In the royal guest-house the Adornes felt themselves constantly watched, cheated and overcharged; but they were able to go about the streets of Cairo unremarked, because of the constant crowds thronging the public places. In Cairo, the party made preparations for the journey across the desert which they were shortly to undertake. It was necessary to engage faithful guides who knew the way and could interpret (here the Adornes felt they were unsuccessful, for they could not trust their guides), to procure all necessary provisions for the inhospitable country they were traversing, and to obtain beasts for the journey; camels were found preferable to mules or horses. On 15 August they set out from Cairo for Mount Sinai in the wake of a large caravan, enduring a dangerous and uncomfortable journey, and arrived at the monastery of St Catherine of Mount Sinai on 24 August 1470. Here they stayed, visiting the monastery and the surrounding holy sites, until 30 August, when they rejoined their guides (who had been camping near the monastery), and, accompanied by brother Laurence de Candia, a monk of Mount Sinai, set out north for Palestine. After another disagreeable journey, made safer and more bearable by the monk's presence, they arrived at Jerusalem on 11 September.

The Adornes party visited all the traditional tourist sites of Jerusalem; as a family with special devotion to the city and to the Holy Sepulchre, they paid particular attention to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, which by lucky chance they visited on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September).⁵⁰ Outside the walls, the pilgrims visited Mount Sion, the Mount of Olives, and other holy sites around Jerusalem; slightly further afield, they visited the church of the Nativity at Bethlehem, and also made a trip to Bethany, the Jordan, and the Dead Sea. On 22 September they left Jerusalem and headed north again towards Damascus, visiting Nazareth on 10 October and the Sea of Galilee on the 11th, reaching Damascus on the 16th. Just outside the city, which impressed Adornes for its commercial vitality and the opulence of its palaces, he was shown the site of the Conversion of St Paul. In the city, he lodged in the very substantial Venetian quarter, where merchants were allowed to come and go at will during the day, but were subject to a curfew at night.⁵¹ For this reason they did not stay in the Venetian quarter on the last night of their stay in Damascus (27 October), but in a stable on the edge of town, so that they would be ready to travel at first light. In the middle of the night of 28-29 October, travelling through a terrifying thunderstorm over high ground, they arrived tired and hungry at Beirut. After a

50. Ibid., 246-50, 268

51. Ibid., 336

disagreeable scene with the local emir, who extorted bribes from them to be allowed to leave the land in peace, they boarded a Venetian galley at Beirut; they gave thanks to God, St John the Baptist, St Catherine and all the saints for their delivery from the land of the Mauri, who had treated them throughout with cruelty, extortion and perfidy, and sailed away from their territories with no regrets. Adornes complains constantly about these qualities (or vices) possessed by the Arabs, which seems to contrast curiously with the enlightened curiosity about other lands and races expressed in the preface; likewise his relief at leaving patria Maurorum forms a contrast to his devotion to the sacred places of the Holy Land. Probably his more generous emotions held greater sway in moments of calm reflection, while the discomforts and dangers of the journey, and proximity to unfamiliar native peoples, brought out his more chauvinistic impulses.

Their Venetian ship was bound for Rhodes, but called first at Cyprus en route; they arrived at Rhodes, after a near encounter with a Turkish pirate ship, on about 10 November. Here they were well received by the grand master of the Knights of Rhodes, John-Baptist des Ursins (Orsini), who assigned several brothers of his household to attend to their wants. Adornes expressed admiration for the work of the Knights in holding at bay the mass of Turkish might, at Rhodes and in the Aegean archipelago;⁵² and he commented on

52. Ibid., 362, 370-2

the system of promotion among the brothers, whereby the young knights undertake military tasks, while the older ones receive prebendis et beneficiis in emolumentis when they have reached a fitting age.⁵³ Had Adornes's Itinerarium been intended to promote a new crusade, though, one would have expected more information about the strength and organisation of the Knights, who must have been at the spearhead of any new crusade; but the description of the island, as much concerned with agricultural produce, native peoples and sight-seeing as with the grand master and his knights, covers a mere three and one-quarter pages.⁵⁴ Anselm and John Adornes sailed from Rhodes on 14 November for Brindisi, where they arrived eleven days later. The last twenty pages of the manuscript contain short descriptions of all the towns in Italy which the Adornes visited. The book concludes with a short conclusio, which returns to the moralistic tone of the opening, urging the reader (though in this passage James III is not directly addressed) to seek treasures in heaven rather than on earth.

Adornes and his son arrived back in Bruges on 4 April 1471, more than a year after setting out. When he returned, he found Thomas Boyd and the princess still staying in Bruges, and was shortly thereafter (25 July 1471) entrusted

53. Ibid., 364

54. Lille, MS 330, 142-145; Itinéraire, 360-366

by Charles the Bold with a new mission to Scotland: to reconcile Mary with her brother King James, and if possible to obtain pardon for Boyd.⁵⁵ They set out from Calais on 4 October, and were in Scotland early in 1472. The mission to reconcile James with his sister was a success, but the king would not accept a reconciliation with Thomas Boyd (who had discreetly remained in England while the negotiations were in progress). The letter of James III to the Duke of Burgundy, dated 14 February but without year-date, should almost certainly be assigned to 1472, and not to 1471 as C. A. J. Armstrong suggested.⁵⁶ It cannot be dated any earlier, as it was not until October 1471 that Adornes acted as an ambassador from Charles the Bold to James; Armstrong admits that 'to demonstrate satisfactorily that in the autumn of 1469 Adorne went to Scotland as a ducal ambassador (besides being the envoy of Bruges) is not easy', and there is no evidence to suggest that Adornes's visits to Scotland in 1468 and 1469 were other than commercial missions designed to restore trade between Scottish ports and Bruges.⁵⁷ The letter states that Adornes presented the duke's letter requesting a reconciliation between James and the Boyds iamdudum (some time ago); this might suggest that it was written after 1472, but may only indicate that James had

55. Comte de Limburg Stirum, op.cit., 22-4

56. C. A. J. Armstrong, "Letter of James III to the Duke of Burgundy", SHS Misc. VIII, 19-32

57. Ibid.; Limburg Stirum, op.cit., 7-14

delayed in replying while taking advice on the subject. The Scottish parliament met in February 1472,⁵³ and it is probable that we should see the letter to Charles the Bold in relation to that meeting. 1472 also seems a probable date for James's letter because it states that Adornes deserves a reward from Charles for his diplomatic skill; and on 18 April 1472 James himself rewarded Anselm with grants of forfeited land formerly possessed by the Boyds.⁵⁹ The reward was due, not only for his diplomatic skill, but also because he presented to the king the recently completed account of his travels in the Mediterranean and the Holy Land, with a flattering dedication to James.

Why did Adornes choose to dedicate the Itinerarium to James III? If he were intending to promote a new crusade (which is hardly mentioned in the book) a better choice of dedicatee would have been Charles the Bold himself; as we have seen, the Burgundian ducal house had a strong interest in all late fourteenth and fifteenth century crusading ventures. But the Itinerarium is not a crusading document, unlike those commissioned by Philip the Good periodically during his reign,⁶⁰ and it does not appear that Adornes's visit to the east was primarily inspired by Burgundian interests. Mgr MacRoberts is wrong to state that 'Adornes

58. APS II, 102-3

59. RMS II, 1060, 1123

60. Vaughan, Philip the Good, 268-9, 271-2; Itinéraire, 2-3

was commissioned by his sovereign, Charles the Bold, to go on a fact-finding mission through the Mussulman territories bordering the Mediterranean Sea, in preparation for a crusade that Charles the Bold had long had in mind'.⁶¹ Charles the Bold is seldom mentioned in the book, and there is no evidence that he was sent a copy; and the recent editors of the Itinerarium rightly remark that 'il semble hasardeux de rattacher ce voyage des Adorni, père et fils, au désir de préparer une croisade éventuelle'.⁶² Robert Brunschvig, another writer on the subject, points out that the introduction nowhere appeals to the crusading spirit, and is dedicated to James III rather than to Charles of Burgundy.⁶³

What seems more likely is that the journey was undertaken out of a mixture of family piety (the Adornes' devotion to the Holy Sepulchre), a genuine desire for travel to foreign parts, and the encouragement of the young James III. It was probably due to his friendship with James, rather than with the Boyds (whom he happily abandoned in 1472, and at whose expense he was enriched), that Adornes's career in Scotland advanced so prosperously; the king knighted him in 1468, and granted him the barony of Cortachy in 1468 or (more probably) 1469, and in the preface John Adornes states that his father had been reluctant to embark on such

61. McRoberts, "Scottish Pilgrims to the Holy Land", IR XX (1969), 80-106, at p.97

62. Itinéraire, 3, 12-17

63. Brunschvig, Deux Récits de Voyage, 144

a bold undertaking before James honoured him with the belt of knighthood, signalling him out as 'one in a thousand'.⁶⁴ Possibly the grant of knighthood, and the safe-conducts which must have accompanied Adornes, constituted him in some sense an ambassador to these foreign courts from the king of Scots; the preface states that at foreign courts Adornes had propounded James's qualities, and caused him to become the most respected western prince in Moslem eyes. Further, the safe-conduct given to Adornes by the king of Tunis styled him 'Anselm Adornes of Flanders, knight of the king of Scots'; as far as the Tunisian authorities were concerned, Adornes was acting on behalf of James, and we have no other documents from nations which he visited which can show otherwise. In a charter under the great seal, issued on 10 June 1472, in which James creates Anselm Adornes conservator of the privileges of Scottish merchants in the lands of the duke of Burgundy, he is described as a familiar knighted by the king and raised to honour,

qui nedum apud pontificem summum christianasque
Regiones verum etiam in exteris barbarijs
sarazenorum et turchorum nacionibus nos et
regnum nostrum decorauit.⁶⁵

Here again the strong implication is that Anselm was acting on James's behalf, in some official or semi-official capacity.

64. Itinéraire, 30

65. Bruges, Stadsarchief, Cartulaire Rodenbook, f. 270r-v
Appendix I, no.6

The question must then be asked, what was James III's interest in sending an emissary round the Mediterranean? It has been mentioned that in 1467 he commissioned a copy of 'The Travels of Sir John of Mandeville' to be made for his own use;⁶⁶ so it would seem that in his teens James took an interest in books of travel and guides to foreign lands. James also seems to have had ambitions of travelling abroad himself, which were discouraged by his parliaments of 1471 and 1472; they urged the king not to seek to increase his glory by travelling abroad, but to set about the administration of law and justice in Scotland, whereby his fame would be carried abroad.⁶⁷ But James does not seem to have envisaged his own overseas travels as a crusade. Only in the parliament of May 1471 is there a single resolution passed, urging the king to mediate between France and Burgundy, both at war and both Scotland's allies, to prevent war between Christians and help Europe to face the common enemy, the Ottoman Turks.⁶⁸ This is a far cry from the sort of enthusiasm which had gripped Burgundy in the 1450s, and which was to be found in Scotland itself a generation later. Probably Adornes's book was designed to suit the temperament of its reader, and to satisfy his curiosity; it is not crusading propaganda, but a careful and detailed account of wide travels addressed to (or

66. Above, 229 and n.34

67. APS II, 104; cf. Nicholson, op.cit., 474-5

68. APS II, 104

commissioned by?) a man with a genuine interest in that subject. It would be dangerous to read back into the reign of James III (as the late Mgr McRoberts does) an ambition which belonged properly to his son, or (following E. de la Coste) to confuse Adornes' mission in 1470-71, apparently largely at the instance of James III, with Adornes's later mission, when in 1474 Charles the Bold sent him as ambassador to the emperor of Persia to conclude an alliance against the Turks.⁶⁹ The later (abortive) mission was presumably assigned to Adornes because of his previous experience of oriental lands and rulers; but that does not in any way imply that Charles the Bold had any hand in organising Adornes's earlier travels.

There is no evidence that Adornes's visit to the Holy Land had any real influence on James IV and his projected crusade of some forty years later.⁷⁰ But some Scots did make the peaceful voyage to Jerusalem during the last years of the fifteenth century and the early years of the sixteenth. The German pilgrim Felix Fabri mentions Scottish priests among the clergymen of many nations who were with him on a Venetian galley bound for Jaffa in the summer of 1483;⁷¹ Sir Cuthbert Hume of Fastcastle returned to Scotland

69. Comte de Limburg Stirum, *op.cit.*, 24-6; E. de la Coste, Anselme Adorne, Sire de Corthuy, pèlerin de Terre Sainte (Brussels, 1855); McRoberts, *op.cit.*, 96, 93

70: For the alternative view, cf. McRoberts, *op. et loc.cit.*

71. "The Wanderings of Felix Fabri", in Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society, VII, 208-9

from an extended stay in Egypt and the Holy Land in 1509; Patrick Gillies, bailie of Peebles, had a respite to go to Jerusalem in 1509.⁷² Aberdeen cathedral library included a book entitled De Passagio ad Terram Sanctam in 1464. When Bishop Elphinstone compiled an inventory of the cathedral's relics in March 1497/8 these were found to include relics of St Catherine, St Helen, St Margaret, and the patriarch Isaac (presumably St Catherine of Alexandria, Helen mother of Constantine, and possibly St Margaret of Antioch).⁷³ One of the best-documented pilgrimages to the Holy Land (cut short by death) was that of Archbishop Blackadder of Glasgow in 1503.

The details of Blackadder's pilgrimage are sufficiently well known to require no more than a brief summary here; most of the details were collected by the late Mgr McRoberts in his work on Scottish pilgrims to the Holy Land,⁷⁴ and additional elucidation has been provided by Dr John Durkan, who uncovered the text of the will which Blackadder drew up in Venice before he sailed for the Holy Land.⁷⁵ The archbishop left Scotland in February 1503, shortly after founding an altar to Our Lady of Consolation in Glasgow Cathedral; travelling via Rome, he arrived at Venice, where

72. McRoberts, op.cit., 91; RSS I, no.1821

73. Aberdeen Registrum, II, 167

74. McRoberts, op.cit., 92-5

75. John Durkan, "Archbishop Robert Blackadder's Will", IR XXIII (1972), 138-48

he was formally presented to the Signory on 16 May. Marino Sanudo noted that he had an income of 2000 ducats (later he referred to him as "that rich Scottish bishop"), and admired the eloquence of his Latin oration in praise of Venice and expressing James IV's friendship towards the Signory.⁷⁶ On 1 June, Blackadder was among the foreign ambassadors who accompanied the doge on his ship for the symbolic espousal and blessing of the sea.⁷⁷ Less than a fortnight later, on 13 June, Blackadder drew up his will, which he lodged with the Florentine firm of Nerli.⁷⁸ This, as it turned out, was a wise precaution; Blackadder set out in a ship chartered from the Marconi of Venice early in July, with thirty-five other pilgrims (presumably all his own suite), and of these twenty-seven were killed by disease, including, on 18 July, the archbishop himself.⁷⁹ News of the disaster at sea was brought back to Scotland quickly, as it was known to the chapter of Glasgow Cathedral by 9 November 1503.⁸⁰ The ship that had carried him towards Jaffa did not return to Venice until about 14 November 1503, bearing news of the death of the pilgrims, including "that rich bishop of Scotland, the king's relation, who was

76. CSP Venetian, I, no.903

77. Ibid., I, 904

78. Durkan, art.cit.

79. CSP Venetian, I, 909

80. Glasgow Rental, II, no.233

treated with distinction by the Signory".⁸¹

Foreign travel was clearly as common for Scots at the close of the Middle Ages as it always had been; an increase of documentary evidence makes it appear that there was an increase in overseas voyages, but this may well be a distortion. Whatever the case, there must have been many Scots like Master John, whose travels are described in "The Thre Prestis of Peblis", a poem written probably towards the end of James III's reign:

For he has bene in mony uncouth land:
 In Portingale and in Civile the grand;
 In fyve kynrikis of Spaine all has he bene,
 In four Cristin and ane hethin I wene;
 In Rome, Flandaris and in Wenys towne,
 And uther landis syndry up and down.⁸²

These travels must have been made before the final conquest of Granada by Castile was completed in 1492; but there was one Scottish knight among the foreigners who aided the Spanish conquest. Many English knights had been made redundant by the general pacification in England following Henry Tudor's dramatic victory at Bosworth in 1485, and their names, along with those of French, German, Swiss, Swedish and others, have been preserved in the Archives of the crown of Aragon (as the campaign was directed by Ferdinand of Aragon, husband of Isabella of Castillo).

81. CSP Venetian, I, 909

82. The Thre Prestis of Poblis, ed. T. D. Robb (Edinburgh, STS, 1920), 4

Among these names appears that of "Joannes Villosotun ciuitatis de Neuburch regni Escocie" under the date 4 March 1492.⁸³ It is doubtful if he can be identified with any certainty. Neuburch is probably Newburgh on Tay, in which case the burgess's surname might be (de) Wallacetown; Wallacetown is in Dunbarney parish, a mile and a half east-northeast of Bridge of Earn. Alternatively, and perhaps less likely, "Joannes Villosotun" may have been a burgess of Newburgh in Aberdeenshire. A third possibility is that his name may simply have been Seton, rendered into Spanish as Ville Setun. It might cautiously be suggested that the name in the Spanish manuscript may represent John de Wallacetown, or John de Seton, burgess of Newburgh [in Fife], but it is unlikely that we can ever hope for real certainty. What is of interest is that, even as opportunities for crusading activity grew more limited, and perhaps tended to be replaced by peaceful pilgrimages, there were still a few Scots, like John of Newburgh, who sought out the last remaining outlets for sacred belligerence.

There can be no doubt, however, that by 1500 such belligerence had become the exception rather than the rule. More common was a peaceful and scholarly interest in foreign travel, of a sort fostered by the Itinerarium of Adornes and the books held in Aberdeen Cathedral Library,

83. Eloy Benito Ruano, "La Participacion Extranjera en la Guerra de Granada", Andalucia Medieval, II (Actas del I Congreso de Historia de Andalucia, 1976) (1978), esp. 317-9

the De Passagio ad Terram Sanctam already mentioned, and De Mirabilibus Mundi; such an interest is reflected in the heraldic ceiling of the nave of St Machar's Cathedral c.1540,⁸⁴ and more widely ranging in the curious list of the rulers of the kingdoms of the world copied into a blank folio at the back of the cartulary of St Nicholas's Church, Aberdeen, in a hand of the late fifteenth century.⁸⁵ Some of the names on the list are familiar from the writings of Marco Polo and from Sir John of Mandeville, but many are not. At the end of the list (which contains some 147 names) is a note:

Monsieur Robert de Pufflit chevalier natif de
Lauduthie de garles Aeste par le space de xxviij
ans pour verir lesdits Royaumes.⁸⁶

This person cannot be identified as Scottish; he may well be Welsh, as "Lauduthie" looks suspiciously like a Welsh place name beginning in Llan- (e.g. Llandaff), and "de garles" might be a misreading or misspelling of "de Galles" i.e. Wales. As the list, like this note, is in French, the whole may have been copied from a French travel-book which had been acquired by one of the canons of St Nicholas. There are a few marginal notes in a later (early sixteenth-century?) hand: "le Roy de Lettoria -- Crestyno with fyr" (which

84. J. S. Coltart, Scottish Church Architecture (London 1936), 222

85. St Nicholas Aberdeen Cartulary, I, 276-3

86. *Ibid.*, 278

indicates only that the list dates from later than the conversion of Jogailo in 1386)⁸⁷; "le Grant Cane de Castenne" (i.e., the Khan of Cathay) "-- hethynne"; and one which suggests an interest in natural history: "le Roy de Harzem -- her ar ye olifants".

Most of the interest in the Holy Land which has been discussed in this chapter has been peaceful, removed from the aggressive crusading spirit. But in the early years of the sixteenth century the crusading movement underwent a remarkable revival in Scotland, led by the interest of that extraordinary personality, James IV. It is uncertain from what source James derived his interest in the crusade. Certainly, there was much talk during the early years of the sixteenth century throughout Europe of a new crusade to push back the Ottoman menace, as it swept on past

Constantinople towards Vienna. Charles VIII of France is said to have toyed with the idea of using his successful invasion of Italy in 1494-5 as a springboard from which to liberate the Holy Land; Maximilian the Emperor is also said to have had crusading ambitions on the occasions when he was not preoccupied with the dynastic advancement of the house of Habsburg.⁸⁸ There was plenty of propaganda favourable to crusading being produced in the early years of the sixteenth century, of which two examples will suffice:

87. Christianson, The Northern Crusade, 158-9

88. R. W. Seton-Watson, Maximilian I, Holy Roman Emperor (London 1902), *passim*

one is the curious Livre des trois filz de Roys, which has already been mentioned in an earlier chapter;⁸⁹ and the other is the poem "The Ship of Fools", by Alexander Barclay.

"Le Livre des trois filz de roys, cest assavoir de france, d'Angleterre et d'escosse, lesquelz en leur jeunesse pour la foy crestienne soustenir, au service du Roy de secille eurent de glorieuses victoires contre les turcz", cannot be taken in any sense as historical evidence for any earlier period, such as Earl David's supposed participation in the third crusade. But as a product of its time, published in Paris in 1504, it can certainly be viewed as an advocacy of peace and co-operation between the rulers of France, England and Scotland from which victories over the Turks could be the eventual outcome. It is couched in the language of a romance, involving stock situations and characters (such as a prince who suppresses his identity and achieves notable victories in a subordinate capacity, and the traditional figure of romance, Fierebras); but its message is essentially a crusading one. "The Ship of Fools" by Alexander Barclay was written probably in 1509, and contains a flattering address to the new young king of England; Henry VIII is told that he may "got with his owne hande Jerusalem agayne", as he surpasses Hercules in manhood and Achilles in strength, and that he shall attack the Turks

89. Chapter I, p. 92

and Saracens and recover Jerusalem and the Holy Cross:

And ye christen Prynces who so euir ye be,
 If ye be destytute of a noble Captayne,
 Take Iamys of Scotlande for his audacyte
 And proued manhode; if ye will laude attayne
 Let hym haue the forwardes, haue ye no disdayne
 Nor indignacion, for neuir kynge was borne
 That of ought of warre can shew the unycorne.

For if that he take onys his spere in hande
 Agaynst these Turkes strongly with it to ryde,
 None shall be able his stroke for to withstande
 Nor before his face so hardy to abyde;
 Yet this his manhode increasyth not his pryde,
 But euir sheweth he mekenes and humylyte
 In worde and dede to hye and lowe degre.

The appeal concludes:

If the Englisshe Lyon his wysdome and ryches
 Conioyne with true loue, peas and fydelyte
 With the Scottis vnycornes myght and hardynes,
 Than is no dout but all hole christente
 Shal liue in peas wealth and tranqūlyte;
 And the holy londe come into christen hondes,
 And mony a regyon out of the fendes bondes. 90

It is impossible to say whether or to what extent these, or any other, items of propaganda influenced James IV in the formation of his own crusading ambitions. It is clear, though, that propaganda of this kind was very common, and that Christian princes spent much of their diplomatic time paying lip-service to the ideals which lay behind it. What is unusual about James IV is the way in which the crusading ideal seems to have become something of an

90. Alexander Barclay, *The Ship of Fools*, ed. T. W. Jamieson (Edinburgh 1874), 203-9

obsession for him; alone among the princes of Europe he took seriously the Ottoman threat, and was also genuinely concerned for the wellbeing of the Holy Land.

What was to culminate in a fatal attempt to promote peace and a new crusade started with a simple desire to go on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Rumours of the king's intended pilgrimage were circulating as early as March 1507, when Hugh O'Donnell of Tyrone wrote to James trying to dissuade him from a lengthy pilgrimage overseas, as his country needed his presence.⁹¹ James replied that he would not be dissuaded, but that he would not leave his kingdom until it was safe to do so.⁹² Towards the end of 1507 and in the early months of 1508 he dispatched a series of letters to Louis XII and his supporters as a result of a meeting with sieur de la Mothe, who had just been to Jerusalem and Alexandria.⁹³ It is likely that the pilgrimage of Archbishop Blackadder, who left Scotland early in 1508, had been intended to gather information for the king's own intended pilgrimage. There is no doubt that the king and O'Donnell were not alone in taking the project seriously, because in 1508 James received a gift from George Brown, bishop of Dunkeld, of forty chalders and seven bolls of oats towards the financing of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the

91. James IV Letters (SHS), 63

92. *Ibid.*, 70-1

93. *Ibid.*, 91

Holy Sepulchre.⁹⁴

But James had also begun to develop plans for the construction of a fleet, which would make Scotland a power to be reckoned with in north European waters;⁹⁵ and it was not long before he started thinking about combining his ambitions for military glory with his projected pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Early in 1508 James wrote to the master of Rhodes thanking him for his letters delivered by hand of James's former familiar, brother George Dundas, a man of fine accomplishments who has committed himself to warfare for Christendom; James has learned of renewed warfare between the knights and the Turks, and wishes them success.⁹⁶ Towards the end of 1509 James's ideas can be seen becoming more definite. He wrote to pope Julius II, saying that Louis XII had informed him of the pope's intention to summon an expedition against the Turks and to lead it himself. James declared that he was prepared to shed his blood for Christendom, and may have embarrassed the pope by asking whether he should be ready to set out the following year. In February 1509/10 Julius replied, telling James that he had come to terms with the Venetians, whose position and maritime strength would be invaluable to the proposed crusade.⁹⁷ During the first six months of 1510 James was actually involved in secret negotiations with the Venetians in an attempt to have himself provided to the vacant post of

94. Dunkeld Rentale, 247

95. James IV Letters, 30

96. *Ibid.*, 101

97. *Ibid.*, 166-70

captain-general of the Venetian fleet;⁹⁸ but by the end of the year the Venetians were more concerned about winning James away from his alliance with Louis XII and into the fold of the "Holy Alliance" of Spain, England, Venice and the papacy against France.⁹⁹

While James was dabbling innocently with ambitious schemes of world-domination, the realities of his position were becoming more difficult. He had perhaps misinterpreted Henry VII's policy of peace and conciliation as a sign of English weakness, and so was unprepared for Henry VIII's unscrupulous aggressiveness. The Holy Alliance made the prospect of a united expedition more remote, and with England becoming increasingly unfriendly, forced James to rely more and more on the effusive promises of the king of France. From 1510 onwards France was at odds with both Venice and the papacy, and for James's plan to have any prospect of success required the co-operation of France, Venice and the pope.

Although the time was inauspicious, James single-mindedly pursued his scheme. At the end of 1510 he sent an ambassador, Andrew Forman bishop of Moray, to France and then on to Rome to negotiate a general peace.¹⁰⁰

98. CSP Venetian, II, 63, 66

99. James IV Letters, 220-1

100. *Ibid.*, 184; cf. *ibid.*, 188-94 for a series of letters from James to the pope, the marquis of Mantua, the duke of Savoy, the emperor Maximilian, the king of Hungary, and the College of Cardinals, encouraging them to strive for peace so that a crusade can be prepared.

Forman presented Louis XII with a detailed calculation of the number of cannon, ships and men that would be required, reminding him of his promise to set James in overall command since he was prevented from going himself due to ill-health.¹⁰¹ However, in the course of 1511 relations between Louis and pope Julius continued to deteriorate, as the former would not abandon his strong position in Italy, and the latter found it unacceptable; by June, Forman had been sent back to France by Julius with uncompromising demands, and the duchess of Savoy was informed that "in conclusion, there is no longer any great hope for this Scottish project".¹⁰² Later in the summer, James wrote to the pope, regretting the breakdown in negotiations; the latter wrote back in January 1511/2, holding out the (incredible) prospect that the Holy Alliance might turn against the Infidel after France had been defeated, and encouraging James to join it.¹⁰³ In the same month, Louis XII informed Forman that the time was no longer propitious for a crusade against the Turks.¹⁰⁴ Events continued to go badly for James and his project, when a creation of cardinals came and went in March 1511/2 without Julius II fulfilling his promise to make Forman a cardinal at the next creation.¹⁰⁵ All indications are

101. Flodden Papers, ed. M. Wood (SHS 3d Ser. XX, 1933), no.III; *ibid.*, no.II, is perhaps Louis's reply to no.III

102. James IV Letters, 206-7

103. *Ibid.*, 211-12, 220-1

104. *Ibid.*, 222-3

105. *Ibid.*, 224; cf. *ibid.*, 200

that James was being used by the parties in their own interests, but with little regard for his aspirations. James's first serious attempt to launch a crusade had failed in its earliest stages.

James, however, was now bent on his project. The response from the princes of Europe had been polite, even flattering; and he still believed that there was a chance of a united Christian expedition setting out against the Turks under himself as leader. James wrote again to the pope about the project, and Julius replied in July 1512 that the project "may now become feasible".¹⁰⁶ But by September Louis XII had persuaded James to renew the Franco-Scottish alliance, while James was complaining of the pope's unfairness and harrassment by Henry VIII.¹⁰⁷ Certainly throughout 1512 there was a deterioration in relations between Scotland and England, for which Henry must be held largely responsible. In April 1513 Henry insultingly told Cardinal Bainbridge in Rome that King James was "more anxious to succour the king of France than for the peace of Christendom or any expedition against the Turks, for which he has no wish, and no ability if he had the wish".¹⁰⁸ Henry also tried in vain to intercept Forman, who was setting out on a fresh mission to try to head off war between France and the Holy Alliance, but Forman arrived at the French

106. Ibid., 251-2

107. Ibid., 265-6

108. Calendar of Letters and Papers, Henry VIII, I, no.1769

court by 17 April 1513.¹⁰⁹ If he and James had hoped for any greater success with Julius II's successor Leo X, they were to be disappointed; Leo angrily wrote to James urging him to break with the king of France,¹¹⁰ and sent Henry VIII a secret interdict to be published as soon as the Scots broke the peace.¹¹¹ James still believed that the best chance for him to be at the leadership of a new crusade was with the help of the king of France, whom he sincerely believed to have been wronged by the pope and by Henry VIII. He showed the English ambassador in Edinburgh "a littel quayr of four sheets of paper sowed together and signed at the end with the Frenshe Kyngs hand", promising James a levy of a tenth on all his kingdom within a year of peace being established, and a number of men-at-arms, guns and ships for the expedition. When James had read this aloud to the ambassador he added, "Now ye see wherefore I favour the Frensh king, and wherefore I am loth to lose him; for if I do I shall never be able to perform my journey".¹¹² James even stated that he was prepared to appeal to Prestor John if he could not get justice from the pope, though it is uncertain whether this was meant as a joke.¹¹³

109. Ibid., no.1499; James IV Letters, 302-4

110. CLP Henry VIII, I, no.2036

111. James IV Letters, 302-4

112. CLP Henry VIII, I, no.1735

113. Ibid.; James IV Letters, 302-4

In the end Henry VIII's harassment and Louis XII's blandishments combined to throw James's weight on to the side of the French. As Henry prepared to cross into France, James "sent eleven ships into Brittany to assist France, including one of one thousand tons and two of five hundred, the others of less burden. Part of these ships had been built for an expedition against the Infidels", as the Signory of Venice were informed.¹¹⁴ When Henry did invade France in August, James marched into the north of England, to meet disaster and death at the hands of an English army at Flodden on 9 September 1513, largely due to James's own military incompetence.¹¹⁵ He died excommunicate, as Henry published the papal bulls against him immediately war was declared.

The battle of Flodden, and the diplomatic manoeuvrings which led up to it, have received plenty of notice from historians, and a number of different interpretations. R. L. Mackie described James IV as a "moonstruck romantic, whose eyes were ever at the ends of the earth".¹¹⁶ Professor Nicholson comments that "this project... had overtones that were quixotic, and the problems that it raised were possibly

114. CSP Venetian, II, no.268

115. For detailed accounts of the battle of Flodden and events leading up to it, cf. R. L. Mackie, James IV of Scotland (Edinburgh 1958), 201ff., passim, and Nicholson, Scotland: the Later Middle Ages, 594-606; for more analytical summaries, cf. G. Donaldson, Scottish Kings (London 1967), 141-6, and J. Wormald, Court, Kirk and Community: Scotland 1470-1625 (London 1981), 6-7

116. Mackie, op.cit., 201

insurmountable";¹¹⁷ but he adds that "never before did western Europe stand in greater need of a grand crusade" because of the Turkish menace to Hungary and Austria and in the Mediterranean.¹¹⁸ Professor Donaldson contends that "An alliance of the princes of Europe against the invaders would have made very good sense.... But they lacked James's breadth of vision, and their only interest was their own aggrandisement".¹¹⁹ Dr. Wormald states that "James did not understand that the dream of a re-united Christendom could never be realised".¹²⁰ James IV and his ambitions can only be understood in the context of a continuing historical process -- the crusading movement. Scotland stood squarely within that tradition at the beginning of the sixteenth century, as it had done throughout the Middle Ages. Insofar as it had any validity at all, the crusading ideal was no less valid in 1513 than in 1095; and it must not be forgotten that only the death of Pius II had prevented the departure of a crusading army in 1464. But James IV did not reckon with the greedy, ambitious princes of his day; Julius II, Louis XII and Ferdinand of Aragon were "machiavellian" in their approach to diplomacy. Machiavelli himself was almost certainly referring to Ferdinand of Aragon when he wrote in

117. Nicholson, op.cit., 594

118. Ibid.

119. Donaldson, op.cit., 142

120. Wormald, op.cit., 7

Il Principe of "A certain contemporary ruler, whom it is better not to name, [who] never preaches anything except peace and good faith; and he is an enemy of both one and the other, and if he had ever honoured either of them he would have lost his standing or his state many times over".¹²¹

To this extent James's ideals were "medieval" rather than "renaissance"; but it is doubtful if either designation has much real value except as a label of convenience. It was faintly possible, for a brief period in 1511 before Julius's final and irreparable breach with Louis XII, that a united crusade could have been organised; had it been, James IV would probably have occupied a prominent place in it. But the opportunity passed, leaving James stranded on the wrong side (in that no crusade could have been organised without papal support, or the help of the Venetians); in the circumstances of 1512-13, the project was much less realistic, and it was in his attempt to pursue it while keeping faith with his allies (which no-one else was prepared to do at the time) that James prepared his own fate. But subsequent interpretations of the events of the previous five years are bound to be coloured by the magnitude of the disaster of Flodden. This could almost certainly have been prevented

121. Machiavelli, The Prince, trans. G. Bull (Penguin, 1961), 101-2 (cap. xviii). Machiavelli comments that "contemporary experience shows that princes who have achieved great things have been those who have given their word lightly, who have known how to trick men with their cunning, and who, in the end, have overcome those abiding by honest principles". Ibid., 99

by more skilful generalship on James's part, and the use of more up-to-date military equipment. As long before as 1498 the Spaniard Pedro de Ayala had detected the tragic flaw in James's military ability: "He is not a good captain, because he begins to fight before he has given his orders".¹²² The irony of Flodden is that it resulted from an attempt by James to prove to the world that he was a great military leader -- and the result was catastrophic.¹²³

As news of the magnitude of the disaster spread through Scotland, it was accompanied by a rumour that the king had survived the battle, badly wounded, and had retired to live as a hermit in the Holy Land.¹²⁴ With James's death ended the last revival of interest in Scotland for the crusading movement or for the wellbeing of the Holy Land. James V's interest in the church was largely confined to seeing how much money he could extort from it; in diplomatic terms he was much more "machievellian" than his father, in that he seldom honoured his promise and was a match for his slippery contemporaries.¹²⁵

122. Quoted in Dickinson and Donaldson, Source Book of Scottish History, II, 3

123. Professor Donaldson (op.cit., 146) suggests that the number of casualties may have been over-estimated because of the large number of important people who died. It has also been suggested that at one point the Scots came close to victory (Nicholson, op.cit., 605).

124. DNB X, 589

125. James V has been poorly served by biographers. Accounts of his reign by Professor Donaldson (e.g., James V - James VII, 43-62), are rather unsympathetic towards the king.

There are a few instances of contacts with the Holy Land and the crusading institutions into the sixteenth century. In 1520 a monk of St Catherine of Mount Sinai was in Edinburgh recruiting members for the confraternity of Mount Sinai, and succeeded in recruiting Richard Maitland of Lethington into the confraternity.¹²⁶ In 1530 the grand master of the Hospitallers, brother Philip de Villers l'Isle-Adam, wrote to James V as a prince "whom the order acknowledges as patron and protector", notifying him of the acquisition of Malta and Gozo for the order as a base for continued warfare against the Turks.¹²⁷ On the whole, James V's correspondence is devoid of the frequent references to crusading which fill the letters of his father.¹²⁸ But the king was impressed by Thomas Doughty, who had fought against the Turks in the eastern Mediterranean and returned to Musselburgh in 1533 to establish a hermitage of Our Lady of Loretto in the burgh, modelled on the shrine of Loretto in Italy;¹²⁹ James gave to his chapel materials for making vestments and altar-cloths in 1534 and 1537,¹³⁰ but some

126. Edinburgh Sciennes Liber (Abbotsford Club), 84-7

127. James V Letters, ed. R. K. Hannay and D. Hay (Edinburgh, 1954), 180

128. *Ibid.*, 181-2, 188, 211-2, 223-4, 329, 353

129. RMS 1513-1546, 309-10

130. TA VI, 200-1, 299

contemporaries influenced by reforming ideas from the continent were sceptical of the genuineness of the hermit and his miracles.¹³¹ Another hermit, John Scott of Jedburgh, was also under suspicion from men of reformed opinion for his doubtful relics of the Holy Land.¹³² The statement of the late Mgr McRoberts, that "as the unity of the medieval church collapsed in the middle decades of the sixteenth century, the Scottish pilgrims to the Holy Land grew fewer and fewer",¹³³ is borne out by the evidence studied by the present writer. They also appear to have been treated with less respect on their return. Pilgrimage, like crusade, was a declining fashion. It is worth noting finally that when Erasmus published his criticism of warfare against the Turk (1529) he sent a copy, along with a dedicatory letter, to his former pupil and colleague, Hector Boece, principal of King's College, Aberdeen.¹³⁴ Boece had been brought to Aberdeen by bishop William Elphinstone, who had himself been an opponent of the policies which led James IV to Flodden.¹³⁵ By the sixteenth century, the old assumptions

131. Diurnal of Remarkable Occurents (Edinburgh, Aitland Club, 1833) 17: cf. John Knox, Works, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, Wodrow Soc. 1895), I, 72-6 and nn.

132. David Calderwood, History of the Kirk in Scotland (Wodrow Soc., 1842), 101

133. McRoberts, art. cit., 100

134. Desiderius Erasmus, Opus Epistolarum, ed. L. S. Allen and H. M. Allen (Oxford, 1906-1948), VIII, 372-7; the "Consultatio de Bello Turcis Inferendo" is printed in Desiderius Erasmus, Opera Omnia, ed. Peter Vander Aa (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703), V.

135. John Durkan, "Early Humanism and King's College", Aberdeen University Review, no. clxiii (1980), 259-279

which had buttressed medieval Christendom for centuries were being questioned more often and from a greater number of angles; and the traditional arguments which had been put forward in their defence were no longer accepted as valid. The "renaissance world" which was trying to digest the new ideas of such varied men as Machiavelli, Erasmus and Luther, had little time to think about crusading.