

# **The Battle of the Standard (1138): A benchmark of Norman and English assimilation.**

**200763510\_Oct2017**

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Liverpool  
for the degree of Master of Philosophy.

Ronald Richard Greenwald

10-05-2017



## ABSTRACT

This dissertation will explore the social science construct of assimilation between the Norman English and the English two generations after the conquest of England in 1066. The Normans English shall be identified as the descendants of Continentals that either fought alongside Duke William at the battle of Hastings or followed shortly thereafter. The English shall be identified as the descendants of the subjects of Edward the Confessor.

This thesis is about perceptions. Many people can perceive the same man very differently. He may be an uncle, son, or brother. He might be a member of a *gens*, which has more than one nationality, religion, language or set of mores. This thesis examines the relationship between two *gentes* that shared a nationality, a government, a language, a religion and the holy relics of indigenous saints. Yet, they were separated by the perception that they were different. This thesis examines this perception of differences with medieval charters and poems and the work of historians: medieval, nineteenth century, and modern.

The battle of the Standard (1138) shall be used as a benchmark to assess the degree of assimilation between the Normans and English. Seventy-two years after the Norman Conquest, this battle took place at Northallerton between the forces of the Scottish King David and a disparate coalition of Yorkshire noblemen of Continental descent, Flemish mercenaries, English and Anglo-Scandinavian parish fyrds and a small contingent sent by a distant king occupied in an internecine war of succession. By this time the bilingual Norman English had co-opted an English identity, yet were still proud of their Norman heritage. In the next fifteen years, two of the chroniclers, Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx, writing about the battle, stripped these

Norman Englishmen of their patina of Englishness and extolled their Norman exclusivity and superiority.

In recent decades, the idea has been established that chroniclers attempted to create a single *gens* in England during the 1120s. Historians have theorised that medieval clerics used the term 'barbarians' for the Christian Welsh, Scots and Irish to create an 'otherness', which fulfilled the assimilation of the Normans and English.

This thesis shall refute this argument.

Nancy,

my love

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation could not have succeeded without the guidance of Clare. Dr. Clare Downham, senior lecturer at the Institute for Irish Studies, University of Liverpool, is my senior supervisor and my enthusiastic mentor. I would not be here without her.

This dissertation would also not have been possible without my muse, Dr. Patricia de Leeuw, Vice Provost for Faculty at Boston College, who inspired me. This year Pat stepped up and became my second supervisor. I am very proud to say I have two strong women guiding me.

There are so many people I need to thank. My family and friends will be pleasantly surprised when they learn of my accomplishment, and I must thank them for all their support. This dissertation could not have been written save for my students at Mount Ida College who allowed me to vent for many years. Academia is different than many professions. I had full professors answer my questions, critique chapters and encourage me. Most of these men and women I either met once at a conference or never met at all. So, I want to thank: Stephanie Christelow; Mary Dockray-Miller; John Gillingham; Graham Loud; Keith Stringer; Fiona Edmonds; Sally Shockro; Matthew Hammond; Hugh Thomas; Judith Green; Emily Albu; Charlotte Newman; Robin Fleming; Paul Hayward; and Loring Danforth.

I must thank some phenomenal librarians at O'Neill Library, and at the Theology and Ministry Library, Boston College. And thank you to the librarians at Mugar Library, the Law Library and the School of Theology Library at Boston University; Goldfrab Library, Brandeis University; Queen's Mother's Library, University of Aberdeen; Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool, and Clapp Library, Wellesley College.

I would not be here without the total love of two very special ladies, the diva, Nala and little Miss Cassandra. I also need to thank my four very special students who are far more than students but an integral part of my life: Jessy; Antwan; Kristin; and Nicole. I also need to mention Steve Li who would be very upset if he was ignored. This is for Nancy, my wife of thirty-nine years. She loves me more than I know and certainly far more than I deserve.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Abbreviations	vii
Notes on Terminology	1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	2
<b>BARBARIANS</b>	3
The Definition of ‘Barbarians’	3
‘Barbarian’ Acculturation	4
Ethnogenesis	6
The Traditionskern school	8
<i>GENS</i>	9
Evolving Definition of <i>Gens</i>	9
Expanding Definition of <i>Gens</i>	11
Evolving Characteristics of <i>Gens</i>	11
Organisation of the <i>Gens</i>	14
<i>Gens, Exercitus, and Regnum</i>	15
<b>ACCULTURATION AND ASSIMILATION</b>	17
Acculturation	18
Examples of Acculturation and Assimilation in Medieval England	20
Assimilation	21
Conclusion to the Introduction	23



<b>CHAPTER ONE; THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH ANS NORMAN ENGLISH ASSIMILATION</b>	25
Introduction	25
Assimilation and Acculturation: pre-20 <sup>th</sup> century national historians	27
Assimilation and Acculturation: Nineteenth Century Yorkshire	30
Historians Assimilation and Acculturation: 20 <sup>th</sup> century perspectives	33
‘The Gillingham thesis’	37
Civilizing the English	39
The ‘Barbarian fringe’	42
Ethnic Hatred of the Scots	44
Northern England or Southern Scotland?	48
Institutions	50
The Aristocracy	51
The Monarchy	53
The Church	56
Laws	61
Intermarriage	65
Language	69
The Problems with Nomenclature-what is <i>Gens</i> and what is <i>Natio</i> ?	72
Conclusion to Chapter One	73
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARD</b>	77
Introduction	77
<b>BACKGROUND</b>	79
David’s Motives	86
The Scottish Army	91
The ‘Southern’ Army	97
Southern Commander	101
Battle Order	103
Religious Overtones	106
Negotiations	114
<b>BATTLE ORATIONS</b>	119
John Bliese	125
‘Show Bravery, Win Honour’	128
‘Our Cause is Just’	129
‘God Will Help Us’	130
‘We Have Some Military Advantage’	131
‘You Should Not Try to Flee	132
‘Defend Yourself, Family, and Country’	132
‘Reminder of Victory’	134

‘Vengeance’	135
‘Remember our Nation’s Reputation’	136
‘A Small Force Can Beat a Larger One’	136
‘Promise Eternal Rewards of Martyrdom’	137
Conclusion to the Battle Orations	138
THE BATTLE OF THE STANDFARD	140
The Initial Charge	141
The Response	145
Earl Henry’s Charge	147
The Outcome of the Battle	150
Conclusion to the Battle	152
Conclusion to Chapter Two	154
<b>CHAPTER THREE; MEDIEVAL SOURCES THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARD</b>	159
<b>PART ONE; THE MINOR SOURCES</b>	160
The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles (E) (1-1154)	164
<i>Chronicon ex Chronicis</i>	164
<i>Vita Thrustani Archiepiscopo Auctore Anonymo</i>	165
William of Newburgh, <i>Historia Anglorum</i>	167
<i>Annales of Dunstaplia</i>	168
<i>Annales Monasterii de Osnei</i>	168
<i>Chronicon Vulgo Dictum Chronicon Wykes</i>	169
<i>Annales de Theokesberia</i>	170
<i>Annales Monasterii de Waverleia</i>	171
Gervase of Canterbury, <i>Chronica</i>	172
MINOR NON-ENGLISH SOURCES	173
Orderic Vitalis, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>	173
<i>Chronicon Sanctae Crucis and Chronicon Anglo-Scotticum</i>	175
<i>The Chronicle of Melrose</i>	176
Robert de Torigni, <i>Chronicon</i>	177
<i>Annales de Monte Fernandi</i>	178
<i>Chronica Regum Manniæ et Insularum</i>	178
Conclusion to Minor Sources	179
PART TWO; THE MAJOR SOURCES	180
Introduction	180
Richard, Prior of Hexham, <i>Historia de gestis regis Stephani de bello de standardii</i>	181
John, Prior of Hexham, <i>History of the Church of Hexham</i>	183
Ailred of Rievaulx, <i>Relatio de Standardo</i>	186
Henry of Huntingdon, <i>Historia Anglorum</i>	192

<i>Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene</i>	195
<i>Rogeri de Wendover Chronica sive Flores Historiarum</i>	198
Matthew Paris, <i>Chronica Majora</i>	200
Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover	202
<i>Proceres Angliae</i>	203
<i>Incipit Descriptio Serlonis Monachi</i>	204
William of Malmesbury	207
Conclusion to the Major Sources	210
<b>THE CONCLUSION</b>	212
<b>APPENDICES</b>	226
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	243

### ABBREVIATIONS

ANS	Anglo-Norman Studies: Proceedings of the Battle Conference
AR	Aelred of Rievaulx: <i>The Historical Works</i> , ed. Marsha Dutton and trans. by Jane Patricia Freeland (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005).
AR 'Introduction'	'Introduction: A Mirror of Twelfth-Century England', p. 1-37. 'Lament for David, King of Scots', pp. 45-70;
AR Genealogy	'The Genealogy of the English Kings', pp. 71-122; 'The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor', pp. 125-243 and
AR Battle	'The Battle of the Standard in the Time of King Stephen', pp. 247-69.
ASC 1	'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (60 B.C. – A. D. 1042)' in <i>English Historical Documents</i> , ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, 12 vols, 2nd edn (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) i. (c. 500-1042), pp. 145- 260.
ASC 2	'Anglo Saxon Chronicle (1042-1154)' in <i>English Historical Documents</i> , ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway, 12 vols, 2nd edn, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979), ii. (1042-1189), pp. 103-215.
AM	<i>Annales Monastici</i> , ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, 36, 5 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1864-69).

AM Tewkesbury	I. De Margram Theokesberia (Tewkesbury) ii. Annals of Tewkesbury
AM Waverley	II. <i>De Wintonia (Winchester) et Waverleia</i> (Waverley) i. Annals of Winchester
AM Dunstable	ii. Annals of Waverley III. <i>De Dunstaplia (Dunstable) et Bermundeseia</i> Bermondsley) i. Annals of Dunstable
AM Osney	IV. <i>De Oseneia (Osney)</i> i. Annals of Osney
AM Wykes	ii. Chronicle of Thomas de Wykes
<i>Bello</i>	<i>De Bello Standardii Tempore Stephani Regis.</i> (Twisden et Selden Rerum Anglic. Script. X, Londini, 1652, I, 337.)
BIHR	Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research

<i>Carmen</i> Barlow	Guy, Bishop of Amiens, <i>The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio of Guy, Bishop of Amiens</i> , ed. and trans. by Frank Barlow (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).
<i>Carmen</i> Morton	Guy, Bishop of Amiens, <i>Carmen de Hastingae Proelio</i> , ed. by Catherine Morton and Hope Muntz (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
CCCC	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
CDI	<i>The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I, King of Scots, 1123-53, and his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52</i> , ed. by G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 1999).
Chronicle Melrose	<i>The Chronicle of Melrose from the Cottonian Manuscript. Faustina B. IX in the British Museum</i> , ed. by A. O. Anderson and M. O. Anderson (London: Percy Lund, Humphries, 1936).
CSHR	<i>Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I</i> , ed. by R. Howlett, Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1884-1890).
CSHR WN	I. William of Newburgh, <i>Historia Rerum Anglicarum</i> books I-IV. II. William of Newburgh, <i>Historia Rerum Anglicarum</i> book V.
CSHR GS	III. i. <i>Gesta Stephani Regis Anglorum</i> .
CSHR RHe	ii. Richard of Hexham, <i>Historia de gestis regis Stephani et bello de standardii</i> (1135-39)
CSHR <i>Relatio</i>	iii. Aelred of Rievaulx, <i>Relatio de Standardo</i>
CSHR RT <i>CHE</i>	IV. Robert de Torigni, <i>Chronicle</i> , 1890 <i>The Church Historians of England</i> , ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson 8 vols (London: Seeley, 1856)
<i>CHE</i> SD	3-2, Simeon of Durham, <i>Simeon of Durham's History of the Kings of England</i>
CH JPH	4-1, John, Prior of Hexham, <i>The History of the Church at Hexham</i> , pp. 3-32.
CH RPH	4-1, Richard, Prior of Hexham, <i>The Acts of King Stephen, and the Battle of the Standard by Richard, Prior of Hexham, from A. D. 1135 to A. D. 1139</i> , pp. 35-58.
CH Chron. Holy	4-1, <i>The Chronicle of Holyrood</i> , pp. 61-75.
CH Chron. Mel	4-1, <i>The Chronicle of Melrose</i> , pp. 79-242.
CH WN	4-2, <i>The History of William of Newburgh</i> , pp. 398-672.
CH RT	4-2, <i>The Chronicle of Robert de Monte</i> , pp. 673-813
CH CIM	5-1, <i>The Chronicle of the Isle of Man</i> , pp. 385-405.

- Dialogi, Serlo *(Incipit Descriptio Serlonis Monarchi, fratris Radulphi, Abbatis de Parcho, de bello inter Regem Scotiae et Barones Angliae)* in Lawrence of Durham, *Dialogi Laurentii Dunelmensis Monachi ac Prioris*, ed. by James Raine (Durham: Andrews and Company, 1880), pp.74-76.
- Dudo Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans*, trans. by Eric Christiansen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998).
- EHR English Historical Review
- ESC *Early Scottish Charters; Prior to A. D. 1153; collected, with Notes and an Index*, ed. by Archibald C. Lawrie (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905).
- ESSH *Early Sources of Scottish History, A. D. 500 to 1286*, trans. by Alan Orr Anderson, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1922).
- Etym. IX* Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae, Book IX*, ed. Marc Reydellet, *Auteurs Latins du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1984).
- EYC *Early Yorkshire Charters*, ed. by William Farrar, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Ballytine, Hanson and Co., 1914).
- GC Gervase of Canterbury, *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. by W. Stubbs, *Rolls Series*, 2 vols (London: London Record Office, 1880).
- HA Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People*, ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- Hardy *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials Relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the End of the Reign of Henry VII*, ed. by Thomas Duffus Hardy, vol ii 1066-1200 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1865).
- HCY *The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. by James Raine, *Rolls series*, 71, 3 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1879-94).
- JMH Journal of Medieval History

- JW John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. by Reginald R. Darlington and Patrick McGurk, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
- MP Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, 2 vols Rolls Series 57 (London, Longman's & Co., 1874).
- ODNB Oxford Dictionary of National Biography  
'<http://www.oxforddnb.com>'
- OV Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols., Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969-1980).
- Priory John, Prior of Hexham, 'Prior John's Continuation of the Chronicle of Simeon', *The Priory of Hexham Its Chroniclers, Endowments, and Annals*, ed. by James Raine, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Andrews and Company, 1864).
- RH, Riley Roger of Hoveden, *The Annals of Roger of Hoveden. Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201*, ed. by Henry T. Riley, 2 vols (London: Bohn, 1853).
- RH, Stubbs Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houeden*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 51, 3 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1868-71).
- RRAN *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum 1066-1154*, ed. by H. A. Cronne and H. W. C. Davis, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).
- RW, Giles Roger of Wendover, *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History Comprising the History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235*, trans. by J. A., Giles, 2 vols (London: Bohn, 1849).
- RW, Hewlett *Rogeri de Wendover Liber qui dicitur Flores historiarum ab Anno Domini MCLIV. annoque Henrici Anglorum regis secundi primo* = The flowers of history by Roger de Wendover: from the year of Our Lord 1154, and the first year of Henry the Second, king of the English / edited from the original manuscripts by Henry G. Hewlett 3 vols (London: Longman & Co., 1886-89).
- SHR Scottish Historical Review
- TRHS Transactions of the Royal Historical Society

- WMGRA William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998-99).
- WMHN William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella*, ed. by Edmund King (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- WN William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. by P. G. Walsh, and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1998).
- YATJ Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal



## Notes on Terminology

This is a thesis on assimilation. It is most important to state who the *gentes* were that were to be assimilated.

The term English will be favoured over Anglo-Saxon. The name 'English' has a long history. It had been used in a host of contexts for periods well before 924 when Athelstan is credited with uniting England. Linguistic scholars tend to prefer 'Old English' to 'Anglo Saxon'. The 'English Church' derived its name from Bede in the eighth century.

Naming the immigrants was more problematic. It would be easy to follow the use of 'Anglo-Normans' applied by most modern medievalists but that puts the emphasis on the land of England rather than their Norman ancestry. In Chapter Three there is a subsection on what the chroniclers called them. The chroniclers emphasised their French background. Therefore, I shall eschew the prevailing label of Anglo-Norman and call them Norman English. I believe that the battle orations of Henry of Huntingdon in 1146 and Aelred of Rievaulx in the 1150s augment my argument that this *gens* still thought more of their Norman ancestry than their Englishness. Henry of Huntingdon's 'Fruitful England fell to your conquest' in 1140 clearly demonstrated they were Normans first and inhabitants of England second.<sup>1</sup>

Since this thesis shall argue that assimilation did not occur by 22 August 1138, providing a name for an assimilated Norman English and English *gens* is moot.

---

<sup>1</sup> Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by Diana Greenway, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), x, 8, pp. 714-15: '*Ferax Anglia uobis capta succubuit*'.

## INTRODUCTION

The following quotation from Nicholas Brooks provides an entry point into the discussion of perceptions and misconceptions of ethnicity:

The Anglo-Saxons, whose artistic, technological and cultural achievements in the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries are displayed in this exhibition, were the true ancestors of the English today.<sup>1</sup>

This deliberate attempt to link an ethnic community from one *gens*, the Anglo-Saxons, with another, the modern English, reveals the strength of the imagined bond between them in the minds of some modern writers. However, this attempt completely ignores the historical fact of the Norman Conquest and demonstrates a desired continuity with a mythic past.

For nineteen years, an internecine battle for succession to the throne of England divided the aristocracy of Norman England. Several interrelated events caused this war known as ‘The Anarchy’ to occur. In 1120, the heir to the throne of England, William, the only legitimate son of King Henry I, died in the White Ship disaster. The king desperately tried to conceive another child but might have been too old. (His second widow, Adeliza of Louvain, bore children to her second husband.) Another son Robert, Earl of Gloucester was deemed inappropriate because he was illegitimate. Ironically, Robert’s grandfather, William *Nothus*, was also illegitimate and carried the papal banner at Hastings in 1066. However, the Gregorian reforms denied Robert the opportunity of his grandfather to obtain either the blessing of the pope or the throne of England. King Henry I’s final solution was to bestow the throne

---

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Brooks, ‘Historical Introduction’ in *The Making of England: Anglo-Saxon Art and Culture AD 600-900*, ed. by Leslie Webster and Janet Backhouse (London: British Museum Press, 1991), p. 9.

of England on his daughter Matilda. On two separate occasions, he made the leading barons and church hierarchy swear an oath to enable and protect Matilda's claim to the throne. Henry doomed this attempt to place a female on the throne of England by marrying his daughter to the arch-enemy of the Norman people, the count of Anjou. The ruling aristocracy and the hierarchy of the church deemed Matilda's nuptial with their enemy, without their permission, as reason to break their vows and support another grandchild of William, Stephen of Blois, for the throne of England. In 1135, many of the ruling elite of England looked upon the county of Anjou as their enemy. They remained Normans first and foremost.

The internecine war between Stephen and Mathilda splintered the ruling elite. It removed the unremitting pressure that the Norman kings had exerted on their neighbours in the British Isles.<sup>2</sup> The overwhelming majority of the population of England, the indigenous conquered English, or *innati Angli*, was little affected. There was one prominent military conflict, which was the exception. At the battle of the Standard (1138), the English, specifically the Northumbrians, were directly involved in the conflict for reasons of self-preservation. Since this battle was the only significant event in 'The Anarchy' in which the conquered English and the conquering Norman English acted so intimately, this thesis chose the battle to measure the degree, if any, of assimilation between the two *gentes*.

Arguments might be made that the two *gentes* fought and died side-by-side for King Stephen, for the Church in England or for their 'culture'. This thesis shall take a much simpler view that the necessity of self-preservation and the defense of kith and kin brought together these two disparate *gentes* for a few hours. This thesis shall

---

<sup>2</sup> David Bates, 'Kingship, Government, and Political Life to c.1160' in *The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. by Barbara Harvey, *The Short Oxford History of the British Isles*, ed. by Paul Langford (Oxford: Oxford University, 2001), p. 96.

further demonstrate that placing two cooperative *gentes* with a mutual goal of survival together, proved the Norman English spoke English and were thus able to communicate the Northumbrian fyrd. This was an example of acculturation, not assimilation.

The introduction is divided into two segments. The first segment shall deal with the formation of various *gentes* during the 'Migration period' of the Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. During the recurring phenomenon called the 'Migration period' *gens* after *gens* clashed, militarily and culturally, with the Roman Empire. The introduction provides definitions of 'barbarians', ethnogenesis, and *gens*. It shall introduce the debate between the Reinhard Weskus - Herwig Wolfram - Walter Pohl and the school of *Traditionskern* and its refutation by Thomas F. X. Noble. This segment shall show some of the general ideas of this interaction and then specific examples of the interaction between the conquering 'barbarians' and the civilised but defeated *gentes*. The second segment shall produce working definitions of acculturation and assimilation. These terms and concepts are central to this thesis. The main argument is that a degree of acculturation between two interacting *gentes* is much easier to achieve than assimilation.

## **BARBARIANS**

### **The Definition of 'Barbarians'**

Thomas F. X. Noble shared an ancient but effective definition of the word 'barbarian'. This word shall have a very different definition in the later chapters of this thesis, but Noble's definition is important to understand how Pohl, Wolfram, and other historians of Late Antiquity used the word. It was first used by the Greeks to define anyone who was not Greek. The Romans expanded the word to include all *gentes* outside the

frontiers of the Empire. It was descriptive; they were ‘not one of us’.<sup>3</sup> Noble emphasised that the word was initially neutral and not pejorative as William of Malmesbury would use it centuries later.

### **‘Barbarian’ Acculturation**

Paul Walter argued that acculturation was a reciprocal matter in which both *gentes* acquired some of the characteristics of the other. Furthermore, acculturation was a lengthy process, which may take several generations. He stated that when different *gentes* come into contact, the initial result might be dislocation, maladjustment, or violent conflict.<sup>4</sup>

J. Liebeschuetz gave an example of the acculturation of ‘barbarians’ into the Roman empire. He studied the Vandals who shared their kingdom with its native inhabitants. The Vandals, the ruling people, were quite distinct from the native inhabitants in their territory although Liebeschuetz cannot explain what requirements had to be fulfilled for somebody to qualify as a Vandal. The Vandals were Arians, and the native inhabitants were Roman Catholics. Liebeschuetz found that the religious conflict was incessant and more severe in this kingdom than in any previous kingdom. Liebeschuetz also found evidence of cultural compromise: Romans began to wear the Vandal style of dress and the Vandals made increasing use of literacy. The acculturation was a tenuous one, but without compromises it would not have worked. Since the king was the king of the native inhabitants and the Vandals, the author imagined that many Catholics became token Arians not only to placate the ruling class, but also to gain access to positions of power in the court. It appeared to have

---

<sup>3</sup> Thomas F. X. Noble, ‘Introduction: Romans, barbarians, and the transformation of the Roman Empire’, in *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 9-10.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Walter, Jr., *Race and Culture Relations* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1952), p. 44.

worked. The Vandals represented the military power of the state (*exercitus*) and the coercive power of the government (*regnum*). Liebeschuetz found that cohesion and military spirit of the Vandal *gens* built up during the migration created the effectiveness of the state. However, perhaps because of low literacy rates among the Vandals, it was mainly Romans, the native inhabitants, who oversaw and continued the old Roman system of administration.<sup>5</sup> Isabel Velázquez gave a later view of the acculturation of the ‘barbarians’. She wrote that *Hispania* was the motherland of a new *gens Gothorum*. Their new lords, the Goths, governed the native inhabitants, in this example, the Catholic people. A *rex* from that *gens* would gradually make *Spania* his *regnum*.<sup>6</sup>

Liebeschuetz and Velázquez were two examples of Wolfram’s *gens, exercitus,* and *regnum* triad, which will be discussed later. This combination did not happen in fifth-century Britain. Gildas’s ‘salvation history’ considered the Anglo-Saxon barbarians’ invasion of Romanised Britain as retribution for the natives’ sins. Implicit in his account was the assumption that, had Roman protection not collapsed – owing, of course to the criminal folly of the Britons – the triumph of the Saxons could not have occurred, because the Britons would have remained under the protection of a more virtuous people whose rule was divinely sanctioned.<sup>7</sup>

As noted in the previous examples of acculturation, ethnic identity might imply prestige. In some cases, the individual had to make the difficult decision and attempt to live the life of the dominant class. It did not come naturally. Frederick

---

<sup>5</sup> J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, ‘*Gens into Regnum: The Vandals*’, in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> Isabel Velázquez, ‘*Pro patriae gentisque Gothorum statu*’ in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), p. 216.

<sup>7</sup> Robert Hanning, *The Vision of History in Early Britain* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1966), p. 16.

Barth quoted a Parthian proverb, 'He is Parthian who does Pashto, not merely who speaks Pashto'.<sup>8</sup> In this thesis, I will argue that the Norman English not only spoke English, but also adopted English customs, native saints, and other distinctions that made them different from the Normans still in the duchy. Hugh Thomas promoted the various institutions, opinions, and beliefs that resuscitated Englishness and the idea of England. He started with the people. He added the place, which was more than the borders of a kingdom but a geographical entity that the English people had accepted for generations. He then moved onto institutions. The government, although ruled by Norman kings and with a surfeit of foreign leaders, through intermarriage and mores was conforming more with the English with each successive generation. The Church was another areas in which the indigenous English were initially shut out of positions of power. However, gradually and with the influx of new Continental religious houses, which revered local saints, the Church helped identify Englishness. The negative stereotypes of the English helped define English identity even more than the positive ones. Finally, Thomas used the anthropological idea that a *gens* was most comfortable with their own by contrasting themselves with others to demonstrate that by the second and third generation after the Conquest, the English regained some of their innate sense of superiority that had been compromised at the battle of Hastings.<sup>9</sup>

## **ETHNOGENESIS**

Ethnogenesis is the study of the formation of the *gens*. The study of ethnogenesis is more than an examination of myths of origin, but an ever-changing combination of personal characteristics, politics, military might, geography, archaeology, and many

---

<sup>8</sup> Walter Pohl, 'Telling the difference: Signs of ethnic identity', in *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-900*, ed. by Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1998), p. 22.

<sup>9</sup> Hugh M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity 1066-c. 1200* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 291-93.

more social sciences that ethnologists wished to add. The following historians demonstrate that, the study of ethnicity is constantly changing and evolving. Pohl agreed that early medieval kingdoms were successfully formed ethnic communities.<sup>10</sup> In his 'Introduction' to the comprehensive *Regna and Gentes*, Goetz listed three different ways modern ethnogenetical research had to consider the subject of *gentes*. First, if the *gentes* changed, then Goetz recommended investigating the changes rather than the origins. This would investigate actual occurrences rather than a mythical or legendary past event. (Goetz contradicted Wolfram who stated that a common biological theory of descent was strongly emphasised even though it was not supported by historical evidence.<sup>11</sup>) Second, the relationship between the *gentes* and the *regnum* was crucial. Hans-Werner Goetz defined the *gens* as political, usually defined as kingdoms who interacted with the Roman Empire, and *reges* (the military kings) as the conduit. This was a conceptual change that occurred after the migratory period. Third, if the *gens* was formed by tradition, then their self-perception becomes an important issue.<sup>12</sup> Walter Goffart doubted that the memory mechanism was as effective as Goetz believed it was. Goffart used the example of Arminius destroying three Roman legions. Although the modern German historians glorify Arminius's name, the only written memory of this battle was Roman not German.<sup>13</sup> The contradictions and differences among historians showed that history is malleable.

Goetz questioned the traditions that gave power to the 'barbarian' kings. He

---

<sup>10</sup> Walter Pohl, 'The Barbarian Successor States', in *The Transformation of the Roman World A. D. 400-900*, ed. by Leslie Webster and Michelle Brown (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 46.

<sup>11</sup> Herwig Wolfram, '*Origio et Religio*: Ethnic traditions and Literature in Early Modern Texts', in *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 71.

<sup>12</sup> Hans-Werner Goetz, 'Introduction', in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), p. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Walter Goffart, 'Does the Distant Past Impinge on the Invasion Age Germans?', in *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (London: Routledge, 2006), p. 93.



doubted whether there were distinctive ‘barbarian’ or Roman institutions.<sup>14</sup> He also questioned whether there was a *regnum* that was not exclusively dependent on a dynasty or specific king.<sup>15</sup> Since the *gentes* were not constant units with distinct ethnic origins, but populations that were continuously changing, then political developments were as important as the distinct ethnic origins. As such, Goetz found that the question of defining ethnicity is unresolved. These questions from late antiquity and the early Middle Ages will help form the basis for the last segment of this chapter.

### **The *Traditionskern* school**

Weskus noted that the ethnogenesis of early medieval peoples was not a matter of racial purity but shared traditions and institutions. He found that they made a conscious choice not to dissolve into the Roman ‘melting pot’ but evolved from a small core or nuclei of elites and then expanded to include all who believed and give personal allegiance to the core leadership.<sup>16</sup> Weskus stated that language, law, diet, clothing and culture might provide some clues to hold a *gens* together but the personal allegiance and a ‘core of tradition’, a *Traditionskern*, were more important.<sup>17</sup> Noble refuted this idea completely. In a more recent book, *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms* (2006), he argued against these principles. Noble stated that the Weskus-Wolfram ideas were ‘enthusiastically embraced’, ‘modified’, and then ‘rejected completely’ by many historians.<sup>18</sup> He then questioned the number in the elite core and the emphasis on elites, which he found had a ‘Germanity’ or *Volkgeist*

---

<sup>14</sup> Note. Goetz used the words ‘Germanic’, ‘state’, and ‘king’ where this thesis shall use the words ‘barbarian’, *regnum*, and *rex* or *regum*.

<sup>15</sup> Goetz, ‘Introduction’, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> Noble, ‘Introduction’, p. 10.

<sup>17</sup> Goetz, ‘Introduction’, p. 4.

<sup>18</sup> Noble, ‘Introduction’, p. 11.

(national spirit), which was so distorted in the middle of the last century.<sup>19</sup> Noble continued that although many believed they had, no *gentes* had an ancient or common history. The *gentes* did not descend from common ancestors and members were not related.

## ***GENS***

### **The Evolving Definitions of *Gens***

*Gentes* should be defined because the results of their interactions are the central idea of this thesis. Walter Pohl defined *gens* in a way that might be used as a point of reference for further examination:

A '*gens*' is a racially and culturally highly homogeneous group sharing a common descent and destiny, speaking the same language and living within one state. Peoples (and not individuals or social groups) were often seen as factors of continuity in a changing world, as the real subjects of history - almost immutable in its course, indeed more a natural than a historical phenomenon.<sup>20</sup>

Following this definition, Pohl questioned how the *gentes* might be distinguished from one another. There are many examples of inclusivity and exclusivity that range from the classical period through late antiquity to the medieval period. Pohl cited that Virgil's *Aeneid* depicted barbarians as having different languages, appearances, and arms.<sup>21</sup> Pohl also cited that Tacitus (56-117 A. D.) was a most attentive historian to ethnic differences. The Roman's criteria included outward appearance, culture,

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>20</sup> Walter Pohl, 'Conceptions of Ethnicity in Early Medieval Studies', in *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings*, ed. by Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein (Malden, MA: Brill, 1998), p.15. Note the substitution of *gens* for 'people'. This is a medieval thesis and *gens* is the more appropriate word.

<sup>21</sup> Note. Pohl, 'Telling,' pp.17-18 is the source for footnotes 21-27. *Vergil, Aeneid 8, 722-3: 'Incedunt victae longo ordine gentes,/quam variae linguis, habitu tam vestiset armis.'*

customs, habits, religions, languages, and weapons.<sup>22</sup> Paulus Orosius (c. 375-418) noted that most earlier lists of racial characteristics did not mention the law.<sup>23</sup> Augustine of Hippo (354-430) claimed he knew that many different *gentes* had different customs, religions, languages, forms of military organisation, and clothing.<sup>24</sup> Menander Protector (c. 550) explained that the Utigurs did not attack their Cutrigur neighbours because they spoke the same language, lived in the same tents, and dressed the same. According to him, they were therefore kinsmen, even though they had different leaders.<sup>25</sup> After stating that *gentes* originated from languages, not languages from *gentes*,<sup>26</sup> Isidore of Seville (560-636) noted Germanic *gentes* differed by arms, colour of dress, languages, and names. Regino of Prüm (880-915) wrote that *gentes* differed by origin, custom, language, and law.<sup>27</sup> At the Diet of Verona (983), Saxons, Suevs, Lotharingians, Bavarians, Italians, and others dissimilar in birth, language, and customs came together.<sup>28</sup> Ado of Vienne, writing in the middle of the ninth century, regretted that, at the battle of Fontenoy (841), two major Frankish armies clashed for the first time. These *gentes* used the same arms and practiced similar customs but were divided not by ethnic backgrounds but political philosophies.<sup>29</sup> Over an eight-hundred year period, historians sought to define ethnic differences. While they had different names and different characteristics, they all demonstrated a common need for people to belong to something.

---

<sup>22</sup> Tacitus, *Germania* 4 (*habitus corporum*), 10 (*patria arma*), 27 (*instituta ritusque*), 28 (*sermo instituta moresque*), 43 (*sermo cultusque*), 45 (*ritus habitusque—lingua*). Tacitus had die ethnische Charakterisierung aufierordentlich vertieft: Timpe, “Entdeckungsgeschichte”, p. 379.

<sup>23</sup> Orosius, *Historiae* 5, 1, 14: ‘*Quaeque provincia suis regibus, suis legibus suisque moribus utebatur.*’

<sup>24</sup> Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 14, 1: ‘*Ut cum tot tantaeque gentes per terrarum orbem diversis ritibus moribusque viventes multiplici linguarum, armorum, vestium sint varietate distinctae.*’

<sup>25</sup> Menander, ed. Blockley, fr. 2.

<sup>26</sup> Isidore, *Etymologiae* 9, 1, 14: ‘*ex Unguis gentes, non ex gentibus linguae exortae sunt.*’

<sup>27</sup> Regino, *Epistula ad Hothonm archiepiscopum*, ed. by F. Kurze, MGH SS Rer. Germ. 50, p. xxx: ‘*Gentes variae armis, discolores habitu, Unguis dissonae.*’

<sup>28</sup> Patrick, Geary, ‘Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages’, *Medieval Perspectives*, 3 (1988), p. 4.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

## Expanding the definition of *gens*

Wolfram expanded the definition of the term *gens*, making it not a biological category but a political one. To the extent that the latter category was composed of people of mixed backgrounds, he saw a *gens* as a multiracial population group that made up an army.<sup>30</sup> There was no simple word to denote both ethnic and religious identities and groups but it was hard to find good intellectual grounds for distinguishing them.<sup>31</sup> These terms were sometimes difficult to keep separate, but they nonetheless indicated subtle differences in the way groups perceived themselves and others. A question at the root of these distinctions was whether or not identity was conceived in religious, political, cultural, or physical terms—or some combination thereof?

Bartlett observed that the problem of ethnic identity was not only sensitive, but also potentially explosive because the terms used to define it can be intellectually confused and vague.<sup>32</sup> Fredrik Barth, a social anthropologist, rejected the ‘reifying and essentializing approach’ that equated biological descent, culture, a society, and ethnic group. His alternative approach consisted of ethnic groups identifying themselves and others by categories of acknowledgment and identification.<sup>33</sup> Loring Danforth extended this argument in relation to Macedonian history, arriving at a conclusion that was already staked out by Gellner and Renan:

when a *gens* learns its history, language, and mores, it must forget its local dialects, village histories, regional folklores, and the battles it fought against others. Simply to remember what binds them together, they must forget what previously separated them.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Herwig Wolfram, *History of the Goths* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978), p. 5.

<sup>31</sup> Robert Bartlett, ‘Medieval and Modern Concepts’, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31 (2001), p. 42; Pohl, ‘Conceptions of Ethnicity’, p. 16 and Wolfram, *Goths*, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Robert Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales, 1146-1223* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), p. 10.

<sup>33</sup> Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston, MA: Little Brown, 1969), p. 10.

<sup>34</sup> Ernst Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Press, 2006); Ernest Renan, ‘*Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?*’ (Paris, FR: Levy, 1882); and Loring Danforth, *The Macedonian Conflict, Ethnic Nationalism in a Transitional World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 19-20.

## **Evolving Characteristics of *Gens***

Patrick Geary argued that the four main medieval characteristics of ethnicity: origins, mores, language, and law were fluid. Origins might include personal ancestors, geographical origin, or even the common origins of a people. In anthropological terms, Geary determined they are all fictive, because a group must determine their origins by either selection or re-creation. Mores were changing and altering. Geary offered an example of how cultural conditions change. As early as the fifth century, he noted, some Gallo-Romans were wearing barbarian dress. He emphasised that weapons and dress were significant in belonging to specific *gens*.

As a characteristic of ethnic difference, some early medieval historians wrote of the unity of Germanic language by the ninth century compared to the simultaneous diffusion of the Romance languages. However, Geary noted that medieval authors were aware that every *gens* did not have its own language. He continued that Gothic disappeared as a spoken language within two generations. He also mentioned the legend that the Franks exterminated all the *Romani* living in the region of Neustria and had adopted their language. If this legend was true, there is no knowledge of the Franks' original language.<sup>35</sup> Language was a powerful discriminator of *gentes*, which worried the Christian clerics who wrote of this situation. The early Christian clerics had a problem analysing and explaining the characteristic of language. They used the biblical example of the Tower of Babel to explain how there could be so many languages and so many *gentes*, quoting Genesis 11:1: 'And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.'<sup>36</sup> This was after the Flood and before the Tower. Thus,

---

<sup>35</sup> Geary, 'Construct', p. 5.

<sup>36</sup> Genesis 11:1. Note. All English Bible quotes are King James Edition and all Latin Bible quotes are *Biblia Sacra Vulgata-Douay-Rheims Bible* [www.drbo.org/lvb/](http://www.drbo.org/lvb/): 'Erat autem terra labii unius, et sermonum eorundem.'

there were many *gentes*, a diversity of *gentes*, but only one language. At this time language could not have been a characteristic of *gens*.

Writing about the world after the Tower of Babel, Isidore of Seville wrote that first we have language and then *gens*, because the *gens* came from language not that language from the *gens*.<sup>37</sup> This was Isidore's famous statement on the relationship of language and *gens* as a characteristic of *gens*. The problem is this was Isidore's fourteenth sentence in his ninth chapter of *Etymologiae*. His first sentence in this chapter contradicted his dictum stating that in the beginning there were as many languages as there were *gentes* and then the number of *gentes* was greater than (the number of) languages, because many *gentes* sprang from one language.<sup>38</sup> This statement corroborated Augustine of Hippo who wrote more than two centuries earlier that the number of *gentes* has grown much more than the languages (of the *gentes*). He added that in Africa many barbarous *gentes* speak the same language.<sup>39</sup> In his initial sentence, Isidore states that a multitude of *gentes* might be speaking the same language. This thesis presents the case that language cannot be a characteristic of *gens* for Isidore and Augustine. It appears that historians have misrepresented Isidore's statements on language as a characteristic of *gens*.

Not only were the *gentes* fluid in this era but an individual could have the characteristics of many *gentes* at the same time. Geary used the example that an individual 'might speak a Romance language, dress as a Frank, and claim Burgundian law'.<sup>40</sup> Walter Pohl continued with a myriad of possible roles, options, and ambiguities that early medieval 'barbarians' might display. For example, Mundo,

---

<sup>37</sup> Note. The next three translations are the author's. Isidore Etmy. 9, 1, 14: '*Ideo autem prius de linguis, ac deinde de gentibus posuimus, quia ex linguis gentes, non ex gentibus linguae exortae sunt*'.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 9, 1, 1: '*Initio autem quot gentes, tot linguae fuerunt, deinde plures gentes quam linguae; quia ex una lingua multae sunt gentes exortae*'.

<sup>39</sup> Augustinus, *De Civitate Dei*, 16, 6: '*Auctus est autem numerus gentium multo amplius quam linguarum. Nam et in Africa barbaras gentes in una lingua plurimas nouimus*'.

<sup>40</sup> Geary, 'Construct', p. 6.

Attila's grandson, might be viewed as a Roman officer, a Gepid, or a Hun. He might also be viewed as a Frank or a citizen of Tours.<sup>41</sup> Geary admitted that the modern historian cannot determine this man's self-perception or how others perceived him. Geary in his *Myth of Nations* abhorred the modern use of the Migratory Era, which is not well understood and is easy prey for ethnic chauvinistic propaganda. Geary showed that the medieval characteristics were a fluid index of ethnic identity that modern politicians with a racist or nationalist agenda do not wish to understand.<sup>42</sup> Pohl agreed with Geary's claim, stating that language, culture, and political allegiance could not be proven to be valid for all *gentes*. A solution that was gradually accepted among historians was to assume that the subjective factor, the belief of belonging to a group with common origins, was decisive.<sup>43</sup>

### **Organisation of the *Gens***

Wolfram reviewed the well-planned organisation of the 'barbarian' *gentes*. The leaders were members of families who claimed divine origins from the gods.<sup>44</sup> Wolfram's term for the formation of new identities was 'nuclei of tradition'. Then in a sentence, which could have been derived from Rollo's dream of coloured birds in Dudo,<sup>45</sup> Wolfram stated that all warriors that acknowledged the tribal tradition, either by birth or adherence, were members of the community. Wolfram's barbarians and the *gens Normannorum* have a similar sense of inclusivity. Later this thesis shall show that the idea of Norman English inclusivity and English exclusivity fostered a

---

<sup>41</sup> Pohl, 'Telling', p. 22.

<sup>42</sup> Patrick J. Geary, 'The Crisis of Identity', in *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 33-42 and Geary, *Nations*.

<sup>43</sup> Pohl, 'Telling', pp. 20-21.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6. Wolfram does not explain how these family leaders proved their relationships with their divinities.

<sup>45</sup> Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans*, trans. by Eric Christiansen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. 29-30.

lack of assimilation.

According to Wolfram, only ‘barbarians’ could gain affiliation or even solidarity with the Roman world through military prowess. Contact with Rome might lead to service in the Roman army.<sup>46</sup> Evangelos Chrysos noted how the Romans refined the individual ‘barbarian’ soldier. The army and the government arranged for their involvement as soldiers or officers and managed their everyday life in the camp and on the battlefield. The Romans inculcated the individual soldier with ideas about the state, its objectives, and the structure of the administration of the Empire. Individual members of the *gentes* had an opportunity for assimilation in the Roman world. Towards the end of the fourth century, two Roman sources stated that the Goths, the ‘barbarians’, became Romans. The relationship between the men of the *exercitus* and the men of the empire’s legion was more inclusive than the two *gentes* in eleventh and twelfth century England. The Norman English did not give the English this military opportunity.<sup>47</sup>

### ***Gens, Exercitus and Regnum***

Herwig Wolfram looked at the relationship between the *gentes* (the ‘barbarians’), the *exercitus* (the army), and the *regnum* (the kingdom). Initially, he saw the *gens* who were outside the civilized world as barbarians. Not only did their languages sound more like noise than a human language, but the barbarians also spoke different and indistinguishable languages. Then Wolfram spent more than an entire

---

<sup>46</sup> Wolfram, *Goths*, pp.5-6; Pohl, ‘Telling’, pp. 11-14. Ralph W. Mathisen, ‘Becoming Roman, Becoming Barbarian’: Roman Citizenship and the Assimilation of Barbarians in the Late Roman World, in *Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. by Ulbe Bosma and others (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), pp. 191-217. Mathisen gives two examples of ‘barbarians’ becoming Romans: ‘In 383, the orator Themistius opined that Goths were ‘no longer called barbarians but Romans’, a sentiment seconded by Pacatus, who stated in 389 that Theodosius I (379 to 395) ordered defeated barbarian soldiers to ‘become Roman’.

<sup>47</sup> Evangelos Chrysos, ‘The Empire, the *gentes* and the *regna*’, in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antiquity and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), p. 14.



page of the *History of the Goths* stating that these ‘barbarians’ did not belong to the observer’s superior culture and remained outside the civilized world.<sup>48</sup> He continued that the barbarians were resilient. If one *gens* were destroyed or disappeared, another arose from the marshes or the steppes. Wolfram insisted they were the same population groups reappearing and that they were constantly changing their names and appearances to deceive the Romans.

Karl Ferdinand Werner observed that the *exercitus*, *gens*, and *regnum* formed a ‘triad’.<sup>49</sup> In barbarian history, the only heroes were warriors. Not only was the population group and the army one, but also any capable warrior could also benefit, their ethnic or social background notwithstanding.<sup>50</sup> This completed the first part of the triad *gens=exercitus*. The agency that created this transformation was the Gothic military kingship, the *regnum* was defined by kings, who Wolfram stated proved and reaffirmed themselves as heroes from a race of gods.<sup>51</sup> Thus, the second part of the triad, the *exercitus*, accepted their *regnum*. The third part of the triad was the relationship between the *regnum* and the *gens*. Goetz did not consider the ‘Migration Period’ and early Middle Ages ‘stable’ but ‘historical’, that is, unstable communities that were prone to change.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, Goetz could not determine if the *gens* established the *regnum*, or the *gens* resulted from the establishment of the *regnum*. Hans Hubert Anton uses geographical terminology to advance the question. First he showed that geographical terms (*Hispania*, *Gallia*, and *Italia*) were surpassed by ethnic terms (*Aquitania*, *Burgundia*, and *Francia*) but then re-emerged as the

---

<sup>48</sup> Wolfram, *Goths*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>49</sup> K.F. Werner, ‘Völker und Regna’, in *Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Reichs- und Nationsbildung in Deutschland und Frankreich*, ed. C. Bruhl and B. Schneidmüller, *Historische Zeitschrift Beiheft N.F.* 24 (München: R. Oldenburg, 1997), pp. 15-44, particularly pp. 15-16 found in Goetz, ‘Introduction’, p.3.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7. Wolfram described how a capable warrior could win riches, have a ‘Hunnic’ marriage, and climb the military hierarchy.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>52</sup> Goetz, ‘Introduction’, pp. 3-4.

kingdoms of Italy and Spain.<sup>53</sup> Goetz viewed this phenomenon as geographical terms losing and regaining their political impact over ethnic terms. Anton and Goetz demonstrated that, although there might be a linkage between Wolfram's *gens* and *regnum*, it would be very difficult to substantiate.

*Gens*, *exercitus*, and *regnum* were the triad that kept the small groups of 'barbarians' together in their migrations during the late antiquity and early medieval periods. Pohl, Wolfram, Geary, and the other modern historians used the scant information available to create the history of the 'Migration Period', viewing and recording the endless stream of 'barbarians' travelling westward from the central Asian steppes into the heart of Europe and beyond. Hans-Werner Goetz credibly questioned all the sources that were used. However, Pohl, Wolfram, and Geary showed that, although ethnicity is a 'modern construct', each historian meticulously demonstrated that the different characteristics of a *gens* were observed by contemporaries. In 1138, Thurstan created a twelfth century triad. The *regnum* was the kingdom of England, the *exercitus* was the 'Southern' army, and the *gens*, was all the warriors that fought against the invaders. The archbishop created a triad of necessity that dissipated as soon as the battle was won and the threat was gone.

## **ACCULTURATION AND ASSIMILATION**

Human migrations are universal in time and space. While much scholarly ink has been spilt on the cause of population movement, this thesis is concerned with the conditions in England, the foreign land the Normans moved to, rather than the reasons behind their relocation. Two common terms used to measure the interaction of *gentes*

---

<sup>53</sup> H. H. Anton, 'Antike Großländer, politisch-kirchliche Traditionen und mittelalterliche Reichsbildung', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung*, 86 (2000) pp. 33-85 found in Goetz, 'Introduction', p. 3.

are acculturation and assimilation. To understand the complex interaction of the English and the Norman English in a history thesis, I shall use definitions that are relevant to historians studying the interaction of two *gentes*.

### **Acculturation**

Acculturation is the adaptation of two or more *gentes* to facilitate interactions, such as the ability to communicate, acceptance of religions, and mores. For instance, in order to communicate, *gentes* from different linguistic backgrounds adopted some elements of each other's language. For example the German word for border, *Grenze*, is derived from a late medieval Slavic word.<sup>54</sup> Edward James has used a simple sociological definition of acculturation as the bringing together of two *gentes* so that they may transfer cultural elements from one to the other.<sup>55</sup> According to Paul Walter, acculturation entailed the development of common arrangements for trading, monetary values, property rights and eventually all phases of life activities.<sup>56</sup> Mu-chou Poo viewed religion as a significant vehicle of acculturation for *gentes* that are physically and economically diverse.<sup>57</sup> Terrence Cook perceived a contrast between levels of acculturation with the dominant *gens* preferring minimal concession to the weaker *gens* and the weaker *gens* seeking maximal concessions.<sup>58</sup>

Many sociological definitions involve migration of small groups into a larger dominant society. Donovan Senter argued that there are three types of possible acculturation. First is a quick acceptance of the new culture, which might include

<sup>54</sup> Walter Pohl, 'Frontiers and Ethnic Identities: Some Final Considerations' in *Borders, Barriers and Ethnogenesis Frontiers in Late Antiquities and the Middle Ages*, ed. by Florin Curta (Turnhout, BE: Brepolis, 2005), p. 261.

<sup>55</sup> Edward James, *Europe's Barbarians: AD 200-600* (Harlow: Longman, 2009), p. 193.

<sup>56</sup> Paul Walter Jr., *Race and Culture Relations* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1952), p. 43.

<sup>57</sup> Poo, Mu-chou, 'To Become Chinese: Cultural Consciousness and Political Legitimacy in early Medieval China (220-681)' in *Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. by Ulbe Bosma and others (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), p. 188.

<sup>58</sup> Terrence E. Cook, *Separation, Assimilation, or Accommodation: Contrasting Ethnic Minority Policies* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), Figure 1.1, p. 3.

resistance and prejudice. Second, the migrating group may try to maintain their initial mores. Finally, they may attempt to develop a culture foreign to both their original and that of the dominant group. Senter viewed the last alternative as more rebellious than creative.<sup>59</sup> Paul-André Comeau presented a political science perspective on acculturation. He has four definitions of various stages of acculturation: minimum acculturation is the result of the minority keeping their language but engaging in the dominant culture; possible acculturation where the minority keep their language and do not engage in the dominant culture; probable acculturation when the minority accepts the dominant language but do not engage culturally; advanced acculturation when the immigrants use the dominant language and culture.<sup>60</sup>

Teresa LaFaromboise, Hardin Coleman, and Jennifer Gerton examined the psychological impact of biculturalism, the presence of two distinct cultures in one country. They have definitions for three different types of acculturation. Biculturalism postulates that two people can identify with two cultures independently of each other and the two cultures have equal status. Multiculturalism has the premise that a people can maintain a positive image of their culture while engaging in a positive image 'in complex institutional sharing' with the larger dominant culture. The final form of acculturation argues that a people can become a participant in the dominant culture while maintaining their identity in the minority culture. In this case the sociologists determined that acculturation is compelled and compulsory.<sup>61</sup> Although these

---

<sup>59</sup> Donovan Senter, 'Acculturation among New Mexico villagers in Comparison to Adjustment Patterns of other Spanish speaking Americans', *Rural Sociology*, 10 (1945), p. 33.

<sup>60</sup> Paul-André Comeau, 'Acculturation or Assimilation: Method of Analysis and Tentative Measures of Franco-Ontarians', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 2 (1969), pp. 158-72.

<sup>61</sup> Teresa LaFaromboise, Hardin L. K. Coleman, and Jennifer Gerton, 'Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory', *Psychological Bulletin*, 114 (1993), pp. 395-412.

sociologists differed in their definitions, they did agree on two points. Acculturation is a reciprocal matter in which both *gentes* acquire some of the characteristics of the other.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, acculturation is a long drawn out process, which may take several generations. Walter argued that when different *gentes* come into contact, the initial result might be dislocation, maladjustment and violent conflict.

### **Examples of Acculturation in Medieval England**

The multiple Viking invasions and seizure of English lands culminating in Cnut's conquest has been used as an example of historical acculturation. The similarity between Old English and the Norse language, a common belief in Christianity, and the English need for a strong king were three accommodating factors that allowed for acculturation between the conqueror and the conquered after the initial bloodshed subsided. In conclusion, the definition of acculturation in this example is based upon accommodations for language, religion, customs and law, which are similar for both interacting *gentes*.

Orderic Vitalis provided a fanciful example of acculturation between the conquering Normans and the indigenous English shortly after 1066,

English and Normans were living peacefully together in boroughs, towns, and cities, and were intermarrying with each other. You could see many villages or town markets filled with displays of Gaulish wares and merchandise and observe the English, who had previously seemed contemptible to the French in their native dress, completely transformed by foreign fashions.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>62</sup> Walter, *Race*, p. 44.

<sup>63</sup> For the most recent summary on Cnut's reign, see Timothy Bolton, *Cnut the Great* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2017) and OV, iv. pp. 256-57: '*Angli cum Normannis cohabitabant in burgis, castris et urbibus conubiis alteri alteros mutuo sibi coniungentes. Vicos aliquot aut fora urbana Gallicis mercibus et mangonibus referta conspiceres et ubique Anglos qui pridem amictu patrio compti Francis uidebatur trupes, nunc peregrino cultu alteratos uideres*'.

Orderic imagined an acculturated England in many of the boroughs, towns and cities of England. The English and Normans lived peacefully, intermarried and traded goods but they were two distinct *gentes*. Although harmonious and co-operative there were distinct differences between the *gentes*. These were examples of acculturation.

### **Assimilation**

The following definitions shall show that there is no common definition of assimilation among sociologists and anthropologists. Wilfred Borrie saw assimilation as complete conformity and Gordon Horobin added the complete elimination of differences, and Ronald Taft defined it as the ‘complete loss of the former identity’.<sup>64</sup> Felix Kessing and John Berry viewed assimilation as a loss of separate identity and the rejection of one of the cultures.<sup>65</sup> James Vander Zanden wrote that assimilation might also be accomplished through bilateral, reciprocal fusion in which a genuine third culture appears through the merger of two or more cultures.<sup>66</sup> However, Ralph Linton disagreed, stating that assimilation is a misnomer since ‘practically all cases of the so-called assimilation of one group by another group could more accurately classed as examples of fusion, since the culture of the assimilating group is usually modified by the introduction of elements from that of the assimilated.’<sup>67</sup> These social

---

<sup>64</sup> Wilfred Borrie, *The Cultural Integration of Immigrants: A Survey based upon the Papers and Proceedings of UNESCO Conference held in Havana April 1956* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1959); Gordon W. Horobin, ‘Adjustment and Assimilation: The Displaced Person’, *Sociological Review*, 5 (1957), p. 242; and Ronald Taft, ‘The Role of Personality of the Mediator’ in *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*, ed. by Stephen Bochner (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1981), p. 60.

<sup>65</sup> John Berry, ‘Marginality, Stress and Ethnic Identification in an Acculturated Aboriginal Community’, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1, (1970), p. 242 and John W. Berry, Rudolf Kalin and Donald Taylor, *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada* (Ottawa, CA: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1977).

<sup>66</sup> James W. Vander Zanden, *American Minority Relations* (New York, NY: Ronald Press 1963), p. 269.

<sup>67</sup> Ralph Linton, ‘The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation’, in *Acculturation in Seven American Tribes*, ed. by Ralph Linton (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1963), p. 502. pp. 501-20.

scientists viewed assimilation as much the loss of former identity as the elimination of differences.

According to Frank Barth the majority group could lose internal diversity and become inarticulate as a low rank minority.<sup>68</sup> John Schumann added that to maximize contact the minority gives up its own lifestyle and values and adopts majority language group.<sup>69</sup> Nimmi Hunik added that members of the ethnic minority identify themselves with the majority group.<sup>70</sup> Assimilation places a great strain on the minority group.

The majority group may also be affected by assimilation. Many social scientists defined assimilation's effect on the majority groups as the minority acculturating to, adopting, and identifying with positive intergroup relations. This leads to the minority culture's gradual but eventual disappearance.<sup>71</sup> Numerically weak or psychologically weakened minorities may decide to give up their life-style, values and language to adopt those of the dominant group.<sup>72</sup> Assimilation policies are difficult because the minority is negative towards its own minority culture, which it must reject to adopt the identity of the dominant group.<sup>73</sup>

In conclusion, most sociological and anthropological definitions of assimilation reflect the minority group accepting the majority group's language and

---

<sup>68</sup> Frank Barth, 'Introduction', in *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural differences* ed. by F. Barth (London: Allen & Urwin, 1969), p. 11 and p. 33.

<sup>69</sup> John H. Schumann, 'Research on the Acculturation Model of Second Language Acquisition', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7 (1986), p. 381.

<sup>70</sup> Nimmi Hunik, *Ethnic Minority Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), p. 163.

<sup>71</sup> Richard Bourhis, Léna Moïse, Stéphane Perrault and Sacha Sénécal, 'Towards an Interactive Acculturation Model: Social Psychological Approach', *International Journal of Psychology*, 32 (1997), pp. 369-86; Stephen Bochner, 'The Social Psychology of Cross-cultural Relations, in *Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-cultural Interaction*, ed. by Stephen Bochner (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982), p. 26; and Chester L. Hunt and Lewis Walker, *Ethnic Dynamics: Patterns of Intergroup Relations in Various Societies* (Homewood, IL: 1974), p. 9.

<sup>72</sup> John Schumann, 'Social Distance as a Factor in Second Language Acquisition', *Language Learning*, 26 (1976), pp. 137-67, at pp.135-43.

<sup>73</sup> Herbert I. London, 'Liberalising the White Australia Policy: Integration, Assimilation, or Cultural Pluralism', *Australian Outlook*, 21 (1967), p. 339.

culture. In this thesis, the (numerical) minority was the dominant group in the administration of the nation, the Norman English.

Hugh Thomas wrote an exhaustive study, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity 1066-c.1200* showing the triumph of Englishness.<sup>74</sup> His main arguments were that the overwhelming numbers and strong identity of the indigenous English, compared to the lack of a unified culture among the few conquering Normans and their dearth of holy relics, assured a victory for English identity. Thomas wrote that the English had been coalescing into a *gens* before they were a nation. This may be dated from the time of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentes Anglorum* more than four hundred years earlier than the battle of the Standard. The Normans had only become a self-identified *gens* less than one hundred and fifty years earlier. The indigenous English might be defined as the majority, not only because of sheer numbers, but also by the strength of their identity of their *gens*.

### **Conclusion to the Introduction**

Sociologists and historians write about three types of assimilation in a conquest scenario. First the conquering *gens* imposes their institutions upon the conquered and the latter's disappears. Second, the overwhelming numbers of the conquered absorb the conquering *gens* then the latter's institutions disappear. Third, the two *gentes* fuse their institutions, languages, religions, customs, and laws and develop a unique third *gens* with its own characteristics. This thesis did not find that on these grounds, assimilation had occurred between the English and Norman English populations of

---

<sup>74</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*.



England before 1138.

This Introduction outlined the four major characteristics of a gens: origins, mores, language, and law were fluid and that an individual could be perceived to be a member of more than one *gens*. It further demonstrated that the 'Migration Period' triad of *gens*, *exercitus*, and *regnum* continued to develop in the medieval period. Chapter Two shows how Archbishop Thurstan shall successfully use this triad in the defence of Yorkshire and England. The definitions of acculturation and assimilation demonstrate that these terms are not interchangeable but represent distinct interactions between *gentes*. This thesis shall establish that there was acculturation between the English and the Norman English by the fourth decade of the twelfth century but there was not assimilation at that time.

## CHAPTER ONE: THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH AND NORMAN ENGLISH ASSIMILATION

### Introduction

Historiography—the study of the methodologies and theories used by historians—reveals the extent to which historians may be influenced by their own loyalties and groups. Once these biases are brought to light, they may be questioned and challenged. This chapter comprises an extensive historiography of the battle of the Standard. It seeks to demonstrate that there is a significant amount of evidence within the body of historical literature surrounding the battle, which refutes the ‘Gillingham Thesis’ and argues that the English and Norman English had *not* been assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century.

First, this chapter will examine the way in which historians have treated the assimilation and acculturation of the English and Norman English. Pre-twentieth century historians’ perceptions of the Norman Conquest’s impact and the ensuing acculturation and assimilation were guided by nationalism and imperialism. Nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians take a particularly chauvinistic view, that the battle of the Standard was fought between two distinct non-assimilated *gentes*. Modern historians—with the notable exception of George Garnett—have predominantly come to agree with the thesis of John Gillingham, who argued that the Norman English had assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century.

This chapter will also consider briefly the way in which historians have dealt with the problems of language—especially what the *gentes* called themselves and how they identified and communicated with ‘others’—as well as some problems with the nomenclature, the often perplexing dichotomy between ‘barbarism’ and ‘civilisation,’ the way in which mixed blood Norman English chroniclers revitalized the *Gens Anglorum*; the way in which an ethnic hatred of the Scots was used as a

vehicle to unite the Norman English and English *gentes*, and the Norman's desire to intermarry and the English use of Continental names.

This chapter will consider the geographic identity of the 'half-conquered' Northumbrian territories, which were never ruled quite as firmly as the other territories under the Norman dynasty. This relates to Keith Stringer's argument that David's late summer invasion of 1138 was intended to create a Scoto-Northumbrian kingdom. The English border counties had as much in common with Scotland as they did with England. This section shows the way in which the Anglo-Scottish border during this period was not only fluid, but also that its very existence was negligible to the cross-border elites.

This chapter looks at the four key institutions of Norman England: the monarchy, the aristocracy, the church, and the law. These four institutions were so essential to English society between the years 1066 and 1138 that, as Thomas claimed, they were integral to the emerging construct of Englishness. The importance of the continuation of the monarchy during this time cannot be overstated. As Keith Stringer claimed, it was imperative that a medieval king secures an orderly succession before his death; failure to do so inevitably resulted in instability. Time and time again, history has demonstrated the English need for and acceptance of a king. Although the English stubbornly opposed acculturation and assimilation, they understood that a kingdom needed a king and were therefore willing to pledge their loyalty to a foreign crown.

Under the Norman dynasty, the relationship that existed between the aristocracy and the monarchy reflected the goals and competence of the king in question. As this chapter will demonstrate, there were often times when the monarchy needed the aristocracy as much as the aristocracy needed the monarchy. King William

accepted the existing body of Anglo-Saxon law establishing legal continuity rather than an abrupt change. As for religion, this chapter considers the two important roles the church played between 1066 and 1138 and the extent to which the Church transformed from an English to a Norman English manifestation of God. It influenced the decisions of aristocrats and monarchs. This chapter will discuss religion at the battle of the Standard, where Thurstan, the desperately clever archbishop of York, combined the discrete elements of religious trappings, clerical edicts, and fear of a 'barbarian' enemy, to create an effective defence.

### **Assimilation and Acculturation: pre-20<sup>th</sup> century national historians**

Historians have debated whether the events of 1066 represent the annexation of a coequal part of a new empire, or whether William viewed England as a colony to be exploited. If the latter, then the barriers to assimilation between conqueror and colonized would be harder to overcome. In addition to which, the contrast between the old regime and the new would be greater. This debate has a long history. Its roots lie in the constitutional controversies of the early seventeenth century. The House of Stuart sidelined Anglo-Saxon laws, which were detrimental to their goal of royal primacy. As early as 1613, John Hayward had issued his remarkable, if somewhat inaccurate, *The liues of the III, Normans, Kings of England William the first, William the second, Henrie the first*, which was written for political, rather than historical reasons.<sup>1</sup> It was penned with the express approval of Henry, Prince of Wales, in order to promote the royal view. About this time, the theme of disjunction with the Anglo-Saxon past was also being discussed in the *Breviary of the History of England*,

---

<sup>1</sup> John Haywood, *The liues of the III, Normans, Kings of England William the first, William the second, Henrie the first* (London: R. Baker Arno, 1613); Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), p. 70 and J. W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart, a Study in 17<sup>th</sup> Century Personation* (New York: AMS Press, 1978), pp. 143-46.

attributed to Sir Walter Raleigh.<sup>2</sup> Already, the study of the Norman Conquest was beginning to be linked with contemporary politics. The attitude of these writers to their subject differed from the one John Rastell (1475-1536) exhibited nearly a hundred years earlier in his *The Pastyme of People* (1529).<sup>3</sup> It was, however, during the ensuing decades that the polemical approach to the subject was established by a multitude of tracts, few of which shared in Hayward's political views.

In the nineteenth century, a debate raged concerning King William I's intentions and his impact in England. Augustin Thierry attempted to demonstrate that William was a conqueror who was more interested in riches, plunder, and power than he was in any pretensions of legitimacy. Speaking of his motives, Thierry writes: 'William published his proclamation of war in the neighbouring lands, he offered strong riches and plunder of England to sturdy men who were willing to use the lance, the sword or the crossbow'.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, Palgrave reduced the conquest to a mere change of dynasties and damned 'the English usurper, the perjured Harold'.<sup>5</sup> Palgrave would claim that William made few changes in the makeup of English laws, customs, and religion, and that whatever changes in landholdings he did make were done legally. He found the followers of the usurper, Harold, were all traitors and deserved to lose their land.

Thierry argued that William was an alien. He did not speak the language, although Orderic maintains that he attempted to learn it.<sup>6</sup> He brought with him his Continental aristocracy and upper-level clergy, thereby ignoring a set of laws that started many generations earlier in several kingdoms of German migrants. Freeman's

---

<sup>2</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh, *An Introduction to a Breviary of the History of England with the Reign of King William I* (London: Keble and Brown, 1693), p. 198.

<sup>3</sup> John Rastell, *The Pastyme of People and a new Boke of Purgatory* (New York: Garland, 1985).

<sup>4</sup> Augustin Thierry, *Historie de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* (Paris, Furne et Ciel, 1851): 'Guillaume fit publier son ban de guerre dans les contrées voisines; il offrit une forte solde et le pillage de l'Angleterre à tout homme robuste qui voudrait le server de lance, de l'épée or de l'arbalete', p. 86.

<sup>5</sup> Francis Palgrave, *The History of Normandy and of England*, 4 vols (London: Macmillan, 1857), iii, p. 300.

<sup>6</sup> OV, ii, pp. 256-7.

views concurred with Thierry. He saw the conquest as the violent and prolonged subjugation of a people.<sup>7</sup> However, the contrast between Palgrave and Thierry is stark. The former saw little more than a dynastic change, yet the latter viewed the events as a foreign military conquest with catastrophic results.<sup>8</sup>

Edward Freeman reasoned that it was the Normans who adopted English laws, English customs, and the English language. In this sense, Edward Freeman's chauvinistic statement that 'At home, *Englishmen were* neither driven out nor *turned into Normans*, but *the Normans in England were turned into Englishmen*' has merit.<sup>9</sup> Freeman promoted the English cause, a people he viewed having origins in the remote forests of Germany. There, according to this historian, they formed self-governing communities that Freeman associated with a continuity over many centuries that manifested itself in Victorian England as Gladstonian Liberalism.<sup>10</sup> He wrote a long *History of the Norman Conquest of England*, which showed his political views that the Norman Conquest did not impede the growth of the English people.<sup>11</sup> As early as 1882, John Horace Round started to criticise Freeman.<sup>12</sup> Round used charters, a method of analysis Freeman neglected and ignored, to show that Stubbs and Freeman had greatly underestimated the effects of the Conquest on the political development of England.<sup>13</sup>

In 1879, John Richard Green published an article, 'Blending of Conquerors and

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward A., Freeman, *A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1880), p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> Palgrave, *History of England* and Augustin Thierry, *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans: Its Causes, and its Consequences, in England, Scotland, Ireland, and on the Continent* (London: J. M. Dent, 1907).

<sup>9</sup> Freeman, *Short History*, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Richard A. Cosgrove, 'A Usable Past: History and Politics of National Identity in Late Victorian England', *Parliamentary History*, 27 (2008), 30-42, pp. 33-34.

<sup>11</sup> Edward A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest, Its Causes and Its Results*, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1867-79).

<sup>12</sup> James Tait, 'John Horace Round', *EHR*, 43 (1928), p. 572.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 575.

Conquered’, in which he claimed that, at Norwich and other towns, the Normans initially isolated themselves from the English with the result that there was an English borough next to a French town.<sup>14</sup> This changed in Henry I’s reign when he vowed to reinstate the ‘old constitution of the realm’ with the changes William I had introduced. Addressing this point, Green commented that Henry’s marriage to the daughter of Margaret, of the house of ‘Cedric and Alfred’, placed an ‘English sovereign’ on the throne of England for the first time since the Conquest.<sup>15</sup> Green continued that, as much as this chagrined Norman nobles into taunting the royal couple,<sup>16</sup> it confirmed to even the ‘meanest English peasant’ that the Norman king of England would honour this commitment to the people. He further pointed out that the fusion of the Norman and the English occurred so rapidly that the name Norman disappeared at the accession of Henry II, in accordance with which the Normans boasted that they were Englishmen.<sup>17</sup> Green’s statements are important for two reasons. First, he allegedly described the pride of the indigenous Englishmen. Second, this nineteenth-century author claimed assimilation had been achieved in the 1150s.<sup>18</sup>

### **Assimilation and Acculturation: Nineteenth Century Yorkshire Historians**

As this thesis discusses acculturation and assimilation in relation to the battle of the Standard in 1138, it is relevant to survey the views of nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians. Modern scholars have often overlooked their work, but they cast an interesting light on the issues raised in this thesis. Edward Lamplough wrote of the battle of the Standard in 1891 that ‘Norman baron and Saxon peasant had not long to

---

<sup>14</sup> John Richard Green, ‘Blending of Conquerors and Conquered’, in *Readings in English History*, ed. by John Richard Green (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1879), p. 65.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.

<sup>16</sup> WMGRA 394.1 p. 716: ‘*Godricum eum et comparem Godgivam appellants.*’ (Godric and Godgifu)

<sup>17</sup> Green, ‘Blending’, p. 64.

<sup>18</sup> See below ‘Gillingham Thesis’, p. 37.

wait the trial of strength.’<sup>19</sup> His quote demonstrates that he perceived a clear socio-economic division between the conquerors, the Norman English, who were the barons, and the conquered, the English, who were the peasants. It raises the suggestion that socio-economic differences could have exaggerated ethnic boundaries.

Edward Lamplough had a confusing attitude towards the Norman dynasty. First, he wrote that ‘The crown which the Conqueror won at Hastings’,<sup>20</sup> which does not follow any of the official Norman renditions that give William legitimate custody of the throne of England.<sup>21</sup> Lamplough called King Henry I and King Stephen usurpers to the throne of England.<sup>22</sup> After branding them as such, he lavishly praised King David I of Scotland, describing him as ‘a humane and religious prince’.<sup>23</sup> This raises a dilemma. If William obtained the throne of England on the battlefield of Hastings, according to Lamplough, he was not the legitimate heir to King Edward. How then would Lamplough interpret and explain Norman soldiers on English soil? Who did they represent, and did they have any legitimacy to be on English soil if all their Norman rulers did not have a legitimate claim to the throne of England? Lamplough implied that the only legitimate king of England was the humane and religious prince David, a member of the house of Wessex on his maternal side. But he calls David’s troops ‘wild Scots’ who were ‘mercilessly slaughtering’.<sup>24</sup> Edward Lamplough demonstrated that he was not in favour of assimilation by damning everyone he wrote about, with the exception of the indigenous English and King Henry II who could claim descent from the house of Wessex. Lamplough concluded

---

<sup>19</sup> Edward Lamplough, *Yorkshire Battles* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co, 1891), p. 73.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>21</sup> These include the well know stories of William’s relationship to Emma, his ‘kinship’ with King Edward the Confessor and Harold’s promise of loyalty when in William’s custody.

<sup>22</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 53 and p, 58. Note. Lamplough called Henry a usurper on page 53 and Stephen one on page 58.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59.



his opus on the battle by stating that, ‘Under Henry (II)’s rule happier days dawned upon the kingdom.’<sup>25</sup>

Nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians often viewed themselves as Yorkshire people first and as English second. Perhaps this might be a reflection of the fluid borders of the medieval age or the fact that Yorkshire was so far north geographically from the seat of English power that it was in a separate ambit or was ignored. Miss A. Crosfield, writing in 1791, wrote of the populations involved, explicitly referred to them as ‘the English, or rather the inhabitants of Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire’.<sup>26</sup> It appears that Crosfield took pains to differentiate the inhabitants of the northern counties.

Alex D. H. Leadman exulted in his Yorkshire countrymen, ‘for it was in the main part by Yorkshiremen that the battle of the Standard was fought and won’.<sup>27</sup> Leadman did not explicitly state whether the Yorkshiremen were yeomen or barons. However, he did imply that, although the northern barons ‘aided’ in the battle, it was the Yorkshire fyrd, led by their priests, which ‘bore more the look of a holy pilgrimage than the preparation for a great battle’ that they won.<sup>28</sup> However, although he mentioned Walter Espec, Leadman did not reiterate a single line of the speech Ailred of Rievaulx put in his mouth praising the glorious ancestor of the Norman English barons. Alex Leadman’s report of the battle of the Standard shows two distinct *gentes*. It does not show a degree of acculturation or assimilation. The nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians were more chauvinistic than the modern historians, as the following segment demonstrates.

---

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75. It would be interesting to ask if Lamplough knew of ‘The Green Tree Prophecy’.

<sup>26</sup> A. Crosfield, *The History of North-Allerton, in the county of York. To which is added a description of the Castle-Hills* (York: J. Langdale, 1791), p. 55.

<sup>27</sup> Alex D. H. Leadman, *Proelia Eboracensia: Battles Fought in Yorkshire: Treated Historically and Topographically* (London: Bradbury, Agnew, & Co. Limd., 1891), p. 15. Previously printed Alex D. H. Leadman, ‘The Battle of the Standard’, *YATJ*, 10 (1889), pp. 375-387.

<sup>28</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 16.

## **Assimilation and Acculturation: 20<sup>th</sup> century perspectives**

In this dissertation, the opinions of nineteenth-century historians as well as more modern ones are relevant. The post-colonial remorse found in historians of the last sixty years is different than the brazen imperialism of Freeman, Round, and their contemporaries.<sup>29</sup> These nineteenth-century writers were influential in later debates, and they provide an interesting study of how attitudes toward assimilation have changed over time. They also remind us that historians of any age are sometimes prone to biases that they may, but not always, be subconsciously aware of. The differences of historical opinions acted as a proxy for political differences that culminated in a vicious attack by Round against Freeman that went to press after the latter's death.<sup>30</sup> For the pre-twentieth-century historians, nationalism, imperialism, and politics guided perceptions of the impact of the conquest and the acculturation and assimilation that followed.

In his article, 'The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest', James Francis West ventured into the realm of the social anthropologists to explain the Conquest, stating that it was part of the medieval expansion of northern Europe. According to him, this expansion created contact between the different cultures of the invading and indigenous *gentes*. West used the anthropologists' term, 'culture-contact', analysing indigenous responses to dominant invading cultures.<sup>31</sup> Barrow and Davies advocated this perspective.<sup>32</sup> Another influential work was Frederick Jackson Turner's 1921

---

<sup>29</sup> Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, and John Horace Round, *Feudal England: Historical Studies on the XIth and XIIth centuries* (London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1895).

<sup>30</sup> Cosgrove, 'A Usable Past', p. 30.

<sup>31</sup> Francis James West, 'The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest?', *History*, 84 (1999), p. 221.

<sup>32</sup> G. W. S. Barrow, 'Frontier and Settlement: Which Influenced Which England and Scotland, 1100-1300', in *The Anglo-Norman Era; Medieval Frontier Societies*, ed. by Robert Bartlett and Angus Mackay (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989); R. R. Davies, *Domination and Conquest: The Experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales, 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

book on frontiers in the American west.<sup>33</sup> The study of English frontiers began with Tout and continued with Barrow, Bartlett, and Davies, all of whom looked beyond the Norman Conquest to the Normans' interaction with the 'Celtic' Fringe.<sup>34</sup> John Gillingham wrote that much of medieval English history might be viewed as the conquest and forced Anglicization of Celtic-speaking *gentes*.<sup>35</sup> England was the dominant state in the British Isles. As Rees Davies stated, acculturation can be an enriching experience because it brings a culture and its values in contact with another culture. It revives and redirects cultural energies, but Davies warned that it could also be a subtly detrimental experience, especially for the minority and subservient culture. The intrusive power, led by an acquisitive kingship, aristocracy, and a centralising church, might realign the political and social order. The subjugated culture is consciously or otherwise exposed to the ambitious ruling class's goal of land acquisition and their proselytizing clerical elite.<sup>36</sup>

A number of historians have analysed the Conquest from an economic perspective. Michael Clanchy wrote that William and his sons needed to exploit the riches of England to survive in Normandy.<sup>37</sup> Susan Reynolds queried whether the Normans could 'have changed English society when they could not change its economic base?' Robin Fleming disagreed, finding that after the 'Rising of the Earls' within nine years of the Conquest that all lands and animals owned by Anglo-Saxon

---

<sup>33</sup> Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1962).

<sup>34</sup> T. F. Tout, 'Wales and the March during the Barons' War, 1258-1267', in *Historical Essays by Members of the Owens College, Manchester*, ed. by T. F. Tout and James Tait (London: Longmans, Green, 1902), pp. 76-136; T. F. Tout, *The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914); and Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

<sup>35</sup> Gillingham, 'Imperialism', p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> R. R Davies, *Domination and Conquest: The Experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 51.

<sup>37</sup> Michael Clanchy, *England and its Rulers 1066-1272* 3rd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), pp. 47-52; J. O. Prestwich, 'Anglo-Norman Feudalism and the Problem of Continuity', *Past and Present*, 26 (1963), pp. 39-57; and D. Roffe, 'From Thegnage to Barony', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 12 (1989), pp. 157-76.

earls reverted to the Norman king.<sup>38</sup> Nevertheless, George Garnett argued that the massive change of land ownership, which followed the conquest, did not necessarily mean a wholesale change in the system of distribution.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, the pillars of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy had been destroyed.

David Bates argued that the Normans were a military elite who purposely dominated the English.<sup>40</sup> The numbers of Norman English remained small because of the paucity of non-aristocratic immigrants. Most Normans entered England either in 1066 at the battle of Hastings or after William's return to Normandy the following year. After the 'Rising of the Earls', the Norman English aristocracy and the crown held most of the land, and the Church had but one English bishop. David Carpenter maintained that, in less than one month in 1066, the political hierarchy of England was in tatters; within nine years, it was completely destroyed.<sup>41</sup> Gillingham observed that no European nation had undergone as radical a change as England after the Norman Conquest.<sup>42</sup> In 1066, England received a new ruling class and the devastation resulted in the development of a new culture.<sup>43</sup> John Gillingham found that the change in culture had a more lasting effect than the change in dynasty.<sup>44</sup>

Hugh Thomas claimed that the English and Normans started off in the worst possible way, with hatred on both sides. However, the destruction of the Old English

<sup>38</sup> Robin Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 229 and Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994).

<sup>39</sup> George Garnett, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 16.

<sup>40</sup> David Bates, *The Normans and Empire*, The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford during Hilary Term 2010 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 86.

<sup>41</sup> David Carpenter, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066-1284* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 63.

<sup>42</sup> Gillingham, 'Historian', p. 45.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18 from Dominique Barthélemy, *Le chevalerie de la Germanie antique à la France du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 2007), p. 193.

<sup>44</sup> Gillingham, 'Integration', p. 85.

<sup>45</sup> George Garnett, 'Franci et Angli: The Legal Distinctions between Peoples after Conquest', ANS, ed.

aristocracy not only reduced further hostility, but it also facilitated assimilation.<sup>45</sup> Garnett drew attention to a charter, which referenced three *gentes*, viz. the French (the Norman English), the English, and the Flemings,<sup>46</sup> which was addressed to the followers of Duke William.<sup>47</sup> Garnett argued that it was written in Old English because the king wanted his English subjects to know that he was protecting their interests. This might be a continuation of Orderic Vitalis's idea that William I desired to be the king of the English, a fact scarcely mentioned by modern historians. Gillingham found a deeply divided society and Garnett found a society in which the Conqueror was making an effort to be accepted by all his subjects.

Hugh Thomas determines that the acquisition of the kingdom of England by a small number of Norman men and women resulted in the triumph of the subjugated culture over that of the conquerors. However, he concluded that the triumph of Englishness was not simply due to there being overwhelming numbers of the English. In his view, the Norman English found that English customs, local saints, relics, and language filled a void in their own military-based heritage. This point was developed by Rollason.<sup>48</sup> As a generation of warriors produced a second and third generation of landowners who interacted with their local English maids, servants, serfs, and lower clergy on a daily basis, English customs were more necessary than Norman feats of arms. Thomas argued that the concept of England, which had been developed well before the Conquest, transcended ethnicity and remained well established with the conquerors.<sup>49</sup>

---

by R. Allen Brown viii. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), p. 114.

<sup>46</sup> See 'Charter for Archbishop Aeldred', Appendix 1, p. 228.

<sup>47</sup> Garnett, '*Françi*': '*Quos W. Normannorum dux suo iussu*' p. 115

<sup>48</sup> David Rollason, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), pp. 235-37.

<sup>49</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 273.

### **‘The Gillingham thesis’**

John Gillingham published five articles on the relationship between the indigenous English and the conquering Norman immigrants between 1992 and 2012.<sup>50</sup> His argument may be summarized as the ‘Gillingham Thesis’, which stated that, the Norman English and the English assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century.<sup>51</sup> Gillingham asked when the conquerors thought of themselves as English, yet his question was open to several interpretations. It might mean when they perceived themselves subjects of the kingdom of England rather than the duchy of Normandy (from 1106 to 1144 they were one and the same). The question could also be answered, not from a political perspective but a cultural one. Reframed in this way, it might be written as follows: were these men and women disassociating themselves from their motherland across the channel and accepting the English language, saints, and mores? Lastly, Gillingham’s question could be viewed both ways. Gillingham used a rhetorical question to answer his argument. If it took several generations for the Norman English to be ‘English’ or English, then what did they call themselves or perceive themselves to be in the interim? He asked if there was an interim stage when they perceived themselves as Anglo-Norman.<sup>52</sup> He described the use of Anglo-Norman as an adjective but never as a noun.

In his article on Henry of Huntingdon, Gillingham stated that when the third recension of *Historia Regum Anglorum* (c. 1140) was written, that there was ‘no longer any sign of the distinction between Norman rulers and English subjects’.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Gillingham, ‘Imperialism’, pp. 3-18; Gillingham, ‘Henry’ pp. 123-44; Gillingham, ‘Civilizing’, pp. 17-43; Gillingham, ‘Integration’, pp. 85-135; and Gillingham, ‘Historian’, pp. 45-74. Note. This thesis shall agree with John Gillingham and use the proper term ‘Celtic-speaking people(s)’ not ‘Celtic’.

<sup>51</sup> Gillingham, ‘Henry’, p. 125.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 129.

In the following sentence, Gillingham wrote that the battle of the Standard was the victory of the northern barons. In the next paragraph, he noted that Henry of Huntingdon wrote 'our victory - was won by the weight of our archery'. Either 'our' victory was the combined effort of this newly formed Norman English and English *gentes*, as Henry of Huntingdon initially wrote, or solely the accomplishments of the northern barons or the Norman-trained English archers. In Chapter Two, this thesis shall demonstrate that a combined effort of Norman English hauberk knights intermingled with English archers won the battle. Both *gentes* contributed to the victory at the battle of the Standard in distinctly different ways. I would argue that John Gillingham was trying to do too much with too little evidence. His sharp distinction between the northern barons and the English archers strengthens the central idea of this thesis that assimilation did not happen by 1138.

Gillingham was not the only historian who stated there was assimilation in the twelfth century. Hugh Thomas noted that Edward Freeman argued for a swift assimilation but more for ideological rather than historical reasons. Thomas was more cautious, placing the assimilation towards the end of the reign of Henry II, in the 1180s.<sup>54</sup> K. S. B. Keats-Rohan wrote that a noteworthy degree of assimilation occurred by 1200.<sup>55</sup> These other historians dated assimilation well after 1138. Gillingham argued that it took two generations for assimilation to occur.<sup>56</sup> This thesis finds that date premature, arguing that there was a degree of acculturation - involving language, customs, and the appreciation of English religious relics - but not assimilation. The ethnic composition of the armies at the battle of the Standard will be used to support this claim.

<sup>54</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 57.

<sup>55</sup> K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, 'The Bretons and the Normans of England 1066-1154: The Family, Fief and the Feudal Monarchy', *Nottingham, Medieval Studies*, 36 (1992), p. 42.

<sup>56</sup> Gillingham, 'Imperialism', p. 392.

## Civilizing the English

According to Gillingham, the English were not merely defeated and damned in 1066 but they were also tinged with barbarism.<sup>57</sup> At the beginning of Chapter Seven of Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, Henry described the Normans as God's messengers who had been sent to destroy the perfidious English *gentes*. William of Malmesbury admitted that the English people were initially war-like, pagan, and barbarous but gradually changed under a civilizing influence. Gillingham observed that William of Malmesbury wrote more than Henry about the progression of a mixture of Christianity and European (French) culture, which brought civilization to England.<sup>58</sup> Gillingham endeavoured to demonstrate that the English were European with a long civilizing process behind them. However, the French were the teachers and the English the pupils.

One significant change the Normans brought to England was the abolishment of slavery. William of Malmesbury saved his greatest anger for his fellow Englishmen when he stated that they impregnated their servants and then sold them to brothels or abroad.<sup>60</sup> The barbarous sexual mores of the English were also linked with Archbishop Lanfranc's wish to curtail sexual excesses and enforce clerical celibacy. William of Malmesbury later used this as a cudgel to beat down the less civilised Celtic-speaking *gentes* that still indulged in slavery and uncanonical marriages. Whereas, the English were perceived to have become civilized; their neighbours had not.

---

<sup>57</sup> Gillingham, 'Problems', p. 94.

<sup>58</sup> Gillingham, 'A Historian', p. 46. Note he referred to his 2001 chapter on 'Civilizing the English?'

<sup>60</sup> WMGRA, iii. 245.4, pp. 458-59: '*Illud erat a natura abhorrens, quod multi ancillas suas ex se grauidas, ubi libidini satisfacissent, aut ad publicum prostibulum aut ad externum obsequium uenditabant*'



Henry of Huntingdon lamented that during the reign of King William II (1087-1100), 'England was miserably stifled and could not breathe'.<sup>61</sup> Orderic Vitalis described the 'Norman Yoke' on the *gens Anglorum*. In the 1120s and early 1130s, the English felt they were second-class subjects in their own country. John Gillingham viewed the transformation of Christian Scandinavians and Celtic-speakers into barbarians at the hands of William of Malmesbury as a precursor to the creation of a unified English identity. John Gillingham saw that 'us' against 'them' created 'our'.

Thomas emphasises that a *gens* will only assimilate with a *gens* that they respect. Yet twelfth-century writers wrote of the treachery of the English, the massacre of the Danes in 1002, the killing of Alfred, and their most egregious leader, Harold, who broke his vows. Thomas carefully explained how these writers morphed the treacherous English to the respectable English worthy of assimilation, by making them appear as loyal subjects. For example, chroniclers exaggerated the actions of the English in support of William II against the barons and of Henry I against his brother Duke Robert. Thomas argued that this helped create an image of an honourable people.<sup>63</sup>

Thomas listed the positive stereotypes of the English, which developed, including 'generosity, hospitality, devotion to good living and intelligence'.<sup>64</sup> However, he admits that negative stereotypes were far more prevalent. They included over-indulgence in food, wine, and sex, which William of Malmesbury had written

---

<sup>61</sup> HA, vii. 22, pp. 448-49: '*Nec respirare poterat Anglia miserabiliter suffocata*'.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 246.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 300.

about. Thomas cleverly converted the negative stereotypes of copiousness and gluttony into a positive image of England. England was the land of plenty and a country of richness. This concept of England had its foundation in Bede's Introduction.<sup>65</sup> The reason the English could eat and drink well was because there was so much to eat and drink. Thomas concluded that medieval stereotypes should not be taken seriously, but if the people accepted these stereotypes, this could bolster their national identity.

A conquered people were able to do the nearly impossible. Not only did the English keep the richness of their culture, the reverence for their native saints, and their language, but they also made their way of life so appealing that their conquerors wished to emulate it. Thomas was of the opinion that it might have been easier for the Normans to identify with England than the English.<sup>66</sup> He perceived a revival of English identity, despite the overwhelming Norman control of the aristocracy, clergy, and monarchy. He categorised the various elements that created Englishness, but he also used the geographical entity of England as a category of English pride. Thomas argued that the concept of England, which had been developed well before the conquest, transcended ethnicity and remained well established with the conquerors.<sup>68</sup>

Gillingham noted that, by the 1140s and 1150s, there was a developing sense of common identity. He noted that Geoffrey Gaimar composed his translation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the *Estorie des Engleis*, for French-speaking men who thought themselves English 'enough to think the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was their past', even if its vernacular was incomprehensible to them.<sup>69</sup> However, if Gillingham stated that these 1150s Norman English could not understand the language of the

---

<sup>65</sup> Bede, i. 1, pp.14-15.

<sup>66</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 281.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 390 and p. 273.

<sup>69</sup> Gillingham, 'Henry', p. 140 and Geoffrey Gaimar, *Estoire des Engleis*, ed. by Ian Short (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, then they would not have been able to communicate in 1138 with the fyrd at the battle of the Standard.

In January 1066, a dying Edward the Confessor is said to have revealed ‘The Green Tree Prophecy’ and the uncertainty of a member of the house of Wessex sitting on the throne of England again.<sup>70</sup> Ailred of Rievaulx made Henry II the central figure in the successful conclusion of the prophecy as the son of Matilda and the grandson of Henry I. Hugh Thomas noted that the differences in English self-perception in the 1120s and 1150s demonstrated the different ways William of Malmesbury, Osbert of Clare, and Ailred of Rievaulx viewed the prophecy. Since Thomas argued that assimilation occurred late in the reign of Henry II, the prophecy fits his timeline, but not that of Gillingham who argued that English assimilation was complete by the early 1140s. Thus, interpretations of the Green Tree prophecy demonstrated the differences in historians’ conclusions on the date of assimilation.

### **The ‘Barbarian fringe’**

By the twelfth century, the English idea of a ‘barbarian fringe’, which included the Scots, Irish, and Welsh, had emerged. Gillingham noted that Henry of Huntingdon, who began writing in the 1120s, did not view the Celtic-speaking *gentes* as barbarians until the late 1130s when he described the devastation caused by King David’s army culminating in the battle of the Standard. A basic thesis of Wyatt’s *Slaves and Warriors* was that medieval authors wrote of the battle of the Standard not as a battle between Englishmen and Scots but as a battle between two different cultures.<sup>71</sup> There

---

<sup>70</sup> Anonymous, *The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. by Frank Barlow, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), pp. 118-19 and *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard (London: Longman, 1858) iii. *Vita Eaduardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium Requiescit*, p. 431.

<sup>71</sup> David Wyatt, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2009).

is a correlation in the rise of negative attitudes towards Celtic-speaking peoples within England, during the English civil war, especially with reference to slave raiding and brutality. It may be that fear of attack from neighbouring peoples led to negative propaganda, and the desire for unity within England lead to the ‘othering’ of non-English neighbours.

Gillingham considered many examples of twelfth-century writers admonishing the lack of civility of the Welsh, the Scots, and the Irish. He attributed the origin of this idea to William of Malmesbury.<sup>72</sup> Gillingham noted that an imperialistic viewpoint existed earlier in English history. King Edgar claimed to be emperor of Britain. However, Edgar was buried at Glastonbury with the saints of Ireland, Scotland, and the Britons.<sup>73</sup> Edgar might have felt that he was a king of kings, but without the sense of animosity that William of Malmesbury engendered in the 1120s. Gillingham asked why did William of Malmesbury have such a hateful attitude towards the Celtic-speaking *gentes*? He stated that William’s classical studies made him more aware of barbarians with connotations that were ‘moral, social and cultural rather than religious’.<sup>74</sup>

Much of John Gillingham’s writing appeared to be influenced by Rees Davies’ idea of the Norman English and English acting as a ‘Second tidal wave’ engulfing and invading the Celtic speaking *gentes* of the British Isles.<sup>75</sup> The two shared a similar view of twelfth-century Norman English imperialism in the British Isles. Gillingham used Norman English and English imperialism of the Celtic-speaking *gentes* of the British Isles to prove that the two *gentes* of the kingdom of England had assimilated within two generations of the Norman Conquest. John Gillingham has set himself a

---

<sup>72</sup> Gillingham, ‘Imperialism’, p. 397.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., pp. 397-98 and Gillingham, ‘Conquering’, pp. 68-69.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., p. 64.

<sup>75</sup> Davies, *Domination*, p. 15. Note. Davies considered the Anglo-Saxon military migration to the British Isles in the mid-fifth century as the ‘First wave’.

formidable task; the Normans and the English would be one people in less than two generations and thus could have imperialistic tendencies less than one hundred years after the Conquest.<sup>76</sup>

### **Ethnic Hatred of the Scots as a Vehicle to Unite the Norman English and English *gentes* at the Battle of the Standard**

Some historians have attempted to portray the battle of the Standard as an epic conflict against the forces of darkness and evil that would be more appropriate in a comic book than a history book. The internecine war between Stephen and Mathilda was a Norman English crisis, which splintered the ruling elite. This suddenly removed the unremitting pressure that the Norman kings had exerted on their neighbours in the British Isles.<sup>77</sup> In order to join the English to their side against the threat of Scottish and Welsh incursions, the Norman English used ethnic hatred and created a new class of barbarians, the Christian barbarians. This created a propaganda war between the 'civilised', the Norman English and the English, and the uneducated, brutal, and cruel 'others', the Welsh and the Scots. John Gillingham and Matthew Strickland have clearly defined the importance of such a distinction when Norman English troops were engaged on the margins of the kingdom of England, in Wales, and in Scotland.<sup>78</sup>

William of Malmesbury and Symeon of Durham condemned Malcolm III for slave raiding, as a symptom of his barbarity. However, the king of Scotland's action may not have been merely slave raiding for booty. Ritchie concurred, stating that if both the king of Scotland and the king of England maintained that it was Scottish land,

<sup>76</sup> Gillingham, 'Imperialism', p. 392.

<sup>77</sup> Bates, 'Kingship', p. 96.

<sup>78</sup> Gillingham, 'Conquering', p. 46 and Michael Strickland, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 183-203.

<sup>79</sup> R. L. G. Ritchie, *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954), p. 26.

they would be difficult to call invasions.<sup>79</sup> King Malcolm III was conducting raids into land that he believed was rightfully his. The twelfth-century chroniclers wrote a generation or two later, at a time when slavery was no longer acceptable in England. John Gillingham called the demise of the old-fashioned, cruel, and barbarous warfare of slavery a striking innovation and a vital moment in the European history of freedom.<sup>80</sup> Frederick W. Maitland might have been the first historian to apply the term ‘Celtic Fringe’, and modern historiography followed suit.<sup>81</sup> A modern journal article demonstrated how raw the field of study was. In ‘England against the Celtic Fringe: A Study in Cultural Stereotypes’, W. R. Jones investigated slavery as a manifestation of the socio-economic differences between England and its Celtic-speaking neighbours.<sup>82</sup> He found that the richer English economy could be maintained without slavery.

King David later entered Northumbria with the intention of expanding his kingdom. Nineteenth-century Yorkshire and modern English historians have twisted this military invasion of one sovereign nation into the territory of another into something much different. For example, Gillingham views the invasion as a clash of cultures. To this, Davis adds that, when the Scottish king crossed the Tees and entered Yorkshire with an army comprised, in part, of a large number of troops from Galloway, it was regarded almost as a barbarian invasion.<sup>83</sup> Everett Crosby disagrees, stating that lowland Scotland, in spite of claims made by certain writers that the ‘Celtic fringe’ was barbarous and therefore ripe for invasion, had in fact been closely connected to the Anglo-Norman kingdom.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>80</sup> Gillingham, ‘Conquering’, p. 73 and Gillingham, ‘Women’, p. 61.

<sup>81</sup> Gillingham, ‘Introduction’, p. xv.

<sup>82</sup> W. R. Jones, ‘England against the Celtic Fringe: A Study in Cultural Stereotypes’, *Cahiers d’histoire Mondiale: Journal of World History*, 13 (1971), p. 155.

<sup>83</sup> R. H. C. Davis, *King Stephen 1135-1154*, 3rd edn. (London: Longman, 1990), p. 38.

<sup>84</sup> Everett U. Crosby, *The King’s Bishops: The Politics and Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066-1216* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 2013), p. 76.

Hugh Thomas exemplified the otherness assigned to the Celtic-speaking *gentes* in Ailred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo*. He used Robert de Brus's speech to King David as the epitome of the difference between the subjects of the kingdom of England and the Celtic-speaking *gentes*.<sup>85</sup> Thomas understood the complexities of Robert's speech, but he mistranslated the baron's message. Robert de Brus was not speaking of, as Thomas phrased it, 'we English and Normans' versus 'those Celts'.

Ailred had very cleverly interspersed the nationalistic term English (soldiers of the King of England, therefore English soldiers) with the ethnic term Norman. To heighten the confusion, Ailred, writing in the 1150s about a battle that took place in 1138, was still referring to the conquerors as the Normans, not Anglo-Norman or Norman English. Yet, Thomas claimed that Ailred was creating a difference between the subjects of the King of England and the 'others', which brought the indigenous and immigrant peoples closer to being one people. The terms Norman, English, Anglo-Norman, and 'English' were confusing and arbitrarily defined. However, for a modern medievalist to accept Ailred of Rievaulx's blanket use of the term 'Norman' for an 1150s opus demonstrated that assimilation was still lacking between the two *gentes*.

The animosity was contrived for two reasons. The first was the fact that Scottish leaders took advantage of King Stephen's perceived weakness and wished to cause havoc. The second is the defensiveness on the part of the Norman English chroniclers. Matilda had a legitimate claim to the throne of England, which many Norman English barons ignored because of her gender. Instead, they supported a non-Norman and non-English 'Frenchman', Stephen of Blois. The county of Blois was an enemy of the Duchy of Normandy. Perhaps animosity to the Scots served two purposes; it provided the English with a means to voice their frustration with Norman

---

<sup>85</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 312.

rule, and it allowed the Norman rulers to find common cause with their English subjects.

Donald Matthew found that ‘the peoples concerned were too similar; the confusions of lordship too great’.<sup>86</sup> The Norman barons only expressed hatred when the King of Scotland unleashed Galwegians from the remoter parts of his kingdom. David's own contingent of household guards was composed of ethnic Normans from England and the Continent, the men of Lothian, and they were not seen as alien or indeed as anything but a temporary enemy.<sup>87</sup> The exact identity of the Galwegians was a source of much confusion for the twelfth-century writers. Strickland saw them as the remnants of the powerful British Kingdom of Strathclyde, which—at its height—stretched to Loch Lomond. Thus, the Galwegians were a blend of Gaelic-speaking Britons and Gaels. As Strickland ventured, ‘this added a further dimension to their otherness’.<sup>88</sup> To confuse matters further, although most twelfth-century writers made a clear distinction between Scots and Galwegians, the Priors of Hexham calling the Galwegians ‘Picts’.<sup>89</sup> However, these same writers were able to distinguish Galwegians and Cumbrians who dwelt south of the Solway.<sup>90</sup>

Thomas used the anthropological idea that members of a *gens* might be self-identified by contrasting themselves with others. He argued that by the second and third generation after the Conquest, the English regained some of their sense of innate superiority, which might have been lost at the battle of Hastings. However, this did not represent the unification of the two *gentes* of England against the ‘others’. Rather, the ‘othering’ might have worked more strongly as an agent against assimilation than for it. This is an idea that Thomas missed. The superiority complex may have been

---

<sup>86</sup> D. Matthew, *Britain and the Continent 1000-1300* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), p. 84.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 84-85.

<sup>88</sup> Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 293.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 292, n. 5.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 292, n. 7.



borne of insecurity. This fear was expressed through loathing.<sup>91</sup> William of Malmesbury had sown the seeds of a cultural bias against the Celtic-speaking *gentes*, which continued to the present day.<sup>92</sup>

### **Northern England or Southern Scotland?**

The Norman dynasty had never been able to rule its Northumbrian territories as firmly as other regions. Northumberland lay far from King Stephen of England's power bases and closer to Scotland; Michael Lynch called it 'half-conquered'.<sup>93</sup> Keith Stringer argued that David's late summer invasion of 1138, which culminated at Northallerton, sought the creation of a Scoto-Northumbrian kingdom.<sup>94</sup> The Anglo-Scottish border began to evolve in the tenth century because of two events. The collapse of the Scandinavian kingdom of York drew the Wessex monarchy farther north, and the growing Scottish kingdom came into closer contact with the still viable Anglian, Bernician and Brittonic Cumbrian families on its southeastern and southwestern borders respectively.<sup>95</sup> For Judith Green, the 'north' referred to all of England north of the rivers Mersey and Humber. She went further than Barrow's compartmentalised kingdoms of York and Bernicia and viewed the north as a patchwork of ethnic identities.<sup>96</sup> While Barrow viewed the north from a Scottish perspective, Green viewed it from an English one. Barrow saw a stronger, more centralised Scottish kingdom advancing south, whereas Green sharply distinguished between England north and south of the river Humber.

---

<sup>91</sup> Chapter Three shall discuss 'The Alfred Adler Theory'.

<sup>92</sup> Rosalind Mitchison, *A History of Scotland*, 3rd edn (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 30.

<sup>93</sup> Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History*, 2nd edn (London: Pimlico, 1992), p. 74.

<sup>94</sup> Keith Stringer, *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare, and Government in Twelfth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 28.

<sup>95</sup> Barrow, 'Frontier', p. 3.

<sup>96</sup> Judith Green, *The Aristocracy of Norman England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 100.

In the south, King William I had little problem, according to Green, instituting Norman rule over ‘a recognised framework of authority’ where the opposition hardly existed. However, north of the rivers, there were still powerful families that had not fought at Hastings. These families still held their land and were reluctant to lose that control.<sup>97</sup> Barrow, Green, Aird, and Strickland all make similar arguments about the fluidity of the frontier and that Northumbria—that land north of the river Humber—was different than south England. According to Aird, in the early twelfth century, the Anglo-Scottish frontier was almost negligible.<sup>98</sup> As Aird explained, the border was merely a construct, which divided communities that had more in common with each other than with their titular overlords.<sup>99</sup>

After the Conquest, the Normans had a problem in the northern reaches of the county of York. Although there were Norman settlers from southern England and the continent, the crown’s relative indifference to this region allowed it to fall into the ambit of King David of Scotland. Since this thesis concentrates on Northumbria, it is important to note as Hugh Thomas has done, how Norman centralisation of power worked against the barons in the north. In the battle of the Standard, the northern barons were hesitant to oppose David. However, Thurstan, who had become Stephen’s political lieutenant in the north, vigorously argued his cause. Thurstan, or their loyalty to Stephen did not sway the northern barons. It was David’s poor planning and control of his army that made the final decision of the northern barons’ obvious and inevitable.

Green stated that the issue in 1138 was whether the Anglo-Scottish border

---

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>98</sup> William M. Aird, ‘Northern England or Southern Scotland? The Anglo-Scottish Border in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries and the Problem of Perspective’, in *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000-1700*, ed. by John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Thrupp: Sutton, 1997), pp. 32-33.

<sup>99</sup> G.W.S. Barrow, ‘The Scots and the North of England’ in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. by E. King (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1994), pp. 231-37.

might have been fixed at the Solway-Tweed line or 'further south'.<sup>100</sup> In Stringer's opinion, the English king maintained a remarkably stout defence from 1136-38.<sup>101</sup> However, Strickland disagreed.<sup>102</sup> David's invasion in the summer of 1138 shows how easily the Scottish army could invade into the heart of Northumbria. The fluid border allowed intercourse between the multiple *gentes* on both sides of the border, and, 'in an act of cultural mimesis,'<sup>103</sup> the Scots adopted key political and social institutions from England. According to Paul Dalton, the allegiances of the cross-border elites were highly complex. They could be conflicting, limited, multiple, shifting, and/or conditional. In times of military or political conflict, their complexity was likely to increase.<sup>104</sup> Davis's example of this complexity during the English civil war was that both Simon de Senlis, an advocate of King Stephen, and Henry, the son of the King of the Scots, claimed the earldoms of Huntingdon and Northampton.<sup>105</sup> Not only was the Anglo-Scottish border fluid during this period, but also its existence was negligible to the cross-border elites. Later, this thesis shall take a concise look at the two armies and attempt to determine why the various *gentes* fought for either David or Thurstan.

## **Institutions**

The largest segment of this historiography shall concern the institutions of Norman England. Institutions represent the very essence of English society in the years 1066-

---

<sup>100</sup> Judith Green, 'Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1066-1174', in *England and her Neighbours 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Ronceverte, 1989), p. 53.

<sup>101</sup> Matthew Strickland, 'Securing the North: Invasion and the Strategy of Defence in Twelfth-Century English Warfare', in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), p. 208.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>103</sup> William M. Aird, 'Sweet Civility and Barbarous Rudeness': a View from the Frontier. Abbot Ailred of Rievaulx and the Scots' in *Imagining Frontiers: Contesting Identities*, ed. by S. G. Ellis and L. Klusáková (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007), p. 60.

<sup>104</sup> Paul Dalton, *Conquest, Anarchy, and Lordship: Yorkshire 1066-1154* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 80.

<sup>105</sup> R. H. C. Davis, 'What Happened in King Stephen's Reign, 1135-54', *History*, 49 (1964), p. 9.

1138. This section is divided into four parts: the monarchy, the aristocracy, the church, and the law. Thomas argued that institutions, including the royal government, aided the creation of Englishness. King William might not have learned the native language, but he strove to be an English king. A joint Norman and English assembly on Christmas Day for his coronation might have been unprecedented, but this demonstrated that William reached out to the English. Thomas stated that William kept this concept not only for propaganda purposes, but also to reinforce the construct that both Normans and English paid allegiance to him as King of England.<sup>106</sup> Thomas recognised that writers were biased towards their own churches, which raised the general consciousness of the Church in relation to Englishness and England.<sup>107</sup> Thomas also noted the strong relationship of the religious and the laity to the saints of England. He observed the lack of Norman relics, the profusion of English saints, and the incorporation of English saints into the international houses domiciled in England.<sup>108</sup> The Normans quickly embraced English saints. Ironically, the institution that Eadmer and William of Malmesbury lamented for excluding the native inhabitants became a solid bulwark for Englishness.

### *The Aristocracy*

Ann Williams and David Carpenter are in agreement that in 1016 new English families were brought to the fore and the English aristocracy may have been shaken but Scandinavians did not displace it. The effect was temporary.<sup>109</sup> However, in less than one month after 1066, the aristocracy of England was destroyed in the south of

---

<sup>106</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 276.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 283-84.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 291-93.

<sup>109</sup> Ann Williams, 'Cockles amongst the Wheat': Danes and English in the Western Midlands in the First Half of The Eleventh Century', *Midland History*, 11 (1986), p. 15 and Carpenter, *Struggle*, p. 64.

England. Within nine years, it was completely eliminated.<sup>110</sup> This allowed King William I to create his own aristocracy. Crouch stated that the nineteenth-century historians Frederick W. Maitland and John H. Round, as well as the early twentieth-century historian Frank M. Stenton, saw the Norman Conquest itself as social revolution that introduced knight service. Although Crouch found this ‘feudal’ analysis of landed tenure producing a new society incorrect, these historians still garner so much respect from modern historians that, even in the first years of the twenty-first century, much English social history remains written in these terms.<sup>111</sup>

The relationship of the aristocracy and the monarchy under the Norman kings was reflective of the competence and goals of the individual kings.<sup>112</sup> In ‘Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, Earl of Warwick: New Men and Magnates in the Reign of Henry I’,<sup>113</sup> David Crouch demonstrated the importance of loyalty to the king, arguing that King Henry established Geoffrey de Clinton in Warwickshire to counter the power of Roger, Earl of Warwick.<sup>114</sup> Warwickshire was situated in the central Midlands, an area which Henry considered essential for his control of the kingdom. After the death of Earl Henry (1119), the king feared that his son Roger would not be as strongly tied to the royal *curia* (court) as his father had been. Geoffrey de Clinton’s appointment as Sheriff of Warwickshire happened shortly after the Earl’s death. The Pipe Roll of 1130 evidenced that Geoffrey owed his fortune to the King. Crouch continued that Geoffrey and Roger were very different men. The *Gesta Stephani* described the Earl

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>111</sup> David Crouch, *The English Aristocracy, 1070-1272: A Social Transformation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), p. xv.

<sup>112</sup> John Hudson, ‘Anglo-Norman Land Law and the Origins of Property’, in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 198-222.

<sup>113</sup> David Crouch, ‘Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, Earl of Warwick: New Men and Magnates in the Reign of Henry I’, *BIHR*, 55 (1982), 113-23.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

of Warwick as an effeminate man, who preferred wanton delights to firm thinking.<sup>115</sup> By 1124, the King gave Geoffrey a large estate from Earl Roger.<sup>116</sup> Crouch concluded that the Sheriff-Earl relationship showed Henry's expertise in managing the politics of the 1120s and exploiting the ambitions of the magnates. His use of the 'New Men' to keep in check the less loyal of his magnates was 'impressive and ruthless'.<sup>117</sup> Not only did the King force Geoffrey de Clinton on Roger, Earl of Warwick, but he also ruthlessly and adroitly dismissed Geoffrey to placate the Earl. Henry's concentration on Warwickshire was part of a cohesive policy to strengthen his position in the strategically important regions that effectively hindered any rebellion to the throne.<sup>118</sup>

In conclusion, the role of the aristocracy after the death of King Henry I's only legitimate male heir in 1120 demonstrated that, at times, the monarchy needed the aristocracy as much as the reverse. Chapter Two will show how modern historians viewed that Stephen's inability to control the aristocracy not only led to nineteen years of civil war, but also the end of the Norman dynasty.<sup>119</sup>

### *The Monarchy*

Keith Stringer noted that it was imperative for a medieval king to secure an orderly succession before his death in order to avoid instability.<sup>120</sup> Henry I's frantic search for an heir, male and legitimate, preceded and helped produce 'The Anarchy'. The accession problems of some earlier Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were linked to similar predicaments. It was as important to a medieval king to avoid instability after his reign as it was during his reign.

---

<sup>115</sup> CSHR GS, 58, pp. 116-19.

<sup>116</sup> Crouch, 'Geoffrey and Roger', p. 116 and p. 116, n. 22. Crouch noted a charter of Earl Roger's confirming Geoffrey's grant.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 123.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 250.

<sup>120</sup> Stringer, *Reign*, p. 1

This thesis concerns the twelfth century, but it is important to understand the history of the *gens Anglorum* in relationship to their kings and kingdoms. The acceptance of the brief Danish dynasty, the return of Edward ‘The Confessor’ from Normandy, the acceptance of Harold, and the ineffective opposition to William I, all demonstrated that the English people needed and accepted a king. Instead of revolting against Cnut who murdered many of their leading earls, many Englishmen joined his army. The same was true of William I. Some earls might have revolted (1075) but there were many Englishmen fighting for William I and William II. Orderic claimed that Henry I could not trust Normans to defend forts in Normandy, so instead he fortified a castle with Breton and English mercenaries.<sup>121</sup> Therefore, according to Orderic, there were times that Normans could not be trusted. The more the conquerors came into contact with the English, the less likely they were to be called *Normanni*.

The kings were also loyal to their subjects.<sup>122</sup> As J. E. A. Jolliffe notes, English kings did not stray from English law.<sup>123</sup> The Norman Conquest created an unexpected problem for William. The fact that he posed as Edward the Confessor’s legitimate successor was particularly important. A conqueror might plunder, but an heir could not plunder his own kingdom. Emma Cownie finds that William either ‘could not or would not’ authorise indiscriminate plundering of English monasteries.<sup>124</sup> Michael Prestwich disagrees, stating that the Norman kings’ exploitation of the *gens Anglorum* gave King William and his sons more money than their rivals.<sup>125</sup>

Henry I’s determination to keep Normandy at all costs led to pressure on

---

<sup>121</sup> OV, xii. 2, pp. 190-91.

<sup>122</sup> C. Warren Hollister, *The Military Organization of Norman England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), p. 68.

<sup>123</sup> John Edward Austin Jolliffe, *Constitutional History of Medieval England from the English settlement to 1485* (London: A. and C. Black, 1937), pp. 156-57.

<sup>124</sup> Emma Cownie, ‘The Normans as Patrons of English Religious Houses, 1066-1135’, in ANS 18 ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill (1995), p. 47.

<sup>125</sup> Michael Prestwich, ‘War and Finance in the Anglo-Norman State’, TRHS, 5<sup>th</sup> series 4 (1954), p. 35.

English resources. The king could not count on the committed support of the aristocracy of Normandy to provide sufficient revenue for his castles and mercenaries. Judith Green observed the combination of the personal powers of the Duke of Normandy and institutional strength of the Anglo-Saxon monarchy was one reason Henry needed to hold both demesnes.<sup>126</sup> According to Richardson and Sayles, the money for castles and stipendiary forces enabled Henry I to firmly hold on to both England and Normandy.<sup>127</sup> Stephen Morillo more bluntly stated that money was the fuel that ran the military machine.<sup>128</sup> Under Stephen this disintegrated and caused the collapse of the Anglo-Norman realm.<sup>129</sup> Stringer counter-argued that many modern historians have been too influenced by R. H. C. Davis's *King Stephen* (1990), which follows an Angevin view. The book, which Stringer calls 'important and influential', portrays Stephen as rash and erratic in personal actions and a study in royal incompetence.<sup>130</sup> The thesis agrees with Stringer that too many modern historians followed the opinions of Davis on this point.

Military historians promote the idea that the stipendiary forces brought by Henry of Ghent bought with English gold made a crucial difference at the battle of the Standard. The role of the fyrd at this battle was also remarkable and unique during the Norman dynasty. The fyrd was essentially a royal force, the peasant army of the king.<sup>131</sup> The battle of the Standard was the only battle in 'The Anarchy' during which the fyrd played a significant role.<sup>132</sup> If the twelfth-century chroniclers' renditions are to be believed, the English militias fought side by side with the Norman English in

---

<sup>126</sup> Green, *Aristocracy*, p. 294.

<sup>127</sup> H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, *The Governance of Mediaeval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1963), p. 157.

<sup>128</sup> Stephen Morillo, *Warfare under the Anglo-Norman Kings* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), p. 17.

<sup>129</sup> J. O. Prestwich, 'Military intelligence under the Norman and Angevin Kings', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 14.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>131</sup> Hollister, *Military Organization*, p. 68.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.



this conflict. Although the English were obstinate in their opposition to acculturation and assimilation, they were loyal to a foreign crown. This binary opposition of loyalty to an office but refusal to acculturate was part of the process that contradicts Gillingham's theory but reinforces Thomas's concerning the revitalization of 'Englishness' later in this segment.<sup>133</sup> The English believed a kingdom needed a king.

### *The Church*

This thesis shall look at the important roles religion played between 1066 and 1138. First, the Church was initially an English manifestation of God and then a Norman English one. It was a powerful entity in England that dominated many of the institutions and decisions made by monarchs and aristocrats. Finally, except for the charters, land grants, pipe rolls, and the Domesday Book, almost all the information modern historians have about this era is gleaned from the works of chroniclers and annalists. The chroniclers and annalists were either regular or secular clerics.

William *Nothus*, with very tenuous claims to the throne of England, sought and received papal approval for his mission. Under William, nearly all of the dioceses and larger abbeys of Normandy had an Italian or a German as their head.<sup>134</sup> The Conquest brought changes in the transfer of ecclesiastical land. Only Wulfstan survived the Normans' ethnic assault on the Church. He had been Bishop of Worcester since 1062. Garnett observed that the first Norman kings believed that all lands belonged to them. All lands of the laity reverted to the king, and all Church lands reverted only temporarily because the Church was an eternal legal entity. This created, as Garnett noted, a vacuum during the interregnums.<sup>135</sup>

The appropriation of English churches and ecclesiastical traditions was a

---

<sup>133</sup> See Gillingham, 'Henry', p. 125 and Thomas, *English and Normans*, pp. 297-306.

<sup>134</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Governance*, p. 27.

<sup>135</sup> Garnett, *Conquered*, p. 57.

political move undertaken by Norman ecclesiastical reformers. Ann Williams stated that Bede inspired Norman reformers to seek a more primitive and ascetic life. King William I came north and presented Durham Cathedral with a copy of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in the 1070s. English clerks were removed from Durham who threatened to revive old traditions.<sup>136</sup> Michael Clanchy noted that the settlement at Durham, which the Normans considered a 'frontier diocese', symbolised their aspirations.<sup>137</sup> The Normans sought to control the Church in the north as part of their plan of domination. Durham did not have many wealthy churches, but it was one of the first dioceses to have archdeacons.<sup>138</sup> The Normans looked at the church in Durham for political stability with an extension of the bishop's authority into the Celtic-speaking fringe of the 'foreign, foul and barbarous' lowland of Scotland, which they considered ripe for invasion.<sup>139</sup> The priory of Durham even possessed an armoury.<sup>140</sup> The Norman domination of English churches can be linked with the 'superiority complex' displayed by Norman English writers such as William of Malmesbury. It was another mechanism to keep the English and Norman English from assimilation.

Ironically, King Malcolm III of Scotland, one of the 'foul barbarians' the Normans opposed, laid the foundation for the cathedral at Durham in 1093.<sup>141</sup> The castle and church were located on a precipitous outcrop suited for defence, as if the surrounding population were pagan hordes not Christians of long standing.<sup>142</sup> Clanchy concluded that the enormity of the cathedral at Durham epitomised the mastery of the

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> Crosby, *King's Bishops*, p. 194.

<sup>138</sup> M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), p. 67 and p. 200, n 5.

<sup>139</sup> Crosby, *King's Bishops*, p. 76. Note: Much of lowland southeastern Scotland spoke English.

<sup>140</sup> Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church*, (London: Longman, 1979), p. 198.

<sup>141</sup> Williams, *English and Norman*, p. 152.

<sup>142</sup> Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, p. 23.

Norman English. The ribbed vaults of the cathedral were at least a decade in advance of other similar constructions in northern France.<sup>143</sup> The Normans used the magnificence of the cathedral to identify divine authority with their own.<sup>144</sup> The Norman invaders might eventually perceive themselves as 'Englishmen', but the monarchy, the aristocracy, and the upper clergy were distancing themselves from the indigenous English. This would not facilitate acculturation or assimilation.

J. R. Green claimed that the English sheep were left without English shepherds. The English members of the Church hierarchy were drawn to the reforming continental orders, especially the austere Cistercians in the north.<sup>145</sup> He claims that this led Walter Espec, King David, and others to sponsor more and more religious houses. Dickinson, Duncan, Oram, and Judith Green based the growth of continental houses not on a power vacuum in the English church, but to an increase of piety engendered by the Gregorian reforms. This assisted in a resurgence of monasticism in England a century after the Conquest. The number of monasteries jumped from sixty-one in 1066 to almost seven hundred by the end of the twelfth century.<sup>146</sup> The infusion of wealth brought about by the Norman Conquest gave the conquerors lands that could be used to demonstrate acts of devotion and piety. Many families followed this fashion, and it was not confined to England. David I founded Selkirk Abbey (1113) for the Tironesians and Holyrood Abbey (1128) for the Cistercians.<sup>147</sup> There was a noticeable cultural shift away from the English Benedictines to the Continental orders, including those of Cluny, Tiron, and

---

<sup>143</sup> Barlow, *English Church*, p. 8

<sup>144</sup> Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, p. 23.

<sup>145</sup> Green, 'Blending', p. 69.

<sup>146</sup> J. C. Dickinson, *The Later Middle Ages: From the Norman Conquest to the Eve of the Reformation* (London: Black, 1979), p. 95.

<sup>147</sup> A. A. M. Duncan, *Scotland The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1975), p. 145 and R. Oram, *David I: The King who Made Scotland* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004), p. 62.

Cîteaux.<sup>148</sup> Judith Green has argued that dependent priories in England illustrated strong cross-Channel ties. The changing pattern of monastic life also allowed less wealthy patrons to found smaller, cheaper religious houses.<sup>149</sup>

Houses were often established on the estates of emerging Norman English aristocratic families. The Church was heavily dependent on these families and their tenants for financial support. Religious patronage became another means of tying dynasties to their estates in England and ultimately distancing them from Normandy. As Barlow has shown in his analysis of English foundations between the Conquest and the accession of King Henry I, the severance from Normandy was a slow process. In those thirty-four years, more than twice as many new foundations were subordinated to Continental houses than to houses in England.<sup>150</sup> Chibnall disagreed, showing that the presence of daughter houses of continental orders in England, Scotland, and Ireland initially helped to bind the kingdom and the duchy.<sup>151</sup> As the ‘cross-channel’ aristocracy diminished and many families established separate Norman English identities, they founded houses in England, which were not attached to specifically Norman houses. The Cistercians, founded in Cîteaux in France, expanded beyond England. By 1150, they had abbeys in Ireland at Mellifont, Boyle, and Bective. The Cistercians were also active in Scotland with abbeys at Dundrennan, Coupar Angus, Melrose, Kinloss, and Newbattle established by the mid-twelfth century. They preached a Catholic and universal Church.

The English abbeys were also a reflection of the non-assimilation of the English and the Normans during the insurgencies, which occurred from 1069-1075. Henry Loyn recalled how monasteries were reckoned to be ‘tenacious of English

---

<sup>148</sup> Dickinson, *Later Middle Ages*, p. 101.

<sup>149</sup> Judith Green, ‘Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State’, *BIHR*, 63 (1989), p. 31.

<sup>150</sup> Barlow, *English Church*, p. 184.

<sup>151</sup> Chibnall, Marjorie, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), p. 46.

sympathy’, but the new Norman policy was committed to the appointment of ‘New Men’ to the highest office, men whose sympathies lay with the crown.<sup>152</sup> Tensions ran so high that, in the most notorious case, Abbot Thurstin at Glastonbury allowed his men-at-arms to slay some of the monks.<sup>153</sup> According to William of Malmesbury, Thurstin’s men-at-arms killed two monks, wounded fourteen, and drove the rest away.<sup>154</sup> The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle viewed the situation from the monks’ perspective, stating that the abbot was unreasonable towards them after they complained in a kindly way.<sup>155</sup> The monarchy in Norman England sought to destroy all forms of dissent, even clerical. Ann Williams noted two other examples of animosity between foreign abbots and their English monks: Tuold, the Fécamp monk, ‘had fallen out with the monks of Malmesbury before he was transferred to Peterborough’, and there was some unspecified trouble at Abingdon during the abbacy of Adelem.<sup>156</sup>

J. R. Green wrote that differences in language and manner separated Norman English prelates from English priests and the common people.<sup>157</sup> Thus, in the twelfth century, the bishops and monasteries took the right from the parish churches to educate the parish priest. They argued that this would produce more literate and celibate priests, but many lay lords were unwilling to give up control over churches they had founded. This widened the gulf between the magnates of the church, who were Norman, and the local parish clergy, who were Englishmen.<sup>158</sup> The leaders of the church acted in ways, which heightened divisions between the English and Norman

---

<sup>152</sup> Henry Loyn, ‘Abbots of English Monasteries in the Period Following the Norman Conquest’, in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by David Bates and Ann Curry (London: Hambledon, 1994), p. 95

<sup>153</sup> Ann Williams, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), p. 135.

<sup>154</sup> WMGRA, iii. 270, pp. 498-99.

<sup>155</sup> ASC 2, [1083], p. 167.

<sup>156</sup> Williams, *English and Norman*, p. 133.

<sup>157</sup> Green, ‘Blending’, pp. 68-69.

<sup>158</sup> Williams, *English and Norman*, pp. 130-31.

English. Nevertheless, the northern revival of monasticism, which emphasised strict adherence to the Rule of St. Benedict, attracted both pious English and Norman English monks.<sup>159</sup> The common purpose of worship and prayer to which all monks and nuns were directed provided a strong ideological bridge across ethnic divisions.<sup>160</sup> This revival enabled the white monks of the Cistercians to come to England early in the twelfth century and watch their houses proliferate.<sup>161</sup> King William I wished to hold the church tightly under his control and also forbade his subjects to send or receive letters from the Pope without his permission.<sup>162</sup>

The Gregorian Reforms changed the Church hierarchy, but they did not always change the believers. Modern historians have fared poorly in contrasting the devotion of Ailred of Rievaulx, an English product of generations of married priests who took the vow of celibacy, and Henry of Huntingdon, a married cleric of Norman and English descent who openly mocked the celibacy laws. Yet, two of the main sources of the history of the battle of the Standard, Ailred and Henry, had very different opinions on obeying the Church. This thesis challenges the oversight of historians who failed to highlight the significance of this distinction.

### *Laws*

The laws had (to a great extent) been immutable since Ine, with some Norman alterations.<sup>163</sup> In the kingdom of Kent, the laws of Ethelberht (ca. 600), Holphere and Eadric (ca. 685-86), and Withred (695) were the earliest to survive.<sup>164</sup> At the same

---

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., pp. 152-53.

<sup>160</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 214.

<sup>161</sup> Williams, *English and Norman*, pp. 152-54.

<sup>162</sup> Eadmer, History of Recent Events in England, *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, trans. by G., Bosanquet (London: Cresset Press, 1964), p. 9 and Eadmer, *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia, et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus*, ed. by Martin Rule, Rolls Series, 81 (London: Public Record Office, 1884), p. 10.

<sup>163</sup> Note. The English could pay a fine and not be required to perform military combat.

<sup>164</sup> Lisi Oliver, *The Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), p. xi.

time as Wihtred was in the kingdom of Kent, the better-known King Ine drafted laws in Wessex. John Michael Wallace-Hadrill argued that the conversion of the English introduced the concept of written law to the English and that secular law was closely associated with the will of individual kings.<sup>165</sup> Pollock and Maitland agreed that there must have been Christian influences on the earliest Kentish kings. A. W. B. Simpson argued that the most important legal shift was not that the laws were written but that Ethelberht changed the method of punishment from retaliation and feud to fixed monetary payments.<sup>166</sup> For every crime, a monetary fine now existed. The laws of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were becoming codified. Barbara Yorke maintained that Kent was in the ambit of Frankish influence, culminating in the marriage of Ethelberht and Eadbald, which was a sustaining influence in bringing civilization and law to England.<sup>167</sup>

By the seventh century, the Anglo-Saxons had coalesced into the hegemony of five major kingdoms. The Laws of Ine clearly demarked the legal difference between Anglo-Saxons and Britons. This is important for defining later relations between England and her neighbors. The *wergild* of the Britons, money paid to the relatives of a murder victim in compensation for loss, was half that of an Anglo-Saxon.<sup>168</sup> Woolf hypothesized that, under this unequal judicial system, property and the land would pass to the Anglo-Saxons over time. This aided the Anglo-Saxons' takeover of the south and east of Britain as a slower and less violent process than the Germanic conquests on the continent.<sup>169</sup> This apartheid-like system may also have fostered

---

<sup>165</sup> John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent: The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1970* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), pp. 40-44.

<sup>166</sup> A. W. B. Simpson, 'The Laws of Ethelberht', in *On the Laws and Customs of England*, ed. by Morris Arnold and others (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), pp. 14-15.

<sup>167</sup> Barbara Yorke, *Kings and Kingdom of Early Anglo-Saxon England*, (London: Sealby, 1990), p. 39.

<sup>168</sup> *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings [Athelberht I to Athelstan]*, ed. and trans. by Frederick Levi Attenborough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), § 24.2, p. 45 and § 32, p. 47.

<sup>169</sup> Alex Woolf, 'Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England' in *The Britons in Anglo-Saxon*

greater population growth among the Anglo-Saxons.<sup>170</sup> Thus, this steady trickle of Britons into the ‘ethnic sausage machinery’ (Woolf’s term) provides a model for explaining the disappearance of a large number of Britons.<sup>171</sup> The early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms discriminated against the Britons and warred among themselves. This is another example of a long-ingrained difference between the *gens Anglorum* and their neighbours.

Centuries later, after 1066, a new set of problems occurred for English law. In order to justify the conquest of England, William and his minions created legal fictions of the laws of Normandy and England to fit his explicit need. According to George Garnett, if William was Edward’s rightful heir, then Harold never reigned.<sup>172</sup> What appeared, at that time, to be a minor situation had large repercussions on English history. During the ten-week gap after Hastings and before his coronation on Christmas Day, William remained duke of Normandy not king of England. Garnett has pointed out that this caused two problems. First, it created an interregnum between kings. Secondly, since the king owned the land, if there were no king during an interregnum, then there were periods when land was not owned. According to Garnett, the interregnums changed the entire system of divestiture of land because, before the Conquest, the English kings had nominated their successors during their lifetime, well before their coronation. After 1066, William changed English kingship completely by creating this interregnum, allowing vulnerability and uncertainty.<sup>173</sup>

Gillingham stated that William the Conqueror’s claim to be the lawful heir to Edward had an unplanned consequence: he continued English law. Gillingham wrote

---

*England*, ed. by N. J. Higham (London: Boydell, 2007), pp. 127-28.

<sup>170</sup> John Pattison, ‘Integration versus Apartheid in Post Roman Britain: A Response to Thomas et al. (2008)’, *Human Biology*, 83 (2011), 715.

<sup>171</sup> Woolf, ‘Apartheid’, p. 129.

<sup>172</sup> Garnett, *Conquered*, p. 3.

<sup>173</sup> Surely in 1087 and 1100 there was uncertainty as to who would be the next king of England.



that a common law for all was a means of integrating people. He cited Ailred's *Genealogy* and its examples of King Edgar's people of different languages obeying a common law.<sup>174</sup> He noted that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle disputed this conclusion, citing the hardships in England in 1087, the year of King William I's death.<sup>175</sup> He argued that Edward Freeman used the fiction of common law to 'fuse together Normans and English, in the long run to change Normans into Englishmen'.<sup>176</sup> Gillingham agreed with Hugh Thomas that English government, simply by its existence, helped to maintain and propagate the constructs of England and Englishness.<sup>177</sup> Gillingham noted that twelfth-century writers had a word for barbarian but he questioned whether they had a word for civilized or could even conceptualise such a category. He emphasised that both 'civilised' and 'civilisation' were intellectual constructs without objective criteria. Gillingham found that the change in culture had a more lasting effect than the change in dynasty. It was a positive vehicle towards the integration and assimilation of the two *gentes*.

Paul Hyams wrote that the Norman Conquest introduced new legal influences from the old Carolingian Empire and, at the same time, provided England with a new aristocracy from Brittany, Normandy, and Flanders. Each of these regions had more localised sets of laws than the systematised Anglo-Saxon codes. Hyams wrote that there were three bridges between the Norman laws of 1066 and the future English Common Law. First, the Normans were confronted with the Old English *leges* and the surrounding mass of unwritten customs the Normans called *laga Edwardi*. According to Hyams, these laws were used to suppress agitation from the lower classes. Second, the innovation of the Normans of trial by battle exempted the English. Hyams

---

<sup>174</sup> AR *Genealogy*, p. 96.

<sup>175</sup> ASC 2 [1087], p. 161: 'But the more just laws were talked about, the more unlawful things were done.'

<sup>176</sup> Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, v. p. 165.

<sup>177</sup> Gillingham, 'Problems', p. 93 and Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 276.

lamented the loss of so many documents, which would have clarified his argument.<sup>178</sup>

Paul Hyams mentions Frederick Maitland's contrast between the *Leges Henri Primi* and *Glanvill*.<sup>179</sup> He concluded that the gap between the French and English legal systems widened to the point that they were quite separate a hundred and fifty years after the battle of the Standard. The important fact to note is that there was interaction between the Anglo-Saxon laws and the Carolingian laws, but after Stephen lost Normandy, the legal systems of the two polities drifted further apart.<sup>180</sup>

J. R. Green saw the English preserving their tradition of Germanic liberties.<sup>181</sup> These traditions include: the right to self-government, the right of free speech in free assembly, and equal protection under the law of one's equals.<sup>182</sup> Green reiterated that the Norman king yielded to his English subjects and allowed them to be tried by their fellow townsmen. They were only subject to the old Anglo-Saxon trials by oath, not the Norman trial by battle. The townsmen existed in 'wards' governed by 'aldermen'.<sup>183</sup> Green's short article, 'Blending of Conquerors and Conquered' (1878) gives insight into the lives and thoughts of the indigenous English that many modern historians overlook. His conclusions are similar to those of John Gillingham and contrary to those of this thesis.

## **Intermarriage**

Although several modern historians subscribe to the idea of King Henry I's ability to

---

<sup>178</sup> Paul Hyams, 'The Common Law and The French Connection', ANS 4. ed. by R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1982), pp. 78-79.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., p. 82.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>181</sup> This is similar to Freeman and the beginnings of English social and legal systems in the woods of Germany.

<sup>182</sup> J. R. Green, 'Blending', pp. 65-66. Green's statements of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly are parts of the First Amendment to the U. S. Constitution which was written by avowed Anglo-Saxonists.

<sup>183</sup> Note. The influences of Anglo-Saxon laws are so long-lasting that in 2016 my city of Newton, Massachusetts is divided into political wards that elects alderman.

force intermarriages, there is no hard evidence of a documented policy for acculturation.<sup>184</sup> Henry married the sister of the King of Scots. Thomas assigned Matilda-Edith the role of ‘bringer of Englishness’; she and her brother David were at court to protect England’s northern border, while Henry fought his brother, Duke Robert, in Normandy.<sup>185</sup> Henry brought his Scots to court for political and military reasons, not for the purpose of cultural assimilation.

### *Continental names*

William of Malmesbury and Orderic Vitalis declared that intermarriage became normal. There were many available English women whose men either died in the three battles of 1066, or fled to Scotland or Byzantium.<sup>186</sup> The Normans had a history of intermarriage that went back to their founder Rollo, who married Poppa, the daughter of the Count of Rennes. William wrote about their custom of intermarriage, ‘*matrimonia quoque cum subditis jungunt*’.<sup>187</sup> Orderic added, ‘*Civiliter Angli cum Normannis cohabitant...conubiis alteri alteros sibi coniungentes*’.<sup>188</sup> Clark noted examples of English women who married Normans and changed their names to Continental or French names. The second Robert d’Oilly had a charter in which his wife was called ‘*ipsa domina Edit*’. Her original English name was Eadgyð.<sup>189</sup> Geoffrey de Wirce married Alveva who Clark asserted was born with the English name Ælgifu.<sup>190</sup> English women adopting Continental names were part of the acculturation of the two *gentes*.

---

<sup>184</sup> RáGena C. De Aragon, ‘In Pursuit of Aristocratic Women: A Key to Success in Norman England’, *Albion*, 14 (1998), pp. 258-67 and Charlotte A., Newman, ‘Family and Royal Favour in Henry I’s England’, *Albion*, 14 (1998), pp. 292-306.

<sup>185</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, pp. 140-46.

<sup>186</sup> Cecily Clark, ‘Women’s Names in Post-Conquest England Observations and Speculations’, *Speculum*, 53 (1978), p. 225.

<sup>187</sup> WMGRA, iii. 246, p. 306.

<sup>188</sup> OV, ii. p. 256.

<sup>189</sup> Clark, ‘Women’s Names’, p. 228.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 227.

The northern Norman English aristocracy made efforts to accommodate and acculturate. They needed to learn English, the common language, in order to communicate with the inhabitants of their manors. Many were completely cut off from Normandy. Eventually, their language changed from the French of the duchy of Normandy and the kingdom of France to an insular vernacular. Only one of the northern barons who fought at the battle of the Standard had an English mother, Robert II, who was born c. 1084 in Estouteville, Haute-Normandie. He was captured by King Henry I's forces shortly before Tinchebrai at Saint Pierre sur Dives but later pardoned.<sup>191</sup> Although there are discrepancies on the birth and wedding dates, both sources name his wife Eneburga FitzBaldric, the daughter of Hugh FitzBaldric, Saxon Thane of Cowsby. She was English. Their son Robert III of Stuteville, Lord of Cottingham, Yorkshire, and Bigby, Lincolnshire, England, was Sheriff of York under Henry II.<sup>192</sup> He married Hawise. Thus Robert III of Stuteville, who fought at the battle of the Standard, had one set of Norman grandparents, one set of English grandparents and an English wife. At Northallerton he might have perceived himself an English baron fighting for his homeland.

### *Intermarriage and assimilation*

Thomas recognised a greater immigrant population in the rural areas than most medieval writers saw.<sup>193</sup> He noted that Richard Fitz Nigel in his *Dialogue of the Exchequer* only perceived intermarriage and assimilation at certain levels of the social hierarchy.<sup>194</sup> However, he argued that the aristocracy needed agents, who were usually English, to act on their behalf with the local rural population. There was also a

---

<sup>191</sup> Warren Hollister, *Henry I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 199.

<sup>192</sup> J. R. Planché, *The Conqueror and his Companions* (London: Tinsley, 1874), p. 253.

<sup>193</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 164.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 169.

substantial English presence at the lowest level of the government's bureaucracy.<sup>195</sup>

Marjorie Chibnall applauded Thomas on his examination of *strong* cultural interactions between the local English and the conquering Normans, but she could not find any justification for the eventual victory of English identity.<sup>196</sup> Perhaps Chibnall was only looking at the aristocracy for her answer. According to Thomas, the triumph of English identity did not come from the peasants nor the aristocracy but from the classes between them. Thomas argued that the Norman English failure to impact on these classes remained a strong obstacle to assimilation.

The acculturated Norman English establishment was more concerned with the consolidation of its power than total assimilation. By the reign of Henry I, all threats to the kingdom were external.<sup>197</sup> The king studiously placed loyal and grateful subordinates on his Welsh and Scottish border marches. There were calculated intermarriages, but these were for military and political expediency not for cultural or dynastic reasons.<sup>198</sup> These intermarriages may have engendered more acculturation, but maintaining the *status quo* was the king's true goal. He married many of his illegitimate children to the ruling families of many European polities, including the above-mentioned kingdom of Scotland. However, Henry would not want, nor did he expect that, any of these illegitimate grandchildren would stake a claim to the throne of England. Henry sought political and military safety for himself and his kingdom; he was not engineering social revolution.

The lack of assimilation was noted as late as 1157. Richard de Luci wrote that

---

<sup>195</sup> Ibid., p. 170.

<sup>196</sup> Marjorie Chibnall, '(Review of) Hugh M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans; Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity, 1066-c.1220* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)', *International History Review*, 26 (2004), p. 363.

<sup>197</sup> After the battle of Tincherbrai (1106).

<sup>198</sup> When Henry forced King Alexander of Scotland to make David, duke of Cumbria, there were few if any, in either the Scottish or Norman court that thought the sixth son of Malcolm III would someday be king of Scotland.

the Normans must stand fast against all enemies, especially the English.<sup>199</sup> Later, Richard Fitz Nigel wrote that, by the 1170s, the English and the Normans lived close together and intermarried. According to him, the nations were so mixed that it was difficult to decide who was English and who was Norman.<sup>200</sup> Fitz Nigel's contemporary, Walter Map, stated that Henry I had joined the two *gentes* in marriages, which brought peace to England.<sup>201</sup> This raises the question, if it was difficult to decide who was English and who was Norman, then what were distinct English and Norman characteristics in the early part of the twelfth century? Gillingham agreed with Robert Bartlett that nationality was a matter of identification and not an objective classification.<sup>202</sup>

Gillingham continued that the English people were the integration of Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, and that the Normans were one people out of many.<sup>203</sup> There was no attempt to keep ethnic purity by prohibiting intermarriages. Gillingham concluded that Richard Fitz Nigel, Walter Map, and Ailred all felt integration between the *gentes* was possible and desirable. The fact that they wrote well after 1138 is further evidence that assimilation did not happen at the time designated by this thesis.<sup>204</sup>

## Language

How *gentes* communicate, what they call themselves, and what others call them are

---

<sup>199</sup> *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. by Eleanor Searle (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), pp. 182-83: '*Et quammaxime aduersus Anglorum insidias*'.

<sup>200</sup> Richard Fitz Nigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. Charles Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 53: '*Set iam cohabiantibus Anglicis et Normannis et alterutrum uxores ducentibus uel rubentibus, sic permixte sunt nationes ut uix decerni possit hodie, de liberis loquor, quis Anglicus quis Normannus sit genere*'. Note. Since Fitz Nigel was born in c. 1130 his work would be too late to be germane to this thesis.

<sup>201</sup> Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium (Courtier's Trifles)*, trans. by Frederick Tupper and William Bladen Ogle (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1924), p. 272 and Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed by Montague R. James, Christopher N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), p. 436.

<sup>202</sup> Robert Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), p. 10.

<sup>203</sup> Cf. Dudo, *Normans*, pp. 29-30.

<sup>204</sup> Note. Richard Fitz Nigel was born c. 1130 and Walter Map in 1140 after the battle.

fundamental to understanding the interaction of two *gentes*. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, both England's language and nomenclature were evolving. These evolutions showed the initial dominance of a form of insular French, now called Anglo-Norman, as the language of the court. At the same time, these evolutions reveal the steady growth and dominance of the Old English language in the household, the marketplace, and the battlefield.

Post-Conquest England was home to three languages: English, French, and Latin. The immigrant and indigenous languages continued during the early period of Norman domination of the state, the Church, and the bureaucracy. Gillingham restated Gervase of Canterbury's observation that Duke William brought to England a 'new system' of living and speaking.<sup>205</sup> He further noted that there was nothing in Gervase's attitude or his further remarks that indicated he resented the introduction of the French language.<sup>206</sup> French became the vernacular of the powerful elite and polite society. Cultural links between England and France were strong. The rulers of England sent their children to be educated in northern France.<sup>207</sup> Yet, the immigrants learned English through their wives, servants, and nurses.<sup>208</sup> After 1066, trilingualism contributed to multiculturalism. Ian Short deduces that a few English words passed into Norman French, but the introduction of Norman words into English was 'wholesale, systematic and profound'. He concluded that the actual victor at the battle of Hastings was the English language but not in its pre-Conquest form.<sup>209</sup>

The meaning of the words Normans, Gauls, and French evolved during the twelfth century. Gillingham was perhaps more aware of this than other modern

---

<sup>205</sup> GC, ii. p. 60: '*Novam vivendi formam et loquendi*'.

<sup>206</sup> Gillingham, 'Slaves', p. 169.

<sup>207</sup> Gillingham, 'Problems', p. 98.

<sup>208</sup> Gillingham, 'A Historian', p. 59 and Clark, 'Women's Names', p. 230.

<sup>209</sup> Ian Short, 'Language and Literature', in *A Companion to The Anglo-Norman World*, ed. by Christopher Harper Bill and Elisabeth van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 213.

historians. He wrote that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which by the twelfth century was only written in Peterborough abbey, employed the word French in 1107 to refer to the Norman oppressors in England.<sup>210</sup> In 1127, the Chronicle entry employed the word solely to refer to the subjects of the King of France.<sup>211</sup> However, a careful reading of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle demonstrates that Gillingham either ignored or overlooked another entry from 1127, which spoke of the displeasure that both the English and the French had with Matilda's marriage to Geoffrey, count of Anjou. Since the Angevins were the Normans' archenemies, the French, in this sentence, referred to Henry's Normans.<sup>212</sup> Gillingham appeared to imply that there was a change in English attitudes towards the word French in these twenty years. However, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle shows a binary opposition that Gillingham appeared to have missed. Thus, sixty-one years after the Conquest, a monk in Peterborough still clearly could distinguish between the conquered and the conquerors in England.<sup>213</sup>

The kings of England were still considered Normans after 1154, but there was some confusion in nomenclature. For more than a century after the Conquest, authors continued to call the conquerors Normans. For instance, the anonymous author of the Waltham Chronicle in the 1180s wrote of Norman kings.<sup>214</sup> Ralph Diceto, the dean of St Paul's in the 1190s and Gerald de Barri from the 1190s to his death in 1217, described the Kings of England as *de genere Normannorum*<sup>215</sup> or *Normannica regum*

---

<sup>210</sup> ASC 2 [1107], p. 189: 'And it was the forty-first year after the French had been in control of this country' and '7 wæs þæt an and fowertigeðe gear þæs þe Frančan þyses landes weoldan.' <http://asc.jebbo.co.uk/e-e-L.html>

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., [1127], p. 203: 'The king of France brought William, and gave him the county (Normandy), and the people of the land accepted him'.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., 'It displeased all the French and English; but the king did it to have peace with the count of Anjou and to get help against his nephew William.'

<sup>213</sup> Gillingham, 'Imperialism', p. 392.

<sup>214</sup> *The Waltham Chronicle: The Account of the Discovery of Our Holy Cross at Montacute and its Conveyance to Waltham*, ed. and trans. by Leslie Watkins and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), p. 2: '*Normanni regis nostri*'.

<sup>215</sup> *Radulphi de Diceto ducani Londoniensis Opera Historica*, ed by William Stubbs 2 vols London: Longman, 1876) ii. p. 183.



*prosopia*.<sup>216</sup>

### **The Problems with Nomenclature-what is *Gens* and what is *Natio*?**

Hugh Thomas attempted to explain the confusion and inconsistency of the terms English and Normans in Henry of Huntingdon's description of the battle of the Standard in *Historia Anglorum*. Addressing this issue, Thomas made poignant observations: Bishop Ralph addressed the Norman nobles of England, but it was the English who said 'Amen' to his speech. As such, it was the Norman and English host who fought the Scots.<sup>217</sup> He also noted that King David listed his English and Norman subjects as separate people.<sup>218</sup> Thomas admitted that sometimes English and Norman could mean different things and therefore the writers were, in his opinion, not only confusing but also perhaps confused. Thomas gave the following example, 'Aelred has Walter Espec addressing a Norman audience, has Robert de Brus complain that David was opposing the English and Normans, and speaks of an army of the English'. However, instead of shedding light on the problem of nomenclature, Thomas merely called it an expected mess. From his point of view, there were no 'clear-cut Normans and clear-cut English'. Thomas did not try to challenge Henry of Huntingdon's perceived inconsistencies. He added little to the debate when he stated that 'the collective identity was therefore highly ambiguous, not to say muddled'.<sup>219</sup>

A clearer and more assertive explanation can be given. Henry of Huntingdon did not have Ralph address the Norman nobles of England; the bishop was addressing English nobles of Norman heritage who called themselves English. As a result, Henry

---

<sup>216</sup> *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. by J. S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock and G. F. Warner, 8 vols (London: Longman, 1861-91) ix. p. 217.

<sup>217</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Proceres Anglie*' and idem, x. 9, pp. 716-17: '*Omnis populus Anglorum*' and '*Tota gens Normannorum et Anglorum*'.

<sup>218</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 75 and HA, x. 9, pp. 716-17: '*Ex Anglis uidelicet et Normannis composita*'.

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid.*

concurred that they were English. Henry listed only northern barons in the army that Archbishop Thurstan had called together. It was Ailred who introduced Yorkshire parishioners with their priests to the southern army. The Norman aristocracy and the anglicised 'French' aristocracy in England, which quickly began to call themselves English, soon were very different. Judith Green understood the difficulty: 'The tangle in Henry of Huntingdon's treatment of the Battle of the Standard shows something of the difficulty of using ethnicity alone as a definition of aristocracy'.<sup>220</sup> Judith Green wrote that Henry of Huntingdon knew that Earl Henry, the king's son, 'who was himself Norman, Scots and English by descent', commanded men described as English and Norman. Many of the former might have migrated from David's English holdings, principally the 'Honour of Huntingdon', while the latter may have been colonists who immigrated to Scotland directly from northwestern Europe.<sup>221</sup>

E. A. Freeman maintained that the English always called themselves English. He argued that it was their enemies, the Welsh and the Scots, who called them Saxons.<sup>222</sup> Ann Williams demonstrated that to call them either Saxons or English, which is used in some contemporary texts, was misleading. She argued that to differentiate the pre-Conquest indigenous inhabitants of England from the post-Conquest inhabitants promoted the hypothesis that English history began in 1066.<sup>223</sup>

## **Conclusion to Chapter One**

Nationalism, imperialism, and politics tended to guide the way in which pre-twentieth century historians saw the conquest, as well as their perceptions of the assimilation that followed. In the late nineteenth century, for example, Yorkshire historian Edward

---

<sup>220</sup> Green, *Aristocracy*, p. 435.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>222</sup> Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, v. p. 825.

<sup>223</sup> Williams, *English and Normans*, pp. 1-2.

Lamplough wrote of the battle of the Standard that ‘Norman baron and Saxon peasant had not long to wait the trial of strength,’ thus demarcating a clear socio-economic division between the Norman English conquerors (the barons) and the English conquered (the peasants). By using an archaic term (Saxon) to describe his own ethnic group, Lamplough might be underscoring the difference between the baron and the peasants and raising the suggestion that the peasants were divided along both racial and socio-economic lines. After the battle, Lamplough implied, the barons would return to their mansions and the peasants to their hovels. In a similar fashion, Alex D. H. Leadman, exulting in his countrymen, wrote: ‘for it was in the main part by Yorkshiremen that the battle of the Standard was fought and won’. Among modern historians, Fleming has claimed that by destroying the pillars of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy, the conquest caused a ‘tenurial’ revolution. Such a major societal upheaval would have made both acculturation and assimilation quite difficult.

Close examination of Norman English institutions also demonstrates that the English were not assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. The preservation and continuation of the monarchy was of the utmost importance to the *gens Anglorum*: the English people needed and accepted their kings. It was therefore possible for the English to obstinately oppose assimilation while remaining loyal to a foreign king. This binary opposition of loyalty to the crown and aversion to assimilation contradicts Gillingham’s thesis. I would argue that the English in the fourth decade of the twelfth century were not assimilated at all. English churches, which were equally integral to societal cohesion, quickly came under the authority of the Normans. The Norman dominion over these previously English churches may be linked to the ‘superiority complex’ seen in the writings of Norman English authors such as William of Malmesbury. This ‘superiority complex’ was yet another

mechanism that would have precluded the assimilation of the two *gentes*. The monarchy, the aristocracy, and the upper clergy alike thus distanced themselves from the indigenous English in a manner that inhibited assimilation. Even after the Norman English establishment had acculturated, they had done so in order to consolidate their power, rather than to achieve total assimilation. When the conquering Norman English did change the *status quo*, it was in a way that made manifest their dominance over the conquered English.

The evolution of the way in which twelfth century authors used the words 'Norman,' 'Gaul,' and 'French,' further supports this thesis. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle recounted the displeasure of both the English and the French at Matilda's marriage to Geoffrey, count of Anjou. If a monk writing in Peterborough sixty-one years after the conquest was still making the distinction between the conquerors and the conquered, it is hard to see how the two groups could have been assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. Indeed, for more than a century after the Norman Conquest, the majority of authors continued to describe the conquerors as 'Norman', to the point where modern medievalists are willing to accept Ailred of Rievaulx's blanket use of the term 'Norman' for an 1150s opus. Even King David listed his English and Norman subjects as two separate peoples.

Ailred's interchanging use of the terms *gens* and *natio* confused some modern scholars but were explained in this chapter. Hugh Thomas demonstrated how twelfth-century chroniclers revitalized the English from a conquered *gens* to a *gens* that had much of its pre-Conquest self-esteem. John Gillingham found that William of Malmesbury was the source of much of the initiative to create an ethnic hatred of the Scots to unify the *gentes* of the kingdom of England. This chapter demonstrates that Thomas succeeded to a degree but Ann Williams and Gillingham's arguments that assimilation resulted from fear of the 'outsider' are unconvincing. Finally, the chapter

showed that the Normans' penchant for intermarriage had an acculturating effect on both the English and the Norman English. These sections, collectively, demonstrated that although there was some acculturation by the fourth decade of the twelfth century, there was no assimilation at the time of the battle of the Standard. Finally, the chapter showed that the Normans' penchant for intermarriage had an acculturating effect on both the English and the Norman English. These sections, collectively, demonstrated that although there was some acculturation by the fourth decade of the twelfth century, there was no assimilation at the time of the battle of the Standard.

There is, therefore, a significant body of understudied evidence—historical, institutional, linguistic, and physical—that demonstrated the assimilation of the English and Norman English did not happen until after the fourth decade of the twelfth century. Gillingham argued that the Norman English and the English were completely assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. It is the central ideal of this thesis that the date given by Gillingham is premature; the historiography of the institutions in this chapter and the discussion of the battle of the Standard in the next, underscores this prematurity.

## **CHAPTER TWO: THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARD – HISTORIOGRAPHY AND EVENTS**

### **Introduction**

This chapter seeks to establish an extensive historiography of the battle of the Standard and supports the argument that the English and Norman English had not been assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. The chapter covers eight themes: The ‘Background’ section focuses on the events leading up to the battle of the Standard. ‘David’s Motives’ specifically focuses on the degree of David’s aggrandizement. ‘Composition of the Scottish army and its Battle Order’, examines both the diversity of the army King David brought into Northumbria and its self-destructive nature. The segment on ‘The Composition of the “Southern” army and its Battle Orders’ demonstrates that the army of the kingdom of England possessed a level of acculturation but not assimilation. ‘Religion’ shows how an ailing Thurstan was able to coordinate the northern barons, the Norman English prelates, the English parish priests, and the people into a cohesive fighting unit. ‘Negotiations’ demonstrates that the meeting between King David, Robert de Brus, and Bernard de Balliol was as Thomas noted, a part of the integral process that united the two main *gentes* of the kingdom of England against their Celtic-speaking neighbours. The ‘Battle Orations’ section demonstrates the uniqueness of a battle with not only specific rather than generic battle orations but two of them for comparison. The ‘Battle of the Standard’ discusses the events on the battlefield in depth, which showed the socio-economic differences might have been as great as the racial differences in this battle. ‘The Outcome of the Battle’ gives several plausible explanations why the ‘Southern’ army did not pursue the Scots and annihilate them.

Although Burne called the battle of the Standard ‘predominately ecclesiastical

rather than military', the evidence presented provides four important points that should be noted.<sup>1</sup> This was the only battle of 'The Anarchy' in which indigenous English soldiers are recorded as playing a significant role. Primarily, for the interest of this thesis, they were an acculturated part of the battle plan of the Norman English military leaders.

Secondly, the battle ended a threat to King Stephen's northern flank by David and Scotland. Thirdly, as a military disaster for Matilda, the defeat might have extended the agony of 'The Anarchy' for many years or at least until King Henry II reached maturity. Finally, the battle had the effect of aligning Matilda in war-time propaganda with Celtic-speaking barbarians. This thesis is primarily interested in the ability of the Norman English and the English to fight together in the 'Southern' army.

More than a hundred and fifty years ago, William Grainge, a nineteenth-century Yorkshire historian, succinctly and subjectively explained his interpretation of how the battle came to be. He wrote of King Stephen's perjury and usurpation of Matilda's right to the throne of England. He then made the statement that King David invaded England not only to support his niece's Scottish army, but also to devastate Yorkshire and much of England. He characterized the very diverse Scottish army as differing in race, in language, and modes of warfare, but the entirety of it was recklessly cruel. Grainge noted that the Scots' desecration and pillaging so angered both the Saxon English and the great northern barons that the Saxon English forgot their hatred of the Normans and both *gentes* concentrated their resources on taking retribution on such a cruel host. This mirrored Ailred of Rievaulx and William of Malmesbury's goal of uniting the major *gentes* of the kingdom of England against the Celtic-speaking *gentes*. Grainge concluded that the northern barons met the Scottish

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Higgins Burne, *More Battlefields of England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1952), p. 96.

king and routed him in battle.<sup>2</sup>

William Grainge is the spokesman for my introduction for several reasons. He was blunt, caustic, biased, and transparent. The formalities and conventions of modern academic writing and political correctness put constraints upon modern writers, which were unknown in Grainge's era.<sup>3</sup> The following historiography shall cite several significant differences between modern and nineteenth-century historians. Modern English historians placed their emphasis on pre-battle conditions, not the battle itself.<sup>4</sup> They made the Scottish invasion more important than its result. The nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians emphasised the diversity in David's army more than modern historians. The purpose of this introduction is to act as a road map to accentuate the important historiographical differences between modern British historians and nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians.

## **BACKGROUND**

Although the Norman Kings wielded overwhelming military power in England, they had limited success enforcing their will in the north. Effective, large-scale military intervention was never anything but problematic. As far as the rulers based in Normandy and Wessex were concerned, Scotland was an obdurate, difficult land against which they could do little more than attempt to demonstrate their military power. As early as 1072, Malcolm III was known to have retreated as soon as he saw the invading army of William the Conqueror. Eventually, the two sides were able to negotiate an agreement that suited them both.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> William Grainge, *The Battles and Battlefields of England, From the Earliest Times to the End of the Great Civil War* (London: A. Hall & Co., 1854), pp. 12-13.

<sup>3</sup> Geoffrey Hughes, *Political Correctness: A History of Semantics and Culture* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

<sup>4</sup> The military historians Oman and Beeler are the exceptions.

<sup>5</sup> Bates, 'Kingship', p. 95.



In the years after 1135, when the intrusive might of the English monarchy was compromised by the loss of a strong ruler, the Welsh revival and the Scottish conquests in northern England indicated how different the balance of forces between the Norman English and their neighbours had become. The civil war between Stephen and the Empress Matilda would have significant implications for most of the British Isles. With the ruling elite suddenly splintered, both Britain and northern France found themselves free of the inexorable pressure they had been experiencing under the Norman kings.<sup>6</sup>

By February 1136, the Scottish King David and the English King Stephen had agreed to terms. If David abandoned his Northumbrian conquests, his son Henry would pay homage to Stephen for both his father's Earldom of Huntingdon and for Carlisle and southern Cumbria. Though Carlisle and southern Cumbria were nominally still part of the English realm, they essentially now belonged to the Scots. While it is unclear whether David ever acknowledged Henry as the overlord of Cumbria, it is certain that he never acknowledged Stephen.<sup>7</sup> The political arrangement between Scotland and England was highly unusual: the northern barons kept their fealty with King Stephen, but they also did homage to Earl Henry.<sup>8</sup> Initially, King David concerned himself with retaining the earldom of Huntingdon; elsewhere, he restricted the majority of his activities to Cumbria and Northumbria.<sup>9</sup> However, once Stephen had departed for Normandy, King David did not wait long before he entered England 'in a hostile manner.'<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle*, p. 166.

<sup>8</sup> Jim Bradbury, 'Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154' in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late English and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by M. Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), p. 40.

<sup>9</sup> Bates, 'Kingship', p. 96.

<sup>10</sup> William Guthrie, *A General History of England: From the Invasion of the Romans under Julius Caesar to the Late Revolution in MDCLXXXIII Including the Histories of the Neighboring People and States, so Far as They are Connected with That of England* (London: D. Browne, 1744-1751), v. p. 467.

Anglo-Scottish warfare revealed a theatre of war in which there was a permanent and decisive military imbalance in favour of the southern kingdom. The sophisticated and professional Norman English military elite was matched against the hybrid forces that were bolstered by a small core of newly planted feudal settlers, mercenaries, and Franco-Norman adventurers. The composition of the Scottish armies, the paucity of defensive equipment among the native infantry, and (most pressingly) the absence of a powerful cavalry profoundly affected the strategy of the respective armies. Ironically, it was the Scottish cavalry that charged during this battle. Norman English commanders consistently sought to exploit this disparity, while the Scots sought to avoid full-scale engagements wherever possible. For the Scots, the caution in committing troops to battle displayed by many contemporary commanders was not a choice but a necessity.<sup>11</sup> Beside from the encounter at Clitheroe, the battle of the Standard was the only pitched battle between forces from England and Scotland during the Norman dynasty.

The northern English castles had been constructed piecemeal over an extended period of time; they did not represent a cohesive, carefully planned group.<sup>12</sup> Thus, these castles could only provide a static defence, sheltering the persons, property, and livestock of those fortunate enough to have found safety within their walls. Castles might hold up an attacking commander if he laid siege to them. Otherwise, they might tie down elements of his army in blockade. But these events were largely at the discretion of the invader. It was not difficult, therefore, for Scottish kings to penetrate the north country, even after the proliferation of castles north of the Humber. David had almost no difficulty laying siege to the northern border castles. The Scots, recognizing that they could not supply or relieve garrisons in the face of a substantial

---

<sup>11</sup> Strickland, 'Securing', pp. 209-11.

<sup>12</sup> R. Allen Brown, *Medieval Castles*, 3rd edn. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), p. 36.

English army, strategically demolished all of the castles that they took.<sup>13</sup>

The defence of the northern border proved too much for the absent King Stephen. As such, it was left to Stephen's old friend, Thurstan, archbishop of York.<sup>14</sup> In order to succeed, Thurstan, had to organise the north against the invaders. One anonymous bard of the early modern period sang of the Archbishop Thurstan's initial meeting with King David and Earl Henry, 'the heroes of the north,'<sup>15</sup> which took place at Roxburgh Castle.<sup>16</sup> In the poet's imagination, the men greeted each other with dignity, following which Thurstan admonished Earl Henry for trying to fight in the absence of King Stephen:

And not when our king is far away,  
To ravage the country o'er  
To murder the weak and the innocent,  
And cruelly spoil the poor.<sup>17</sup>

The ballad goes on to recall King David's promise to Archbishop Thurstan, wherein David swore that he would give the county of Northumberland to Earl Henry and refrain from invading until King Stephen had returned from Normandy.

In 1138, having pledged his support to the Empress Matilda, David launched three invasions into England in the hopes that he might improve upon the 1136 settlement. Stephen marched north to counter the first; mounting tensions elsewhere in his kingdom led him to ignore the second, which ravaged the bishopric of Durham and managed to penetrate as far south as Craven in Yorkshire. In David's army were

---

<sup>13</sup> Strickland, 'Securing', pp. 217-19.

<sup>14</sup> The king's mother, Countess Adela, sheltered the archbishop when he was in exile in 1119, and his advice had helped her to decide to enter the convent at Marcigny, where she spent the remainder of her life. He had been present at the Easter court of 1136 and had had no hesitation in accepting Stephen as king. Hugh the Cantor, *History of the Four Archbishops of York*, in Raine, ed. *Historians*, II.183-97.

<sup>15</sup> Anonymous, 'Bishop Thurstan, and the King of Scots, A Ballad', in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*, ed. by Thomas M. Evans, (London: T. Evans, 1784), iv. pp. 86-93.

<sup>16</sup> Priory, p. 115: '*Thurstinus, quoque, archiepiscopus Eboracensis, quamvis multo confectus senio, locutus est cum rege Scottiae et filio ejus apud Rochesburch, et impetravit inducias usque ad reditum regis Stephani de Normannia*'.

<sup>17</sup> Anonymous, 'Bishop', p. 91.

Scots and Galwegians who committed unspeakable atrocities. According to Richard, prior of Hexham, they tossed babies on their spears. In addition, they led long columns of fettered women away, pressing them into service as prostitutes and slaves. Of the several twelfth-century chroniclers who give full accounts of the battle, Richard of Hexham is pre-eminent. His opinion was that the attack was not only on Yorkshire, 'but also the greatest part of England.'<sup>18</sup> Appleton, Dalton, and King, have accepted Richard's opinion but not Stringer, who viewed a more limited goal for King David.<sup>19</sup>

Stephen, despite his campaigns against the Scots in Northumberland and the Scottish lowlands, was unable to permanently secure the north against future Scottish attacks. Yorkshire became a military frontier region.<sup>20</sup> Stephen began to lead an expedition to the north but quickly called it off because he feared that his men were in league with the Scots.<sup>21</sup> In the winter of 1138, the Scots invaded Northumberland, bringing misery to the Northumbrian countryside, which they pillaged and burned. Once again, the king marched north. David, afraid to give open battle, lay vainly in wait, hoping that he would be able to ambush and entrap Stephen, who took no notice as he laid waste to Scotland's entire border district. When May came, however, Stephen found himself embroiled in a laborious war against Robert of Gloucester, who had just declared for his sister. With Stephen otherwise occupied, David I decided that it was time to undertake as massive an onslaught against northern England as the resources of his kingdom would allow.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> RPH, p. 47.

<sup>19</sup> Edmund King, *King Stephen* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 92; Paul Dalton, *Conquest, Anarchy and Lordship: Yorkshire 1066-1154* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 150-51; and Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53.

<sup>20</sup> Dalton, *Conquest*, p. 50.

<sup>21</sup> Bradbury, 'Battles', p. 183.

<sup>22</sup> Frank Barlow, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216*, 5th edn (London: Longman, 1999). p. 132.

David amassed an army from all parts of his kingdom and advanced into England.<sup>23</sup> At Roxburgh, David turned back, fearing, as Stephen had, treachery in his own camp.<sup>24</sup> It was not long before the Scots invaded the north with renewed fury. On 8 April 1138, King David and his army descended upon Northumberland, where they would ravage the eastern coast for the first time.<sup>25</sup> Having pillaged Country Durham, the Scots then set their sights on the North Riding.

David did not have the gold to pay his large army. He saw them living off the land and encouraged their desire for booty. Medieval chroniclers and modern historians have repeatedly written about the ‘barbarous’ nature of the Scottish army and the Galwegians in particular. They wrote how this army raped, pillaged, desecrated and sold men, women and children into slavery. These writers were determined to show the army was a savage mob. My research, to the contrary, finds that the army, especially the Galwegians, was highly sophisticated in ‘protecting’ monasteries that paid them money. ‘The Charter of Protection to Priory of Tynemouth’ indicated that King David’s army of *Francis et Anglis et Scotis et Galwensibus* protected the abbey. Richard, prior of Hexham, corroborated that the abbey paid silver for their protection. In the next sentence the prior continued that his abbey was protected by the apostle Andrew (*Andreae apostoli*), other saints, and the Bishop Wilfrid (*Wilfirdi episcopi*).<sup>26</sup> Although Richard’s boast of celestial interference might be improbable, the corroboration of the protection of the priory of Tynemouth indicates two things. First the Galwegians, and perhaps other elements of the Scottish army were sophisticated to understand that a standing monastery or abbey was a source of wealth that a ravaged one was not. Second, the Galwegians honoured

<sup>23</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 15.

<sup>24</sup> Davies, *Domination*, p. 77.

<sup>25</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 15.

<sup>26</sup> CSHR RHe, p. 153: ‘*Unde et illud coenobium quod ad Tinae fluminis hostium situm est, quod Anglice Tinemuthe dicitur, ut sibi et illic existentibus pro praesenti necessitate pacem redimeret, regi Scottia et suis xxvij. marcas argenti persolvit*’.

their commitments and were rewarded for doing so. Third, the protection of Tyemouth was not a random act of kindness. Other abbeys and monasteries might also have been spared but the documentation has been lost.

There was a contrast in how nineteenth century Yorkshire historians perceive events. Lamplough blamed the barons for the devastation wrought upon the inhabitants of their manors.<sup>27</sup> Where Lamplough saw nothing but misery and despair, Leadman was able to envision everlasting hope and salvation:

Yet one event occurred during the second year of this reign, which presents a gleam of glory amidst all the surrounding gloom and turbulence, and that event is an honour to Yorkshire, for it was in the main part by Yorkshire-men that the Battle of the Standard was fought and won.<sup>28</sup>

By approximately 22 July, David, emboldened by the success of the battle of Clitheroe (10 June 1138), amassed his largest army yet, with contingents present from all parts of his domain and some stipendiary forces from lands that did not belong to him, such as the Orkney islands, which were still dependencies of Norway.<sup>29</sup> When David crossed the river Tees, he marched into Yorkshire.<sup>30</sup> Rumours of his advance preceded him, but these seemed only to have subjugated the population of the northern counties to a state of hopelessness. Until the invasion of Yorkshire there was no organized resistance to David's repeated invasions.

The northern barons of Yorkshire, many of whom were still more sympathetic to David than to Stephen, were left to fend for themselves. Indeed, even the barons who opposed the Scots were said to have offered little resistance until the counsel of

---

<sup>27</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 58-59.

<sup>28</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 15.

<sup>29</sup> James Henry Ramsay, *The Foundations of England: or Twelve Centuries of British History (B. C. 55- A. D. 1154)*, 2 vols (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1898), p. 367.

<sup>30</sup> Davis, *King Stephen*, p. 36.

Thurstan, Archbishop of York, rallied them. Thurstan had met King Stephen in council at Northampton in early May, before the king had marched off to deal with the southwestern rebels and had likely been ceded some formal authority with which he might organize the defence of the north.<sup>31</sup> Leadman, Matthew, and Ritchie noted that the cruelty of the invading army roused the indignation of the Archbishop of York and the principal barons in the county.<sup>32</sup> Thus, David's plan of intimidation did not work.

### **David's Motives**

David I, King of Scotland, son of a royal English mother and a royal Scottish father was raised in his brother-in-law's Norman English court. As a younger son, David had little expectation that he would become a king. Nevertheless, David's royal background, excellent marriage, and status as the 'brother of the queen,' made him one of the wealthiest and most respected members of King Henry I's court. With his knowledge of the Norman court, the Norman economy, and the Norman military, David was able to 'modernise' the kingdom of Scotland. His time at Henry's court only served to fuel David's ambitions: he became Earl of Huntingdon, then Prince of the Cumbrians, before finally becoming King of Scotland. It was apparent to Eustace fitz John, who had encountered David at Henry's court, that David had the ambition to extend his influence south of the Humber.<sup>33</sup>

For thirty-five years Henry I enjoyed an unbroken peace between England and Scotland.<sup>34</sup> When Henry I died, Stephen and Matilda, the grandchildren of William

---

<sup>31</sup> Carpenter, *Struggle*, p. 166.

<sup>32</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 17; Donald Matthew, *Britain and the Continent: 1000-1300*, pp. 84-85 and Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 61; Strickland, *War*, p. 62; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 154; Grainge, *Battles*, p. 13. Brune, *More Battles*, p. 96. Leadman, *Battles*; p. 16. Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 86; and C. R. B. Barrett, *Battles and Battlefields in England* (London: A. D. Innes, 1896), pp. 26-27.

<sup>33</sup> David Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (New York, NY: Longman, 2000), p. 164.

<sup>34</sup> Ritchie, *Normans in Scotland*, p. 256.

the Conqueror, each laid claim to the kingdom of England. David had sisters named Maude-Edith and Mary. They each had a daughter named Matilda. Maude-Edith married King Henry I and their daughter, Matilda, claimed the throne of England. Mary's daughter Matilda married Stephen of Blois, the other claimant to the throne of England. David could not remain uninvolved in the succession dispute. Moreover, David's own son, Earl Henry, was regarded as the heir to the martyred Earl Waltheof and he maintained ancient Scottish claims in northern England.<sup>35</sup> When Stephen made concessions to Scottish interests, he made them to David's son. Thus in February 1136 the king of England ceded Carlisle—David's new headquarters—to Earl Henry.<sup>36</sup>

The medieval chroniclers commented extensively on King Henry I's effort to retain the throne of England for Matilda and the usurpation of that throne by Stephen of Blois.<sup>37</sup> These chroniclers agreed that the first layman to swear an oath to Matilda was her uncle, David. With the pretense that he was defending Matilda's interests, David pursued his territorial aspirations 'which must be recovered by sword'.<sup>38</sup> Ostensibly on behalf of his niece, King David took Carlisle, Norham, Wark, Alnwick, and Newcastle. Although it is not possible to know what David desired, this segment shall examine three of King David's options to ascertain his goal. His options might have been: his oath to Matilda, his desire to expand Scotland to a Scoto-Northumbrian state, and his hopes of invading and conquering England for himself. This thesis favours the third option.

### *David's Oath*

---

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., pp. 257-58.

<sup>37</sup> HA, x. 1: '*regni diadema Deum temptans inuasit*' and Map, 'A fine knight, but in other respects almost a fool'.

<sup>38</sup> Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 259.



The historians who support the idea of a Scoto-Northumbrian state saw David's purported loyalty to his niece as mere pretense for territorial gain. Rosalind Mitchison claimed that David initially remained neutral in the dispute because his other niece was Stephen's wife and that David only changed his stance when Matilda asked for his support.<sup>39</sup> Barrow corroborated Mitchison's account and added that David was defeated on 22 August 1138 by Yorkshire men who were fighting not for King Stephen, but for a much more local interest—they had no desire to see their county devastated.<sup>40</sup> Archibald Duncan noted that David posed a serious threat to England. J.D. Mackie claimed that at different points in time, David had actually supported both factions of the internecine war.<sup>41</sup> In sum, modern Scottish historians have taken the view that David's support for Matilda was not his first criterion for participation in the war.

Jean Truax and David Carpenter also took the position that David's support for his niece was merely a pretense under which he could claim more land for himself.<sup>42</sup> However some English historians have argued that David's support for Matilda was genuine. Marjorie Chibnall claimed that despite the bribe given by Stephen with the cession of Cumbria in 1136,<sup>43</sup> that David invaded England in 1138 on behalf of his niece, Matilda.<sup>44</sup> Robert Wright, a modern Yorkshire historian, agreed that King David crossed the border in order to support Matilda's claim to the throne.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Mitchison, *History*, p. 30.

<sup>40</sup> Barrow, *Kingship*, pp. 38-39.

<sup>41</sup> Duncan, *Scotland*, p. 219 and J. D. Mackie, *A History of Scotland*, 2nd edn (New York, NY: Dorset Press, 1978).

<sup>42</sup> Jean A. Truax, 'A Time for Peace: Aelred of Rievaulx and the End of the Anglo-Norman Civil War', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 46 (2011), p. 173 and Carpenter *Struggle*, p. 166.

<sup>43</sup> Note. Wilson's 'Crown colony' of Cumberland in the 1130s was smaller than the current county. J. Wilson, 'Domesday Book, Pipe Rolls, and Testa de Nevill', *VCH Cumberland*, i (1901), in Richard Sharpe, *Norman Rule in Cumbria: 1092-1136* (Carlisle: Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, 2006), p. 67.

<sup>44</sup> Marjorie Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 88-89.

<sup>45</sup> [http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/12906158.The\\_bloody\\_battles\\_that\\_shaped\\_Yorkshire\\_s\\_history/](http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/12906158.The_bloody_battles_that_shaped_Yorkshire_s_history/)

### *Scottish Expansionism*

In any debate about King David's motives, a number of issues must be noted. The first is that according to Green and Carpenter, the allegiance of many northern barons lay more with David than with Stephen.<sup>46</sup> If David's goal had been to attain sovereignty over Northumbria, Bernard de Balliol, sent by King Stephen, might have extended a peaceful diplomatic solution to the barons of the north. Instead of trying to 'win the hearts and minds' of his would-be subjects, David opted to systematically intimidate the northern barons into submission by ravaging the land. It might never be known how much control he had over the Galwegians and others in his army. The charter of Tynemouth Priory demonstrated that the Galwegians could keep their word but several sources indicate that his army was motivated by the promise of booty rather than loyalty to the king. Instead of motivating the northern barons to submit, David had incensed the northerners, giving them a reason to fight for their 'kith, kin, and kirk.' Keith Stringer, J.O. Prestwich, David Bates, and Xavier Storelli argued that it was David's goal to extend his frontiers so that Northumbria would be dependent upon Scotland.<sup>47</sup> According to Michael Lynch, it was David's inability to fight in northern England, not his military prowess, that caused his southernmost incursions.<sup>48</sup>

However another view can be advanced. In 1138, on the eve of the battle of the Standard, Robert de Brus and Bernard de Balliol offered, on behalf of King Stephen, to grant the earldom of Northumbria to David's son, Henry, but David

---

<sup>46</sup> Green, 'Anglo-Scottish,' p. 63 and Carpenter, *Struggle*, p. 166.

<sup>47</sup> Stringer, *Reign*, p. 28; J. O. Prestwich, 'Military intelligence under the Norman and Angevin Kings', in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 14; Bates, 'Kingship', p. 96; and Xavier Storelli, 'Les Harangues de la Bataille de l' étendard (1138)', *Médiévales*, 57 (2009), p. 28.

<sup>48</sup> Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History*, 2nd ed. (London: Pilmco, 1992), p. 84.

refused.<sup>49</sup> As Stephen had in 1136 been willing to exchange Cumbria for peace, it is not unlikely that he, suspecting that David wanted more than Northumbria, would have once again attempted to placate David with another province. This thesis will present the case, in opposition to Stringer and others' view, that it was David's intention to invade more deeply into England or perhaps as a direct descendant of the house of Wessex, to conquer England.

### *Conquering England*

When David saw Stephen struggling in the south, he saw an opportunity for Scottish aggrandisement.<sup>50</sup> An army was amassed from all parts of his kingdom. It included soldiers from the Highlands and the Isles, Lowlanders—both Norman and English—Scots, Gaels, and Galwegians. It was reported by Richard of Hexham that David's army was composed of 26,000 soldiers and also included stipendiary forces from the Orkneys, Germany, Normandy, and the Flemish duchy.<sup>51</sup> David's army was not an army of incursion—it was the army of an invasion.

A Benedictine monk, writing almost 300 kilometres south of the battlefield, offered the following account: '*On þis gær com Daidid king of Scotlande mid ormete færd to þis land. wolde winnan þis land.*'<sup>52</sup> (In this year David, king of Scots, came to this country with an immense army: he meant to conquer this country.)<sup>53</sup> Closer to the battlefield a Cistercian monk wrote: '*Nam qui prius iactitabant Angliam subvertere.*' (Those who before boasted to overthrow England).<sup>54</sup> Edmund King concurred, citing

---

<sup>49</sup> Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>51</sup> CSHR RHe, p.159.

<sup>52</sup> ASC 2 (E) [1138].

<sup>53</sup> Anglo Saxon Chronicles (1042-1154)' in *English Historical Documents*, ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway, 12 vols, 2nd edn, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979), ii. 1042-1189, p. 212.

<sup>54</sup> *Laurentii Dunelmensis*, p. 75.

Richard of Hexham, that David sought to attack not just Yorkshire but ‘also the greater part of England’.<sup>55</sup> Obviously, there are many historians who agreed with Stringer, that David sought a Scoto-Northumbrian state. It seems difficult for modern historians to imagine that a twelfth century Scottish king might have such delusions of grandeur or that he might have found himself—with an army—in precisely the right time and place.

### **The Scottish Army: Composition and Battle Order**

Scholars have not been able to agree upon what King David expected to encounter when he made his southern advance. According to the Norman English chroniclers, including William of Malmesbury, in the introduction of his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, David was a living legend; few men have been as popular among their contemporaries.<sup>56</sup> Barrow, a Scottish historian, suggested, however, that the northern barons viewed David as one of their own and were therefore dismayed to see the king leading an army full of barbarians into their lands.<sup>57</sup> According to Barrow, it was Stephen’s crises—not David’s military genius—that were responsible for David’s southern advances.<sup>58</sup> But when David led his invading army into England, it was (ostensibly) to support Henry’s daughter in her claim to the throne. David claimed to be an honourable man who treated his oath to Henry as his word and solemn trust. This thesis will contradict Barrow and suggest instead that David might not have expected any opposition from the northern barons.

David’s army combined two basic components: an indigenous native levy, which was composed of sundry diverse elements, and a ‘Frankish’ Norman English

---

<sup>55</sup> King, *King Stephen*, p.92 from RPH, p. 159.

<sup>56</sup> Michael Lynch, *Scotland: A New History*, 2nd ed. (London: Pimco 1992), p. 84.

<sup>57</sup> G. W. S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), pp. 84-90.

<sup>58</sup> Lynch, *Scotland*, p. 84 from G. W. S. Barrow ‘David I of Scotland: The Balance of New and Old’ (Stenton Lecture, 1984), p. 5

component, which was made up of the royal *familia*, Norman English settlers, and a number of other external mercenary units.<sup>59</sup> David's charter demonstrated the diversity of *gentes* in his kingdom, '*francis et Anglicis et Scottis et Galwensibus*'.<sup>60</sup> This was not another raiding party but the largest army that had ever marched south from Scotland.

### *The Poems*

While the battle of the Standard is not the most important battle to have ever been fought on British soil, at least four poets found it to be highly inspirational. These illustrate how later historians have romanticised the battle. Lamplough began his poetic survey of the Scottish army as follows:

The tumultuary army, which followed him  
consisted of Normans, Germans, and English,  
of Cumbrian Britons, of Northumbrians, of men  
of Teviotdale and Lothian, of Picts commonly  
called men of Galloway, and of Scots.<sup>61</sup>

Sir Walter Scott seems to have borrowed from the battle of the Standard for his poem 'Marmion,' which was about the battle of Flodden (1513):

Galwegians, wild as ocean's gale,  
And Lodon's knights, all sheathed in mail,  
And the bold men of Teviotdale.<sup>62</sup>

A third anonymous poet whose voice echoed in several British ballads may have preceded Scott or Lamplough:

And first marched forth the Galloway men,  
And then came the Norman troops,  
With English them among:  
And then marched forth the Scottish foot,

---

<sup>59</sup> Strickland, 'Securing', p. 222.

<sup>60</sup> Part Two of Appendix 2, '*Munimenta Mailros*', p. 230.

<sup>61</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 59.

<sup>62</sup> *The Poetical Works of Walter Scott*, ed. by Walter Scott, (Frankfort, DE: Broenner, 1826), p. 92.

And then marched forth the horse;<sup>63</sup>

*The Composition of the Scottish Army*

Historians have echoed medieval chroniclers by passing negative judgment on the Scottish army. William Grainge revealed a distinct pro-English bias when he writes that these men who came from different races, spoke different languages, and practiced different modes of warfare, were all equally ferocious and equally excellent in their propensity for rape and slaughter.<sup>64</sup> By downplaying the ethnic diversity of the Scottish army, Grainge underscored the barbarity of the Scots. Oman too used derogatory terms to make the Scots appear comparatively barbaric: he wrote disparagingly of ‘disorderly masses of Highlanders and Galwegians crossing the Tweed ‘in their clans’ and ‘orderly levies from English speaking eastern Lowlands.’ Bradbury notes the significance of the ‘undisciplined Galwegians’ in the army. Of the Scots, the Galwegians had the worst reputation as ruthless ravagers. John of Hexham claimed that the Galwegians were ‘more atrocious than the whole race of pagans, neither fearing God, nor regarding man’ so that they ‘acted in the manner of beasts.’ Such biases thus precluded more nuanced and accurate descriptions of the Scottish army’s composition.<sup>65</sup>

Discussions about the army’s size have been considerably more objective. The historians Appleby and Dalton, basing their estimates upon a quote from Richard of Hexham, figured that there were 26,000 soldiers in King David’s army,<sup>66</sup> but James H.

---

<sup>63</sup> Anonymous, ‘The Battle of Cuton Moor’, found in *The Common Place Book of Ancient and Modern and Metrical Legendary* (Edinburgh: John Anderson, 1854), pp. 192-204; *Calliope: A Collection of Poems, Legendary and Pathetic by Various Authors* (Baltimore, MD: Edward J. Coale, 1814), pp. 290-304; *The legendary cabinet: a collection of British national ballads, ancient and modern from the best authorities*, ed. by John Doowra Parry (London: W. Joy, 1829); and *The Ballads and Songs of Yorkshire, transcribed from Private manuscripts, Rare Broad-sides, and Scarce Publications; with other notes and a Glossary*, ed. by C. J. Davison Ingledew (London: Bell and Daldy, 1860), pp. 18-35.

<sup>64</sup> Grainge, *Battles and Battlefields*, p. 13.

<sup>65</sup> Bradbury, ‘Battles’, p. 191 and CHE RPH, p. 8.

<sup>66</sup> CSHR RHe, p.159; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 52; and Dalton, *Conquest*, pp.150-51.

Ramsay warned that the estimated size of King David's army given by medieval chronicles should be considered utterly untrustworthy. Ramsay blamed these inflated figures on the chroniclers' inability to realise the scantiness of the resources at their disposal, but these accounts are not important because they offer an exact figure; they are important because they reveal that, in the perspective of the chroniclers, this was the largest army to have ever marched out of Scotland.<sup>67</sup> Several chroniclers copied Henry of Huntingdon and used the term '*innumerabilem exercitum*'.<sup>68</sup> John of Worcester used the term, '*multitudine equestrium et pedestrium*'.<sup>69</sup> Ramsay might have interpreted the fact that because Richard of Hexham gave an exact number, 26,000, that other chroniclers did also. This was not true.

### *Scottish Battle Order*

There was comparatively little difference of opinion among historians surrounding the Scottish order of battle; nevertheless, it was unusual because King David was forced to change his dispositions on the battlefield in the presence of the enemy. Beeler argued that David tried to emulate the English pattern by using dismounted knights and archers as the spearhead of his attack.<sup>70</sup> Then, 'the highland kerne' and those whom Oman misguidedly identified as the 'Picts from Galloway,' armed with nothing more than a dart, a targe, and a broadsword, were to exploit the gap that would open in the Yorkshire host.<sup>71</sup> King David's plan was represented as a sensible and rational one.<sup>72</sup> However, it was upset by the Galwegians' unrelenting demands that they be placed in the front line, in spite of their lack of armour. To be in the van and to make

---

<sup>67</sup> James H. Ramsay, 'The Strength of English Armies in the Middle Ages', *EHR*, 29 (1914), p. 221.

<sup>68</sup> HA, x, 7, p. 712; MP, p. 167; CSHR RT, p. 135; RH, Stubbs, p. 193; and RW, Hewlett, p. 222.

<sup>69</sup> JW, p. 51.

<sup>70</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 90.

<sup>71</sup> 'A kerne' was a lightly armed Gaelic soldier.

<sup>72</sup> Barrett, *Battlefields*, p. 31; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 90.

the first assault, as Crosfield, wrote, which they claimed, was theirs by ancient right.<sup>73</sup> Beeler commented that the medieval sources were faulty.<sup>74</sup> Oman had the Galwegians referring to David's knights as 'Norman and English strangers'.<sup>75</sup> This implies a lack of acculturation in the Scottish army. David withdrew his first order of battle, and placed the Galwegians in the front line.<sup>76</sup>

Oman called this the right wing of the second rank. Barrett and Beeler asserted that there were three lines and no wings. Crosfield, mistakenly stated that the men of Lothian, an English-speaking *gens* in the Lowland of Scotland, were 'Scotch highlanders' and King, also had the men of Lothian on the third line with King David. This is significant in the 'Battle' segment because several sources stated that the men of Lothian retreated when the Galwegian leaders were killed. This might be another example of the sloppiness of the modern historians in their use of medieval sources. According to Crosfield, Henry, Prince of Cumbria, commanded the second line: the Normans, and the men from Cumbria, and Teviotdale, as well as Eustace fitz John, lord of Alnwick and Malton, and his followers.<sup>77</sup> These were a large proportion of the archers (who were, of course, all but useless in such a position) and mounted knights, and these two groups were organized as the main striking force of the army. In the third line were the Lowland Scots—the men of Lothian and Lennox and the men from the Isles. According to Beeler, a military historian, the left wing Lowlanders and the Western Highlanders were all on foot. The fourth line was composed of the 'Scots'

---

<sup>73</sup> Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 55 and Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 90. Again, the only source for the Galwegians' 'ancient right' was Ailred, 'Battle', p. 258.

<sup>74</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 90: 'As nearly as can be reconstructed from the incomplete account of Richard of Hexham, and the rather confused statements of Ailred'.

<sup>75</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 392.

<sup>76</sup> Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 56; King, *King Stephen*, p. 93; and Strickland, 'Securing', p. 222. King and Strickland attributed all their information of the Scottish battle order to Ailred.

<sup>77</sup> Augustin Thierry, 'Battle of the Standard', in *Readings in English History*, ed. by John Richard Green (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1879), p. 73; Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, pp. 55-56; and King, *King Stephen*, p. 93.



men of Moray, who had forgotten their ancient grudge,<sup>78</sup> and the eastern Highlanders, and the royal bodyguard. Though it was highly unusual for the period, the fourth line, which Crosfield combined with the third was a tactical reserve that was under the command of King David himself. Although the royal guard had as a body no more than 200 knights, Ritchie described this as ‘large number even for a king’.<sup>79</sup>

Modern interpretations of the battle of the Standard have sometimes been inaccurate and biased. The following examples demonstrated the clear argument of this thesis. Jim Bradbury attempted to think for the King of the Scots; ‘David, like Harold Godwinson at Hastings, pinned his hopes on a surprise attack, in this case through the fog, and like Harold he failed to achieve it’. And again Bradbury’s opinion, ‘David had a sensible plan of battle, but when the tough Galwegians claimed it was their right to be in the van, he changed his mind and let them have their way. It was a serious error’. Charles Oman also thought for David, ‘But David had forgotten to reckon with the pride and headlong courage of his Celtic subjects’.<sup>80</sup>

It is the duty of the historian first to present a set of data-based facts, then to form fact-based conclusions. When it comes to the composition and formation of the Scottish army, however, many historians hold opinions that are inappropriate enough to bear mention. Even inane opinions like Leadman’s, with his continuous praise for his fellow Yorkshire men, reveal a breach of the historian’s trade and colour the argument accordingly.

---

<sup>78</sup> Richard D. Oram, ‘David I and the Scottish Conquest and Colonisation of Moray’, *Northern Scotland*, 19, (1999), pp. 1-19.

<sup>79</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 90. (Beeler noted that the knights stayed mounted. This might be from the ‘confused statement of Ailred’, which led up to the earl of Henry’s cavalry charge.)

<sup>80</sup> Bradbury, ‘Battles’, p. 191; Jim Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53* (Thrupp: Sutton, 2011), p. 35; and Oman, *Art*, p. 392.

The evidence cited in the segment, 'The Background' and this section demonstrates that there is a clear case to be made that recent historians' emphasis tended to be on the pre-battle instead of the battle itself. As for the modern military historians, Beeler and Oman, and the nineteenth century Yorkshire historians who put much more emphasis on the composition of the two armies and their battle plans. The concluding section of 'The Battle of the Standard' will examine the different ways in which the military historians and the nineteenth century Yorkshire historians have handled the same information.

Based on the evidence cited above, this thesis asserts that Charles Oman's *The Art of War* created the following scenario based loosely on Ailred of Rievaulx. Oman wrote that:

When the king persisted in his design, Malise Earl of Strathern, one of the chiefs from beyond the Forth, angrily exclaimed, 'Why trust so much, my king, to the goodwill of these Frenchmen? None of them, for all his mail, will go so far to the front as I, who fight unarmoured in to-day's battle.' At this the Norman, Alan Percy, cried, 'That is a big word, and for your life you could not make it good.' The earl turned on him in wrath, and so hot an altercation burst out between the Highlanders, who refused to give precedent.<sup>81</sup>

Matthew Strickland in *War and Chivalry* also pursued this line of thinking.<sup>82</sup>

This thesis finds that modern historians followed Ailred of Rievaulx's uncorroborated 'Battle of the Standard' unquestioningly. Thus, understandings of the battle are needlessly skewed by one source of dubious merit.

### **The 'Southern' army and Battle Order**

In the twelfth century, Norman armies were accustomed to dismounting a considerable proportion of their mounted knights to fight on foot in battle. King

---

<sup>81</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 392

<sup>82</sup> Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, p. 114.

Henry I fought three battles in Normandy: at Tinchebrai (1106), at Bremule (1119) and at Bourg-Theroulde (1124). Bradbury claimed that the archers who were used in the last two battles were not interspersed with hauberk knights, as they were at the battle of the Standard. At Northallerton, the 'Southern' army appeared to have formed a frontline across the field. Bradbury was not quite sure how the mixing occurred. He emphasised that the bowman used the longbow and thus were 'most probably' northern English levies. According to him, there were three common elements of Norman battle tactics that can be found in the hundred years after Hastings: dismounted knights, archers usually placed in a forward position, and cavalry normally reserved for a decisive charge. He admitted that he could not explain these tactics.<sup>83</sup>

### *Barons*

Two foreign captains, William Count of Aumâle and Walter of Ghent, brought stipendiary forces.<sup>84</sup> They stiffened the local forces that might not have been as effective without them.<sup>85</sup> The Scottish historian, Ritchie, called the barons 'French landowners and a French archbishop'.<sup>86</sup> Bradbury also raised the issue of the ethnic composition of the hauberk knights. He found that all the barons mentioned as settled in England were of Norman or French extraction.<sup>87</sup> In this situation, Thurstan summoned the leading northern barons to a meeting at York to decide on strategy. There would be an impressive roll call when they convened: William of Aumâle, Walter de Ghent, Robert de Brus and his son Adam, Walter Espec, Ilbert de Lacy, Roger de Mowbray, William de Percy, Richard de Courcy, William Fossard, Robert

---

<sup>83</sup> Bradbury, 'Battles,' pp. 191-92 and Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda*, p. 35.

<sup>84</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368.

<sup>85</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Governance*, p. 75.

<sup>86</sup> Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 259.

<sup>87</sup> Bradbury, 'Battle', p. 192. This thesis calls them Norman English.

III de Stuteville, and ‘many other powerful and sagacious men’.<sup>88</sup> Once Stephen got word of the northern invasion, he dispatched Bernard de Baillol, the north midlands barons Robert de Ferrers, William Peverel of Nottingham, Geoffery Alselin, and a force of knights to serve as reinforcements for the Yorkshire barons. Even with the Derbyshiremen, the Nottinghamshiremen, and the contingent that de Balliol brought from the king, the barons were still vastly outnumbered.<sup>89</sup> Hollister claimed that Norman England continued the Old English custom of two months of military service, which produced better trained warriors than the Scottish could provide.<sup>90</sup> Lamplough claimed that the real strength of the movement was the concentration of the northern barons but ignored the fact that the decisive force in the battle was the foreign stipendiary knights.<sup>91</sup>

The contemporaneous charters demonstrated that the northern barons had close ties to those of Yorkshire. Appendix 2: *The Charters of King David of Scotland*; Appendix 3: *The Early Yorkshire Charters*; Appendices 5 and 6 from the *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* all show that northern barons were witnesses to agreements in the county.<sup>92</sup>

Volume Three of *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* comprises a catalogue of the charters of England during the reign of King Stephen. The editor, H. A. Cronne noted that Anglo-Norman charters cannot be dated with precision and many charters during Stephen’s reign had wide date ranges. Therefore, Part Three of the *Regesta* is not chronological in order but geographical with charters listed according to the place

---

<sup>88</sup> King, *King Stephen*, p. 92.

<sup>89</sup> Appleby, *Troubled Reign*; pp. 52-53; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 86; Crouch, *King Stephen*, p. 82; King, *King Stephen*, p. 92; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; and Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 91. Nottinghamshire was in the diocese of York, and it was closely linked with Derbyshire, which was in the diocese of Coventry. Strickland, ‘Securing’, p. 220: ‘He invaded a third time in September, to be met at Northallerton by the feudal host supplemented by the shire levies of Yorkshire.’ Strickland should know better the date of the Kalends of September.

<sup>90</sup> Hollister, *Military Organization*, p. 94.

<sup>91</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>92</sup> Appendix 2, pp. 229-30; Appendix 3, p. 231; Appendix 5, pp. 233-34; and Appendix 6, pp. 235-43.

where they were signed. During the period of ‘The Anarchy’, Stephen’s authority was challenged. This thesis shall also list the charters that were granted by his challengers, his wife and his sons.

This research shall be divided into two parts. The first part shall examine all the charters during Stephen’s reign that mentioned combatants at the battle of the Standard. Charters 428 and 429 dealt with the lands of Ilbert de Lascei. All the other charters mentioned had the barons, the king of Scotland and the earl of Huntingdon as witnesses. Robert de Courci witnessed most of his charters in Normandy. However, I find two important facts in this research. First, many of the locations where the northern barons witnessed charters were in either Yorkshire or adjacent counties. This supports the argument that the Norman English barons at the battle of the Standard were northern barons. Second, almost all the locations where the king of Scotland and his son the earl witnessed documents were not in Yorkshire. This supports the argument that after the battle of the Standard, Stephen did not consider the Scottish royal family to be a military threat.

Although some of the northern barons gave their children English names, only one had English blood, Robert III of Stuteville.<sup>93</sup> The *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* mentioned most of the northern barons but Robert de Stuteville III was only mentioned once as a witness to King Stephen’s grant to Alexander, the bishop of Lincoln.<sup>94</sup>

### *Fyrd*

Thurstan called a general levy, and the villagers had sent their contingents. It would also seem likely that the civic militias of York, Beverley, and Ripon were called out,

---

<sup>93</sup> Planché, *Conqueror*, p. 253.

<sup>94</sup> RRAN, iii, no. 482, p. 180.

each marching under the banner of its patron saint. Beeler noted that these were the result of an ancient charter which Henry I reconfirmed. According to Richardson and Sayles, this charter from the reign of King Henry I, reaffirmed an ‘ancient obligation that the church of York discharge their military obligation by the townsmen under the banner of St Peter’.<sup>95</sup> At the advent of Stephen’s reign, the obligation regained its earlier military importance. The Freemen of Yorkshire fought alongside dismounted knights<sup>96</sup>

### *Archers*

Several historians stated that the archers were so numerous because they were local. The Yorkshire archers formed the wings and advanced guard of the army. Archers were occasionally mentioned in the accounts of the civil contests between King Stephen and the Empress Matilda. It seems, also, that at the battle of the Standard both armies had their archers. The ‘Southern’ army’s were most effective and caused the Galwegians terrible losses, forcing them to flee.<sup>97</sup>

### **Southern Commander**

Grainge, Beeler, and Strickland stated that Archbishop Thurstan of York, the king’s lieutenant in the north, took the first action. He united the country against invaders. He invoked a ruling from King Henry I, which gave the archbishop of York authority

---

<sup>95</sup> Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 261; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 86; Richardson and Sayles, *Governance*, p. 75 and RRAN ii, no. 1083, p. 122.

<sup>96</sup> Hollister, *Military Organization*, p. 229.

<sup>97</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Governance*, p. 75; Thierry, ‘Battle’, p. 73; Thomas Hastings, *The British archer, or, Tracts on archery* (London: R. Ackerman, 1831), p. 29 and *The Archer's Guide*, By an Old Toxophilite, 1833: <https://www.archerylibrary.com/books/guide/>. Note. Thierry used the term Saxon. He also described an anachronistic revolution of the indigenous English weaponry from their earlier battle-axe to the bow. The English had used bows in 1066.

to protect his demesne.<sup>98</sup> Beeler, using Richard of Hexham as his source, viewed the absence of any local military leader as the cause of mutual distrust and suspicion among the northern barons.<sup>99</sup> This situation appeared to permit all land north of the river Humber to fall to the Scots by default. This absence also exacerbated the jealousy that the barons had for each other. Their unifying factor was the need to defend their territory. As Strickland noted, at the very time when high morale and structure were crucial, an army composed of hybrid forces was likely to have disputes over rank and honour, which could sow discord.

There were two incidents, which allayed the northern barons' mutual suspicion and the dread of treachery. Archbishop Thurstan preached a holy war and promised absolution. Appleby, based on Ailred, wrote that he sent an episcopal edict to all his parish priests that they lead their parishioners into holy battle under their processional crosses and the co-operation of the local fyrd under the parish priests. The appearance of Bernard de Balliol with a troop of horses sent by King Stephen was the second incident. Edmund King wrote that the archbishop staged an elaborate choreography to convey the impression that they were fighting for God, king, and country in a holy war. Thus assured, Appleby and Thierry remarked that the barons then swore an oath that they would be faithful to each other and that they would either win or die.<sup>100</sup>

Dalton and Bradbury disputed who had command of the 'Southern' army on the field of battle. Dalton stated that, when faced with the imminent military and administrative crisis of 1138, Stephen placed the secular government of the county in

---

<sup>98</sup> In Appendix 1, p. 228.

<sup>99</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 86 from Richard, *Priory of Hexham*, p. 160.

<sup>100</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 86; Leadman, *Battles*, p. 15; Strickland, *War*, pp. 113-14; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53; King, *King Stephen*, p. 92; and Thierry, 'Battle', p. 73.

the hands of William of Aumâle.<sup>101</sup> Bradbury was not that assured. He could not state definitively who was in command. He noticed that the awareness of current tactics might suggest a proven military leader, Bernard de Balliol. Ailred emphasized the role of Walter Espec, who was a strong patron of Rievaulx. Bradbury also mentioned that Orderic reminded his readers that King Stephen rewarded William of Aumâle with the earldom of York shortly after the battle.<sup>102</sup> Based on the evidence presented above, I would be inclined to pick Bernard de Balliol for three reasons. His presence as a direct representative of the king boosted morale. Secondly, he negotiated with King David. Lastly, the ‘Southern’ army’s unique defensive position, with archers and hauberk knights interspersed, was a sophisticated manoeuvre and suggests the sort of command that de Balliol would provide. The northern barons, faced with overwhelming odds, did not panic and followed their religious and military leader after some initial squabbling. The cohesiveness of the commands was a decisive element in the defeat of the Scots.

### **Battle Order**

Only Ramsay and Ritchie noted that the ‘Southern’ commander placed the ‘pick of the men-at-arms’ in the front rank. These were the stipendiary soldiers brought by William of Aumâle and Walter of Ghent from the Boulonnais, Ponthieu, Normandy, and Flanders.<sup>103</sup> Lamplough maintained that the real strength of the northern barons romanticised a battle that Stephen won with gold.<sup>104</sup> Leadman would have the reader believe that the hauberk knights were from Yorkshire as were the archers, the spearmen, and lancers.

---

<sup>101</sup> Dalton, *Conquest*, p. 146.

<sup>102</sup> Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda*, p. 35.

<sup>103</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 369 and Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 265.

<sup>104</sup> The stipendiary soldiers were paid in gold.



In fact, despite the best efforts of Lamplough and Leadman to elevate the role of the English priests, who had strengthened the men by advice and holy relics, as well as the Yorkshire spearmen and lancers, they were merely decorative.<sup>105</sup> Many Yorkshire and modern historians followed Ailred of Rievaulx's personification of Norman English might. Walter Espec, an old man who would rather be playing chess, cast a shadow over the battle. This battle was the might of the descendants of the *gens Normannorum* (and their stipendiary cohorts in mail) against a very large Scottish rabble, according to Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx.

Bradbury stated that, in the post-Conquest period, dismounted knights became a constant in battle. There was a long tradition of such methods in England. For the battle of the Standard, the 'Southern' command decided to assume the tactical defensive; all personnel were to fight on foot, with the exception of the unit commanders and a small number of men assigned to guard the horses. One solution was to abandon warhorses and the knights who were to fight as infantry. This reduced the vulnerability to missile weapons, while stiffening fighting resolve. All soldiers dismounted, except a few who were sent to the rear in charge of the horses. Leadman disagreed stating that the horses were placed in the rear to cut off all chance of flight.<sup>106</sup>

In describing the 'Southern' army's battle order, Beeler displayed a bit of sarcasm: 'Why this should require an elaborate interpretation is difficult to understand'.<sup>107</sup> According to him, the front was composed of archers, stiffened with dismounted men-at-arms to prevent a charge from breaking the line. Burne and

---

<sup>105</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 61 and Leadman, *Battle*, p. 19

<sup>106</sup> Ramsay, *Foundation*, p. 369; Bradbury, 'Battles', p. 192; Stephen Morillo, *Warfare under the Anglo-Norman Kings* (Woodbridge: Boydell 1994), p. 190; Leadman, *Battle*, p. 19; and Ayton, Andrew, 'Arms, Armour, and Horses' in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 205.

<sup>107</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 89.

Barrett concurred that the ‘Southern’ army’s order of battle consisted of three lines: the first line consisted of archers, the second of spearmen, and the third of men-at-arms. In their rendering, all of the troops were dismounted. However, neither Burne nor Barrett presented evidence for their assumptions.<sup>108</sup> Oman agreed that the Yorkshire archers were ‘mixed’ with the frontline troops. They drew up their whole force in one deep line along a hillside. The knights all dismounted and served on foot with the shire-levies, apparently forming a mailed frontline behind which the half-armed Yorkshire archers arrayed themselves.<sup>109</sup>

The Hexham chronicler goes on to say that the remainder of the knights and barons were arrayed around the Standard, and that the rest of the host—presumably the shire-levies—were posted on the flanks and in the rear. The chronicler also asserted that the horses with their mounted guard were posted some distance in the rear, lest the din of battle should frighten them. Beeler, Crosfield, Lamplough, and Oman all agreed that men-at-arms of the northern barons were drawn up in a dense column with the chariot bearing the standards in the rear of their centre. Oman stated that some of the more elderly knights formed a sacred band in reserve around the Standard.<sup>110</sup> The fact that the northern barons and the less agile among them were kept in reserve gives further evidence that the frontline consisted of foreign stipendiary soldiers.

Bradbury raised the idea that the ‘Southern’ army used a tactical reserve. The horses of the dismounted knights were led to the rear, away from the battle, so they would not be disturbed by the noise and killing. This is contrary to the idea raised above that the northern barons distrusted each other and feared that some of their

---

<sup>108</sup> Burne, *More Battlefields*, p. 97 and Barrett, *Battles*, p. 31.

<sup>109</sup> Oman, *Art*, pp. 391-92.

<sup>110</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, pp. 88-89; Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 55; Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 66-67; and Oman, *Art*, p. 392.

number would flee. But some men were still retained on horseback. This gave the force more than simply defensive power. Bradbury stated that the pattern of the English army fit closely to that found in most medieval battles of this era: archers, dismounted knights, and a reserve force of cavalry.<sup>111</sup> The nineteenth-century and modern historians claimed that there was acculturation between the Norman English and the English. However, the fact that Norman English hauberk knights held their line during the initial Galwegian assault was the crucial factor in the victory of the ‘Southern’ army, not the decimation of Scottish troops by English arrows.

### **Religious Overtones**

For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.<sup>112</sup>

The evolution from Romans 13:4 to St Augustine of Hippo’s ‘Just War’ to Christopher Holdsworth’s study of the opinions regarding warfare held by twelfth-century medieval people demonstrated that the definition of righteousness evolved. The New Testament separated God’s powers from man’s powers.<sup>113</sup> However, by the time of St Augustine (d. 430), the state was Christian. The sovereign’s authority (*auctoritas principis*), that the cause was just (*bella causa*), and the belligerent’s intention of advancing of good and avoiding evil (*recta intentio*) were the three criteria upon which Augustine based his distinction between just and unjust wars.<sup>114</sup> Christopher Holdsworth’s observations of twelfth-century chroniclers espoused these

---

<sup>111</sup> Bradbury, *King Stephen*, p. 35.

<sup>112</sup> Romans 13:4.

<sup>113</sup> Matthew 22:21.

<sup>114</sup> Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt, *The Popes and the Baltic Crusades: 1147-1254* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2007), p. 9.

beliefs. He demonstrated that the twelfth-century chroniclers wrote that God brought success to the righteous and damnation to those who offended Him. He also observed that the idea of a just war, based partly upon the defence of country, Church, and God, emerged in the battle of the Standard in 1138.<sup>115</sup> King Stephen had the *auctoritas principis*. The cause was just (*bella causa*) because the barons were defending their country and their Church. And the belligerents had the intention of avoiding evil (*recta intentio*) that the Galwegians' and the Scots' desecration of the churches embodied.

David Bachrach noted that twelfth-century military campaigns attracted historians concerned with religious as well as with military matters. These included Richard, prior of Hexham; Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon; and Ailred, abbot of Rievaulx. Bachrach further asserted that Richard interviewed eyewitnesses to the battle. He also noted that the battlefield was close to Rievaulx. This proximity and the dangers that might have occurred coloured the accounts of the battle that were given by these historians. Chapter Three will more closely examine the role of the twelfth-century chroniclers.<sup>116</sup>

After the archbishop called for a holy war against the barbarous Scots, the barons decided to fight. As Dalton noted, elaborate religious rituals preceded this battle, including placing relics and the consecrated host onto a cart, around which the English army fought. Ritchie referred to Thurstan as the French Archbishop of French landowners. Ritchie dramatised the archbishop's position as follows: 'on his shoulders the religious mantle of the Conquest had fallen'! Ritchie ignored the plight of the northern barons and the peasants. He viewed the upcoming battle as one in

---

<sup>115</sup> Christopher J. Holdsworth, 'War and Peace in the Twelfth Century: The Reign of Stephen Reconsidered' in *War and Peace in the Middle Ages*, ed. by B. P. McGuire (Copenhagen, DK: C. A. Reitzels Forlag, 1987), pp. 67-93.

<sup>116</sup> David Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War, c. 300-1215* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 153.

which the archbishop would protect the Church from destruction. According to King, Thurstan assured the barons that they were fighting for king and country in a holy war. Appleby stated that Thurstan told the barons their cause was just (*bella causa*) and that they would be fighting for Holy Church and their fatherland. He carefully displayed an impression of solemn religious pilgrimage. They would fight under the standards of the northern saints, a fact which gave the battle its name, and win what seemed a God-given victory.<sup>117</sup> Based on the arguments presented in this thesis, the assumption of divine retribution appeared to have been based more on the words of Richard, Prior of Hexham, than reality.

Despite the ravages and rapine of the Galwegians and other members of the Scottish army, the previous segment on ‘Negotiations’ noted that both the northern barons and the king of Scots had a degree of ambivalence about fighting this battle. Many modern historians viewed the battle as a defence of Northumberland and by extension England. However, the ailing Archbishop Thurstan appeared to have been more astute than these historians indicated. He had to have a reason to rally the northern barons to fight for a very distant King Stephen.

There are several issues that appear to have been overlooked. First, this thesis shall demonstrate that the Galwegians honoured their charters not to attack abbeys that paid them.<sup>118</sup> If abbeys could pay Galwegians not to attack, then wealthy northern barons could have done the same. If, as noted in ‘David’s Motives’, David desired to press either his niece’s case for the crown of England or his own, then not wasting men, materials, or time in Northumberland would have been to his best interest. The northern barons might have paid him in gold and his army might have crossed the

---

<sup>117</sup> Burne, *More Battlefields*, p. 96; Paul Dalton, ‘Civil War and Ecclesiastical Peace in the Reign of King Stephen’ in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 54-55; Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 259; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, pp. 52-53; King, *King Stephen*, p. 92; and Carpenter, *Struggle* p. 166.

<sup>118</sup> Appendix 4: Charter of Protection to Priory of Tynemouth p. 232.

river Humber as it had crossed so many more northern rivers. This might have been in the best interest of King David, Matilda, and the northern barons, but it was not in the best interest of the archbishop. As the lieutenant for Stephen in the north, it was Thurstan's duty to halt David's invasion and not burden King Stephen with another army attacking him from the north. Thurstan had to make the barons fight.

As Barrett stated, Thurstan employed the full power of the priesthood to induce the barons to fight. Edmund King stated that Thurstan's participation 'represented the apotheosis of an unrivalled political and spiritual leader'. Bachrach demonstrated that Thurstan had the ability to use a sermon to raise the barons' feelings. He continued that the archbishop promised the men that they would win the battle and save their sacred Church and country, if they gave themselves to God in true penance (*per veram poenitentiam Deo reconciliati*). Davis noted that he persuaded the barons to fight by ordering them to defend the Church of Christ. They would be fighting for God. Ailred understood this seventeen years later when he wrote that so many celestial figures were fighting on the side of the 'Southern army'. According to Thurstan, this was not a war but a 'Holy War'. The reasons are noted in the first paragraph of this segment. The archbishop told the barons they were fighting for their sovereign, *auctoritas principis*; he told them their cause was just, *bella causa*; and the Scots were evil, *recta intentio*. Thurstan knew that the Augustinians, the Benedictines, and the Cistercians, among others, had sister houses in Scotland. Furthermore, he knew that David was a founder of Rievaulx and that his mother Margaret was a devout and pious Catholic. However, as archbishop, Thurstan had a duty to his clergy and his parishioners. Unlike Ailred, de Brus, de Balliol, and many of the northern barons, Thurstan did not have the personal affinity to David that he had to Stephen. For the reasons outlined above, I would argue that Thurstan had a

duty and that he exercised it to the best of his ability. The archbishop saw *recta intentio* as advancing of the good of the Norman English and avoiding the evil of the Scots and the Galwegians. Philip Morgan reiterated Richard of Hexham's tale that two Scottish soldiers were driven mad after having plundered an oratory of Hexham priory. This was a 'Holy War' against forces that would destroy the Church. The archbishop of York had turned God-fearing Christians into evil barbarians.<sup>119</sup>

The northern barons worked in harmony with the archbishop. According to Thierry, they skillfully took advantage of the local cults and invoked the aid of those English saints who they had treated with contempt in the early days of the Conquest. Now they treated these saints as leaders of the 'Southern' army.<sup>120</sup> Leadman, Lamplough, and Bachrach wrote that Thurstan mobilised the rural militias in the archdiocese in support of the baronial troops. The archbishop had the parish priests read an episcopal edict from their respective altars. The edict called all of the male population qualified to carry arms. Leadman noted that they were to join God in a holy pilgrimage. The priests promised a certain victory and paradise for those who perished on the field. The edict had a very great effect as the armed rural parishioners, led by their priests in canonical vestments, bore crosses, banners, and relics of the saints, which Lamplough, Appleby, and Davis stated increased the courage of the parishioners.<sup>121</sup> Bachrach added that the white-robed priests gave spiritual support to troops going into battle who were ordered to bring relics and banners with their

---

<sup>119</sup> Barrett, *Battles*, p. 27; Edmund King, 'Introduction' in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. by Edmund King (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), p. 14; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 154; Davis, *King Stephen*, pp. 38-39; Philip Morgan, 'The Naming of Battlefields in the Middle Ages' in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 39; Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 154, and Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53.

<sup>120</sup> Thierry, 'Battle', p. 71.

<sup>121</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 16 and Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 62, Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53; and Davis, *King Stephen*, pp. 38-39.

crosses.<sup>122</sup> Richardson noted that parish priests at the battle were unusual.<sup>123</sup> Appleby added that the barons went to their estates to collect their forces and then assembled at York. They went to confession, fasted three days, and received absolution. The archbishop gave them his cross and the banner of St. Peter to carry into battle.<sup>124</sup>

### *The Standard*

According to Davis and King, Thurstan had a standard made as the emblem of resistance. Barrow added that it would serve as a rallying-point for the ‘Southern’ army. Leadman and Lamplough noted that the standard was a symbol to defend their homes against the ravages of a barbaric invader. Appleby noted that it was in the form of a ship’s prow and that on it were hung a silver pyx containing the Host and the banners of St Peter the Apostle, the patron of the York diocese, and the local northern saints St John of Beverley and St Wilfred of Ripon. David Bachrach stated that these emblems symbolised the various ‘homelands’: local, regional and celestial, which combined to strengthen the courage of the army. Storelli incorrectly observed that the royal banner and banner of St Cuthbert flew from the standard also. He argued that Christ was presented as the leader of the southern army in the absence of King Stephen.<sup>125</sup> The standard on the *carroccio*, or carriage, as suggested, made a good tactical point in the battle and a good morale booster.

The army rallied around this standard and drew up for battle. Oman suggested that the standard was in the rear of the centre of the battle lines, which Beeler repeated. Lamplough claimed that David had a standard which was simply a wreath

---

<sup>122</sup> Bachrach, *Religion*, p. 154 from *Bello*, [Col 0703A]: ‘*Sed et Turstinus archiepiscopus per totam diocesim suam edictum episcopale proposuit ut, de singulis parochiis suis presbyteris cum cruce et vexillis reliquisque sanctorum praeuntibus, omnes qui possent ad bella procedere, ad proceres properarent, ecclesiam Christi contra barbaros defensuri*’.

<sup>123</sup> Richardson and Sayles, *Governance*, p. 75.

<sup>124</sup> Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, pp. 52-53.

<sup>125</sup> Bachrach, *Religion*, pp. 153-61 and Storelli, ‘Les Harangues’, p.31.



of blooming heather, attached to a long lance, which he compared to the abundance of religious symbolism of the ‘Southern’ army.<sup>126</sup> The contrast made Scots look like heathens or barbarians. Bradbury noted that the southern standard was the only one erected on a British battlefield.<sup>127</sup> This is one of the few battles fought on British soil, which is not named after the location. Philip Morgan noted that iconic names, especially those that did not embody a toponym, might not last.<sup>128</sup> It had either been adopted by a vigorous patron or was firmly embedded in the national iconography. The battle of the Standard had a vigorous patron in Ailred of Rievaulx.

A remnant of a poem that might be the earliest reference to the standard has been attributed to Hugh Sotevagina, the archdeacon of York:

*Dicitur a stando Standardum, quod stetit illic,  
Militiae probitas, vincere sive mori.*<sup>129</sup>

The significance of references to the standard in the poem of Serlo of Louth Park on the battle of the Standard is discussed in Chapter Three.

An anonymous later ballad cited by Thomas Evans shed a different light on the standard:

A mast of a shipp is so hie,  
Akke bedect with golde so gaye;  
And on the top is a holye crosse,  
That shynes as bright as the daye.

---

<sup>126</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 63; Davis, *King Stephen*, pp. 38-39; King, *King Stephen*, p. 93; Leadman, *Battles*, pp. 18-19; Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 62; Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, pp. 55-56. Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 54; Oman, *Art*, p. 391; and Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 89.

<sup>127</sup> Bradbury, ‘Battles’, p. 35

<sup>128</sup> Philip Morgan, ‘The Naming of Battlefields in the Middle Ages’, in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 39.

<sup>129</sup> RHe, p. 63 and RPH, p. 49:

Our gallant standby all confest,  
By this standard flight.  
Where death or victory the rest,  
That proved the warriors’ might.

Note. Some of Hugh the Chanter’s poems of this individual are preserved in the Cotton MA. Vitell. A. xii. in which he is styled chanter and archdeacon of the church of St. Peter’s of York.

Oh let us (David speaking of the Scottish army) but fighte like valiante men,  
And to Christe's wyll ybowe,  
And yon hallow'd standarde shall be ours  
And the victory also.<sup>130</sup>

Perhaps the ballad was demonstrating that David was a pious Christian who believed that victory in the battle depended on two things: bowing to Christ's will and attaining the standard. According to Evans, if these two things had been accomplished, the Scots would have won.

### *Fasting, Confession, and Absolution*

Appleby, Lamplough, Ramsay, and Leadman followed Ailred in establishing marked differences in the religious practices of the two armies. The 'southern' army went to confession, fasted three days, and received both absolution and Archbishop Thurstan's blessing.<sup>131</sup> Ailred might have read William of Malmesbury's account of the battle of Hastings in which Duke William's army confessed their sins and made communion.<sup>132</sup> It was he that gave them his cross and the banner of St. Peter to carry into battle.

Bachrach stated that many officers and soldiers, even if they did not normally behave in a religious manner, 'got religion' before going into battle and were able to draw strength and spiritual comfort from the presence of a wide variety of sacred objects, including relics, holy banners, and crosses. The stipendiary soldiers performed their ritual obligations, had undertaken penance and had received absolution from Archbishop Thurstan while still at York. The rural levies had

---

<sup>130</sup> Thomas Evans, 'The Battle of Cuton moore' in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative* iv. (London: T. Evans, 1784), pp. 93-111.

<sup>131</sup> Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, pp. 52-53; Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 68; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; and Leadman, *Battle*, p. 17.

<sup>132</sup> WMGRA, 242:1: '*Contra Normanni, nocte tota confessioni peccatorum uacantes, mane Dominico corpori communciarunt*'.

received absolution either from their parish priests or from the clergy who had been brought by Bishop Ralph of Orkney. By the morning of 22 August, all of the soldiers in the ‘Southern’ army were able to confess their sins and receive communion (*Christi carnis et sanguis*). Ailred emphasised that the bishop granted a final remission of sins (*remissio peccatorum*) to those who were fighting. The priests, dressed in their white habits, were then said to have walked among the soldiers, carrying crosses and saints’ relics speaking comforting words and prayers (*sermo simul et oratio*).<sup>133</sup>

### **Negotiations**

After the first Treaty of Durham (1136), Stephen forced David to relinquish his gains in Wark, Alnwick, Norham, and Newcastle, but he conferred the honour of Huntingdon on David’s son Henry. Stephen also pledged that the fate of Northumbria would not be decided at this time.<sup>134</sup> Thus, the invasion in the summer of 1138 might revert to David’s goals.<sup>135</sup> If David’s aims were, as Stringer stated, a greater ‘Scotto-Northumbrian’ kingdom, and if de Brus and de Balliol had the power to grant this annexation, then there was no need for a battle. But there was a battle, which might indicate that David would not have been satisfied with Northumbria. If that is not the case, then the promise of de Brus and de Balliol represented another example of an uncorroborated piece of evidence that historians have taken too credulously from Ailred of Rievaulx, its only source.

This segment deals with two completely independent issues: trust and dual loyalties. The two barons, de Brus and de Balliol, had different obligations to King Stephen and to King David. David had the problem of opposing the barons who had helped him secure Cumbria against Alexander, his brother, and also

---

<sup>133</sup> Bachrach, *Religion*, pp. 154-59.

<sup>134</sup> Barrett, *Battles*, p. 28. Note. Barrett listed the treaty in 1135 not 1136.

<sup>135</sup> Note. See ‘David’s Motives’, pp. 87-88.

helped him quell a revolt by the Mormaer of Moray against his royal authority. David had to trust the Scottish army, including its most dissident and independent elements, to achieve the numerical superiority needed to achieve his goals. Therefore, the outcome of the negotiations, if these negotiations occurred, was known before they began. King David would deny the negotiators or there would not be a battle and the negotiators would side with their fellow northern barons.<sup>136</sup> Thus, the negotiations might have allowed Ailred an opportunity to indulge his rhetorical flourish and nothing more. This segment shall deal first with the barons' dilemma and then with David's.

According to Lamplough:

The position of the Anglo-Norman barons was extremely peculiar; not only did King David claim Northumberland, where they held lands, but they acknowledged him for their liege lord, holding from him estates which were situate on the Scottish side of the border.<sup>137</sup>

Ramsay wrote that, since David had not advanced beyond the limit of the See of Durham, the northern barons sought to make peace. In addition to noting that both barons were men of double allegiance, he also observed that de Brus had spent a great deal of time in the Scottish court. Beeler agreed, noting that de Brus and de Balliol were both tenants of the kings of Scotland and England and were authorised to promise the earldom of Northumberland to David's son if he would abandon the hostilities. Lamplough also stated that the northern barons dispatched de Brus and de Balliol and procured the earldom of Northumberland for Henry. Judith Green also had the duo negotiate with the Scottish king. Oman had de Brus ride to the Scottish camp alone and try to induce the king to consent to terms of peace.<sup>138</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> The previous segment, 'Composition of the 'Southern' army' stated that de Balliol was the king's representative.

<sup>137</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 64.

<sup>138</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; Beeler, *War*, p. 87; Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 65; Green, 'Anglo-

Chalmers was more specific. He claimed that Walter Espec sent Robert de Brus, a friend of David's, to convince him of 'the uncertainties of war and the felicities of peace'. In perhaps the most scathing indictment of the Brus's speech, Chalmers argued that the speech, 'which the historian assigns to Brus', contained 'curious facts and much pathetic argument'.<sup>139</sup> The historian in question was Ailred. Chalmers prided himself on corroboration.<sup>140</sup>

### *Robert de Brus's Speech*

Three historians - Ramsay, Ransford, and Thomas – reminded us that the Norman English were David's true allies. How could he remain king of the Scots without Norman English support? Ransford stressed the words de Brus used to establish national identity in Ailred's account. She noted that Robert de Brus mentioned Norman and English together twice. She also observed that, without reference to the Normans, Robert mentioned the English twice, while making seven, always derogatory, references to the Scots.<sup>141</sup>

Ramsay demonstrated that Ailred, whom he called a well-informed contemporary, showed that David and his brother Edgar needed Norman English support to maintain their thrones. Thomas raised the question whether David ultimately wanted to depend entirely on the Scots and reject the Norman English. Thomas went on to highlight that the relationship between David and the Norman English brought the de Brus family to Scotland.<sup>142</sup> Robert de Brus had a simple

---

Scottish', p. 66; and Oman, *Art*, p. 393.

<sup>139</sup> George Chalmers, *Caledonia: A Historical and Topographical Account of North Britain, from the Most Ancient to the Present Time*, second edition, 8 vols. (Paisley: Alexander Gardner, 1887), iv. p. 622.

<sup>140</sup> Charles W. J. Withers, 'Writing in Geography's History: Caledonia, Networks of Correspondence and Geographical Knowledge in the Late Enlightenment', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 120 (2004), p. 38: 'He sacrificed immediacy for credibility from (first-hand) corroboration'.

<sup>141</sup> Rosalind Ransford, 'A Kind of Noah's Ark: Aelred of Rievaulx and National Identity' in *Religion and Church History*, ed. by Stuart Mews, Studies in Church History, 51 vols. (Oxford: Backwell, 1982), xviii. p. 139.

<sup>142</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 312; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 369; and Ransford, 'Noah's Ark' p.

request: please do not attack your friends. Thomas illustrated how the fluid Northern England /Southern Scotland border created complicated political and ethnic loyalties. Ailred, in his speech, had de Brus ask David if he wanted to rely on the Galwegians and the Scots against the Norman English and the English. Twice the Norman English had ridden with David into Scotland, willing to fight on his behalf against Scots.<sup>143</sup>

### *David's Response*

Depending upon the historian consulted, David responded in one of two ways. He either scorned de Brus and de Balliol or wept publicly. Ritchie and Squire were two historians who followed Ailred of Rievaulx by stating that David wept. Owing to their identities, one a Scot and the other a Cistercian, these writers might have had very different reasons for stating their observations. The Cistercian, Squire, might be echoing his mentor, the abbot of Rievaulx, who lamented that the situation was out of David's control. David heard de Brus's reminder of their shared glory and interdependence but was powerless to help his long-time friend. The king wept tears of frustration and anguish.<sup>144</sup>

Conversely, five historians—Beeler, Appleby, Leadman, Ramsay, and Grainge—maintained that he rejected de Brus and de Balliol with contempt. The King would not listen to them. He turned a deaf ear, laughed at them, and rejected them with contempt or scorn.<sup>145</sup> Lamplough said he was firm in his resolution to maintain the cause of the ex-Empress.<sup>146</sup> Lamplough and Ritchie recorded that William fitz

---

139.

<sup>143</sup> The Norman English had ridden into Cumberland against David's brother King Alexander and into Moray against the Mormaer on behalf of David.

<sup>144</sup> Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 263 and Aelred Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1972), p. 81.

<sup>145</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 87; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53; Leadman, *Battles*, p. 18; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; and Grainge, *Battles*, p. 14.

<sup>146</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 64-65.

Duncan called Robert de Brus a traitor.<sup>147</sup> Therefore, of the historians who mentioned the negotiations, two agreed with Ailred that the king wept, four treated Robert de Brus and Bernard de Balliol poorly, one claimed the king supported his niece, two called de Brus a traitor, and one, Hugh Thomas, questioned whether the speech occurred.<sup>148</sup> According to Strickland, when a vassal had two lords who were at war with each other, he was allowed to sever his relationship with one them. Garnett called it the formal renunciation of the vassal's oath. Ritchie defined *diffidatio*: if either the lord or vassal had failed to carry out his part of the contract, the other could end it in a year and a day. Beeler, Appleby, Ramsay, Ritchie, and Lamplough contended that Robert de Brus renounced the homage that he had done to King David for his lands in Scotland and that Bernard of Balliol renounced the fealty that he had sworn when David had captured him in an earlier engagement.<sup>149</sup> Oman had the original concept that Robert de Brus disavowed his feudal allegiance for Annandale.<sup>150</sup> The Scottish historian, Ritchie, noted that Robert de Brus ended it immediately, not waiting the customary period of time.<sup>151</sup>

Without corroboration, these historians used one source, Ailred of Rievaulx, for all of their information. Hugh Thomas summarised Robert de Brus's speech as a 'tricky piece of rhetoric' between two opposed pairs of *gentes*. Based on the evidence cited above, there is clear evidence to concur with Thomas and question whether Ailred 'invented or adapted' something de Brus might have said. Thomas found it suited Ailred's message of attempting to erase the differences between the English

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., and Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 263.

<sup>148</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 313.

<sup>149</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 87; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 53; Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 368; Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 263; and Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 64-65.

<sup>150</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 393

<sup>151</sup> Strickland, *War*, p. 235; Garnett, *Conquered England*, p. 236; and Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 263. Strickland suggested Judith A. Green, 'Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier of England, c. 1100-1174', in *England in the Twelfth Century* ed. by D. Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), pp. 83-100 for a more in depth explanation of the obligations of aristocratic loyalties.



and the Norman English, replacing this conflict with antagonism against the Celtic-speaking *gentes*. In Chapter Three, this shall demonstrate that William of Malmesbury used the same idea eight hundred years earlier.<sup>152</sup> Thomas concluded by questioning whether ‘Ailred accurately represented speech or opinions’.<sup>153</sup> I would argue that the speech was Ailred’s imaginative attempt to ally the Norman English and the English; to exonerate David; prepare for the accession of King Henry II; and remain true to the principles of the Cistercian order. If that is the case, then the abbot accurately recorded his personal feelings, not those of Robert de Brus.

## BATTLE ORATIONS

The speech of Ralph, bishop of Orkney, written by Henry of Huntingdon, and that of Walter Espec, written by Ailred of Rievaulx, were not verbatim reports of contemporary orations; these historians were not at the battle. Instead, they wrote about them years later.<sup>154</sup> Antonia Gransden finds it unlikely that either battle oration was proclaimed on the battlefield, at least not in the form we read them. She went on to speculate that they might have never been spoken at all. But she finds it would be easy to compare the two speeches because two different men, Henry, a secular cleric living in the south, many miles from the battle, and Ailred, an abbot who lived near Northallerton, wrote about the same subject.<sup>155</sup> Both speeches had the same goals: to instill in the English of Norman ancestry pride in their *Normanitas*,<sup>156</sup> to rouse their courage and to illustrate that the Lord was on their side.

---

<sup>152</sup> See pp. 208-09.

<sup>153</sup> Thomas, *English and Normans*, p. 312.

<sup>154</sup> John R. E. Bliese, ‘The Courage of the Normans—A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric’, *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991), p. 1.

<sup>155</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 215.

<sup>156</sup> In the twenty-first century, Bates speculated that this ephemeral word melded national identity and ethnic character. He also theorised that *Normanitas* may have been ‘invented during the social life of one of the early Battle Conferences but has become so vague a word that it has no historical validity’. Bates, *The Normans and Empire*, p. 7, n. 34.

During the 1970s, Sir Richard Southern and others had argued that chroniclers' battle orations were neither verbatim reports of actual orations nor transcriptions from the classics. Instead, they perceived that these texts were heavily influenced by classical rhetoric.<sup>157</sup> Xavier Storelli stated that the tradition of bellicose rhetoric inserted into the historical discourse went back to antiquity: the classical writers used this process in order to enhance their stories.<sup>158</sup> John Bliese disagreed, stating that the chroniclers perceived that their orations were their own rhetorical inventions.<sup>159</sup> He viewed them as set pieces with readily defined characteristics, composed largely from a relatively short inventory of motive appeals.

The Norman English chroniclers of the twelfth century gave a special place to battle orations. These speeches are supposed to have been spoken to galvanize energy at the beginning of an expedition or just before impact. Composed after the fact, these literary compositions embellished descriptions of military encounters or attempted to clarify their meaning. Most written accounts of medieval battle orations were generic and usually short, just a few lines or a brief paragraph with little attempt to adapt to the situation. There was no effort at *ethopoeia*, adapting the oration to the specific personality of the speaker or his audience.<sup>160</sup> Instead, they were mostly interchangeable; targeting what appeared to be universal themes of bravery and heroism.

Bradbury stated that the English battle speech at the battle of the Standard was made from a hill, but this has been given more significance than it deserves. There are several low rises in the vicinity, any one of which would answer, but the main feature

---

<sup>157</sup> R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 1. Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth', *TRHS*, 20 (1970), pp. 173-96.

<sup>158</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues', p. 19.

<sup>159</sup> John R. H. Bliese, 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric and Morale at the Battle of the Standard, 1138', *Albion*, 20 (1988), p. 543.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 548.

of the area is its general flatness. Ailred, who should have been familiar with the geography, says it was fought 'in a broad field near Northallerton'. There is a tradition of burials at Scotpits Lane. This is the most promising indication of the site, and would place it some way south of that traditionally accepted. This would fit better with Richard of Hexham's two miles from Northallerton. There are several full accounts of the battle, including those of Richard of Hexham and Ailred, but most chroniclers copied Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>161</sup>

These battle orations are a construct: the chronicler attempted to understand the motivation and thinking of the commander, which might enhance the commanders' complexity and character. By combining a variety of rhetorical devices, the chroniclers are a source of information about the motivations that can lead men to make the supreme sacrifice. The latter is the focus of this segment.<sup>162</sup>

### *Henry of Huntingdon*

Henry of Huntingdon added two speeches to his *Historia*. One was attributed to Duke William before the battle of Hastings and one attributed to Bishop Ralph before the battle of the Standard. Henry was the true author of both.<sup>163</sup> Demonstrating his ability as rhetorician, Henry of Huntingdon was developing a literary style that presented itself as entertainment for a courtly audience.<sup>164</sup> In relation to the battle of the Standard, Henry wrote about the military superiority of Norman knights, stating it would be easy for a small group to defeat a larger one.<sup>165</sup> Because later authors routinely borrowed from earlier ones, making minor alterations as they saw fit, Henry

---

<sup>161</sup> AR Battle, p. 247; Burne More Battlefields, pp. 96-99; and Bradbury, *Battles*, p. 191.

<sup>162</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues', p. 15.

<sup>163</sup> Bliese, 'Ailred's Rhetoric', p. 549.

<sup>164</sup> Nancy Partner, *Serious Entertainment: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1977).

<sup>165</sup> Bliese, 'Ailred's Rhetoric', p. 551.

of Huntingdon's speech sometimes appears abridged in the chronicles of Roger of Wendover, Matthew Paris, Roger of Howden and also the Peterborough Chronicle.

Henry took great pride in the military; accomplishments of the *gens Normannorum*. He was not extolling the 'English' or the Norman English in England. He stated, 'Fierce England fell to your conquest'.<sup>166</sup> He was specifically singling out the virtues of the Normans, which directly contradicts John Gillingham's statement that the man who wrote these 'Normanising' words was sympathetic to the English not the Normans.<sup>167</sup> In addition to this example, the speeches made by Ralph, bishop of Orkney, and Espec rallied the barons, reinforcing the theory of Norman superiority. The English may have been their comrades-in-arms at the battle but both works praised not the English, not the Norman English but the ancestors of the latter the *gens Normannorum*. There was little evidence of assimilation.

#### *Ailred of Rievaulx*

Storelli accused Ailred of rewriting Henry of Huntingdon's battle description to be propaganda literature. Storelli made three unique observations. First, that Ailred has a detailed description of interactions between Scottish and Northumbrian barons. Second, that Ailred's intended audience, which was composed of his Cistercian monks, the Augustinian canons and the barons of Northumbria, differed from Henry of Huntingdon's. The latter, he noted, was writing to clerics and the royal court of England. Third, Storelli found the text is more nuanced than that of Henry of Huntingdon who adopts an 'Anglo-centric'<sup>168</sup> bias and presents the Scots and their king as the enemy, whereas Ailred seeks to save David and his knights and to mitigate

---

<sup>166</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Ferax Anglia uobis capta succubuit*'. It should be noted that Diana Greenway translated *ferax* as fruitful. A more correct translation would be fierce.

<sup>167</sup> Gillingham, 'Henry', p. 129.

<sup>168</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues': '*anglo-centré*', p. 20.

their responsibility in the conflict.<sup>169</sup>

Ailred focused completely on Thurstan's propaganda efforts, which made the enemy the central focus of his narration. Storelli understood that Ailred's narration concentrated on events that led directly to galvanising the troops in anticipation of Walter Espec's speech rather than the battle itself. Storelli finds that the speeches were probably spread over several days, considering that the initial remarks of Thurstan took place in York on July 27, more than a month after the defeat at Clitherhoe (10 June) and more than three weeks before the battle of the Standard (22 August).<sup>170</sup>

Acting as if the English did not exist, Ailred had Walter Espec address only the Normans. He also called English archers 'gadflies'.<sup>171</sup> Ailred ignored a major part of the southern military build-up just prior to the battle: namely, the arrival of men from Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, as well as the emergence of Bernard de Balliol's household contingent.<sup>172</sup> Ailred also ignored the fact that Richard of Hexham had written earlier that Geoffrey Halsalin had brought men from the other side of the Humber. Thus, analysis of the battle orations appears to highlight the cultural and social divisions within the 'southern' army. Ailred here indulged shamelessly in the Norman myth. Yet the strategy adopted by the twelfth-century Norman English armies to secure the northern border showed Norman military supremacy over the Scots was no mere literary creation, but a stark reality.<sup>173</sup>

### *Walter Espec*

---

<sup>169</sup> Freeman, *Narratives*, pp. 31-53 and Aelred Glidden, 'Aelred the Historian: The Account of the Battle of the Standard', in *Erudition at God's Service*, ed. by J. R. Sommerfeldt (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), p. 182.

<sup>170</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues', p. 25.

<sup>171</sup> AR Battle, p. 266 and *Relatio*, p. 192.

<sup>172</sup> AR Battle, p. 248.

<sup>173</sup> Strickland, 'Securing the North', p. 211 and Prestwich, *Armies and Warfare*, p. 148.

The speech that Ailred of Rievaulx attributed to Walter Espec is very long and contained a vast number of the usual appeals.<sup>174</sup> The framework of much of the speech was set up in a series of rhetorical questions, with parallel constructions, and the rhetorical pattern of circumstances, *peristalsis*.<sup>175</sup> Ailred's speech, which was written in 1155-57, after Henry's, was more developed. Where Henry listed conquest, Ailred embellished. The orators speak as Normans addressing a Norman audience, ignoring the fact there was a sizable English contingent in the army.<sup>176</sup>

Aelred Squire theorized that the abbot's account might have been written at the request of Walter Espec, the founder of Ailred's abbey. In *Historia Anglorum*, Walter Espec was just one of many northern barons. In '*Relatio de Standardo*', he was a leader and the individual who gave the battle oration. Squire further argued that Espec might have wanted to correct what he thought were the inaccuracies in earlier descriptions of the battle.<sup>177</sup> If Walter Espec wanted a better and more accurate account of the battle than the one found in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, he could hardly have found anyone better equipped than Ailred to write it.<sup>178</sup>

Ailred of Rievaulx wrote that, just before the battle, the priests dressed in their sacred vestments and carried crosses and relics of the saints. According to him, the priests acted as shepherds to their flock, comforting the people through sermons and prayers. As Storelli noted, this implies that the 'slogans' (*employés pour rallier*) of York were, as Thurstan relayed, originally composed in the vernacular, both in the parishes and in the army. Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx wrote about the battle in Latin; these were not the same speeches that were actually given in 1138.

---

<sup>174</sup> John R. E. Bliese, 'Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Manuals', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 24 (1994), p. 102.

<sup>175</sup> Aelred Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1972), p. 79.

<sup>176</sup> Bliese, 'Ailred's Rhetoric', p. 550.

<sup>177</sup> Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, pp.77-79.

<sup>178</sup> Bliese, 'Ailred's Rhetoric', p. 555.

Storelli appeared to be the only modern historian to note the priests spoke in the vernacular. Storelli found Henry of Huntingdon's battle oration significant, not because it began by addressing the noble barons of Norman descent but because it ended with the bishop blessing the entire army. They, the people of England (*populus Anglorum*), all responded in an immense shout, 'Amen! Amen!'<sup>179</sup> Henry no longer differentiated between Norman English and English as they were all Christians.

Storelli and Bliese studied the battle orations for the battle of the Standard extensively, but their methodology was very different. Bliese closely observes the nuances of each sentence and compares the compatibility of sixteen character traits that English either had or did not have. Storelli looked at the historical events that contributed to the battle. He also analysed the two writers of the battle speeches: Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx.

### **John Bliese**

John Bliese focused on the morale instilled in individual warriors by leaders, not on the motivations of individual warriors. He then raised the idea that morale of an army has always been an intangible but important factor in military success. Ensuring the high morale of troops as they went into battle was one of the most difficult problems facing medieval commanders.<sup>180</sup> Although morale could be ensured by alcohol, high pay and better food, one of the most common practices used was public oration, better known as the battle oration. David Bachrach recounted numerous medieval chroniclers who used representations of the battlefield oration to enliven their

---

<sup>179</sup> HA, x. 9, pp. 716-17.

<sup>180</sup> Bliese, 'Aelred's Rhetoric', p. 543 and Bernard Bachrach, 'Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations Against Muslims, 1080-1170', *International History Review*, 26 (2004), p. 2.

narratives and to show off their own skill as writers.<sup>181</sup>

If we consider Ailred's own position and the characteristics of Espec's speech that did not conform to the generic norms, we can reasonably conclude that his oratory accurately reflected the emotions of the southern army, their fears and desperation.<sup>182</sup> It is remarkable that any medieval author would write battle operations reflecting reality. It is especially remarkable that an early Cistercian would write them.<sup>183</sup> Walter Espec's harangue reinforced the conclusion that it gave an authentic picture of the mental state of the Norman English as they faced a most uncertain future. Bliese attempted to make the argument that much of Ailred's writing 'strikes one as realistic and specific for its rhetorical situation'.<sup>184</sup>

Battle orations, a literary genre used by medieval chroniclers, provided the psychological construct to improve morale. Bliese was not researching battle orations given before and during battles, but the writings of Norman and non-Norman chroniclers years after the event. Therefore, his research was about chroniclers and not about military men. Bliese researched over three hundred different battle orations in sixteen different categories, demonstrating ways to bolster morale of troops. However, this research sheds little light on the military leaders who supposedly uttered these harangues. The chroniclers had the wisdom of hindsight. They knew the outcome of the battle, which may have tempered what they wrote or did not write in their orations. In the literature of Western Europe between 1000 and 1250, Bliese found thirty-six Norman battle orations and two hundred and ninety-five non-Norman orations to use for comparison.<sup>185</sup> He then compared the orations to determine which

---

<sup>181</sup> Bachrach, 'Conforming', p. 2.

<sup>182</sup> Bliese, 'Rhetoric War', p. 107.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>184</sup> Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', p. 555.

<sup>185</sup> John R. E. Bliese, 'The Courage of the Normans—A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991), p. 3. It is curious that Bliese categorised Ailred of Rievaulx



features were distinctively Norman. The relative frequency of the appeals established a hierarchy of motives. These will be used to compare the two orations written about the battle of the Standard. The distinct differences noted in the charts below are significant enough to justify Bliese's inclusion in this thesis.

### *John Bliese's Appeals*

1. Show Bravery, Win Honour
2. Our Cause Is Just
3. God Will Help Us
4. Instructions And Orders
5. We Have Some Military Advantage
6. You Should Not Try To Flee
7. Plunder And Booty
8. Defend Yourselves, Family, Country
9. Reminder Of Past Victories
10. Promise of Victory
11. Vengeance
12. Remember Our Nation's Reputation
13. A Small Force Can Beat A Larger One
14. Promise Eternal Rewards Of Martyrdom
15. Fight For Christ
16. Follow My Example
17. Here Is The Battle We Sought<sup>187</sup>

### *John Bliese's Analysis*

Motive	Norman 36 speeches	%	Non-Norman 295 speeches	%
Bravery, glory	24	67%	132	45%
Just cause	17	47%	88	30%
Divine aid	16	44%	92	31%
Military advantage	14	39%	52	18%

---

and Henry of Huntingdon as the authors of Norman battle orations. Although it was true that an argument could be made that their audience was primarily Norman, the former was an Englishman and the latter had a Norman father and by most accounts an English mother.

<sup>187</sup> Bliese, 'Rhetoric and Morale', p. 220.

Past victories	13	36%	30	10%
Don't flee	9	25%	41	14%
Few can beat many	9	25%	26	9%
Nation's reputation	8	22%	29	10%
Plunder	6	17%	42	14%
Vengeance	5	14%	32	11%
Promise victory	3	8%	39	13%
Eternal rewards	3	8%	30	10%
Defense	1	3%	45	15%
Fight for Christ	1	3%	20	7%
Battle we wanted	1	3%	11	4%
Follow me	-	-	23	8%

In the following comparisons, the writers are allowed to use their own words as much as possible to show how these speeches were not mere exercises in rhetoric but professed the feelings of the two authors and how subjectively they viewed this battle.

### **'Show Bravery, Win Honour'**

Appeals to the martial, chivalric values are found in nearly half of all speeches. The speaker calls on his men: 'Be brave, show your valour, fight like men.' Closely connected with these virtues is the public recognition they produce: 'You can win glory and honour'.<sup>188</sup>

Ailred of Rievaulx emphasised that the honour would be even greater because Stephen, king of England, was not present. He had Walter Espec say:

---

<sup>188</sup> Ibid.

Think of your absent king, how great will be your glory when you report the triumph of a king without the king's presence. Yours will be the court, yours the kingdom: everything will be done by your counsel through whom today a kingdom is sought for the king, peace for the kingdom, and glory for the peace. The king will say that he has been crowned again today by your hands.<sup>189</sup>

In dealing with the same appeal, Henry of Huntingdon was more succinct. Ralph said: 'Of what avail, then, are ancestral glory, regular training, and military discipline, if, when you are few, you do not conquer the many?'<sup>190</sup> Ailred's statement had more impact because he acknowledges that the king was missing. Thus, the abbot of Rievaulx was reminding his readers that Normans were warriors who fought because true men fought. Storelli had a different interpretation. Storelli mocked Ailred for writing that the southern army feared defections in a speech Ailred had Espec speak allegedly on the day of the battle, which the modern reader knows was written almost two decades later.<sup>191</sup> Thus, the modern French historian was telling his readers that there were no defections because the founder of Rievaulx, Walter Espec, gave a moving speech. A reason there were no defection was the barons were fighting to protect their families and manors.<sup>192</sup> Both Henry and Ailred indicated that Norman valour was innate and just needed an auditory prod.

### **'Our Cause is Just'**

The next appeal on Bliese's list was to emphasise the justice of the cause of battle.

---

<sup>189</sup> AR Battle, p. 256 and *Bello* [Col. 0706C-D]: '*Cogitate regem absentem, quantumque uestrae accedet gloriae, cum reportaueritis de rege sine rege triumphum. Uestra erit curia, uestrum erit regnum, uestris consiliis omnia tractabuntur, per quos hodie regi regnum, regno pax, paci gloria perquiretur*'.

<sup>190</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Quid ergo conferet uobis gloria parentelis, exercitatio sollempnis, disciplina militaris, nisi multos pauciores uincatis?*'

<sup>191</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues', p. 17: '*Qui auraient été prononcés le jour même de la bataille les propos tenus*'.

<sup>192</sup> When a small group of English colonists signed of *The Declaration of Independence*, in defiance of the Crown, Benjamin Franklin announced: '*We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately*'.

Bliese described the logic behind this moment as follows: 'We are fighting for right, against the forces of evil'. Interestingly, Ailred and Henry viewed this segment very differently. Henry of Huntingdon looked at the barbarous Scottish hordes and felt vindicated in opposing them:

I, therefore, as bishop, deputising for your archbishop, declare to you that this has come about by God's providence, so that those who have violated the temples of God in this country, have spilt blood on altars, have murdered priests, have spared neither children nor pregnant women, shall in this same country undergo their deserved punishment for their villainy.<sup>193</sup>

Ailred of Rievaulx appeared to be justifying King Stephen's right to the throne of England after the king was dead:

But we are not undertaking an unjust war on behalf of our king, who has not invaded a kingdom not rightfully his, as enemies falsely claim, but has accepted it as an offering, he whom the people sought, the clergy chose, the pope anointed, and apostolic authority confirmed in his kingdom.<sup>194</sup>

Ailred was writing revisionist history. At the Treaty of Westminster (1153), Henry fitz Empress was named Stephen's successor and the next year ascended the throne.<sup>195</sup>

The abbot of Rievaulx was attempting to remove any lingering doubts over Stephen's legitimacy.

### **'God Will Help Us'**

---

<sup>193</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Quod tamen uobis ego presul, et archipresulis uestri loco situs, diuina prouidentia factum denuntio: ut hii qui in hac patria templa Dei uiolarunt, altaria cruentaerunt, presbiteros occiderunt, nec pueris nec pregnantibus pepercerunt, in eadem condignas sui facinoris luant penas*'.

<sup>194</sup> AR Battle, p. 254 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705D]: '*Sed non injustum bellum pro rege nostro suscipimus, qui regnum non, ut hostes calumpniantur, inuasit indebitum sed suscepit oblatum; quem populus petiit, quem clerus elegit, quem unxit pontifex, quem in regnum Apostolica confirmauit auctoritas*'.

<sup>195</sup> Note. There shall be an in depth discussion about the date of Ailred's opus in Chapter Three, but the consensus appears to be that it was written 1155-57.

In the third appeal, the two writers assured their audiences of divine aid: ‘God will help us win the victory.’ Following the emphasis that Richard of Hexham placed on the heathen barbarity of the Galwegians, Ailred of Rievaulx was cautious: ‘Then let us gather confidently, for our cause is more just, our force stronger. Necessity drives us on, and glory calls us. Divine aid is with us; the whole heavenly court will be fighting with us’.<sup>196</sup> ‘More than that, I say that Christ himself will take up arms and shield and will rise to our aid’.<sup>197</sup> But Henry of Huntingdon proclaimed: ‘Through your hands today, God will carry out His just decision according to His plan’.<sup>198</sup> They both followed upon Archbishop Thurstan’s clever plan to make the expulsion of David’s army a sacred duty. Both authors had God picking a side in a fight between two Christian nations.

### **‘We Have Some Military Advantage’**

Both authors were convinced of the military superiority of the Norman knight. Bliese described this logic as follows: ‘We are stronger than the enemy, better armed.’

Ailred of Rievaulx waxed poetically about the fragility of the Scots’ weaponry: ‘The wood is fragile, the iron dull: when it strikes, it shatters, when it shakes it breaks, scarcely capable of a single blow. Oppose only a staff and the Scot will stand unarmed’.<sup>199</sup> But Henry of Huntingdon was blunt and specific as he recalled the battle strength of Norman armour: ‘Your head is covered by a helmet, your breast by a hauberk, your legs by greaves, your whole body by a shield. The enemy cannot find

---

<sup>196</sup> AR Battle, p. 256 and *Bello*, [Col. 0706D]: ‘*Secure igitur congregiamur, cum nobis sit causa justior, manus fortior; quos urget necessitas, quos gloria prouocat, quibus diuinum auxilium praesto est, cum quibus tota caelestis curia dimicabit*’.

<sup>197</sup> AR Battle, p. 257 and *Bello*, [Col. 0707A]: ‘*Amplius dico, ipse Christus apprehendet anna et scutum, et exurget in adiutorium nobis*’.

<sup>198</sup> HA, x. 8, p: 714-15: ‘*Quod iustissimum sue dispositionis arbitrium per manus uestras hodie perficiet Deus*.’

<sup>199</sup> AR Battle, p. 254 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705D]: ‘*Sed lignum fragile est, ferrum obtunsum, dum ferit perit, dum impingitur frangitur, uix ad unum ictum sufficiens*’.

where to strike when he looks carefully and discovers that you are enclosed in steel'.<sup>200</sup> Again the two authors looked at the same picture from opposite perspectives. Ailred saw the weakness of the Scottish arms and Henry saw the strength of the Normans. Ailred had read Henry's account of the battle and was perhaps attempting to show that he was not copying *Historia Anglorum* verbatim. Perhaps he wanted to show a novel, imaginative approach.

### **'You Should Not Try to Flee'**

Both authors reminded their readers that the northern barons had not trusted each other before the battle. In hindsight, both authors offered their encouragement for the barons to feel safe, have courage and be confident of victory. Henry did not mention the next criteria in Bliese's list, which was to avoid fleeing. Ailred of Rievaulx was emphatic that the army had made a stand and fought. This was shown dramatically in his battle plan as the leaders placed the horses 400 yards away from the line of battle: 'Surely we must conquer or die. For who would choose to be a survivor of a victory of the Scots, to see his wife subjected to the lust of the Scots, his children pierced by their lances?'<sup>201</sup> As a northerner, Ailred might have either witnessed or heard more stories of the horrors perpetrated on his parishioners than Henry who lived much to the south. However, Ailred was showing distrust, almost twenty years after the fact, among the northern barons. That might be counterproductive because they were his neighbours and could be beneficiaries to his abbey.

### **'Defend Yourself, Family, and Country'**

---

<sup>200</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Tegitur uobis galea caput, lorica pectus, ocreis crura, totumque clipeo corpus. Ubi feriat hostis non repperit quem ferro septum circumspicit*'.

<sup>201</sup> AR Battle, p. 257 and *Bello*, [Col. 0707A]: '*Certe aut uincendum nobis est, aut moriendum. Quis enim victoriae Scottorum se uelit esse superstitem, ut uideat uxorem suam*'.

Ailred of Rievaulx made the remembrance of the battle of the Standard a defence of family and country: 'No one surely will deny that we are right to take up arms for our country; that we fight for our wives, for our children, and for our churches, warding off an impending danger. Need presses us'.<sup>202</sup> Henry's approach was more subtle and indirect: 'So lift up your spirits, gentlemen, and rise up against the evil enemy, trusting in the bravery of your country.'<sup>203</sup> It is interesting that the celibate Ailred noted wives and children and Henry, the married cleric, who mocked the Gregorian changes, mentioned neither wife nor children.

### **'Reminder of Past Victories'**

The reminder of past victories was the soul of the Norman identity. This appeal was the appeal that separated the Normans at the battle of the Standard from all the other men fighting for the southern army at Northallerton. 'Remember the many glorious victories we and our ancestors have won'. Ailred of Rievaulx began his tribute: 'We have seen, seen with our own eyes, the king of France and his whole army turn their backs to us and all the finest barons of his realm captured by us, some to be ransomed, to be handed over in chains, some to be condemned to prison. Who subdued Apulia, Sicily, Calabria, if not your Normans?'<sup>204</sup> Henry, not Ailred, noted that the Normans captured England: 'For no one has resisted you with impunity. Bold France, when she had put you to the test, melted away. Fruitful England fell to your conquest. Wealthy Apulia, gaining you, renewed herself. Jerusalem, the celebrated, and famous Antioch

---

<sup>202</sup> AR Battle', p. 254 and *Bello*, [Col. 0706D]: '*Sed, ut interim de rege taceamus, nullus certe justum negabit, quod pro patria arma suscipimus; quod pro uxoribus nostris, pro liberis nostris, pro ecclesiis nostris dimicamus, imminens periculum propulsantes*'.

<sup>203</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Attollite igitur animos, uiri elegantes, et aduersus hostem nequissimum, freti uirtute patria*'.

<sup>204</sup> AR Battle, p. 253 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705B]: '*Vidimus, vidimus oculis nostris, regem Franciæ cum uniuerso suo exercitus nobis terga uertentem, optimos quosque regni ejus procures a nobis captos, alios redimi, alios mancipari uinculis, alios carcere condempnari. Quis iam, Siciliam, Calabriam, nisi uester Normannus edomuit?*'

both submitted to you'.<sup>205</sup> He used *uos* (you) five times in that short paragraph. Henry was to emphasise the genetic Normanness of the northern barons not their English nationalism. Both Ailred and Henry made the 'reminder of past victories' a very Norman not English remembrance. Since Henry wrote this rendition in the 1140s and Ailred wrote *Relatio de Standardo* in the 1150s, both would appear to refute the idea that assimilation between the native English and the Norman English had occurred by the mid-twelfth century.

### **'Promise of Victory'**

The promise of victory was assured because both writers wrote after the battle when the results were known. They both knew the outcome of the battle. Furthermore, it is quite possible that the reader also knew the outcome of the battle when he or she read either work. These facts helped to explain the following quotation from Ailred of Rievaulx, which expresses his self-assurance as a historian: 'For myself, as I consider for what reason, what cause, and what need we fight today, and who it is we are fighting, I stand fearless, as confident of victory as I am certain of battle'.<sup>206</sup> Storelli destroyed this argument: '*Il faut, en outre, associer aux discours qui auraient été prononcés le jour même de la bataille les propos tenus.*'<sup>207</sup> Henry of Huntingdon also assured his readers of his confidence in victory: 'They do not know how to arm themselves in war, while you exercise your arms even in peacetime, so that in war you may feel no doubt of its outcome'.<sup>208</sup> Since Henry's readers knew the battle

---

<sup>205</sup> HA, x, 8, pp. 714-15: '*Uobis enim nemo impune restitit. Audax Francia uos experta deliquit. Ferax Anglia uobis capta succubuit. Diues Apulia uos sortita re floruit. Ierosolim famosa et insignis Antiochia se uobis utraque supposuit*'.

<sup>206</sup> AR Battle, p. 252 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705A]: '*Ego sane considerans qua ratione, qua causa, qua necessitate, qui aduersus quos hodie dimicamus, sto intrepidus, tam securus de uictoria quam de praelio certus*'.

<sup>207</sup> Storelli, 'Les Harangues', p. 18.

<sup>208</sup> HA, x, 8, pp. 714-15: '*Illi nesciunt armari se in bello, uos in pace armis exercemini, ut in bello casus belli dubios non sentiatis*'.



occurred before the arrest of the bishop of Lincoln (1139) and Ailred's readers knew that Henry II was king of England, their insistence to make the battle contemporary comes at the expense of their credibility. The plausible explanation might be that this was the formula used for medieval battle orations. The writers wrote in the present and the readers knew they were writing about past events.

### **'Vengeance'**

After describing how the Galwegians had killed people and livestock and destroyed not only homes but also churches, both authors had ample evidence to justify vengeance. Ailred of Rievaulx described the desecration in terms of his disbelief in Walter Espec's speech: 'I shudder to say how they entered the temple of God, how they defiled his sanctuary, how they trampled the sacraments of Christian salvation under their feet'.<sup>209</sup> For Henry of Huntingdon, the events give rise to the need for reprisals: 'So you who in today's battle are going to avenge the house of the Lord'.<sup>210</sup> Ailred, a Cistercian abbot, and Ralph, the auxiliary bishop, who 'spoke' Henry's words, both advocated vengeance. The Bible is very clear that only God can avenge sins and misdeeds.<sup>211</sup> Therefore, both writers were going to extraordinary lengths to demonstrate the sins of the Galwegians were so egregious that the people of Yorkshire were too frightened, scared, and angry for 'Thy will be done' and took action into their own hands.

---

<sup>209</sup> AR Battle, p. 255 and *Bello*, [Col. 0706B]: '*Horreo dicere quomodo ingressi sunt templum Dei, quomodo polluerunt sanctuarium ejus, quomodo salutis Christianae sacramenta pedibus conculcauerunt*'.

<sup>210</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15: '*Uos igitur, archipresulis uestri loco, qui hodie commissa in domini domum...uindicaturi estis*'.

<sup>211</sup> Romans 12:19: '*Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.*' and Hebrews 10:30: '*For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.*'

### **‘Remember our Nation’s Reputation’**

Bliese raised the appeal to the notion of national or ethnic reputation: ‘Remember the glorious past of our people’. This appeal is very similar to number nine, ‘Remember your Past Victories’, but it is both more general and exclusive. The slight twist that Henry engineered was that, instead of writing of specific Norman victories, he endeavoured to make the Normans Englishmen. Henry of Huntingdon suggested that national pride should remain uppermost: ‘Noblemen of England, renowned sons of Normandy, before you go into battle you should call to mind your reputation and origin: consider well who you are and against whom and where you are fighting this battle’.<sup>212</sup> Henry was specifically addressing the descendants of the *gens Normannorum* but implicitly acknowledging that they were now subjects of a king of England. Ailred was not listed here because he used specific examples and never made the kinds of sweeping statements that are present in Henry’s text.

### **‘A Small Force Can Beat a Larger One’**

The next criterion stated that ‘A Small Force Can Beat a Larger One’. The speaker reassures his men when they face a more numerous foe. Ailred of Rievaulx included the history of Norman achievements, but a close examination shows that he mentioned the Angevins of the future Henry II rather than the perennial scapegoat, the king and Kingdom of France: ‘Since victory does not depend on numbers and is not acquired by strength, by righteous prayers and an honest cause let us obtain it from the Almighty’.<sup>213</sup> ‘How many times did a few Cenomani, Angevins, and Aquitanians bring back a victory over many?’<sup>214</sup> Ailred had an unusual choice of *gentes* to praise.

---

<sup>212</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 716-17: ‘Uos igitur, archipresulis uestri loco, qui hodie commissa in Domini domum’.

<sup>213</sup> AR Battle, p. 252 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705A]: ‘Cur enim de victoria desperemus, cum uictoria generi nostro quasi in fendum data sit ab Altissimo?’

<sup>214</sup> AR Battle, p. 253 and *Bello*, [Col. 0705A]: ‘Quoties ab eis Francorum est fusus exercitus; quotiens

In 1138, the Angevins were from Matilda's husband's county, while the Normans were a dangerous enemy. When Ailred wrote in the 1150s, he knew Normandy had fallen to the Angevins in 1144. In 1153, the Duchess of Aquitaine, Eleanor, married the soon-to-be Henry II. He must have written Espec's speech in 1155-57 when these two events were known, so he could curry favour with the new king. Henry of Huntingdon again was more succinct: '(Besides,) very small numbers of you have often defeated greater'.<sup>215</sup>

### **'Promise Eternal Rewards of Martyrdom'**

Another important conceit that runs throughout battle orations is the idea of eternal rewards. Bliese refers to this trope as follows: 'Whoever falls in this battle will be blessed in paradise as a martyr'. As Bliese noted, this rhetorical move had roots in early Christianity. In Henry of Huntingdon's text, Ralph remarks that 'if any of you fall in combat, as your archbishop's deputy we absolve you from all penalty for sin, in the name of the Father'.<sup>216</sup> Walter Espec, who was not a cleric, could not make this statement. Ailred is therefore silent on this criterion.

Three other historians noted the battle orations. Appleby was the only modern historian to discuss the speeches of both Espec and Bishop Ralph.<sup>217</sup> Leadman stated that Ailred put a long speech into the mouth of Walter Espec, which was a deliberately untrue account to glorify the founder of Rievaulx.<sup>218</sup> Ramsay, writing in the nineteenth century, might have been the most damning of critics when he wrote that Espec's was exclusively for a Norman audience. Not only were the English never

---

*a Cenomansibus, Andegauensibus, Aquitanensibus, pauci de multis, victoriam reportarunt*'.

<sup>215</sup>HA, x, 8, pp. 714-15: '*Preterea maiores uestri multos pauci sepe uicerunt*'.

<sup>216</sup>Ibid., x, 9, pp. 716-17: '*Si, quis uestrum prelians occubuerit, absolumus ab omni pena peccati, in nomine Patris*'.

<sup>217</sup>Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 54.

<sup>218</sup>Leadman, *Battles*, p. 17 n. 5.

mentioned but also their assistance 'was not worth taking into account in calculating the chances of the day'. England was merely another Norman conquest as was Apulia or Sicily. Ramsay also noted that Henry of Huntingdon's speech by Bishop Ralph also praised only the Normans.<sup>219</sup>

### **Conclusion to the Battle Orations**

Storelli brought up a great many historical facts, whereas Bliese merely looks at the rhetoric. Addressing the same material, David Bachrach states that medieval warriors were just as worried about death and mutilation as modern soldiers. John Bliese shared this opinion. However, they disagreed on the nature of battle orations. David Bachrach stated that medieval chroniclers used battlefield orations allegedly spoken by priests to enliven their narratives. In his view, many of the orations were inventions.<sup>220</sup> Bliese appeared to have viewed all these orations as actual historical occurrences. He listed them in his appendix. Bliese seems to have forgotten that most of the narrators of the battle orations were not present at the time of the battles. Also, any battlefield orations would presumably have been in a vernacular language, yet, the written orations in the chronicles were in Latin.

Bliese never addressed the issue that the chroniclers all wrote in Latin and that the battlefield orations were in the vernacular. Most laymen did not understand Latin. The two orations most discussed in this subchapter by Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx were written in very high-quality Medieval Latin. Both clerics were meticulous in their wording. Could a battlefield commander just prior to a battle be so meticulous? Finally, the most important question of all: what actually happened on the day of the battle? Did John Bliese have any concrete evidence that any of his

---

<sup>219</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 369.

<sup>220</sup> Bachrach, 'Conforming', p. 2.

over three hundred battlefield orations occurred? However, there should always be a caveat that this research was based on the words of chroniclers and not on commanders before battle.

King David's failure, according to Storelli, was mainly the result of an inability to obtain the support of the Yorkshire barons. I agree, but would argue that the king lost that support when his troops committed atrocities in the region. Storelli argued that the politico-military arguments, which he called propaganda, formalised rhetorically allowed the northern barons to fight for Stephen. Storelli continued that Henry and especially Ailred 'created' the fear, which inspired the barons to fight for Stephen. I disagree. Henry of Huntingdon's battle oration has been termed generic, and Ailred wrote a generation after the battle. Somehow, and none of the chroniclers tell us how, Yorkshire men and northern barons knew of the devastation that the Galwegians and other parts of the Scottish army were perpetrating on northern Yorkshire county. The northern barons had been frightened and hesitant, but they had made up their minds before 22 August 1138.

The central idea of this thesis is that the Norman English identified themselves with England by 1138, but they had not assimilated with the English people. Both Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx's battle orations were directed solely to the Normans, specifically the descendants of the Normans. This shows that the Normans were loyal subjects of the king and that they considered themselves 'Englishmen'. They were not fighting for the Duke of Normandy. However, the

English were completely ignored in these orations. Both orations mentioned that the Normans conquered England, implying the subjection of the English. The battle orations helped confirm the significance of the battle of the Standard as a benchmark of assimilation. The Norman English and English were treated differently in accounts of the battle, even if the Normans now perceived themselves to be ‘Englishmen’.

## **THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARD**

On 22 August 1138, the Scots met the Norman English and the English in the battle of the Standard. As with most medieval battles, the two sides fought for no more than three hours.<sup>221</sup> According to Ailred of Rievaulx, the Scottish formation consisted of four groups. At the front were the Galwegians, who insisted upon leading the charge. Compared to the English, they were both poorly equipped and poorly organised. The ‘Southern’ army positioned their best knights, their archers, as well as their lancers in the first rank. As a result of this positioning, the archers did so much damage that the Galwegians were ‘stuck all around by arrows like the spine of a hedgehog, shaking [their] sword[s] nonetheless...beating the air with futile blows.’<sup>222</sup> Ailred of Rievaulx offered a vivid image of Scottish impotence.

In distinction to the Scots, the entirety of the Norman English and English host ‘stood unmoved in its dense formation around the standard’.<sup>223</sup> Several Scottish generals were killed early.<sup>224</sup> Earl Henry of the Scots, ‘longing for glory and honour,’<sup>225</sup> attempted to lead a cavalry charge, but he and his force were eventually beaten back. In general, the Scottish army was less coordinated; once their first charge

---

<sup>221</sup> Burne, *More Battles*, p. 96.

<sup>222</sup> AR Battle, p. 267.

<sup>223</sup> HA, x. 9. pp. 716-17: ‘*Tota namque gens Normannorum et Anglorum in una acie circum Standard conglobata*’.

<sup>224</sup> King made the statement that one of their leaders was killed by his own men, which is unsubstantiated by any medieval chronicler, *King Stephen*, p. 93.

<sup>225</sup> An analysis of Earl Henry’s charge will be noted later in this segment.

was repulsed, panic began to spread through the ranks. Eventually, both David and Henry were forced to flee the fight. With great difficulty, David managed to escape to Roxburgh; his son arrived at Carlisle on foot three days later, accompanied by only one knight. Of the (allegedly) 10,000 Scottish fatalities, some were slain on the battlefield, but most were killed as they tried to retreat. English losses, on the other hand, were minimal. By all accounts, the battle of the Standard was a complete rout.<sup>226</sup>

Historians tend to agree that the Scots' lack of discipline was directly responsible for their defeat. According to Crouch, the Scots lost the battle of the Standard because their infantry lacked order, breaking in a wild assault on well organized Norman English knights. Appleby, having noted that the Scots outnumbered the 'Southern' army, proceeded to contrast the undisciplined Scottish rabble with the experienced knights of the Norman English. Additionally, as Barrow noted, the regional jealousies plagued the Scots. Though the historians agree that the Scots were undisciplined, each nevertheless painted a different picture of the events that transpired during the battle of the Standard.<sup>227</sup>

### **The Initial charge**

Historians have not been able to agree on how the 'Southern' army received the Galwegians' charge. The authors showed different results about the effectiveness of the initial charge and who it was against, which is understandable since the medieval sources are very different; no two accounts are exactly the same. The historiography of the initial charge demonstrated that historians' descriptions changed dramatically over two hundred years.

---

<sup>226</sup> King, *King Stephen*, p. 93.

<sup>227</sup> Crouch, *King Stephen*, p. 82; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 54; and Barrow, p. 116.

Thomas Carte (1747) wrote that the Galwegians, after their three customary huzzahs, charged with such fury that the defending lancers initially gave ground. William Guthrie (1767) began with the horrible battle outcry, but, in his assessment, the Galwegians were quickly cut to pieces and forced to withdraw. Miss A. Crosfield (1791) wrote that the English lancers gave ground before the Galwegians' furious charge. However, the hauberk knights sustained the line while the archers rained such a large number of arrows down on them that the Galwegians were all but blinded, which thwarted their attack.<sup>228</sup> Two of the eighteenth century historians noted that there were lancers in the forward line of the 'Southern' army, which retreated. Ailred corroborated both facts '*ut primos lancearios stationem deserere compellerent.*'<sup>229</sup>

George Chalmers (1807, reprinted in 1887) wrote that the Galwegians furiously and relentlessly charged the front line of the defenders. However, the archers, defended by the knights, were able to kill the Galwegians' leaders, Ulgrick and Dovenald. Alex Leadman (1891) stated that the Galwegians launched a fierce charge upon the 'Southern' army. Had the defenders not been well prepared, this assault would have succeeded. Though somewhat startled, the defenders were able to recover. The 'Southern' army then ordered the Yorkshire bowman to shoot volley after volley of arrows on the helpless Galwegians. C. Barrett (1896) described the Galwegians charging up a gentle slope into the mixed line of lancers and archers, whose volleys of arrows devastated the 'savage men'. In two sentences, Barrett stood apart from the other historians. He did not mention the mailed Norman English, and he made a derogatory remark about the Galwegians. James Ramsay (1898) took a

---

<sup>228</sup> Thomas Carte, *A General History of England... Containing an Account of the first Inhabitants of the Country, and the Transactions in it, from the earliest Times to the Death of King John*, A. D. MCCXVI (London: Thomas A. Carte, 1747), p. 532; Guthrie, *General History of Scotland*, v. p. 470; and Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 56.

<sup>229</sup> *Bello*, [Col. 0710D].



similar but more detailed view. After describing the rush with the war cry, the Galwegians charged the wall of closely-locked shields. The wall was driven backwards somewhat but not broken. Ramsay then introduced the idea that the Galwegians had swords to fight the shield wall. The image of the Southern army taking up their swords is only found in Ramsay, whose account is not substantiated by a medieval chronicler. As the Galwegians repeated their valiant but powerless charge, Ramsay noted that the archers decimated their ranks.<sup>230</sup> The British historians of the last decade of the nineteenth century (with the exception of Barrett and Ramsay's mention of swords) had a consistent account of the battle. They might have been using the same medieval sources and repeating each other's interpretations.

Augustin Thierry (1907) rendered the most sensationalistic and uncorroborated view, recalling how the men of Cumberland, Liddesdale, and Teviotdale made a strong and quick attack on the centre of the defenders' line. Thierry proceeded to tell of an old, unnamed chronicler who claimed that the Scots were able to break through the enemy line as though it were a spider's web; however, the chronicler went on to concede that the Galwegians were not supported by the other Scottish troops and were therefore unable to reach the Standard.<sup>231</sup> Thierry continued with his imaginative misinformation, describing a second Galwegian charge that employed long lances. These broke fruitlessly against the iron mail and the shield of the Norman English knighthood. He continued, stating that the Highlanders, confusing Galwegians with others in the Scottish army, drew on their two-handed swords and rushed forward for a hand-to-hand engagement. In his third piece of imaginative information, Thierry had the Norman English horseman, 'in

---

<sup>230</sup> Chalmers, *Caledonia*, iv. p. 623; Leadman, *Battles*, p. 20; Barrett, *Battles*, p.32; and Ramsay, *Foundations*, ii. p. 370.

<sup>231</sup> Ailred of Rievaulx was the unnamed chronicler, but he was describing Earl Henry's charge not that of the Galwegians in both sentences. AR Battle, p. 266.

serried line and with lances at rest,' charge the Galwegians while English archers destroyed them with a flight of arrows. The details of the melee and the Norman cavalry charge were both original to Thierry's account.<sup>232</sup>

Charles Oman (1924) quoting Ailred, wrote that the Galwegians rushed wildly, made the fyrd waver for a moment, only to be repulsed by the hauberk knights who rallied and 'sustained the common folks'. Oman exhibited the clear distinction between the Norman English knights and the English, 'the common folk.' Oman perceived an acculturated army, not an assimilated one. R. L. G. Ritchie (1954), a Scot, stated that the attack failed because the Galwegians' leather buckler and wooden shaft were militarily inferior to the mail armour and all-steel spears of the Norman English.

According to John Beeler (1966), the front rank archers took a tremendous toll, and the Galwegians' initial charge forced a momentary penetration of the 'Southern' line. Nevertheless, Beeler wrote, the dismounted knights steadied the line, restored the situation, and beat back the attack. The unarmoured Galwegians made several attempts to break the hauberk Norman English formation. English arrows lethally rained down on them. John Appleby's (1969) description was also succinct. He wrote that the Galwegians assaulted the defender's line, but the wall of shields deterred them. Following this description, Appleby notes that the archers, 'the bulk of whom appear to have been commoners from Yorkshire,'<sup>233</sup> then destroyed the Galwegians who broke and fled. Alfred Burne (1973) wrote that the Galwegians rushed against the line of English archers, but completely unarmoured they were clear targets for the English bowmen. The slaughter was immense and the attackers came to a halt just short of the English line. The evidence outlined above contradicts Burne's

---

<sup>232</sup> Thierry, *History*, ii. pp. 11-14.

<sup>233</sup> Hollister, *Military Organization*, p. 230.

assertion that the Galwegians never contacted the defenders' line. R. H. C. Davis (1990) wrote that the 'Picts' of Galloway discovered very quickly the invulnerability of dismounted Norman English knights. He continued, stating that the knights protected the archers whose arrows immensely slaughtered the onrushing Galwegians and routed them.<sup>234</sup> The twentieth century historians demonstrated that some of them adhered to Ailred of Rievaulx's version of the battle. There was acculturation in the 'Southern' army but not assimilation.

### **The Response**

As the Galwegians recoiled from the initial meeting, Lamplough noted that the archers showered shafts upon them. Grainge described the native English archery as 'matchless,' while Lamplough claimed that it was on this eventful day that 'the English archers won their first laurels' with their long bow and arrows.<sup>235</sup> This was an acculturated army with the hauberk knights providing protection and the lower class, indigenous English providing devastating death from the sky. According to Lamplough, the Scots found it impossible to rally and re-form in the face of the storm of deadly shafts. As the men of Galloway staggered back from the storm of arrows, leaving their leaders, Ulgrick and Dovenald, dead upon the field, the Scottish line began to break and flee. In his rendition of events, the 'Southern' army taunted the scattering Scots with cries of 'Eyrych, Eyrych!' ('You are but Irish'). This imaginative detail is not mentioned by any of the other historians.<sup>236</sup>

Ramsay wrote that the English assumed the offense by charging the men of

---

<sup>234</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 91; Appleby, *Troubled Reign*, p. 54; Burne, *More Battles*, p. 97; and Davis, *King Stephen*, p. 37; Oman, *Art*, p. 393; and Ritchies, *Normans*, p. 267.

<sup>235</sup> Grainge, *Battles*, p. 15 and Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, pp. 68-69. Note. Lamplough's addition of archers from the other counties.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*

Lothian, who gave way at once.<sup>237</sup> Lamplough gave a much fuller account, in which he described the Norman English men-at-arms drawing themselves up into a dense column around their holy standard, a move which prevented any Scottish hand from reaching the Standard. He further remarked upon the interesting contrast between the expected service performed by the militarily experienced northern barons and the unexpected excellence of the English archers.<sup>238</sup> Indeed, the combination of the Norman English barons defending that Standard and the indigenous English bowmen slaughtering the panicked Scots won the battle. Edmund King viewed this as a vivid image of Scottish incompetence.<sup>239</sup>

Leadman wrote that one man in the midst of the battle cut off the head of a dead soldier and, having placed it on his spear, cried that it was the King David's head. Lamplough cautiously and carefully made certain to state that the story was both 'curious' and 'not over-reliable'. Ailred copied this episode from *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, just as Duke William 'bared his head of his helmet' at the battle of Hastings.<sup>240</sup> Lamplough paid more attention than Leadman to the effect of this English soldier's trick. The former noted that, before this trick, the retreating Galwegians were stymieing the advance of the second row and causing the third row of Scots to retreat. However, Leadman and Lamplough had King David react swiftly to the ruse. The king threw off his helmet and, bare-headed, leaped upon his horse and rode amidst his soldiers to reassure them of his safety. Although Leadman and Lamplough remarked that David's own bodyguards 'stood bravely, the gesture was futile'.<sup>241</sup> Only Ritchie noted the connection to the battle of Hastings in which Duke William threw off his

---

<sup>237</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 370.

<sup>238</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 72

<sup>239</sup> King, *King Stephen*, p. 93.

<sup>240</sup> *Carmen*, l. 448: 'Iratu, galea nudat et ipse caput.'

<sup>241</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 22 and Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 71.

helmet and showed his face.<sup>242</sup> Beeler, Oman, and King do not mention this incident.

### **Earl Henry's Charge**

Leadman called Earl Henry both 'bold and reckless' in rallying his men, and invents his own battle oration:

Whither go ye, good fellows? Here shall ye find armour and force, neither shall ye, while life remaineth in your captain (whom ye ought to follow), depart without victory. Therefore choose whether ye had rather try the matter with your enemies by battle, or be put to a shameful death at home when you return thither.<sup>243</sup>

Thus exhorted, said Leadman, Henry's troops followed him, bravely charging the 'Southern' flank composed of Yorkshire fyrd with such force that they actually fought their way through the flank all the way to the barons' tethered horses but with heavy casualties. Beeler uniquely stressed that Henry's charge was purely on his own initiative, noting that no evidence existed that would demonstrate that he received an order. Thus, Beeler wrote, Henry launched the Scot's right wing against the English left. Barrett had Henry rally his men and lead them in the charge. Ramsay wrote that the earl had a few score horsemen but quickly outdistanced the Cumbrians who followed on foot.<sup>244</sup> Oman specified that this was the only cavalry charge of the day as the northern barons dismounted every rider, not merely the greater part as Henry I did at Tinchebrai.<sup>245</sup> Only Bradbury and Burne have the contradictory view that 'Southern' cavalry met Earl Henry's x.<sup>246</sup> However, there are no medieval sources to support the latter view. If the barons had tethered their horses out of mutual distrust, then

---

<sup>242</sup> Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 267. In AR Battle, p. 267, Ailred stated that a man held a head that he cried was the king's, but Ailred did not have the king respond.

<sup>243</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 22.

<sup>244</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 91-92; Oman, *Art*, p. 394; Barrett, *Battles*, p. 33; and Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 371.

<sup>245</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 391.

<sup>246</sup> Bradbury 'Battles', p. 191 and Burne, *More Battles*, p. 98.

Bradbury's opinion cannot be substantiated.

According to Beeler, the cavalry used a flanking manoeuvre that smashed through the mass of the shire-levies behind the line of dismounted knights. Crosfield had the Scottish cavalry passing beyond the Standard and attacking the horses of the dismounted barons. They cut their way forward and emerged, although greatly diminished in numbers, at the rear of the English left. Oman concurred that Henry led the charge and, with his horsemen, carved his way through the Yorkshire fyrd until the remainder of the Scottish cavalry appeared at the back of the entire 'Southern' army. This assault created chaos and disorder. If they had reached the tethered horses, they were behind the 'Southern' army as Crosfield stated and could have wreaked havoc on the northern barons.<sup>247</sup>

Grainge's account, wherein Earl Henry came to the rescue of the Scottish men-at-arms and tore asunder 'like a spider's web'<sup>248</sup> the Yorkshire yeomen's line, might make it sound as if Henry was poised to save the day. Beeler indulged in a moment of speculation, suggesting that, if the Scots had reined in to attack their enemy from the rear, they might have created a serious diversion. Bradbury and Leadman take a much more pessimistic view of Earl Henry's charge, with Bradbury simply surmising that Earl Henry led a flanking cavalry charge that was beaten off. Leadman, offering a unique opinion, stated that Henry realised the manoeuvre was a mistake. Even Ritchie conceded that the prince's knights might have been more impressive than effective.<sup>249</sup> Oman drew a sharp contrast between the charge's potential success and its actual failure. He went on to tell how Henry drove through the 'Southern' line, presupposing that the battle was won, as he assumed that his

---

<sup>247</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 91; Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 57; and Oman, *Art*, pp. 393-94 .

<sup>248</sup> AR Battle, p. 266.

<sup>249</sup> Grainge, *Battles* p. 15; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 92; Bradbury, 'Battles', p. 191; Leadman, *Battles*, p. 22; and Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 267.

infantry would penetrate into the entry that he had made. Although Henry's error in judgment led him to waste no more than a few minutes, Oman described these few minutes as 'the crisis of the day,' since they gave the 'Southern' army the time not only to close the gap through which Henry had cut his way, but also to drive back the Cumbrians who were striving to thrust themselves into it. These minutes also gave the northern barons the time to face Henry's cavalry with mounted soldiers of their own. Beeler also agreed that, by the time Earl Henry could regroup, the opportunity had passed. Interestingly, Crosfield told a rather different version of this story. In her view, Henry's impetuous charge was so successful that it terrified the English to the point where they were on the verge of quitting the field. Crosfield claimed that the day was only saved when that 'artful and experienced' English warrior purported to have the head of King David on his lance. Only then, wrote Crosfield, did the English renew the battle more vigorously than before.<sup>250</sup>

According to Oman, Earl Henry was in serious peril when the rest of the Scottish host began to break and retire; many historians offered the same account of his clever escape. However, Barrett wrote that the Earl's charge prevented complete disaster for the Scottish army.<sup>251</sup> Beeler wrote that Henry and his men escaped by removing their insignia and mingling with their foes, from whom they were indistinguishable in arms.<sup>252</sup> Oman added that Henry faced to the north and bided his remaining few knights to remove their badges and mingle with the advancing line of the enemy. Thus, he and his cohorts were able to leave the field of battle unobserved by the comparably armoured enemy. They were able to gradually pass them. Ritchie

---

<sup>250</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 394; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 92; and Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 57.

<sup>251</sup> Barrett, *Battles*, p. 33.

<sup>252</sup> *Bello*, [Col 0712A]: '*Nunc consilio non minus opus est quam virtute. Nec est aliud majus animi constantis indicium quam in adversa fortuna non frangi, et quando non potes viribus, consilio superes inimicum. Projectis itaque signis quibus a caeteris dividimur, ipsis nos hostibus inseramus quasi insequentes cum ipsis, donec praetergressi cunctos ad paternum*'.

remarked that Henry ordered his men to ‘cast away their bannerets’ so that they could mingle with the pursuing horsemen. They became indistinguishable from them by accoutrements, language, or equestrian skill, which allowed their escape. Crosfield gave a simple account of Henry’s escape, wherein Henry made his knights throw away their marks of distinction. They were then able to mix with the enemy, as if a part of their corps.<sup>253</sup> This raises the question of class and socio-economic differences. If all noble knights appear to be of the same socio-economic class, then the fact that they were Norman English, Scottish, and other *gentes* was not as important. Both armies at the battle of the Standard might have had many different unassimilated *gentes*, but there were clear socio-economic differences that exaggerated the ethnic differences.<sup>254</sup>

### **The Outcome of the Battle**

After the initial charge, the Galwegians began to retreat. According to Beeler, David tried to order his reserve forward, but in vain, which left him with the few English and Norman knights in his bodyguard. Finding the situation hopeless, the rear guard therefore called for their horses and retired from the field. Leadman’s account echoed Beeler’s, stating that the king’s bodyguard bravely held firm as the army retreated in disarray. Lamplough offered a more detailed description of the waning battle. He portrayed the Galwegians withdrawing and thus blocking the advance of the second and third rows of the Scottish army. Lamplough declared this was the turning point in the battle. David then undertook command of his cavalry and protected the retreat of his disorganised army. Conversely, Burne had the rear guard protecting the king.

---

<sup>253</sup> Oman, *Art*, pp. 394-95; Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 92; Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 58; and Ritche, *Normans*, p. 267.

<sup>254</sup> The same Yorkshire archers that decimated the Galwegians did not appear to shoot arrows at the nobles who rode with Earl Henry.



Ritchie, taking a notably different stance, claimed that David did not retreat of his own accord. The Scottish historian followed the writings of Richard of Hexham and wrote that the older men guarding the king forced him to withdraw. Crosfield took an interesting position that aligned with the accounts of both Ritchie and Oman.

According to her, David's guard of knights forced him to mount his horse and retreat.<sup>255</sup> Medieval chroniclers claimed that between ten and twelve thousand lay dead on the battlefield.<sup>256</sup> Leadman went on to say that many more Scots were killed not in battle, but on the retreat home, as the roads and the country were unfamiliar to them.<sup>257</sup>

The Norman English did not make an organised pursuit but returned to the standard, their rallying point. They then mounted their horses and returned home.<sup>258</sup> The reason for this is much disputed. Crouch stated that the Yorkshire army did not feel it necessary to pursue King David beyond the county border because 'the bulk of the army had been massacred.'<sup>259</sup> Ramsay stated that the men were anxious to get back to their own homes in this period of uncertainty when all laws were suspended and therefore there was not a great slaughter on the battlefield.<sup>260</sup> This anxiety was original to Ramsay; it is not at all reflected in Leadman's account. The latter remarked that the English returned to the Standard, mounted their horses, and returned to their homes. The battle demonstrated that Norman English and English, facing annihilation, had reached a degree of acculturation that they could understand battle orders, risk

---

<sup>255</sup> Beeler, *Warfare*, p. 92; Leadman, *Battles*, p. 22; Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 72; Burne, *More Battles*, p. 98; Ritchie, *Normans*, p. 267; Oman, *Art of War*, p. 394; and Crosfield, *North-Allerton*, p. 58.

<sup>256</sup> Lamplough, *Yorkshire*, p. 72 from 'slew very many of his gang'; ASC; 'duodecim milia', AM Dunstable, p. 15; 'xi. milia', AM Tewksbury, p. 46; 'xii. milia', AM Waverley, p. 227; 'decem milibus', GC, p. 105; 'undecim milia', HA, pp. 718-19; 'x. milia', Priory, pp. 119-20; 'undecim milia', MP, p. 1066; 'plusquam decim milia', CSHR RHe, p. 165; 'duodecim milia', CSHR RT, p. 135; 'undecim milia', RH, Stubbs, p. 234; 'undecim milia', RW, Hewlett, p. 490; 'innumera multitudine', p. *Vita Thurstani*, p. 529; and WN, p. 34 'multa milia'.

<sup>257</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 21.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid.

<sup>259</sup> David Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (New York, NY: Longman, 2000), p. 82.

<sup>260</sup> Ramsay, *Foundations*, p. 371.

their lives together, and fight effectively to save their homes and loved ones.

### **Conclusion to the Battle**

It was not always clear if the northern barons were revolted or covered by David's army. Thurstan, the archbishop of York, gave the barons the moral backbone to fight. Jean Truax noted that the true tragedy of the battle was that these men had known the King of the Scots for years. Robert de Brus's decision to fight with the southern forces must have been particularly painful, as he had served in David's household.<sup>261</sup> Modern historians made an oversight in pointing out the lack of danger posed to either Durham or York during the invasion. David was avoiding most castles, with the exception of Wark. If David was intent on invading England, as this thesis contends, then he would not be wasting time and manpower attacking Northumbrian castles.

The battle was a glorious day for Yorkshire and even more so for England. The defensive military tactics had succeeded brilliantly. The Scots lost, due to the lack of discipline of their lightly armoured infantry, which assaulted the heavily armoured and disciplined Norman English knights. English archery under the protection of the dismounted hauberk knights decimated the Scots. As the 'Southern' army decisively defeated the Scots, King David's household knights removed him from the battlefield. It was a vivid image of failure.<sup>262</sup>

Hollister and Squire arrived at very different conclusions. Hollister might have been referring to the fyrd when he stated that mainly regional forces contended

---

<sup>261</sup> Truax, 'Time for Peace', p. 174. Note. The charter granting Annandale to the de Brus family was David's first official act as king. See Appendix 2, p. 229.

<sup>262</sup> Matthew Bennett, 'The Impact of 'Foreign' Troops in the Civil Wars of King Stephen's Reign', in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), p. 98.

in the battle.<sup>263</sup> Aelred Squire, a modern Cistercian monk, stated in contrast that all the defenders against David's invasion were conscious, first and foremost, of being Normans. He used Walter Espec's speech to emphasise this contention. Squire further asserted that the banners on the Standard did not represent what these Normans were fighting for.<sup>264</sup> Perhaps a member of a religious order is not the most objective individual to critique a member of the same order.

Oman summarised the battle as very abnormal for the twelfth century, since the Norman English had a decisive cavalry advantage, which they made no attempt to use. Oman saw a comparison between the tactics of the Yorkshiremen and Harold's arrangements at Hastings, even down to the detail of the central standards planted on the hill. However, at Hastings the English king lacked archers who proved decisive at the battle of the Standard. David's wise plan of attack was ruined by the Galwegians' pride. If his two hundred knights, commanded by his son, could have opened a gap and the fierce Galwegians could have thrown themselves into it, then the fortune of the day might have been changed. But the wild rush of unarmoured clansmen against a steady front of hauberk knights and bows was never going to succeed.<sup>265</sup>

The Normans had a different problem in the northern reaches of the county of York. Although there were Norman settlers from southern England and the continent, the crown's indifference to this region allowed it to fall into the ambit of David and the kingdom of Scotland. Since this thesis concentrates on Yorkshire and Northumbria, it is important to note how the Norman centralisation of power worked against them in the north. Hugh Thomas observes that, as much as the Normans tried to control all avenues of power, the north remained different because of its distant

---

<sup>263</sup> Hollister, *Military Organization*, p. 133.

<sup>264</sup> Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, p. 76.

<sup>265</sup> Oman, *Art*, p. 396.

location from London. In the battle of the Standard, the northern barons were hesitant to oppose David. However, Thurstan, who had become Stephen's political lieutenant in the north, vigorously argued his cause. I find that it was not race, their Norman heritage, or Thurstan, or loyalty to Stephen that swayed the northern barons. It was David's poor planning and control of his army that made the final decision of the northern barons' obvious and inevitable.

Medieval chroniclers and modern historians may have overlooked why the barons made their decision. They blamed the Scots for rapine, pillaging, and slavery, but they did not explain the circumstances that surround these acts. First, David knew he could not support so large an army. As a result, he allowed them to live off their booty. Second, there was a supposed threat to the life of David and his family by the Galwegians, which has never been adequately documented. However, David's acquiescence to these warriors in front of de Brus and de Balliol demonstrated how little control he had over them. He had, as Ailred noted in de Brus's speech, more in common with the northern barons than he had with many of his own troops. Yet, David had crossed his Rubicon. He was committed to paying his troops by booty and he feared his Galwegians. For a much poorer nation that could not afford to hire the stipendiary forces that Walter de Ghent brought to Northallerton with Stephen's gold, the battle was lost before it commenced. No medieval chronicler or modern historian had raised this argument. In reiterating the stories of the Galwegians' gore, they might have missed the actual reasons for David's defeat.

## **Conclusion to Chapter Two**

On 22 August 1138 two disparate armies clashed in one of the larger conflicts of 'The Anarchy'. Medieval chroniclers, annalists, and modern historians noted it was of little

military importance. Although Ailred of Rievaulx wrote almost four thousand words, William of Malmesbury ignored it completely. Yet this thesis chose the battle as the benchmark in its examination of mid-twelfth-century assimilation because of the significant contribution of indigenous English forces. This thesis has concentrated its attention not on the military or political causes and effects of the battle but the racial composition of the two armies.

This chapter compares the composition and battle formations of the two armies. Although this thesis is explicitly about the interaction of the *gentes* of the ‘Southern’ army the contrast with the ethnic components of the army, which King David led into battle and its similarities and differences from the opposing force might help confirm the central idea that assimilation did not happen during the fourth decade of the twelfth century. The Scottish army included men of different languages, mores, and *gentes* from many regions of the kingdom of Scotland. The ‘Southern’ army was composed of several elements including the northern barons, the barons sent from Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, the house guards under de Balliol, sent by King Stephen, and the Yorkshire fyrd. Flemish and other continental stipendiary forces brought by Walter de Ghent and William le Gros supplemented them. The battle orations of Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx identified the barons (*Proceres Anglie*) as the descendants of the *gens Normannorum*. They were the Normans in England, the children and grandchildren of the men who came with William the Conqueror in either 1066 or 1067. This thesis uses the term the Norman English. The cooperation between the *gentes* in this army is the central topic of this thesis. They were able to communicate and fight effectively, but they went their separate ways after the battle. The two *gentes* of Norman English and English were not only divided by ethnic background, but also by socio-economic rank.

The chapter began with an explanation of the internecine war for succession to

the throne of England. The civil war between Stephen and the Empress Matilda was an internecine war confined to the Norman English for succession to the throne of England, which fractured the ruling elite. Since this thesis concentrates on Yorkshire and Northumbria, it is important to note how the Norman centralisation of power worked against them in the north. Hugh Thomas observed that, as much as the Normans tried to control all avenues of power, the north remained different because of its distant location from London. In the battle of the Standard, the northern barons were hesitant to oppose David. However, Thurstan, who had become Stephen's political lieutenant in the north, vigorously argued his cause. This thesis presents the case that it was not ethnicity, their Norman heritage, Thurstan, or loyalty to Stephen that swayed the northern barons. It was David's poor planning and control of his army that made the final decision of the northern barons' obvious and inevitable. This lack of discipline and structure might have been one of several explanations for the invaders' defeat. Other explanations could include inferior defensive armament, the lack of annual training mentioned by Hollister, and a considerably smaller contingent of hauberk knights. The reaction of the two armies in the aftermath of the battle is telling of the different degrees of assimilation within the two organisations. The invaders, in defeat, did not retreat in an orderly manner but took out their rage on other parts of the 'Scottish' army. According to the priors of Hexham, most of the fatalities were not inflicted by the victorious defenders but by elements of their own army. The Scots demonstrated that although King David had worked on a systematic Normanisation of Scotland since he ascended the throne in 1124, there were serious divisions in the kingdom that might demonstrate a lack of acculturation. Immediately after the battle the 'Southern' army disbanded rather than pursue the defeated foes. The fyrd returned to their families and the barons returned to theirs. The fyrd and the barons were able to communicate and fight effectively as a unit but after the three-

hour battle they demonstrated that they were two separate *gentes*. There was a degree of acculturation but there was not assimilation.

Some modern historians have had a problem differentiating between *natio* and *gens*. This problem was evident in Ann Williams' terse summation of the battle that differed with this author's examination of the battle in style, substance, and conclusion. She made a unique presentation of the battle and Norman English and English acculturation using two works of Ailred of Rievaulx, the *Genealogia* and *Relatio* as her primary sources. She began with Ailred's *Genealogia regum Anglorum* and weaved together an argument based on tracing Duke Henry's ancestry back to Wodin, the Green Tree prophecy, and Ailred's idea of a Norman and English *natio*. She noted that Henry of Huntingdon and John of Worcester concurred on the idea of a *natio*. Williams then added Ailred's *Relatio de Standardo* to demonstrate that the northern barons had affinity to and finally a rejection of that loyalty to King David. She then added the Yorkshire fyrd in alliance with the barons based not on a desperate need to protect kith and kin but that the Standard exemplified the archbishop's use of local cults to encourage a common identity from the two *gentes*.<sup>266</sup>

She concluded by resurrecting Bede, the original creator of a unified English *gens*, and compared him to the work of his twelfth-century admirers. According to Williams, the chroniclers wished to state that by presenting the pre-Conquest English

---

<sup>266</sup> Williams, *English and Norman*, p. 185.

history as part of a 'continuous history' they were instrumental in creating a sense of historical continuity, which acknowledged the new without forsaking the old. Ann Williams concluded that this continuity fused the Norman English and the English into a new English nation. Williams appeared to make the same confusion as Gillingham, between *gens* and *natio*. She based her work, as did Ailred, on the accession of Duke Henry to the throne of England with his mixed Norman and English blood. Acknowledging the new without forsaking the old might be an example of acculturation, the acceptance of mores of both *gentes*, but there is nothing in her writing that would indicate that assimilation occurred, that the two *gentes* became one.<sup>267</sup> Thus, Williams placed herself between Gillingham's assimilation in the early 1140s and Thomas's assimilation late in the reign of King Henry II. None of these historians make an argument that contradicted the central idea of this thesis that assimilation between the English and Norman English had not occurred by 22 August 1138. In the midst of 'The Anarchy', the union of the Norman English and English into a single and united army was a matter of necessity not assimilation.

---

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., pp. 184-86.



## CHAPTER THREE:

### MEDIEVAL SOURCES ON THE BATTLE OF THE STANDARD

The medieval sources concerning the battle of the Standard vary significantly in the amount of attention they provide. For example, Ailred of Rievaulx spent almost four thousand words describing it, whereas a number of annalists spare only a sentence. Chapter Three is divided into two parts. Part One deals with the minor sources for the battle of the Standard. Part Two shall deal with the sources that are of substantial interest because of their detailed analysis and impact on modern historians. There is always the tendentious question of how the terms ‘annals’ or ‘chronicles’ should be used. Antonia Gransden and Given-Wilson considered that the word chronicle should only apply to sustained historical writing. Gransden and Taylor argued that the word annals should only refer to a text, which briefly recorded yearly events in chronological order.<sup>1</sup> It was not just chronicles and annals that reported on the battle of the Standard: there are two near contemporary poems. The two surviving lines of Hugh the Chanter’s poem are discussed in Chapter Two. Serlo’s poem on the battle consists of over seventy lines. It is considered as a major source in this chapter because of its length and the amount of information it provides. This chapter eschews the divisions between annals, chronicles, and poems. Rather, it divides historical works according to their minor or major significance in describing the battle of the Standard. Finally, the work of William of Malmesbury will be considered. Although

---

<sup>1</sup> Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 2004), p. xix; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 29; J. Taylor, *Medieval Historical Writing in Yorkshire* (York: St. Anthony’s Press, 1961), p. 3; and ‘*The Annals of Multyfarnham*’: *Roscommon and Connacht Provenance*, ed. and trans. by Bernadette Williams (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2012), p. 42.

he was one of the most important historians of the twelfth century, it is interesting to note that his *Historia Novella* did not mention this conflict.

Malasree Home and M. B. Parkes have analysed the evolution of English historical writing in the twelfth century. Home emphasised the role of the compiler, which involved the ability to weave material from a range of texts and sources into a new, composite whole. The concepts of ‘*ordinatio*’ (arrangement) and ‘*compilatio*’ (assembling information) became the means of monitoring the reader’s response to ‘*auctoritates*’ (credibility). While many of the texts listed below were woven together from other sources, there are hints of authorial bias and agenda influencing the manner in which events are described and what information is added or omitted.<sup>2</sup>

## **PART ONE: THE MINOR SOURCES**

The minor sources are considered in two categories; those written in England, and those outside the kingdom of England. Three abbeys in northern England yielded minor sources. These were York, the home of the two *Vita Thurstani*, and Bridlington, the home of William of Newburgh. In southern England, the abbeys in question were located in Peterborough, Dunstable, Osney, Waverley, Tewksbury, Worcester, St Albans, and Canterbury. The six abbeys, which produced accounts outside the kingdom of England, were in four separate geo-political entities. Two of these sources, the histories of Orderic Vitalis and Robert de Torigni, were written in the duchy of Normandy at Saint-Evroult and Bec respectively. Melrose and Holyrood

---

<sup>2</sup> Malasree Home, *The Peterborough Version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Rewriting Post-Conquest History* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2015) and M. B. Parkes, *The Influence of the Concepts of “Ordinatio” and “Compilatio” on the Development of the Book* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

were in the kingdom of Scotland. Rushen Abbey was on the Isle of Man, while the

abbey of Multyfarnham was in Ireland.<sup>3</sup>

This thesis poses the question whether any national, racial, and geographical preferences are noticeable in the sources. For example, the order in which the national groupings of *Angli* and *Scoti*, which fought in the battle were listed. The two Scottish sources, Melrose and Holyrood, used the order ‘*Scotos et Anglos*’, whereas the other three, Osney, Wykes, and Man entered ‘*Anglos et Scotos*’.<sup>4</sup> Several sources simplified the list of combatants to two human beings, namely King David I of Scotland and Archbishop Thurstan of York. There are several possible explanations for this. One possibility is that they might not have accepted the armies as representative of the kingdoms of England and Scotland. A second is that writers might have been honouring the king of the Scots and the archbishop of York as the most significant players in the battle. *The Annals of Dunstable* added that Thurstan was *auxilio provinciae suae* and thus had a religious and a secular title.<sup>5</sup> *The Annals of Multyfarnham* noted that ‘*David Scottic’ et archiepiscopum Ebor et victus est Rex David*’.<sup>6</sup> *The Annals of Waverley* had David lead the *innumerabilem exercitum* against

---

<sup>3</sup> William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. by P. G. Walsh, and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1998); *Annales Monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, 36, 5 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1864-69); De Margram Theokesberia (Tewkesbury), *De Waverleia* (Waverley), *De Dunstaplia* (Dunstable), *De Oseneia* (Osney), Chronicle of Thomas de Wykes; John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. by Reginald R. Darlington and Patrick McGurk, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); Gervase of Canterbury, *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. by W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London: London Record Office, 1880); Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols., Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969-1980); *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. by R. Howlett, Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1884-1890). IV. *Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, 1890; *The Chronicle of Melrose from the Cottonian Manuscript Faustina B. IX in the British Museum*, ed. by A. O. Anderson and M. O. Anderson (London: Percy Lund, Humphries, 1936); *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition, 1. Introduction and Facsimile*, ed. by Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007); *Chronicon Coenobii Sanctae Crucis and Chronicon Anglo-Scoticum*, ed. by Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1888); and *Multyfarnum*, ed. by Williams.

<sup>4</sup> *Chronicon de Mailros*, p. 71; *Chronicon Coenobii*, p. 30; AM Osney p. 22; and Man, p. 65.

<sup>5</sup> AM Dunstable, p. 15

<sup>6</sup> Williams, ‘Annals of Multifarnham’, p. 42.

the *proceres borealis Angliae* led by Thurstan.<sup>7</sup> This was copied verbatim from Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*.<sup>8</sup>

Three sources identified William le Gros, Count of Albermarle (or Aumale) as the leader of the southern army over Thurstan.<sup>9</sup> These were the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *The Chronicle of Robert de Torigni*, and Orderic Vitalis's *Historia Ecclesiastica*.<sup>10</sup> A possible explanation for his prominence in the two Norman sources might be that the authors were more familiar with William, who was a grandson of Odo of Champagne, the first Count of Albemarle and Duke William's brother-in-law. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle may have named William, because he was the most powerful baron of his time in the northern counties of England. He held almost the entire peninsula of Holderness, and considerable estates in Lincolnshire in addition to his Continental possessions.

A lot of the sources about the battle appear to be interdependent, with one source copying another. The information in a number of texts can be traced back to Henry of Huntingdon. Among modern historians he has acquired a negative reputation as a weaver and compiler. However in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it appeared that he was more respected. Richard of Hexham and John of Hexham both might have used him as a source.<sup>11</sup> Ailred of Rievaulx had access to Henry's work and Robert de Torigni owned a copy to 1147.<sup>12</sup> The *Annal of Osney* used Torigni as did the *Annal of Waverley*.<sup>13</sup> Roger of Howden, Roger of Wendover, and Matthew Paris copied sections verbatim from Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*. Therefore, directly or

---

<sup>7</sup> AM Waverley, p. 15.

<sup>8</sup> HA, x. 7, pp. 712-13.

<sup>9</sup> George T. Clark, 'Scarborough Castle'. YATJ, VIII, 1881(London: Bradbury, Agnew, & Co.), p. 181.

<sup>10</sup> ASC 2 {1138}, p. 212; RT, p. 176; and OV, xiii, p. 522.

<sup>11</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 216 and p. 261.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195 and p. 195 n. 87.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 429-30 and p. 262.

indirectly, Henry of Huntingdon was a source for several works.<sup>14</sup>

In terms of the winners and losers of the battle, our sources also show interesting shades of difference. The *Chronicle of Melrose*, a Cistercian abbey, and the *Chronicle of Holyrood*, an Augustinian abbey, had all but verbatim statements: '*Fuit bellum inter Scotos et Anglos*'.<sup>15</sup> They omitted to record the outcome of a battle the Scots lost. However different emphases can even be noted between two works written at the same place. *The Annals of Osney* and *The Chronicle of Thomas Wykes* were both written at Osney. They both named the combatants as *Anglos et Scottos*. However, only Wykes noted '*multa milia Scotorum interfecta sunt*' but also observed that '*Rex vero Scotorum David et filius ejus Henricus fugae beneficio vix evaserunt*.'<sup>16</sup> *The Chronicle of Man* also wrote disparagingly '*Scoti victi fugerunt*'.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> HA, Book Ten.

<sup>15</sup> *Chronicon de Mailros*, p. 71 and *Chronicon Coenobii*, p. 30

<sup>16</sup> AM Osney p. 22 and AM Wykes, 23.

<sup>17</sup> Man, p. 65.

## **The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles (E) (1-1154)**

Written in a Benedictine Abbey in Peterborough, 240 km southeast of Northallerton, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is the only non-Latin chronicle which mentioned the battle of the Standard. The continuation of the work in Old English after 1066 may be interpreted as an act of cultural defiance. As such, the work reflected the point of view of the conquered English. It was subjective and critical of the monarchy. Its account of the battle of the Standard is significant because it stated that David *wolde winnan þis land*.<sup>18</sup> It was very clear that the king of one country was invading another with the goal of conquest. The most powerful lord in the north 'William, earl of Albemarle who the king had entrusted York' went forward to meet David in battle.<sup>19</sup>

John of Worcester and Symeon of Durham translated the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle into Latin and Henry of Huntingdon borrowed from it for his history from the time of Bede onwards.<sup>20</sup> The chronicle is relevant because it gave an almost contemporary record of events and its composition in English is relevant to the consideration of acculturation and assimilation.<sup>21</sup>

## ***Chronicon ex Chronicis* (The Chronicle of John of Worcester) (Creation-1140)**

Worcester Cathedral Priory was a Benedictine house, which stands 290 km southwest from the battle site of Northallerton. Bishop Wulfstan commissioned John of Worcester to continue his chronicle from 1128 to his death in 1140, so it is a near contemporary account. John stated that Archbishop Thurstan and the northern barons opposed King David. He went on to write that King David ordered an attack on our

---

<sup>18</sup> ASC 2 [1138], p. 212.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writings*, p. 41; p192; and p. 198.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 32.

troops (*decreuit nostros preoccupare*).<sup>22</sup> In 1140, John finished the work and the editing is preserved in his own hand. Brett stated that John might have exchanged texts or information with scholars from Malmesbury, Canterbury, Durham, and Saint-Evrault, and that copies of John's chronicle reached Coventry, Abingdon, Bury St Edmunds, and Peterborough during the twelfth century.<sup>23</sup> This suggests that the Chronicle was highly influential.

***Vita Thurstani Archiepiscopo Auctore Anonymo,***

This text was, according to James Raine, anticipated as part of a planned canonization of York's great defender.<sup>24</sup> It might have been compiled at the Cluniac Monastery of St John at Pontefract where the archbishop retired. Rigg attributed the text to the author Hugh of Pontefract who flourished in the mid twelfth century.<sup>25</sup> This text contains a short paragraph on the battle of the Standard that is memorable for the use of the term *Petronces*. The anonymous author was either implying that the English sent cattle ahead of their forces to discombobulate the enemy or that they used cow horns to make sounds to strike fear into the enemy. This idea is unique to this description of the battle. The author noted that the battle took place between King David and Archbishop Thurstan, which further enhanced Thurstan as the saviour of York and thus worthy of canonization.

The second *vita Thurstani* is hidden in a conglomeration of annals composed by various anonymous clerics in York. It is preserved in Bodleian Library manuscript,

---

<sup>22</sup> JW, iii. pp. 252-53: '*nostros*'.

<sup>23</sup> Anne Lawrence-Mathers, 'John of Worcester and the Science of History' *Journal of Medieval History*, 39 (2013), p. 257; Patrick McGurk, 'Illustrations in the 'Chronicle of John of Worcester', *Source: Notes in the History of Art*, 33 (2014), p. 28; and M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by R.H.C. Davis and M.H. Keen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), p. 125.

<sup>24</sup> HCY, ii. pp. vii-viii.

<sup>25</sup> Rigg, *Anglo-Latin*, p. 52



MS. Digby, 140 which was written at the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>26</sup> Rigg argued that the second *vita Thurstani* was not written as previously thought by Thomas Stubbs, fl. 1373, but by Galfridus Trocope of Nottingham.<sup>27</sup> The length, tone, and substance of this second *vita* was different than the other rendition. It was much longer and had a serious, religious tone, which the following lines reveal: *Sed potius de Summi Pastoris misericordia praesumens and Deo auxiliante, Angli victoriam obtinuerunt.*<sup>28</sup> It had the wrong year, 1139, for the battle of the Standard (as did the chronicle of Holyrood). Thurstan was represented as the leader of the resistance, which included the barons and other major, influential and wise men. It did not mention that the king was absent or the name of any significant lay leaders. Only Thurstan's efforts were showcased. His orations and benedictions to God for divine help were illustrated. The priests and other clerics with their crucifixes and their parishioners join the fight, further enhancing Thurstan's reputation as the one saviour of the Northumbrian people. The work mentioned the innumerable multitude of David's army, which gave more credit to Thurstan for defeating so great an army: *Non ex humana virtute sed ex Divina pietate haec victoria provenire.*<sup>29</sup> There was one line that is especially relevant to this thesis. At the very beginning, the author noted that the Scots were a threat to *omnes pariter, tam divites quam pauperes.*<sup>30</sup> Thus, both the rich (the Norman English barons) and the poor (the English) were united in their fear of the Scots. This might not be assimilation, but it showed two *gentes* uniting against a common foe. This could be considered the beginning of a common bond.

---

<sup>26</sup> HCY, ii. pp. vii-viii.

<sup>27</sup> Rigg, *Anglo-Latin*, p. 53.

<sup>28</sup> *Vita Thurstani*, pp. 528-29.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 529.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 528.

**William of Newburgh *Historia Anglorum* (1066-1198)**

William was an Augustinian canon at Bridlington, which is situated 100 km west of Northallerton. William's own manuscript did not survive, but a c. 1200 copy did. William by stating, '*gentes nostrae, id est Anglorum*' identified himself as an Englishman.<sup>31</sup> He composed *Historia rerum Anglorum* between 1196 and 1198.<sup>32</sup> He might be best known for being the one medieval writer who called the Conqueror William *Nothus* and who debunked Geoffrey of Monmouth. In the 'Prologue' to *The History of English Affairs*, he stated that Geoffrey wove 'a laughable web of fiction'.<sup>33</sup> His nineteenth century editor Howlett noted his high moral character, intelligence, and eloquence.<sup>34</sup>

William copied material from Symeon of Durham, Henry of Huntingdon, Jordan Fantosme, and the priors of Hexham.<sup>35</sup> He began his account of the battle of the Standard with an adaptation of Henry of Huntingdon's initial '*Cum ergo in australibus Angliae partibus*'.<sup>36</sup> William had a friendship with the Scottish royal family, which did not extend to their subjects whom he hated. After he noted that the Scottish army viewed their adversaries with contempt, they rushed into battle. The poorly armoured Scots were pierced with javelins that were 'thrown at a distance.' They quickly fled, leaving thousands of casualties on the battlefield. Finally, William praised God's 'kindness' for the victory.<sup>37</sup> William of Newburgh added two original ideas. The Scots viewed their enemy with contempt and it was the javelin, not the

---

<sup>31</sup> WN, i. p. 28.

<sup>32</sup> ODNB John Taylor.

<sup>33</sup> WN, i. p. 28: '*Ridicula de eisdem figmenta contextens*'.

<sup>34</sup> CSHR WN, 'Introduction', p. ix.

<sup>35</sup> WN, i. 'Introduction', 17 and Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 264.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* : '*Hoc bellum Deo propitio adversus Scottos feliciter gestum est*'.

arrows, which decimated the Scots. According to his modern editors, Walsh and

Kennedy, William thought more highly of David and his grandson than of any king of England.<sup>38</sup> This might be a reason he hurried through David's embarrassing loss at Northallerton so quickly.

As stated above William held David in high regard, which could not be said of his opinion of Stephen. He viewed the English king as a breaker of oaths, who, as the war continued, depleted Henry I's treasury and became less and less effective as a king. William dedicated this work to Abbot Ernald of Rievaulx, in part because the 'Southern' army successfully fought against the Scots by the assistance of God.<sup>39</sup> For these reasons, I would argue that his audience was the royal families of Scotland and England, the literate men at court, and the higher echelons of the Church.

#### ***The Annales de Dunstaplia (The Chronicle of Dunstable) (1-1297)***

An Augustinian canon at the Priory Church of St Peter in Dunstable, Bedfordshire wrote the Annals of Dunstable over 300 km south of Northallerton. The single MS. is preserved in the British Museum marked Tiberius A. 10. It is a folio, on parchment, the annals occupying ff. 5-89 b'.<sup>40</sup> Gransden described this work as the epitome of a domestic annal focused on household history. However, the annalist was aware of the world beyond their home. '*David, rex Scottorum, cum exercitu tendens in Angliam, a Turstano archiepiscopo, auxilio provinciae suae, repulsus est, fixo Standart apud Alwertune, ubi duo-decim milia Scottorum occisa sunt*'.<sup>41</sup> Since few of the annals and chronicles noted the Scottish army in England rather than Northumbria, this annal might be significant. Archbishop Thurstan helped his country, raised a Standard, and repulsed David. The annal did not comment on the news but merely reported it.

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 'Introduction', p. 10.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., pp. 26-27.

<sup>40</sup> AM Dunstable, p. ix.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

According to Gransden, the monks of St Albans lent material to Augustinians at Dunstable.<sup>42</sup> The chronicle, which began with the Incarnation, had only twenty-five printed pages in the Rolls series through to A.D. 1201, which might indicate that information outside the priory was not considered to be highly relevant to the canons.

*Annales Monasterii de Osenei* (*The Annals of Osney*) (601-1293) and *Chronicon Vulgo Dictum Chronicon Wykes* (*The Chronicle of Thomas de Wykes*) (1066-1289)

Situated in an islet adjacent to the town and castle, the Abbey of St Mary the Virgin was the Augustinian priory of Osney located 330 km south of Northallerton. The abbey, founded by Robert d'Oyly in 1129, most likely produced two chronicles. Both chronicles were composed in the thirteenth century. Thomas Wykes, who became a canon of Osney in 1282, composed one of the texts. Both texts survive in a single MS. in the Cotton Collection in the British Museum. In an odd typographical relationship, the two chronicles were printed as parallel texts in the Rolls Series #36, vol. iv. Alex Leadman observed that Wykes's chronicle 'dates about 160 years later' than the battle.<sup>43</sup> The two works drew on the works of William of Newburgh, Robert de Torigni, and Matthew Paris. Gransden determined that Wykes generally garnered information from Osney rather than Osney being abridged from Wykes.<sup>44</sup>

Comparison of *The Annals of Osney* and *The Chronicle of Thomas de Wykes*.

*The Annals of Osney*

'*Eodum anno commissum est grave praelium inter Anglos et Scotos apud Alvertone,*

---

<sup>42</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, pp. 424-29.

<sup>43</sup> Leadman, *Battles*, p. 398.

<sup>44</sup> AM Osney, 'Preface', p. ix; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, pp. 429-30; N. Denholm-Young, 'Thomas Wykes and his Chronicle', *EHR*, 61 (1946), p. 157; and Leadman, *Battles*, p. 24.

*ubi erectum et eductum est Standardum. Cuius usque hodie memoria non sopitur.*<sup>45</sup>

*The Chronicle of Thomas de Wykes.*

*Eodem anno commissum est praelium inter Anglos et Scotos, in provincia Norhanhinbrorum juxta villam quae dicitur Alurintona, ubi multa milia Scotorum interfecta sunt. Rex vero Scotorum David et filius ejus Henricus fugae beneficio vix evaserunt.*<sup>46</sup>

They both wrote of a battle between Scots and English. This thesis has determined that these are nationalities and not *gentes*; perhaps by the end of the thirteenth century annalists and chroniclers were not drawing distinctions between Norman English and English. The Chronicle of Thomas Wykes showed it was written well after King Henry II was on the throne of England.

#### **Annales de Theokesberia (The Annals of Tewkesbury) (A. D. 1066-1263)**

The Benedictine Abbey of St Mary the Virgin, Tewkesbury (Gloucestershire), was situated 310 km southwest of Northallerton. The annals covered the period from the founding of the abbey in 1016 to 1293. To the end of the twelfth century, the annals' writer copied from an earlier chronicle of Osney, which was mainly a compilation of Robert de Torigni and William of Newburgh. The abbey owned a copy of the latter's works. According to Gransden, the annals displayed a typical combination of general and local information. It had a considerably smaller proportion of local material than the Dunstable annals.<sup>47</sup> By describing the battle of the Standard as a conflict that took place between a king and a group of barons, (*David rex Scottorum victus est a baronibus de Everwichsire, et xi. milia Scotorum occisi.*) rather than as a battle

---

<sup>45</sup> AM Osney, p. 22.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, pp. 429-30.

between the armies of two kings, the chronicler might have diminished its importance. The annal described David losing a battle to the barons of Yorkshire. It might have suggested that the battle was considered to be an event of local rather than national significance.

*Annales Monasterii de Waverleia (The Annals of Waverley)* (A. D. 1-1291)

Waverley Abbey, Farnham, Surrey was located 400 km south of Northallerton. It was the first Cistercian abbey in England, founded in 1128. These annals covered the years from the Incarnation to 1291. The first portion, which covered the period up to 999 AD, was written in a twelfth-century hand. The second section, which is most pertinent to this thesis, covered the period from 999 to 1201 AD. This section employed a script from the beginning of the thirteenth century.<sup>48</sup> This chronicle drew from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury, Ralph Diceto, Roger of Wendover, and the lost Worcester chronicle as sources. After 1127, the chronicle was, according to Gransden, entirely taken from Robert de Torigni, with a few additions from Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>49</sup>

*Occupato rege circa partes australes Angliae, David rex Scotorum innumorabilem exercitum promovit in Angliam. Contra quem proceres borealis Angliae, ammonitione et jussu Turstani archiepiscopi Eboracensis, restiterunt viriliter, fixo Standart, id est, regio insigni, apud Avertune, ibi xii. milia Scotorum fama refert occisa, extra eos qui in segetibus et silvis inventi sunt perempti. Caeteri vero nimio sanguine fuso feliciter triumphaverunt. Hujus pugnae dux fuit Willelmus consul de Albemare, et Willelmus Peverel de Notingham, et Walterus Aspec, et Gillbertus de Laci, cujus frater ibi solus ex omnibus equitibus occisus est. Cujus eventus belli cum regi Stephano nunciatus esset, ipse et omnes qui aderant summas gratias Deo exsolverunt.<sup>50</sup>*

---

<sup>48</sup> AM Waverley 'Preface', ii. pp. xxxi.

<sup>49</sup> Gransden, Historical Writing, p. 412 and AM Waverley, 'Preface', ii. pp. xxxi-xxxii.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, p. 227.

It began with *Occupato rege circa partes australes Angliae*, which was copied from Roger of Wendover, who copied Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>51</sup> *David rex Scotorum innumorabilem exercitum promovit in Angliam* demonstrated several ideas.<sup>52</sup> The author found that David was skilled in bringing together forces from throughout his kingdom and he was invading England not Northumbria. The barons of northern England resisted David (*proceres borealis Angliae*). This phrase is important for two reasons. First is the addition of the word *borealis* (northern), which was also found in Matthew of Paris and Roger of Wendover but not found in Roger of Howden or the original Henry of Huntingdon. Second, this might imply that the barons were a regional group with no indication of ethnicity, which was not that significant when this annal was written.

### **Gervase of Canterbury, *Chronica***

Canterbury is located 450 km SE of Northallerton. Gervase was a Benedictine monk fl. 1163-1210. Gransden noted he was an ‘uncritical copyist’, a compiler who took from many sources.<sup>53</sup> Carol Davison Cragoe, using William Stubbs’s analysis of the chronicle and adding her investigation of the *Imaginos*, put Gervase’s *terminus post quem* as 1188 and his *terminus ante quem* in the late 1190s.<sup>54</sup> His two main sources were Henry of Huntingdon and John of Worcester.<sup>55</sup>

*Interea rex Scotiae David in multitudine gravi equitum et peditum de finibus suis egressus, circa terminos Northimbriae coepit rura, villas et oppida concremare, et fere totam verram devastare. Archiepiscopus vero*

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 260.

<sup>54</sup> Carol Davidson Cragoe, ‘Reading and Rereading Gervase of Canterbury’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 145, (2001), p. 48.

<sup>55</sup> Stubbs, Preface to GC, pp. xx-xxi and pp. xliii-xliv.



*Eboracensis Turstanu consilio habito cum Eboracensibus, Scotticis conatibus viriliter resistere proposuit, unde ipse rex David vehementius iratus, dissuadentibus etiam amicis suis, Eboracenses subito praecipere putavit. Sed cum exercitus uterque mense Augusto in unum convenissent et ferociter pugnatum esset utrimque, rex tandem vix fuga vitam salvavit, amissis ex suis fere decem milibus.*<sup>56</sup>

Gervase of Canterbury copied part of his history of the battle almost verbatim from John of Worcester who wrote circa 1140, year before Gervase was born:

*Interea rex Scottiae David in gravi multitudine equestrium et pedestrium de vagina finium regni sui iam tertio egressus, circa terminos Northybrae rura, oppida, et castella cremare et fere totam terram devastare.*<sup>57</sup>

He wrote that the battle was between King David and Archbishop Thurstan and an invasion of Northumberland. De Brus and de Balliol's negotiations and David's reluctance to fight might be referred to in *unde ipse rex David vehementius iratus, dissuadentibus etiam amicis suis*.<sup>58</sup> This would be the only mention of the negotiations other than the priors of Hexham and Ailred of Rievaulx. There is no known link with these other chroniclers, which makes this observation most interesting.

### **MINOR NON-ENGLISH SOURCES**

#### **Orderic Vitalis *Historia Ecclesiastica* (A. D. 1-1141)**

Orderic was a Benedictine monk at Saint-Evroult abbey in Normandy. Initially, he wrote in Books iii-vi the Story of Saint-Evroult at the behest of his abbot, during the years 1123-31. He then changed from ecclesiastical matters to more mundane history focusing on the first three Norman kings of England in Books vii-xiii, which included

---

<sup>56</sup> GC, p. 105.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., p. 105: '*Scotticis conatibus viriliter resistere proposuit*'.

the battle of Lincoln in 1141. He wrote almost to his death in 1142. In the late 1130s he added Books i and ii, which concentrated on the lives of the popes.

Orderic hoped his work would be a *divina lectio*. Roger Ray speculated that the work suffered neglect because it was unpopular with the monks, its immediate audience. They might have considered this material inappropriate for *lectio divina* because his work was too temporal to be for the scriptural readings, which were a tradition of the Benedictine order.<sup>59</sup> Orderic Vitalis fulfilled the unique role of being an *Angeligena*. He was born in England to a Norman father and an English mother. At ten his father exiled him to a monastery in France. Orderic considered himself an Englishman-in-exile. Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* influenced Orderic Vitalis to such a degree that he gave his work the same title. His wide-ranging interest in the human condition prompted Orderic to write a history that was neither theological nor secular. Emily Albu theorised that Orderic initially planned to write a modest history of his local monastery but that his efforts resulted in a more ambitious work, which combined the sacred and the secular from the time of Christ to his own times.<sup>60</sup> His goal was to write about the Church for the edification of his audience, which evolved to be much greater than just his fellow monks.<sup>61</sup>

According to Hingst, Orderic was too aware of the world to be bound by monastic conventions. He had a keenness to learn the history beyond the walls of his abbey.<sup>62</sup> Citing full-length documents, verbal information, and his own observations,

---

<sup>59</sup> Roger D. Ray, 'Orderic Vitalis and His Readers', *Studia Monastica*, 14 (1972)', pp. 27-28.

<sup>60</sup> Emily Albu '(Review of) Amanda Jane Hingst, *The Written Word: Past and Present in the Work of Orderic Vitalis* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009)', *American Historical Review*, 115 (2010), p. 1204.

<sup>61</sup> OV, i. 1 pp. 130-01: '*De rebus aecclesiasticis ut simplex aecclesiae filius sincere fari dispono*' and Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 152 and p. 154.

<sup>62</sup> Amanda Jane Hingst, *The Written Word: Past and Present in the Work of Orderic Vitalis* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), p. xviii; John O. Ward, 'Orderic Vitalis as Historian in the Europe of the Early Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Parergon*, 31 (2014), p. 1; and John O. Ward, 'Orderic Vitalis as Historian in the Europe of the Early Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Parergon*, 31 (2014), p. 1.

---

Orderic's goal was to improve his readers' prospects of salvation by showing how God punished the sinful. In Orderic's view, the purpose of history was the saving of souls. Orderic Vitalis was not a particularly influential historian during the Middle Ages. However, modern historians have made up for the neglect Orderic suffered from his contemporaries.<sup>63</sup>

His rendition of the battle of the Standard differed from others:

*Eadem septimana Stephano regi similis fortuna in alia regni parte blandita est. Nam comes Albamarlae et Rogerius de Molbraio contra regem Scotiae pugnaverunt, et interfecta multitudine Scottorum regem fugauerunt, caedemque truculentam quam illi super Anglos absque omni reuerentia Christianae religionis iam pridem exercuerant ulti sunt. Scotti nempe minacem gladium metuentes ad aquam fugerunt, et in ingens flumen nomine Zedam sine uado irruerunt, mortemque fugientes a morte protinus absorpti sunt.*<sup>64</sup>

He mentioned the title of king of Scotland but did not name David. He also listed two of the barons, William of Albemarle and Robert de Mowbray. He never mentioned King Stephen or Archbishop Thurstan. Orderic imagined many Scots drowning 'to escape death'.<sup>65</sup> The re-crossing of the river Tweed, which no other author mentioned, was a symbolic return to Scotland; Orderic showed the irony of so many Scots drowning just as they reached their home country.

***Chronicon Coenobii Sanctae Crucis and Chronicon Anglo-Scoticum (The Chronicle of Holyrood) (1-1163)***

In 1128, King David founded the abbey of Holyrood near Edinburgh with

---

<sup>63</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 154; Jean Blacker, *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1994), p. 159; Marjorie Chibnall, *The World of Orderic Vitalis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984); and Hingst, *Written Word*.

<sup>64</sup> OV, xiii, p. 522.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 522-23: 'A morte protinus absorpti sunt'.

---

Augustinian canons from St Andrews. It stands 260 km northeast of Northallerton. The only existing script of its chronicle is housed in the library of Lambeth Palace London, Lambeth MS. 440 and it was written in the twelfth century.<sup>66</sup> The chronicle ranged from the Incarnation to 1163. The first half, which used Bede as its source, covered material to 731. However, the second half, which covered the years from 1065 to 1163, gave information on northern England and the Lothians of Scotland.<sup>67</sup> *M, CXXXVII quinto decimo Kalendarum Decembris fuit bellum inter Scotos et Anglos.*<sup>68</sup> It is a poor record of the battle, as the year was dated 1137 and the month November, both incorrect. However, it was significant for its nationalistic tone by listing the Scots first whereas the other annals and chronicles list the *Angli* first, and by not noting the Scottish defeat.

### **The Chronicle of Melrose**

This text survives in British Library, MS. Cotton Julius B. XIII fos 2-47.<sup>69</sup> The chronicle was written at St Mary's Abbey, Melrose, Scotland, which was 190 km northeast of Northallerton. King David founded the abbey on Easter Monday, 23 March 1136 with Cistercian monks from Rievaulx. The chronicle, which began in 735 and extended to 29 December 1170 was the production of a series of writers who were monks of Melrose. It was a compilation from existing histories. The Melrose chronicler drew from the work of Symeon of Durham and Roger of Howden who used the same Scottish annals, now lost.<sup>70</sup> Similar to other Cistercian annals, most

---

<sup>66</sup> *Chronicon Coenobii*, 'Preface', p. vi.

<sup>67</sup> Chron. Holy, 'Preface to the Chronicle of Holyrood', p. viii.

<sup>68</sup> *Chronicon Coenobii*, p. 30.

<sup>69</sup> *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition, 1. Introduction and Facsimile*, ed. by Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007), p. vi.

<sup>70</sup> Chron. Mel, 'Preface to The Chronicle of Melrose', p. ix-xvi and Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 226 n. 45.

sections were bare of unnecessary prose.<sup>71</sup>

The chronicle can be contrasted with Ailred's *Relatio* as it mentioned David by name but none of his opponents. After noting that, in 1138, King David devastated Northumbria (*miserabiliter vastavit*) and King Stephen came to Roxburgh and quickly and shamefully returned to England, the chronicle described the battle in one sentence: '*Fuit bellum in Cutenemor inter Scotos et Anglos ad standardum xi kalendas Septembris [22 August] feria ii*'.<sup>72</sup>

### **Roberto de Torigni, *Chronicon* (1094-1186)**

Robert was a Benedictine monk at Bec in Normandy. It was at Bec that Henry of Huntingdon first saw the *Historia Regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth.<sup>73</sup> Robert began writing his chronicle in 1150, borrowing heavily from Henry of Huntingdon regarding English affairs.<sup>74</sup> Henry of Huntingdon visited Robert at Bec. Robert borrowed the line *Occupato igitur rege circa partes australes Angliae* from Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>75</sup> Later, Ailred of Rievaulx began his story of the battle with this same line. He listed the combatants as '*David Scotorum rex... Contra quem proceres borealis Angliae et Tustani*'.<sup>76</sup> Robert who was a Norman, might have differentiated between the 'Normans', who stayed in Normandy, and the Normans in England whom he might define as 'English'.

Robert de Torigni might have made an unwitting contribution to this thesis. If

---

<sup>71</sup> N. Denholm-Young, '(Review of) *The Chronicle of Melrose. Studies in Economics and Political Science, No. 100* by Allan Orr Anderson, Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson, William Croft Dickinson', *Medium Ævum*, 5 (1936), pp. 129-132.

<sup>72</sup> *Chronica de Mailros, E Codice Unico, in Bibliotheca Cottoniana Servato, Nunc Iterum in Lucem Edita, Notulis Indiceque Aucta (Edinbrugi: Typis Societastis Edinburgensis, 1835)*, p. 71.

<sup>73</sup> Ronald Greenwald, 'Henry of Huntingdon: Schemer or Dupe?', *Public Heritage Institute at Regis College*, 1 (2012), pp. 131-36 and Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 212.

<sup>74</sup> CHE RT, 'Preface to Robert de Monte', p. xi.

<sup>75</sup> CSHR RT, iv. p.135.

<sup>76</sup> *Bello*, [Col. 0701C]: '*Rege Stephano circa partes australes occupato*' and HA, x. 7, pp. 712: '*Occupato igitur rege circa partes australes Angliae*'.

he viewed the 'English' as the younger sons of Norman families who emigrated for land and booty, then this monk in Normandy observed a change in the population. By the second and third generations, these men were no longer Normans. They were an acculturated *gens* that might be of Norman blood but had the appearance being English. They spoke English, accepted English saints, and fought against the foes of the king of England. They were committed to the king of England in this internecine war of accession. Thus, as loyal followers of the king of England, Robert de Torigni viewed them as Englishmen. Based on the evidence cited above, there is a clear argument that Robert de Torigni viewed the acculturation and perhaps the assimilation of these 'Englishmen' into the general population.

***Annales de Monte Fernandi*** (The Annals of Multnham) (1000-1274)

Stephen de Exonia was a Franciscan who composed this set of annals between the ages of 26 to 28, in the years 1272-74.<sup>77</sup> He created the only annal from Ireland which mentioned the battle of the Standard.<sup>78</sup> The entire entry is succinct: 1138.2 '*Bellum inter David Scottie'. et archiepiscopum Ebor'. et victus est Rex David'*.<sup>79</sup> This entry was written down long after the event. It named the defeated David twice and named the victorious Thurstan only by his title. It is different from the other annals and chronicles for these reasons.

***Chronicle of Man (Chronica Regum Mannicæ et Insularum)*** (1016-1313)

The only manuscript of the Chronicle of Man, 'so far as known' is preserved in the British Library, BL Cotton MS Julius A. vii. Broderick and Stowell stated that the

---

<sup>77</sup> Williams, 'Annals of Multyfarnham', p. 42.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.

<sup>79</sup> University College, Cork gave permission to use this source.

Cistercian monks chronicled events from 1066 to 1316 at Rushen Abbey on the Isle of Man and continued listing the bishops of Man until 1376. The text is written in a fourteenth century hand 'in or about 1376' the year of the last entry.<sup>80</sup> The framework for the Chronicle of Man has been taken from the Chronicle of Melrose. The author used this source indirectly for a general record of events and added in records of events of Manx interest. It does not appear that the *Chronicle of Man* drew directly from Symeon of Durham, rather the author just drew the same information from the Chronicle of Melrose. The chronicle was not a direct copy of the latter because there are various errors, which suggest the use of an intermediary copy.<sup>81</sup> The chronicle incorrectly listed the battle of the Standard in 1139, not 1138. The entry, '*Bellum de Standarath inter Anglos et Scotos, et Scoti victim fugerunt*' mentioned the Standard by name, which indicated that the chronicler might have read the work of Ailred of Rievaulx, a fellow Cistercian.<sup>82</sup> It has a very strange and perhaps unique spelling of the *Standarath*. It stated it was a battle between the *Anglos et Scotos*, and further added that the Scots fled, a fact not listed in many annals. Only the island's elite might have read this chronicle.

### **Conclusion to the Minor Sources**

Some of the annals and chronicles viewed a battle of two nationalistic armies, the *Anglos et Scotos*. Others saw the battle in personal terms as a battle between a king, David, and the lieutenant of a king, Thurstan. However, the only two writers that did not tell of a victory were the two Scottish abbeys at Holyrood and Melrose. Although

---

<sup>80</sup> *Chronicle of kings of Mann and the Isles=Recortys reeaghyn Vannin as my hEllanyn*, ed. by George Broderick, Brian Stowell; and The British Museum (Edinburgh: G. Broderick, 1973), pp. i-iii.

<sup>81</sup> *Antiquitates Celto-Normanniae: Containing the Chronicle of Man and the Isles*, ed. by J. Johnstone, (Copenhagen, 1786), pp. xxvi-xxvii.

<sup>82</sup> *Chronicle of kings of Mann and the Isles*, p. 65.

part of a catholic and universal church, the Augustinian canons of Holyrood and the Cistercian monks of Melrose were the only authors who did not give the outcome of



the battle. All the other works, including those of foreign abbeys in Ireland, the isle of Man, and Normandy, noted a defeat for the Scots. Only William of Newburgh and the second *vita Thurstani* stated that the battle was won with the assistance of God.

The three northern writers described not only the defeat of the Scots but their utter rout. The first *vita Thurstani*, which sought the beatification of the archbishop, would desire to make the victory under Thurstan's stewardship as impressive as possible. All the southern writers also wrote of the Scottish defeat. The priors of Hexham, Richard and John placed the number of fatalities at 10,000. The *vita Thurstani*, William of Newburgh and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle noted that many Scots fell in battle. However, the writers from the southern abbeys all exaggerated the priors' numbers and stated either 11,000 or 12,000 Scots died.

The annals and chronicles listed in Part One were brief, providing only one sentence to one paragraph of commentary on the battle with the exception of the second *vita Thurstani*. So many diverse sources, some of which have been neglected by modern historians, noted a battle near the archbishopric of York which lasted all of two or three hours.

## **PART TWO: THE MAJOR SOURCES**

### **Introduction**

Three sources, namely, Richard of Hexham, Henry of Huntingdon, and Ailred of Rievaulx have been highly influential in later written accounts of the battle of the Standard. These authors lived close to the battlefield, and the location may have been significant in colouring their attitudes towards Scotland and Northumbrian history. In terms of textual inter-relationships, John of Hexham followed Richard of Hexham. Matthew Paris copied Roger of Wendover, who copied Roger of Howden, who

copied Henry of Huntingdon. This thesis added two more sources to Part Two, a poem by the Cistercian Serlo and a comment on the Benedictine William of Malmesbury. The former was added because of a unique poem and the latter because such a famous source of twelfth-century information did not write on the battle of the Standard.

The main chronicle sources of the battle of the Standard agreed substantially in content. The exceptions to the general formula can be listed as follows: John of Hexham saw David as an honourable man because he kept his oath to King Henry; Richard of Hexham believed that God banished evil and won the battle; Henry of Huntingdon damned David as being hypocritical, using his oath to Matilda in order to allow his army to commit unspeakable crimes; Ailred had the unenviable task of resurrecting David's reputation while remaining loyal to King Stephen and being a harbinger for King Henry II. Serlo loved David, but hated the Scots, and he downplayed the religious aspects of the standard, which he noted four times in his poem.

**Richard, Prior of Hexham, *Historia de gestis regis Stephani et bello de standardii* (1135-1139) fl. 1135.**

The priory of Hexham was 100 km northeast of Northallerton. Richard, prior of Hexham, wrote a short work that just covered the years from 1135 to 1139. In the context of belonging to Hexham Priory, he might be referring himself as '*quidam canonicus nomine Ricardus*'.<sup>83</sup> Stevenson wrote that this was the work of a knowledgeable historian writing a contemporaneous account of the period.<sup>84</sup> A late twelfth century copy survives in Archbishop Parker's library Corpus Christi College,

---

<sup>83</sup> CSHR, i. 'Preface,' p. lvii.

<sup>84</sup> RPH, p. vii.

Cambridge, MS. 139.

### *Purposes*

Richard of Hexham's primary purpose was to demonstrate not only that God was on the side of the 'Southern' army, but also that the army would not have won without His divine intervention. It was a victory for the Northumbrian saints and if there were human heroes, they were the ecclesiastics not laymen.<sup>85</sup> The 'Southern' army was said to hold three days of fasting and displayed a lot of religious imagery at the instigation of Archbishop Thurstan.<sup>86</sup>

Richard criticised David for the acts of his troops. This contradicted the idea that David had control over his men, which made the charters offering protection to churches effective.<sup>87</sup> The twelfth-century chroniclers and the modern historians had a problem with the idea that discipline was so well enforced in such a large and disparate army paid by booty. Another contradiction was the question of oaths. If all the aristocracy and the high princes of the Church could renege on their oath to accept Matilda as their queen, then why would their oaths of solidarity before Archbishop Thurstan be more binding? The bloody internecine aftermath to the battle confirmed that David might have had control while invading but lost all control during the desperate attempt to evade capture on English soil. The prior was able to differentiate not only between David and his army, but also between Stephen and David. Although armies devastated the land, only the Scots destroyed churches, killed, and enslaved individuals. Celtic-speaking *gentes* still accepted slavery.<sup>88</sup> Richard attempted to show that the good 'Southern' army fought the evil army of Scots.

---

<sup>85</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 217 and p. 289 and p. 289 n. 152.

<sup>86</sup> RPH, p. 48.

<sup>87</sup> RPH, 'Preface', p. lviii and Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 217.

<sup>88</sup> Slavery only became unacceptable in England after the Norman Conquest.

Richard admitted there were also English sinners. Their retribution was death and slavery. He described the loyalty of Eustace Fitz-John, Robert de Brus, Bernard de Balliol, and all the barons and clergymen who took oaths to King Henry. There was a binary opposition between Richard writing about divine intervention and human frailties--ignoring oaths, desecrating holy houses, slavery, and greed. Robert de Brus was an example of that greed. He had one son fight for King Stephen and one for King David to ensure his holding in both kingdoms. As prior, Richard placed himself above the sins of the laymen. When William fitz Duncan led a portion of the Scottish army into Yorkshire, they gained a victory on account of the sins of the people. They destroyed by fire and sword the main parts of a splendid monastery. Richard answered, 'Blessed be the God over all, who protecteth the righteous, but overpowereth the wicked!'<sup>89</sup>

Richard, continuing on the idea of protection and wickedness, was direct about the land the Scottish army both spared and decimated. It did not spare St Cuthbert's land; there was no divine retribution. Yet the Scots, including the Galwegians, spared Hexham and Tynemouth. Richard admitted that there were charters drawn up between certain abbeys and the invading army. King David and Earl Henry guaranteed the monastery at Hexham, its brethren, and all belonging to it safety from hostilities, which he confirmed by charter. The canons of Hexham would reciprocate by preserving the peace with the king and earl. He further admitted that the Scots honoured their commitments. An army that honours its commitments is shrewd not savage. As mentioned elsewhere in this thesis, David bypassed Stephen's castles and filled his coffers at the wealthy and defenceless abbeys. For an army that had been

---

<sup>80</sup> RPH, p. 45.

promised booty rather than pay, this was a practical military move, even though some might find it unsavoury.

Richard admitted that a Cistercian monastery was destroyed, and that accounts for why the Benedictine monastery at the mouth of the River Tyne paid the king of the Scots and his men twenty seven marks of silver for their protection.<sup>90</sup> Richard then continued in two opposite veins. First, he claimed that the northern saints, Andrew, Wilfrid, Acca, Alcmund, and Eata, protected the monastery at Hexham. Richard wrote of Hexham as a place secure from hostile assaults because of the saints. But later, in the same paragraph, he admitted that David and Henry guaranteed the safety of the monastery, which he confirmed with charters.<sup>91</sup> The Scots spared Hexham but not St Cuthbert's land. It appeared that the Scots were selectively collecting 'protection money' from certain monasteries and destroying other monasteries. Did Richard and other chroniclers exaggerate the wanton destruction of the Scots? If the Scots (including the Galwegians) were this sophisticated, and under the tight discipline of their king, this is in complete contradiction to the reasons given for David's refusal to listen to de Brus and de Balliol and for acquiescing to the Galwegians, whom he placed in the front line at the battle. It is also a contradiction of the fact that, after the battle, the various *gentes* of the Scottish army were said to turn on each other in bloody slaughter. The credibility of Richard of Hexham, who wrote the second longest description of the battle, is in doubt.

### **John, Prior of Hexham *History of the Church of Hexham* (1130-1154)**

The only known copy of this text is in Corpus Christi College Cambridge, Parker Library, MS 139. John was prior from 1160 until 1209. His work was a continuation

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., p. 43.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., p. 44. Since the charters have been destroyed, Richard was the sole source for their existence.

of Symeon of Durham. He copied Richard of Hexham until 1138 and also used Henry of Huntingdon and John of Worcester. Covering the period from 1130 to 1154, *History of the Church of Hexham* was written in the annalistic style of north country historians. John made clear his love for peace and his belief that David was a pious man. Stevenson and Gransden agree that it was written after the death of King Stephen and it gives the impressions of a contemporary author. This was a reflection of what Gransden called the annalistic tradition: a dry accurate catalogue of events.<sup>92</sup>

The prior's list of combatants appeared to be Ailred's source as they were more extensive than Henry of Huntingdon's. He also put the Scots not the Picts (Galwegians) in the front line. Unlike Richard, John did not give God the credit for the 'Southern' army's victory. He also had a unique ending to the battle. After writing that the Picts and Scots destroyed each other in their retreat, the prior had King David summon the Scots and the Picts to him, at which time he fined them a large sum of money and received hostages and oaths from them. Although John did not have orations in his narrative, perhaps he shared Robert de Brus's argument that the northern barons were more loyal to David than these barbarous components of the Scottish army. After the barons broke their oath to King Henry, and after Robert de Brus and Bernard de Balliol broke their fealty to King David, John made a unique observation. He stated that David believed his oath obligated him to conquer or die.<sup>93</sup> The prior demonstrated that David was perhaps more honorable than the barons and clergyman who broke their oaths. John ironically made David, who was the leader of an army of barbarous savages, a good Christian.

John's narration of the battle was unique. He showed his hatred of the Scottish

---

<sup>92</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 247, p. 261, and p. 261 n.104 and JPH, 'John Prior of Hexham Introduction', p. vii.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

invaders and their acts of brutality and barbarism. Yet perhaps even more than Ailred,

he excused David from all wrongdoing. In addition to keeping his oaths, he stated that David:

out of respect, however, to the dignity and antiquity of the church of Hexham, he kept his peace with it and with all who had taken refuge at it sending thither five Scots lest any one should venture to invade it with a hostile intention.<sup>94</sup>

The annalistic views of the 1138 Scottish invasion that the priors of Hexham related were similar to each other, but had significant differences with the other major sources. This may in part be because of Hexham's proximity to David's invasion. As noted in the Appendix, the monastery at Tynemouth paid twenty-five pieces of silver not to be ransacked by the invading army. However, neither prior of Hexham noted that any money was paid to David. In fact, they noted that David returned to Richard all his booty, in token of their freedom.<sup>95</sup> The priors further relate that two Scots broke into outlying edifices of the church of Hexham, carried off booty, and met with dire consequences. Richard noted that the vengeance of God destroyed them, but John merely stated that fiends possessed them.<sup>96</sup> At the beginning of their descriptions of the battle, both priors made it very significant that Hexham was a special place. Not only did David give them booty, but also their priory was immune from the Galwegians and the Scots. The modern historian can only ask why they were exempt from destruction when other abbeys, monasteries, and other religious edifices were pillaged and desecrated. Chapter Two shall show that abbeys that had agreements with the Galwegians were spared destruction.

---

<sup>94</sup> RPH, p. 7 and CSHR RHe, p. 116: '*Deferens autem dignitati et antiquitati ecclesiae Hagustaldensis, pacem ei, et omnibus qui confugerant ad eam, conservavit, quinque Scottos illuc dirigens, ne quis hostili animo irrumperere praesumeret*'.

<sup>95</sup> JPH, p. 8.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid. and RPH, p. 44.



**Ailred of Rievaulx *Relatio de Standardo* (1155-57) fl. 1142-67**

The Cistercian house of Rievaulx stands only 30 km south of Northallerton.<sup>97</sup> Ailred was a prodigious writer best known for his work on brotherly love. His better known histories are this work on the battle of the Standard (1155-57), *Vita Davidis regem Scotorum* (1153), *Genealogia regum Anglorum* (1153-54), and *Vita S Eduardi regis et confessoris* (1161-63). Despite its significance for modern historians, there are only two contemporary manuscripts of *Relatio de Standardo*, which might suggest that it was not widely read in Ailred's lifetime.<sup>98</sup> Gransden, who published in 1974 only two years after Squire, noted only one manuscript Corpus Christi College Cambridge, Parker Library, MS. 139, which was written in the late twelfth century. But Dutton, who published in 2005, noted a manuscript from the Rievaulx library now housed at the York Minster, York Minster Archives XVI. I. 8, which was also written in the late twelfth century. However, an 1835 edition of the *Chronicle of Melrose* edited by Joseph Stevenson noted in a footnote that there were two known manuscripts.<sup>99</sup>

Glidden has argued that the lack of background material in Ailred's narrative indicated he was not writing for posterity. Ailred assumed the reader knew the reason for the battle and the outcome. Gransden emphasised that he was writing for his fellow monks and Glidden wrote he intended to address a contemporary audience.<sup>100</sup> Three significant events occurred between the battle of the Standard and the time when Ailred wrote his account: Henry of Huntingdon had written three versions of his

---

<sup>97</sup> Rosalind Ransford, 'A Kind of Noah's Ark: Aelred of Rievaulx and National Identity', in *Religion and National Identity*, ed. Stuart Mews, Studies in Church History, 51 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), xviii. p. 137.

<sup>98</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 215 and Glidden, *Aelred the Historian*, p. 176.

<sup>99</sup> Dutton, 'Mirrors', p. 15 and *Chronica de Mailros*, p. 71 n. d.

<sup>100</sup> Glidden, *Aelred the Historian*, p. 177.

*Historia Anglorum*, King David of Scotland had died and King Henry II had ascended the throne of England as the first king of a new dynasty. Ailred was aware of Henry of Huntingdon's work and even imitated the beginning of his account of the battle of the Standard. Henry wrote: '*Occupato igitur rege circa partes australes Angliae* and Ailred paraphrased: '*Rege Stephano circa partes australes occupato*'.<sup>101</sup> This has led historians to date Ailred's text to the years 1155-1157 after Henry's sixth and final version of his *Historia* was written in 1154.<sup>102</sup>

### *Purposes*

Aelred Glidden argued that Ailred's purpose was to resurrect the reputation of King David in the face of the criticisms of that king made by Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>103</sup>

Dutton argued that Ailred was a harbinger for King Henry II. Truax wrote that Ailred's intention was to teach the young king how to act in a royal manner. I would argue another purpose was to show that the northern barons chose the political expediency of supporting a distant king of England rather than a close personal friend, the king of Scotland.

Henry of Huntingdon blamed David for the atrocities committed by the Scottish army. He also obfuscated the fact that Stephen and all the barons gave an oath to King Henry I to allow Matilda to succeed him.<sup>95</sup> Ailred legitimized Stephen but very curtly,<sup>104</sup> and justified the treaties of accession, which, in a circuitous way,

---

<sup>101</sup> HA, x. 7. p 712 and *Bello*, [Col. 0701C].

<sup>102</sup> Greenway, 'Introduction', lxxvi.

<sup>103</sup> Glidden, *Aelred the Historian*, p. 177 and HA, x. 6, pp. 710-11: '*Rex namque Scotorum, quia sacramentum fecerat filie regis Henrici, quasi sub uelamento sanctitaris, per suos exercrabiliter egit*'.<sup>95</sup> Glidden, *Aelred the Historian*, p. 179.

<sup>104</sup> *Bello*, [Col. 0705D]: '*Qui regnum non ut hostes calumniatur inuasit debitum, sed suscepit oblatum, quem populus petiit, quem clerus elegit, quem unxit pontifex, quem in regnum apostolica confirmavit auctoritas*'.

endorsed King Henry II. Ailred raised Thurstan as a military commander above the laity. The abbot of Rievaulx never had Thurstan condemn or condone the fact that Robert de Brus and Bernard de Bailliol broke their oaths to David. Nor did Ailred ever raise the fact that all but David broke their oaths to King Henry I.<sup>105</sup> As Ailred wrote after the accession of the Angevin king, his writing was not compromised by the need to please Stephen's supporters.

Another purpose of the work was for Ailred to showcase the close working relationship between the northern barons and David, and to touch on his own friendship with the king. King David was of mixed English and Scottish royal heritage and he grew up in a Norman court. It seems fitting that the English-born, Scottish-raised abbot of a French order was friends with the Scottish-English, Norman-raised king. Their backgrounds transcended racial and national lines. Ironically, David was a founder of Cistercian monasteries, yet in Ailred's narrative he has Walter Espec state: *Horreo dicere quomodo ingressi sunt templum Dei, quomodo polluerunt sanctuarium ejus, quomodo salutis Christianae sacramenta pedibus*'.<sup>106</sup> Ailred showed himself to be a very conflicted soul as he tried to extricate his friend, David, from the actions of his army.

Ailred ignored the realities of 1138 and looked forward to King Henry II's accession in 1154. Henry was to begin a new dynasty that extended beyond the kingdom of England and the duchy of Normandy, which his father conquered in 1144. Ailred's narration gave an interesting insight into his perception of *gentes*. First Espec's speech praised the military abilities of three foreign *gentes*: '*Quoties ab eis*

---

<sup>105</sup> Elizabeth Freeman, 'The Many Functions of Cistercian Histories, using Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo*', in *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle Driebergen/Utrecht 13-16*, ed. by Erik Kooper (Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, July 1996), p. 125.

<sup>106</sup> *Bello*, [Col. 0706B].

*Francorum est fusus exercitus, quoties a Cenomanensibus, Andegavensibus,*

*Aquitanensibus, pauci de multis victoriam reportarunt’?*<sup>107</sup> At the time of the battle of the Standard, Matilda was using the forces of her husband, the count of Anjou, against the king of England. Ailred’s choice of three former enemies of the *gens Normannorum* compounded the idea that he was using *Relatio* as a harbinger for the accession of King Henry II.

Freeman argued that *Relatio* demonstrated Ailred’s national leanings towards his English king but also that Ailred’s training transcended national boundaries, which were less important than the internationalism of Cistercian houses. Note that King David had not only been a founder of Rievaulx but also its daughter house Melrose in his kingdom of Scotland. Freeman also claimed that Espec’s speech demonstrated the Norman myth, which R. H. C. Davis renewed in the twentieth century. Mentioning the victories in England and the Mediterranean basin, Espec made, in Freeman’s words, a militarily invincible *gens* that transcended national boundaries and was also international. The irony of comparing the Cistercians, a disciplined order of monks, to the Normans, an undisciplined militant *gens*, is duly noted.

Ailred had a continuing problem of being aware of differentiating national identities from *gentes*. Ransford demonstrated David’s dilemma: he swore fealty to a king of England, Henry I, yet he had to maintain the integrity of his own kingdom, Scotland, against another king of England, Stephen.<sup>108</sup> Freeman wrote that *Relatio* was composed at the end of a period of identity reformation, during which the Normans were portrayed as inheritors of the land, with a legitimate history, and a superior

---

<sup>107</sup> Freeman, *Cistercian Historians*, p. 43.

<sup>108</sup> Ransford, ‘Noah’s Ark’, p. 137.

fighting capacity, which might be thought of as ‘the best qualities’. Ailred’s *Relatio* demonstrated a lack of assimilation between the Norman English and the native English. Espec’s speech addressed the ‘Southern’ army as exclusively Normans, ‘*Quis Apuliam, Siciliam, Calabriam, nisi noster Normannus edomuit?*’<sup>109</sup> In contrast de Brus’s speech to King David which was inclusive, ‘*Adversum quos hodie levas arma, et hunc innumerum ducis exercitum? Adversum Anglos certe et Normannos!*’<sup>110</sup> Ailred’s text provided evidence for the continued distinction between English and Normans. It was Normans who conquered much of the Mediterranean basin and it was David who rejected a union of English and Normans. Writing in 1155-57, Ailred indicated that the *gens Normannorum* still existed and that assimilation between the two gentes of the kingdom of England had not yet been achieved.

#### *Audiences and Sources*

*Relatio* lacked the traditional preface in which medieval writers presented their personal views.<sup>111</sup> Ailred’s sources and influences must therefore be deduced from the main body of the text. It is uncertain how much Ailred depended on earlier historians.<sup>112</sup> Much of his information might have been based on Richard of Hexham, but Ailred also clearly knew the writings of Henry of Huntingdon.<sup>113</sup> Gransden was interested in Ailred’s use of Benedictine historiographical traditions. Ailred produced

---

<sup>109</sup> *Bello*, [Col. 0705B-0705C].

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, [Col. 0709D].

<sup>111</sup> Ransford, ‘Noah’s Ark’, p. 137.

<sup>112</sup> Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, p. 78; Pauline Stafford, ‘The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Identity and the Making of England’, *Haskins Society Journal*, 19 (2007), p. 77; Glidden, ‘Aelred the Historian’ p.184; and Derek Baker, ‘Ailred of Rievaulx and Walter Espec’, *Haskins Society Journal*, 1 (1989), pp. 91-92.

<sup>113</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 215; *Bello*, [Col. 0705B]: ‘*Quis Apuliam, Siciliam, Calabriam nisi vester Normannus edomuit?*’; and HA, x, 8. pp. 714-15: ‘*Quod scilicet in Normannia et Angli, Apulia, Calabria, Sicilia, et Antiochia, terries quas eis Deus subject, magis magisque apparet?*’

works that were more serious and less gossipy than other, contemporary writers. He followed the Benedictine tradition of history to record and edify, rather than to entertain. Squire noted that, as English Cistercian abbeys grew, their libraries contained not only Christian theology and spiritual doctrine, but also historical writings, which reflected local interests.<sup>114</sup> The period from the 1120s to 1150s was a prolific era of historical writing in England. English Cistercians published on two historical themes: endorsement of memory and history, on the one hand, and the emphasis on genealogy and legitimate foundations, on the other. *Relatio* accomplished both of these goals. Medieval Cistercian authors also used the written word to demonstrate their uncertainties about continuity and change.<sup>115</sup> The continuity of a king of England, coupled with the change from the Norman dynasty to the Angevin, makes *Relatio* a strong example of the Cistercian historiographic tradition.

### *Quantitative Analysis*

Rosalind Ransford and Aelred Glidden dissected *Relatio* quantitatively and showed Ailred was both methodical and clever. Ransford noted that the abbot mentioned the English and Normans twice, the English twice alone, and the Scots seven times. He repeated the phrase ‘us’ (*nos* or *nobis*) indicating the English and the Norman, fourteen times.<sup>116</sup> Ailred contrasted this by calling David ‘you’ (either *tu* or *tuus*) forty times to emphasize David’s isolation.<sup>117</sup> Ailred showed that David was isolating himself from his true friends.

Glidden also used the quantitative method to compare Ailred of Rievaulx and

---

<sup>114</sup> Gransden, *Historic Writing*, p. 213 and Squire, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, p. 72.

<sup>115</sup> Elizabeth Freeman, ‘Meaning and Multi-Centeredness in (Postmodern) Medieval Historiography: the Foundation of History of Foundation Abbey’, *Parergon*, 16 (1999), p. 60.

<sup>116</sup> Ailred, [Col. 0706D]: ‘*Secure igitur congregiamur, cum nobis sit causa justior, manus fortior.*’

<sup>117</sup> Ransford, ‘Noah’s Ark’, p. 137.

Henry of Huntingdon's description of the battle by counting the number of lines in Migne. Henry had one hundred and thirty-seven lines. Fifty-one were Ralph's speech, thirty-eight described the battle, and the remaining forty-eight lines were other accounts of preparation and the aftermath. Thus, thirty-seven per cent of Henry's

presentation of the battle was Ralph's speech, which Glidden dismissed. This thesis shall analyse his speech very carefully.

Ailred had a total of four hundred and forty-five lines describing the battle, which was more than three times as many lines as Henry of Huntingdon. Perhaps Glidden was right that Henry's attack on David had a profound effect on Ailred. The abbot might have deemed it necessary to thoroughly note all of Henry's arguments in order to protect David's reputation yet also be an advocate for Stephen's army and a harbinger of Henry II. Ailred's three speeches by Walter Espec, King David's nobles, and Robert de Brus totaled two hundred and sixteen lines, almost half the presentation. It appeared both men used the speeches for some of their more profound thoughts.

### **Henry of Huntingdon *Historia Anglorum* (40 B.C.-1154)**

Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon, was a secular chronicler who wrote, according to Greenway, six versions of his history of the English people between 1129 and 1154.<sup>118</sup> Much of *Historia Anglorum* was woven together from pre-existing sources. Patrick Wormald defended Henry, stating that his training was to be a commentator and not a recorder of events.<sup>119</sup> Rees Davies argued he was not a mere scissors and paste historian but chose, revised, abbreviated, and lengthened his sources, sometimes adding his own comments to make a story more readable.<sup>120</sup> Henry's purpose was not originality, but the writing of a structured and readable history of the English people.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> Diana Greenway, 'Introduction', p. lxvi.

<sup>119</sup> Patrick Wormald, 'Bede, Beowulf, and the Convention of English Aristocracy', in *Bede and English England*, ed. by R. T. Farrell (Oxford: *British Archaeological Reports*, 1978), p. 63.

<sup>120</sup> Reese Davies, '(Review of) Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)', *Medium Aevum*, 66 (1997), p. 320.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*



Henry perceived that God afflicted the people with five successive invasions to punish them for their sins. Henry used the concept of *plagas* after the biblical term in Genesis as the centrepiece of his historical writing.<sup>122</sup> Thus, the archdeacon developed a systematic way of explaining a thousand years of history. However, the Normans were castigated in the most vitriolic terms. God chose them to destroy the English people because of their unparalleled savagery.<sup>123</sup> David Bates noted that it was crucial to recognize that Henry was not writing about genocide or necessarily the physical slaughter of the English people. Bates saw that what was at stake in Henry's writing was ethnic denigration and the loss of the unique characteristics of the English *gens*.<sup>124</sup> Henry's work showed that deep divisions still existed in the 1150s between the Norman English and the indigenous English.

### *The Battle of the Standard*

Henry's work on the battle of the Standard is significant for several reasons. First, he was the first to use the phrase, '*Occupatio igitur rege circa partes australes Anglie*', which was copied by many later chroniclers.<sup>125</sup> Second, Henry admitted that he was not objective and was open about his changing opinion toward King Stephen. Finally, *Historia Anglorum* was one of the most influential texts of twelfth-century English historiography.<sup>126</sup> At least three other chroniclers copied his battle oration though not verbatim.<sup>127</sup>

This thesis shall show that the differences in the battle orations were

---

<sup>122</sup> HA, i, 4, pp. 14-15.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, vi, 37, pp. 402-03: '*Elegerat enim Deus Normannos ad Anglorum gentem exterminandam, quia prerogativa seuicie singularis omnibus populis uiderat eos preminere*'.

<sup>124</sup> Bates, *Normans and Empire*, p. 21.

<sup>125</sup> HA, x, 7, pp. 712-13.

<sup>126</sup> Davies, '(Review)' pp. 320-21.

<sup>127</sup> MP; RH; and RW.

significant because they also illustrate the degree of acculturation, or lack thereof, in England at this time. His oration began with the statement that the barons of England were not only of Norman descent, but also the best of the Normans. Perhaps Henry might be stating that the best of the *gens Normannorum* not only followed William to England, but settled north of the Humber as well. One explanation might be that they were not as involved in the internecine war between Stephen and Matilda that embarrassed and shamed many Norman English to the south. Henry continued that their ancestors were mighty warriors. One of the regions they conquered was '*ferax Anglia*'.<sup>128</sup> This phrase alone separated the Norman English from the English. Henry's spokesperson, Bishop Ralph, praised the descendants of the men who conquered England, which could not include the English contingent in the 'Southern' army. Henry wrote his sixth and final recension in December 1154, after King Henry II ascended the throne of England.<sup>129</sup> Thus, throughout the reigns of the last two Norman kings, Henry saw the Norman English and the English as two distinct *gentes*.

Henry was not objective. At the end of the battle of the Standard, he wrote '*Nostris uero minime sanguine fuso feliciter triumpharunt*'. Henry did not appear to have the mixed emotions about having a Norman English father and a presumed English mother that anguished William of Malmesbury. The basic premise of *Historia Anglorum* was that man was sinful and God punished him by having five invasions (*plagas*) to rid Britain/England of her sinners. God had Aethelred marry Emma so that evil would befall the ungodly English. Henry noted that through either the Danes or the Normans, God intended to exterminate the English people.<sup>130</sup> Henry's justification of the Danish and Norman attacks on the native population did not promote the idea

---

<sup>128</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714-15.

<sup>129</sup> Greenway, 'Introduction', p. lxxvi.

<sup>130</sup> HA, vi. 1. 338-39: '*Genti enim Anglorum, quam sceleribus suis exigentibus disternere proposuerat*' and *idem* x. 10, pp. 720-21.

of assimilation. *Historia Anglorum* was concerned with using a *gens* to destroy another *gens*, not to incorporate them into a new *gens*.

*Henry of Huntingdon and John Gillingham*

Gillingham claimed that Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum* was an effective tool for determining the date of assimilation between English and Norman English because it became a standard work in the Middle Ages. Gransden supported this argument, finding more than twenty-five medieval copies extant.<sup>131</sup> Gillingham used its authoritative nature to defend his use of 'Englishness', not only by quoting several modern authors, but also by examining Henry's title, *The History of the English People*.<sup>132</sup> Henry's work, according to Gillingham, was about the English people from the invasions of Julius Caesar to his own time. However, Gillingham's sleight of hand, which translated the *gens Anglorum* into 'Englishness', should be questioned. This was English history in national terms. Bede wrote of the *ecclesia* of the *gens Anglorum*, but Henry of Huntingdon wrote of the *Historia* (of the *gens*) *Anglorum*. Neither wrote, as Gillingham stated, of something approaching 'Englishness'. There is a fine distinction between the medieval notion of the *gens* and the modern notion of national sentiment.

***Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene***.<sup>133</sup> (732 to 1201) fl. 1172-1201/2

The rich parsonage of Howden was located 90 km southeast of Northallerton.

However Roger was in service to King Henry II and after Henry's death, to Hugh de Puiset, bishop of Durham. Roger wrote the *Chronica* during his time in Durham,

---

<sup>131</sup> Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 194.

<sup>132</sup> Gillingham, 'Henry', p. 125, n. 12.

<sup>133</sup> RH, Riley and RH, Stubbs.

which would be after 1189. The British Library manuscript Royal MS 14 Cii is the oldest manuscript, which contains the *Chronica* from the beginning after the death of

Bede to 1180 and then extends to 1201.<sup>134</sup> Stubbs, Holt and Corner have recognised Roger's distinctive cursive script.<sup>135</sup> Corner put the *terminus ad quem* at either 1201 or 1202.<sup>136</sup>

Riley, the editor of a nineteenth-century translation, surmised that Roger was born in Howden not York, taught theology, and might have been King Henry II's chaplain.<sup>137</sup> He went on crusade with King Richard I in 1191 and upon returning to England in 1192 commenced his *Chronica* from 732 to the present 1192. However, this thesis concentrates on the first half of the twelfth-century. Roger of Howden's chief sources until 1148 were *Historia post obitum Bede* that was extracted from *Historia Regum Anglorum* attributed to Symeon of Durham and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*. Since his entire description of the battle of the Standard was copied almost verbatim from the latter, this segment shall examine the few differences between Roger and Henry's descriptions of the battle. It shall determine if the fact that Roger wrote two generations after Henry had any bearing on their differences.

The dates of his floruit are significant because although Roger of Howden copied Henry of Huntingdon there were four noticeable differences of which two are considered significant. The two minor differences were in the sentence, '*Occupatio igitur*, Roger named Stephen the king of England whereas Henry just wrote 'the king'. Henry noted the battle was at Northallerton but Roger wrote that it was in '*Cutune mor*' at *Alvertun*.<sup>138</sup> Roger copied verbatim Henry's sentence, '*Tota namque gens Normannorum et Anglorum in una acie circum Standard conglobate*

---

<sup>134</sup> RH, Stubbs, 'Preface', i, p. lxxiv.

<sup>135</sup> <https://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/TourHistoryLatin.asp#HOVEDEN>.

<sup>136</sup> David Corner, 'The Earliest Surviving Manuscripts of Roger of Howden's *Chronica*', EHS, 98 (1983), p. 304.

<sup>137</sup> RH, Riley, 'Preface', p. iv.

<sup>138</sup> HA, x.7. pp. 712-13 and RH, Stubbs, i. p. 193.

*persistebant immobiles*'.<sup>139</sup> Later in this segment we will see that Roger of Wendover who copied Roger of Howden amended this sentence. The more significant differences were that Roger wrote of the '*equitum Anglorum*' whereas Henry wrote of '*nostri*' knights. Roger also wrote that '*Angli et Normanni*' were triumphant<sup>140</sup> but Henry wrote '*Nostri*' were triumphant<sup>141</sup> describing the winners of the battle of the Standard.

Perhaps these differences were influenced by the time and the state of the English kingdom at that time. When Henry wrote in 1140 there were still two distinct *gentes* that he wanted his readers to view as one nation. This is the basis of Gillingham thesis of assimilation by the 1140s. Roger wrote two generations later during a new dynasty with a king that was as much English as he was Norman. Henry used *nostri* (our) in both places in an effort to demonstrate that the 1140s were a very different era than the 1120s when he and William of Malmesbury began writing. This thesis accepts the idea that there was a degree of acculturation between the English and the Norman English at the battle of the Standard. However, Roger of Howden wrote that there were English horsemen (*equitum Anglorum*) but in the 1190s there still were *Angli et Normanni triumpherunt*. More than fifty years after the battle Roger of Howden differed with Henry of Huntingdon to state there were still two *gentes* that fought at the battle of the Standard. Henry might have been writing of a national victory but Roger still discerned two separate *gentes*.

This problem of differentiating between the English, the subjects of the king of England, and the English, the conquered *gens*, shall be the most confusing problem in this thesis. In this segment we have seen that Roger quite clearly demonstrated that *equitum Anglorum* had to be a nationality because the only forces in the 'Southern'

---

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., p. 195.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid.

<sup>141</sup> HA, x. 10, p. 718.

army with horses were the Norman English barons. He wrote *Angli et Normanni triumphaverunt* to demonstrate that a chronicler in the 1190s still viewed two unassimilated *gentes* at the battle.

***Rogeri de Wendover Chronica sive Flores Historiarum (Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History Comprising the History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A. D. 1235)***

Roger of Wendover was a Benedictine cleric at St Albans, which lay 330 km south of Northallerton. There are two manuscripts, one a thirteenth-century MS. No. CCVII of the Douce collection in the Bodleian Library, and the second a fourteenth-century Otho B. V. among the Cotton collection at the British Museum, which was damaged in an eighteenth-century fire.<sup>142</sup> Gransden stated that little is known about Roger, and that he might have begun writing as late as 1231 and died in 1234.<sup>143</sup> His sources of information included Robert de Torigni, Ralph Coggeshall, and Henry of Huntingdon for the first half of the twelfth century, Diceto to 1202, and then some lost annals. He also copied from Roger of Howden by beginning each entry with the location where the king spent Christmas. He also used Bede's *History of the Abbots of Wearmouth, Historia Dunelmenis Ecclesiae*, and *Liber Eliensis*.<sup>144</sup>

The central idea of this thesis is the use of the battle of the Standard as a benchmark for assimilation. Therefore this segment shall concentrate on Roger of Wendover, the battle, and his primary source for his account of this battle: Henry of Huntingdon. Roger copied Henry but with slightly different wording. For example Henry wrote: '*Occupato igitur rege circa partes australes Anglie*'<sup>145</sup> and Roger copied: '*Occupato itaque rege Stephano circa australes Angliae.*'<sup>146</sup> Henry did not mention

---

<sup>142</sup> RH, Howlett, 'Preface', p. viii.

<sup>143</sup> Gransden, *History Writing*, p. 359.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 262, p. 326 n. 51, p. 363, p. 363, n. 52, and p. 374, n. 145, n. 146, and n. 147.

<sup>145</sup> HA, x. 7, p. 712.

<sup>146</sup> RW, Howlett, ii. p. 222.

Stephen by name but Roger did.<sup>147</sup> Henry wrote that the king was in the southern parts of England, but Roger wrote that Stephen was in southern England.<sup>148</sup> Henry wrote that the Scottish army: '*promouit in Angliam*'; but Roger wrote: '*in Northanhumbriam promouit*'.<sup>149</sup> Perhaps to Henry, Northumbria was a part of England, yet a century later Roger saw a province or he might have been more specific. Or, did Roger perceive as Stringer did that there was a Scotto-Northumbrian identity? Roger and Henry named the same northern barons: William, Count of Albemarle, William of Nottingham, Walter Espec and Ilbert de Lasci. The difference was that Roger named them before the battle and Henry named the same leaders after the battle. Roger had Henry's information of the combatants and wanted to emphasise the victors' importance.

Roger copied the speech, which Henry of Huntingdon wrote for Bishop Ralph verbatim, except he omitted four sentences or phrases. Roger excluded the following: '*In quibus quidem nulla uel rei militaris scientia, uel preliandi peritia, uel moderandi gratia*'. Roger omitted Henry's platitude to the military abilities of a no longer existent *gens*: '*Et archipresulis uestri loco situs*'; '*Quod iustissimum sue dispositionis arbitrium per manus uestras hodie perficiet Deus*'; and '*Neque uos temeritas eorum moueat, cum illos tot nostre uirtutis insignia non deterreant*'.<sup>150</sup> Roger's omissions subtly remind the careful reader that Henry wrote in the 1150s when the Norman English were the dominant force in England and Roger wrote that the acculturation of the two *gentes*, the Norman English and the English, was a much more accomplished fact.

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., '*partes australes Angliae*'.

<sup>149</sup> HA, x. 7, pp. 712 and RW, Hewlett, ii, p. 222.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., p. 223.



Henry had Ralph introduce the idea that the Normans should remember their reputation and their origins as fierce warriors who conquered many lands including England. Roger had to accept the fact that by the thirteenth century the *gens Normannorum* did not exist in the form it did in 1138. Roger of Wendover, writing about one hundred years after Henry of Huntingdon, copied much of *Historia Anglorum* verbatim. But he did not copy the line Gillingham chose for assimilation, *gens Normannorum et Anglorum*; Roger wrote '*gens Anglorum et decus Normannorum*'.<sup>151</sup> Writing in the thirteenth century, he made two significant changes; he listed the only *gens* still in existence, the *Anglorum*, first but he called the other, '*decus Normannorum*', the 'glory of the Normans'.

When Roger of Wendover wrote in the thirteenth century, the *gens Normannorum* had ceased to exist. The Angevins conquered the duchy of Normandy by 1144 and the Norman dynasty in England ended in 1154. There were still descendants of the Norman English in England at this time but their identification was much more English than Norman. The Norman English acculturated into England well after the battle of the Standard. The differences between Henry of Huntingdon's writing and that of Roger of Wendover, illustrated the demise of the Normans.

### **Matthew Paris *Chronica Majora*. fl. 1235-73**

Matthew Paris was a Benedictine monk at St Albans, which lay 330 km south of Northallerton. He was a prolific writer.<sup>152</sup> Rigg claimed that he might have been the greatest and arguably the most entertaining of English medieval chroniclers.<sup>153</sup> His *Chronica* continued the work of Roger of Wendover. Corpus Christi College,

---

<sup>151</sup> HA, x. 8, pp. 714 and RW, Hewlett, ii, p.223.

<sup>152</sup> 'Preface', p. ix and Björn Weiler, 'Matthew Paris on the Writing of History', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), p. 254.

<sup>153</sup> Rigg, *Anglo-Latin*, p. 198.

Cambridge University has a copy of the *Chronica*, MS. 26 dating from 1240-53.<sup>154</sup>

There is also a complete manuscript in the British Library, Royal MS 14 C VII, ff 8v-156 v dating from 1250-55.<sup>155</sup> Another copy of the *Chronica* dating to the late thirteenth or fourteenth date also survives in the British Library, Cotton MS, Nero D V.<sup>156</sup> Powicke noted that Matthew Paris might have started writing as early as 1213 but did not use Roger as a source for information before 1189.<sup>157</sup>

Matthew Paris followed Roger of Wendover closely in *Chronica Majora* until 1234, which is well past the area of information from this thesis. He obtained information from other sources which including documents and charters. Gransden found that Matthew Paris's critical powers were less remarkable than his almost unlimited curiosity and his wide range of interests.<sup>158</sup> Matthew Paris borrowed from many earlier writers and added his own details on England before and after 1066. William of Malmesbury had shown an interest in architecture, describing churches from personal observation.

Henry of Huntingdon had added the practice of summarising people's characters. From both Roger of Howden and Roger of Wendover, Matthew might have inherited the annalistic style of recording where the king held Christmas. He could possibly have adopted information from Benedict of Peterborough. Gransden praised Matthew for adding details about art, architecture, heraldry, and natural history. Matthew of Paris showed a zeal for accumulating data, which might be why he became such a well-known historian.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> <http://manuscriptminiatures.com/4454/8413/>.

<sup>155</sup> [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal\\_MS\\_14\\_C\\_VII](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_14_C_VII).

<sup>156</sup> [http://searcharchives.bl.ok/ptimo\\_library/libweb/action/diDisplay.do?docid+1AMS040-001102726&vid=IAMS\\_VU2](http://searcharchives.bl.ok/ptimo_library/libweb/action/diDisplay.do?docid+1AMS040-001102726&vid=IAMS_VU2).

<sup>157</sup> F. M. Powicke, 'Notes of the Compilation of the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris', *Modern Philology*, 38 (1941), p. 306.

<sup>158</sup> Gransden, *History Writing*, pp. 359-61.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 362-65.

## **Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover**

Roger of Wendover influenced Matthew's criticism of the king, the government, the pope, and any ecclesiastic who interfered with established privilege. When Matthew took over Roger's chronicle in 1236, he elaborated his views to increase the dramatic effect and to underline the political invective in Roger's work. However, only three of the approximately 3500 printed pages that constituted the *Chronica Majora* are relevant to this thesis.<sup>160</sup> Matthew of Paris relied on Roger of Wendover, who relied on Roger of Howden, who had copied Henry of Huntingdon, account of the battle of the Standard.

It is ironic that someone who attempted to be such a rebel politically should follow the writings of Henry of Huntingdon, Roger of Howden, and Roger of Wendover so religiously on the battle of the Standard. It might be that Matthew viewed the battle of the Standard as so insignificant to the history of England specifically and *Chronica Majora* in general that it was not worth original effort or an original conclusion. This hypothesis presents the thesis with the following argument. The battle of the Standard and 'The Anarchy' were insignificant events in the long narration of British and English history. However, Matthew Paris and the other six chroniclers who devoted no more than three sentences to the battle all share the same piece of evidence: the Norman English and the English fought as an integrated unity during the battle. In addition to this point, these sources all agree that unified forces of the Norman English and the English did not pursue the Scots after the battle, but they immediately disbanded. All seven chroniclers listed in Part Two supported the case that there was acculturation but no assimilation in 1138.

---

<sup>160</sup> Weller, 'Matthew Paris', p. 255.

### *Proceres Angliae*

The style of Bishop Ralph's speech was examined in the segment 'Battle Orations' in Chapter Two. This chapter is about medieval sources, and the differences between the four renditions of Bishop Ralph's speech are worthy of attention but are not germane to this thesis. This speech, written by Henry of Huntingdon and then copied by Roger of Howden, Roger of Wendover, and Matthew Paris, coupled with Walter Espec's speech in *Relatio*, is critical to the central idea of this thesis that there was no assimilation between the Norman English and the English in 1138. First, and most important, each speech was written well after the battle. Henry of Huntingdon's last rendition was in 1154. Ailred wrote shortly thereafter in 1155-57. Roger of Howden wrote during the reign of King Richard I (1189-99), while Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris wrote towards the beginning and the end of King Henry III's reign respectively (1216-1272). Thus, in a period from sixteen years after the battle (Henry of Huntingdon) to over one hundred and ten years after the battle (Matthew Paris), five writers categorically divided the glory and the martial abilities of the Normans from the ferocious (*ferax*) England (or English) that they conquered. There was no assimilation of the two *gentes*. As noted in Roger of Wendover, Matthew of Paris also substituted *decus* for *gens* as the Normans (English) and English rallied around the standard.

Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris, copying Roger of Howden's imitation of Henry of Huntingdon, created a confusing situation. They both copied Bishop Ralph's speech but ignored the entire section on the Norman's martial abilities and defensive armament. Then they use the term *decus*. On the one hand, in the speech, they accepted Norman military superiority yet eliminate its concrete examples, on the other hand, they wrote of the glory (*decus*) of the Normans. In Ralph's speech, the

Normans were very much a *gens*, yet, in the battle, they were a memory. The final disposition of the Norman English is beyond the scope of this thesis, which used the battle of the Standard (1138) as a benchmark.

***Incipit Descriptio Serlonis Monachi, fratris Radulphi, Abbatis de Parcho, de bello inter Regem Scotiae et Barones Angliae fl. 1139-40***

The title states that Serlo was a brother of the abbot of Louth Park in Lincolnshire on the southeastern border of Yorkshire.<sup>161</sup> Louth Park was a daughter house of Fountains abbey. However, A. J. Rigg and Derek Baker have argued that Serlo of Louth Park is not to be confused with another contemporary author, Serlo of Fountains.<sup>162</sup> Serlo used rhythmical trochaic septenarii for his poem on the battle of the Standard. This is the only trochaic meter used for dialogue in Latin plays. The poem also cites biblical and classical sources and thereby created such contradictory images that this may be the reason that no modern poet or writer has published a translation of it.<sup>163</sup> The trochaic septenarii was the favourite metre of Plautus, who has been criticised as teaching indifference to the gods, which in the Roman Republic was more akin to a state religion intensifying patriotism than a mystic veneration of a deity.<sup>164</sup> This was an unusual role model for a twelfth century monk in northern England. It might demonstrate that Serlo was highly educated. The introduction of Plautus and the trochaic septenarii metre might also show that Serlo's poem was very different than the other sources in this chapter.

According to Serlo, the combatants at the battle of the Standard were the king

---

<sup>161</sup> Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of Latin writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Turnhout, BE: Brepolis, 1997), p. 604.

<sup>162</sup> Rigg, *Anglo-Norman*, p. 53 and <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25101>, accessed 11 Dec 2016.

<sup>163</sup> James Halporn, Martin Ostwald, and Thomas Rosenmeyer, *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963), p. 77.

<sup>164</sup> Hazel Tolliver, 'Plautus and the State of Gods in Rome', *The Classical Journal*, 48 (1952), p. 49.

of Scotland and the barons of England. In the title of the poem, Serlo indicated that he was writing about two national forces and not about *gentes*. The only *gentes* he mentioned were the *Scotti* and the *Gawadenses* and both derogatorily. This poem was about a clash of nations and their territorial sovereignty. Serlo noted that misfortune became David's when he crossed the Tees (*Tysam contra suum transit infortunium*). Serlo emphasised the national integrity of England. In the next line of the poem, he wrote that David barely escaped.

Serlo showed his awareness for the name of the battle by using the word *standardius* four times in the poem. It was always employed as the last word of a line, giving extra emphasis. Yet the same word in Latin could have different meanings in translation. The first usage of the word was, '*Quem invadit vix evasit Stephani standardium*'. This was the abovementioned David barely escaping the standard of Stephen. The standard was an emblem of the English army and its king. Serlo told his readers the reason David barely escaped: '*Ex adverso namque situs belliger standardius*', the warrior standard opposed David, which could be a double entendre. Either Serlo was reporting that the 'Southern' army had a standard or the 'Southern' army had a warlike demeanour. This beginning to the poem demonstrated that Serlo was different than the other sources on several levels and he demanded to be read carefully. In the middle of the poem again, after noting that one hundred English triumphed over tens of thousands, Serlo wrote that in our time '*Triumphalis protestatur Anglorum standardius*'.<sup>165</sup> This two-line sentence tells us that the poem was almost contemporaneous to the battle and that it was a triumphant English standard. The fourth and final mention of the standard is near the end of the poem immediately after the Scottish wives prohibit their men to fight again, '*Maloht patric*'

---

<sup>165</sup> Dialogi, Serlo, p. 75.

*imprecantes Anglis et standardio*’, bringing a curse upon the English and their standard.<sup>166</sup> Serlo’s four interpretations of the word *standardius* were different than all the other medievals. He might have been the first writer of the battle (*nostris...liquido temporibus*) and gave the battle its name.

Serlo combined Leviticus with Book Five of the Aeneid (Dares and Entellus), which demonstrated knowledge of the Hebrew bible and Virgil’s classical work of the early Roman Empire. He also wrote of the Books of Maccabees (164 BC- 63 BC) and of the ‘leo Parthicus’, the ‘Lion of Parthia’, the Emperor Lucius Verus (AD 165).<sup>167</sup> Yet, he eschewed the common chorus that the standard had religious significance along with the banners of the saints and the pyx.

He never mentioned Thurstan, archbishop of York and the leader of the religious and perhaps secular forces opposing David.<sup>168</sup> Thus Serlo, a Cistercian monk, had what might be considered the most contemporaneous and nationalistic source for this thesis. He also explained the battle through an insightful knowledge of biblical and classical references. This demonstrated that not only did he have access to a large library of works but also that he read many of them. He exonerated David, ‘*David ille manu fortis sceptrum tenens Scotticum*,’<sup>169</sup> condemned the Scots and the Galwegians, barely mentioned the barons of England and ignored Thurstan. This was a very different interpretation of the battle than the other sources in this thesis. Modern historians, perhaps with the exception of A. G. Rigg, have overlooked this alternative source of the battle of the Standard.

---

<sup>166</sup> Ibid., p. 76.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>168</sup> Rigg, *Anglo-Latin*, p. 53.

<sup>169</sup> This is a word play. David means strong hand ‘*manu fortis*’.

**William of Malmesbury (*Gesta regum Anglorum*, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*, and *Historia Novella*) fl. 1120s-41.**

William of Malmesbury has been considered the greatest English historian between Bede and Macaulay.<sup>170</sup> His modern biographer, Rodney Thomson, considered him the greatest historian of twelfth-century Europe and an extraordinary classicist.<sup>171</sup> His writing on the battle of the Standard is noted by its absence. The reasons why William did not write about the battle when so many other authors did is worthy of consideration. William's final years were spent recording and analysing secular events unfolding before him.<sup>172</sup> William had reservations about writing contemporary history but might have felt compelled to finish the project. His goal was to have the English history of England in the same work as the Norman history of England. By calling his work *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, *Deeds of the Kings of England*, William of Malmesbury attempted to show a continuum from 449 to 1125, downplaying the divisions caused by the events of 1066. He then added *Historia Novella* to record the events until shortly before his death in 1142.

While William of Malmesbury has been lauded as a historian, he did ignore well-known and established facts.<sup>173</sup> William of Malmesbury desired to see his favourite, Robert, earl of Gloucester, on the throne of England. Unfortunately, the earl's illegitimacy prevented this. William sided with the earl's legitimate half-sister, the Empress Matilda, but he still dedicated *Historia Novella* to Robert. An example of his omission of facts involved not Robert, Earl of Gloucester but the earl's uncle, David, King of the Scots. William wrote, in 1135, that King Stephen hastened to

---

<sup>170</sup> Rodney M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 5.

<sup>171</sup> Rodney M. Thomson, 'William of Malmesbury and the Latin Classics Revisited', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. by Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge and J. N. Adams (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 383.

<sup>172</sup> Sigbørn Olsen Sønnesyn, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), p. 2.

<sup>173</sup> Sverre Bagge, 'Ethics, Politics and Providence in William of Malmesbury's *Historia Novella*', *Viator*, 41 (2010), p. 130.



Northumbria to meet a Scottish incursion led by King David. In an unexpected turn of *Fortuna*, William of Malmesbury praised the ability of King Stephen to obtain ‘what he wanted from him’ because David was meek and old.<sup>174</sup> Thus the usurper had outfoxed an old man who had been the first layman to swear the oath for his niece Matilda, just ahead of Stephen himself. This is the same David whom William of Malmesbury honoured with the first letter in his revised *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. William of Malmesbury noted how King Stephen had intimidated an old man into a written submission in 1135. Yet, in 1138 when this same old, enfeebled king of the Scots led an army of invasion deeper into Northumbria than any previous northern invasion and threatened England with destruction, William was not only uncharacteristically quiet, he was mute.

William of Malmesbury created ‘barbarians’ out of God-fearing Christians to differentiate the Celtic-speaking ‘barbarian’ hordes from the English and Normans in the kingdom of England. Although the Celtic-speaking peoples were Christians, he began to observe them as barbarians.<sup>175</sup> Gillingham viewed William as the agent who began the process of English imperialism, or detaching and differentiating the Norman English from the other *gentes* of the British Isles. There are several explanations for this growing detachment and feeling of superiority. Gillingham has suggested it was a growing awareness of ‘Englishness’, that sixty years after the Conquest, in a nation at peace, the English and the Normans were becoming one *gens*.<sup>176</sup>

However, the exact opposite may have been just as true. G. W. S. Barrow argued that at this time the English were less assured of their identity than at any time

---

<sup>174</sup> William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella: The Contemporary History*, ed. by Edmund King and K. R. Potter (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), pp. 30-31.

<sup>175</sup> Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 100.

<sup>176</sup> Gillingham, ‘Imperialism’, pp. 8-9.

---

in their history.<sup>177</sup> It is possible that during this period of identity confusion, William and others developed a superiority complex. According to Alfred Adler, who coined the term, this is a psychological defense mechanism, which conceals the person's true feelings of inferiority.<sup>178</sup> In the 1120s there were still vast cultural, linguistic, class and legal differences between most English and Normans. William of Malmesbury might have been jealous that he perceived that the Welsh, Irish and Scots had more cohesive cultural identities than the amalgamation of English and Norman English in 1120s England. This thesis shall conclude that William of Malmesbury's actions were based upon a psychological fear that the English and the Normans were still two unique *gentes* while the other *gentes* of the British Isles appeared to William to be more homogeneous.

I have not found a plausible reason why William of Malmesbury ignored the battle of the Standard. Perhaps, he wanted all the glory in *Historia Novella* to shine upon Robert, earl of Gloucester. Perhaps, he did not want to remind his readers that on his mother's side, David was a direct descendant of the house of Wessex and might be conceived to have a more legitimate claim to the throne than either Stephen or Matilda. The fact remains that William of Malmesbury, a great historian, ignored a battle between the *gentes* of the kingdom of England and a Celtic-speaking kingdom in the British Isles.

### **Conclusion to Major Sources**

Medieval chroniclers and modern historians used Richard of Hexham as the source for the twenty-six thousand strong Scottish army, the destruction of Northumbria and

---

<sup>177</sup> Barrow, *Anglo-Norman Era*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>178</sup> *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler - A Systematic Presentation in Selections from his Writings*, ed. by Heinz L. Ansbacher, and Rowena R. Ansbacher (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1956), p. 259.

the fact that the Scottish army's crossing the river Tees was a significant incursion into the kingdom of England. Although Archbishop Thurstan urged the barons not to be cowered by utter savages, Richard of Hexham never wrote of an attempt to assimilate the barons and the peasants within the 'Southern' army. Another influential source was Ailred. He wrote to protect the reputation of King David, which had been damaged by Henry of Huntingdon. He wrote for a Cistercian audience, with his emphasis on the religious characteristics of the battle, which he embellished. The complexities, the conflicted loyalties, and the personal anguish demonstrated a very human abbot who had little interest in assimilation.

This thesis shall accept Gillingham's argument that the phrase *gens Normannorum et Anglorum* found in Henry of Huntingdon confirmed that the northern barons perceived themselves as 'Englishmen' but it shall also use the same phrase to disagree with his argument that the English and the Norman English had assimilated. Henry of Huntingdon wrote as an English propagandist who never disclosed that many of the southern barons sided with the Empress Matilda, that she was King David's niece, nor the oath all barons swore to support Matilda. According to Glidden, Henry therefore focused on the Scottish atrocities in an attempt to ignore the oath. Some historians depicted Henry of Huntingdon as a mere compiler of facts but perhaps he was cleverer than they gave him credit. His speech by Bishop Ralph showed a strong commitment to Norman identity but his reference to 'our' victory in his version of *Historia Anglorum* in 1140 reflected growing acculturation between the Norman English and the English.

Chapter Three was a compilation of over twenty different chronicle and annals that noted there was a battle of the Standard. There were several goals in this chapter. First, I wanted to show how widespread was the dissemination of information on this

battle. The north of England, the south of England, and four other polities reported on the event. It was noted that Richard of Hexham, Henry of Huntingdon, and Ailred of Rievaulx were the source of the information for other medieval chroniclers and annalists. The absence of William of Malmesbury as a commentator on the battle was also noteworthy. It was demonstrated that the works of Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris show that the Normans were no longer an entity in the thirteenth century. Furthermore, the chapter shows the animosity between the Scottish and English nationalities might have been manufactured, but there was also distrust between the different *gentes* of the Scottish army. These chroniclers had biases and weaknesses that transcend time. Finally, the central idea of this thesis finds support in the contemporary sources: namely, that there was a lack assimilation between the English and the Norman English at the time of the battle of the Standard.

## THE CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis is to establish that the Norman English and the English did not assimilate by 22<sup>nd</sup> October 1138. Rather than using one conspicuous source to support this premise, I chose to give many examples that consistently demonstrate this view. The goal is to show that many events contributed to this outcome. For example, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, iii. includes many charters that used the phrase ‘*Franci et Angli*’ denoting separate identities, and the date of the charter is noted. There are two hundred and seventy-five (275) examples. The ‘Gillingham Thesis’ might say that the two *gentes* were assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century but the warring governments of King Stephen and the Empress Matilda suggest otherwise. Over thirty percent of the charters which distinguish *Franci et Angli* were issued by the Empress or her son, Duke Henry, the future king, Henry II. Stephen did not have full control of the kingdom of England during ‘The Anarchy’, and if the government was not united, one could not expect the *gentes* to be united either.

The Introduction is divided into two separate parts. The first part observes the ‘Migratory period’ of the Late Classical and early medieval era. The Classical definition of the barbarian, beginning with the Greeks, was they were ‘not one of us’, an outsider, which changed from an objective assessment to a pejorative one, as discussed in Chapter Three. The Introduction presented the idea that the four traditional characteristics of a *gens* -- origins, mores, language, and law -- were fluid. Not only were the *gentes* fluid in this era but also an individual could have the characteristics of many *gentes* at the same time. In twelfth-century England, William of Malmesbury proclaimed that the blood of

two nations ran through his veins. Initially he cursed the Normans that had oppressed his people but within two decades he thought of himself as part of this *gens*. By the third version of *Historia Anglorum*, Henry of Huntingdon, another chronicler with Norman father and English mother was claiming that the battle of the Standard was ‘our’ victory. These chroniclers had demonstrated the fluidity in individuals who could change their identity and their perspective on who they were in less than twenty years. This might have been the basis for the ‘Gillingham Thesis’ that the Norman English and the English were assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century

The other significant idea that came from the first part of the introduction was the relationship between the *gens*, the *exercitus* (the army), and the *regnum* (the military kings), which created a triad of identity. In 1138 Thurstan manufactured this triad. The *regnum* was the kingdom of England, the *exercitus* was the ‘Southern’ army, and the *gens*, was all the warriors that fought against the invaders. The archbishop created a triad of necessity that dissipated as soon as the battle was won and the threat was gone.

The second half of the Introduction defined the terms acculturation and assimilation. Acculturation is the adaptation of two or more *gentes* to facilitate interactions, such as the ability to communicate, acceptance of religions, and mores. That the northern barons and the Yorkshire fyrd fought well together at the battle of the Standard is an example of acculturation. They listened to the same commanders and took orders in the same language. However, after the battle they separated according to their socio- economic levels. This was not assimilation. Assimilation is the complete loss of separate identities with the creation of a third culture, which is the merger of two or more cultures. It is the complete conformity and elimination of differences between two or more *gentes*.

There are three possible alternatives for the assimilation of two *gentes* in a conquest scenario: the first is that the conquering *gens* imposes its will over the other which disappears; the second is that the overwhelming numbers of the conquered *gens* absorbed the minority of conquerors, who eventually lost their identity. The final option is that the two *gentes* fuse their institutions, languages, religions, customs, and laws and develop a unique third *gens* with its own characteristics. This thesis did not find any of these options occurred between the English and Norman English *gentes* of England before 1138.

Chapter One reviewed the history of Norman English and English interaction before the battle of the Standard. King William seemed uncertain whether he would rule England as a separate kingdom or an annexation of the Duchy of Normandy. He wanted to rule England peacefully but he was beholden to the men who conquered England and those that secured Normandy during this period. His only reward to these men was land, much of which came from the estates of the destroyed English nobility. The men who fought with William at Hastings were members of a military caste. The generations subsequently born in England became an aristocratic class of rural landowners. Many members of this new Norman English aristocracy held land in both Normandy and England. Henry I created many changes for his self-preservation in his war with his brother, the Duke of Normandy. King Henry brought in many 'New Men' who were loyal to him not his father. He secured Scotland and the Welsh Marches with judicious intermarriages of his 'New Men' with the established aristocracy. His Norman English chroniclers created an ethnic barrier between the Celtic-speaking *gentes* of the British Isles and Henry's Norman and English subjects. Unfortunately, all Henry's plans were



for naught when his only legitimate male heir drowned. Upon his death, the refusal of the aristocracy to accept a female ruler created the twenty-year chaos of 'The Anarchy'.

The concept of England, which had been developed well before the Conquest, transcended ethnicity and remained well established with the conquerors. Initially the English felt excluded from most positions of power in the government, the aristocracy, and the Church by foreigners, which created hatred on both sides. The almost total destruction of the Old English aristocracy not only reduced further hostility but it also facilitated acculturation. The small number of Norman English immigrants resulted in the triumph of the subjugated culture over that of the conquerors. This success was due to the fact that the Norman English found English customs, local saints, relics, and language filled a void in their own military-based heritage. As a generation of warriors produced a second and third generation of landowners who interacted with their local English maids, servants, serfs, and lower clergy on a daily basis, English customs were more necessary than Norman feats of arms. A conquered people were able to do the nearly impossible. Not only did the English keep the richness of their culture, the reverence for their native saints, and their language, but they also made their way of life so appealing that their conquerors wished to emulate it. The Green Tree Prophecy, written in 1065, still portrayed a miserable reflection of the status of the English in 1125. It was gloriously rewritten in the 1150s by Ailred of Rievaulx and personified the accession of Henry of Anjou to the throne of England. Some nineteenth-century Yorkshire historians agreed and stated that the beginning of the Angevin dynasty was a happier time for the English than it was under the Norman dynasty.

The 'Gillingham Thesis' stated that the Norman English and the English

assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. This thesis noted that assimilation might have political and cultural connotations. Politically, the Norman English perceived themselves as subjects of the kingdom of England rather than the duchy of Normandy. Culturally, these men and women were disassociating themselves from their motherland across the channel and accepting the English language, saints, and mores. Lastly, the Gillingham Thesis could be viewed both ways. He stated that in the third recension of *Historia Anglorum* (c. 1140) Henry wrote 'our victory' indicating that the Norman rulers and English subjects assimilated into one *gens*. However, Gillingham then contradicted himself stating that the victory was due either to the accomplishments of the northern barons or the English archers. This thesis shall demonstrate both *gentes* contributed to the victory at the battle of the Standard in distinctly different ways. I would argue that John Gillingham was trying to do too much with too little evidence. His sharp distinction between the northern barons and the English archers strengthens the central idea of this thesis that assimilation did not happen by 1138. This thesis continues that the date was premature, arguing that there was a degree of acculturation - involving language, customs, and the appreciation of English religious relics - but not assimilation. The composition of the armies at the battle of the Standard supports this claim.

The kingdom of England was the dominant state in twelfth-century British Isles. Much of medieval English history might be viewed as the conquest and forced Anglicisation of the Celtic-speaking *gentes*. English imperialism was a two-edged sword. Although there might have been reasons for English imperialism, this thesis shall concentrate on the effects of the ion of a barbarian versus civilized societies argument within the kingdom. William of Malmesbury attempted - to create the

impression that Christians could be barbarians. His goal was to use this fear of the outsider - that all *gentes* outside the kingdom of England were barbarian and dangerous - to create the Norman English and English into a single *gens*. This thesis gives many examples after William stopped writing, that the Norman English and English were still two distinct *gentes*.

Medieval and modern historians had problems differentiating between *gens* and *natio*. Much of the confusion concerning the descriptions of the battle of the Standard stem from the writings of Henry of Huntingdon and Ailred of Rievaulx. The terms English and Normans in the description of the battle of the Standard were a confusing mixture of racial and national terminology. Henry of Huntingdon had Bishop Ralph address the Norman nobles of England, all the people of England saying 'Amen' and King David listing his English and Norman subjects as separate people. Ailred had Walter Espec addressing a Norman audience, Robert de Brus complaining that David was opposing the English and Normans, and speaking of an army of the English. Dr Hugh Thomas called the inconsistencies a mess. A clearer and more assertive explanation can be given. Henry of Huntingdon did not have Ralph address the Norman nobles of England; the bishop was addressing English nobles of Norman heritage who called themselves English. Ailred's speech by Walter Espec had the same audience. Robert de Brus addressed the issue of *gentes* but Ailred's English army was a national not a racial army. Perhaps Henry and Ailred were intentionally confusing to draw attention to the fact that members of the English and Norman *gentes* fought on both sides during the battle of the Standard. This corroborates the central idea of this thesis.

Chapter One explained that although the English stubbornly opposed assimilation,

they understood that a kingdom needed a king and they accepted a foreign king. The Norman English dominated their institutions: the monarchy, the aristocracy, the Church, and the laws. Gradually through intermarriage and the Norman English acceptance of English mores, saints, and language the indigenous English preserved more of their pre-Conquest culture. Eventually the strength of 'Englishness' and the sheer number of the conquered English demonstrated that Freeman's chauvinistic statement, 'At home, *Englishmen were* neither driven out nor *turned into Normans*, but *the Normans in England were turned into Englishmen*' has merit.<sup>736</sup>

After debating King David's motives for attacking another sovereign state, Chapter Two examined the battle of the Standard. By 1138, the Normans of Northumbria were comfortable calling themselves English. The land was immutable but perception of the fluidity of the artificial barriers called borders was well established by the Middle Ages. Noble families were rooted in the border region by intermarriage with Englishmen of Lothian, Scotia and Northumbria. They were also comfortable in their affiliation with King David, an honoured member of King Henry I's court and the largest landowner in England. Thus, there was a degree of acculturation.

The kingdom of Scotland was not a rogue state that sent incursions into English territory for booty but the battle of the Standard was a struggle for sovereignty. David built up a network of contacts in northern England, and his efforts to reorganise the church in Scotland brought him into contact with bishops, abbots, and lay aristocrats. Geographically the north was closer to the court of David than to Stephen's. David challenged English authority, promoted Norman English influence in Scotland and

---

<sup>736</sup> Freeman, *Short History*, p. 5.

developed expansionist desires for the Kingdom of Scotland. The Scottish army, which marched into England, included a small cadre of English and Norman knights loyal to King David and Scottish soldiers many of whom were motivated by desire for booty. The 'Southern' army was made up of Norman English barons, from Northumbria and a small contingent from south of Northumbria, levied Englishmen, and Flemish mercenaries. As in most cases of non-cohesive organisations, there was a great deal of dissension and distrust. Distrust was the one thing the two armies did have in common.

The site of the battle of the Standard at Northallerton in northern Yorkshire might have marked the southern limits of sympathies with Scotland. The northern barons acted out of self-preservation. They may have known David better than Stephen and felt more in the ambit of the Scottish royal house than the English, but they were aware that it was more politically expedient for them to ally with Stephen for two important reasons. First, the English kingdom was wealthier and more powerful. Second, they may have perceived David as an efficient administrator who would have controlled their affairs to a greater extent than the distant king of England. For Ailred, the battle was not about military actions but a personal interaction between prominent individuals who were comfortable in both kingdoms. Although Thurstan, archbishop of York, carefully choreographed religious symbols to convey the impression that the southern army was fighting for God was a clever morale booster, this battle was fundamentally about power, not *gens*, or religion, or civilisation.

This thesis is concerned with the perception of twelfth-century chroniclers and modern historians regarding the interaction of various segments of the 'Southern' army.

As King David's vast army invaded Northumbria in late summer, Henry of Huntingdon explicitly reported that the northern barons opposed the invasion. There was no mention of the lower ranks, which had no Norman descendants, who formed the bulk of the army. This thesis focused on the role of English and Norman English in the battle. It was also concerned with whether or not the grouping of levied Englishmen and Norman English barons created assimilation between two *gentes*. Certainly the archers and the steel-clad knights fought well together, but that in and of itself did not create assimilation.

Furthermore, a great many Norman barons, although unnamed, fought for David. Finally, the most telling argument against assimilation was the cavalry charge of Earl Henry. When his remaining forces removed their insignias containing the St. Andrew's cross, they were indistinguishable from the Norman English knights they had just fought. The knights on both sides had more in common with each other than they had with either the levied Englishmen or the unarmoured Scots. The socio-economic differences between the barons and the peasants were more significant than the acculturation of the Norman barons and Yorkshire fyrd. This indicated that the Norman English and the English did not assimilate in 1138.

Chapter Three began with an observation of the minor medieval sources on the battle of the Standard. They recorded that the battle was between two different types of combatants. Several noted that the subjects of two countries, the English and the Scots fought at Northallerton, whereas others wrote that King David I of Scotland and either Archbishop Thurstan of York or the leading baron of the north, William le Gros, earl of Albemarle led the armies. Many of the English sources listed the number of Scottish army killed. They consistently used ten, eleven or twelve thousand dead as their figure.

The two Scottish sources did not mention the outcome of the battle. Many of the sources were too limited to observe the racial composition of the 'Southern' army. These sources were included to provide a detailed study of the battle as a historical benchmark.

Whether they were regular or secular clerics, in England or in Scotland, all of the writers who addressed the Battle of the Standard observed the national composition of the two armies. Many annals simply record that the English fought the Scots. Others record the number of Scottish casualties or the fact that the English won. Only Ailred called the English army the 'Southern' army. The entries on the battle of the Standard ranged from less than a sentence to several thousand words. None of the entries viewed the battle of the Standard as a significant milestone in English and Norman assimilation.

The three main medieval sources were the chronicles of Richard, prior of Ham, Ailred, abbot of Rievaulx, and Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon. Richard was the source of the battle for John, prior of Hexham. Ailred was the source for many modern historians. Henry was the source for Roger of Wendover, Roger of Howden, and Matthew of Paris all of whom copied parts of his work verbatim. These primary sources showed that medieval chroniclers could present different perceptions of the same event due to their proximity to the battle and their biases.

Richard's priory of Hexham was in northern Northumbria. Richard's primary purpose was to demonstrate that the 'Southern' army won because of the Northumbrian saints and that God was on their side. Richard admitted that there were charters drawn up between certain abbeys and the invading army. King David and Earl Henry guaranteed to the priory at Hexham, its brethren, and all belonging to it safety from hostilities, which he confirmed by charter. The bloody internecine aftermath to the battle confirmed

that David might have had control while invading but lost all control during the desperate attempt to evade capture on English soil. Richard attempted to show that the good 'Southern' army fought the evil army of Scots and with God's blessing won.

It was unusual to find different versions of the same battle orations specifically targeted to one battle. Henry of Huntingdon, writing two years after the battle, and Ailred of Rievaulx, writing seventeen years after the battle, gave the historian a rare opportunity for comparison. Their battle orations were not mere exercises in rhetoric but professed the feelings of the two authors and how subjectively they viewed this battle. Henry never wrote about or addressed any group other than those of Norman descent. Both Henry and Ailred wrote of the history of Norman exploits in Apulia, France, and England. This demonstrated a lack of assimilation.

Ailred was perhaps the more complicated of the chroniclers. A descendant of a long line of married English clergyman, he grew up in the Scottish court of David, and became abbot of a house of a French order, the Cistercians. He wrote three histories but he is best known for his writings on brotherly love. Modern historians claimed that Ailred was not writing for posterity and that he assumed the reader knew the reason for the battle and the outcome. There are several modern theories as to why Ailred wrote about the battle. The primary purpose was to resurrect the reputation of King David in the face of the criticisms of that king made by Henry of Huntingdon. Others theories argued that Ailred was a harbinger for King Henry II or it was Ailred's intention was to teach the young king how to act in a royal manner. I would argue another purpose was to show that the northern barons chose the political expediency of supporting a distant king of England rather than a close personal friend, the king of Scotland. Ailred showed himself to be a very conflicted soul as he tried to extricate his friend, David, from the



actions of his army.

Ailred had a continuing problem of being aware of differentiating national identities from *gentes*.<sup>737</sup> The *Relatio* was composed at the end of a period of identity reformation, during which the Normans were portrayed as inheritors of the land, with a legitimate history, and a superior fighting capacity, which might be thought of as ‘the best qualities’. Ailred’s *The Relatio* demonstrated a lack of assimilation between the Norman English and the native English. Espec’s speech addressed the ‘Southern’ army as exclusively Norman. When Ailred wrote about the Battle of the Standard, he chose not to refer to the army of King Stephen or the army of the Kingdom of England. He used the much more politically neutral term the ‘southern’ army. In Robert de Brus’s speech to King David, Ailred demonstrated that the aristocracy of the two countries had more in common than either country’s aristocracy had with their lower class subjects. Ailred’s text provided evidence for the continued distinction between English and Normans. Writing in 1155-57, Ailred indicated that the *gens Normannorum* still existed and that assimilation between the two *gentes* of the kingdom of England had not yet been achieved.

Henry of Huntingdon wrote the well-known line *Tota namque gens Normannorum et Anglorum*. Gillingham seized upon this sentence for his theory that the Norman English and the English assimilated by the fourth decade of the twelfth century. Although it was tempting to mix ethnic and nationalistic views, a close reading of Chapter Ten of *Historia Anglorum* revealed that a few sentences after the ‘*gens Normannorum et Anglorum*’ quote Henry clearly distinguished English from Normans. In describing King David’s household mounted contingent, Henry described that they

---

<sup>737</sup> Ransford, ‘Noah’s Ark’, p. 137.

were composed of English and Normans. Henry of Huntingdon did not view an assimilated *gens* in 1138.

The three chroniclers that followed Henry of Huntingdon were noteworthy because of the time they wrote. Roger of Howden wrote of the '*equitum Anglorum*' whereas Henry wrote of '*nostris*' knights. Roger also wrote that '*Angli et Normanni*' were triumphant<sup>738</sup> but Henry wrote '*Nostris*' were triumphant describing the winners of the Battle of the Standard. Perhaps these differences were influenced by the time period and the state of the English kingdom at that time. When Henry wrote in the 1140s there were still two distinct *gentes* that he wanted his readers to view as one nation. This is the basis of Gillingham thesis of assimilation by 1140s. Roger wrote two generations later during a new dynasty with a king that was as much English as he was Norman. More than fifty years after the battle Roger of Howden differed with Henry of Huntingdon to state there were still two *gentes* that fought at the battle of the Standard. Henry might have been writing of a national victory but Roger still discerned two separate *gentes*. This problem of differentiating between the English, the subjects of the king of England, and the English, the conquered *gens*, was the most confusing problem in this thesis. Roger wrote *Angli et Normanni triumphaverunt* to demonstrate that a chronicler in the 1190s still viewed two unassimilated *gentes* at the battle.

Roger of Wendover's omissions, from Bishop Ralph's battle orations, subtly remind the careful reader that Henry wrote in the 1140s when the Norman English were the dominant force in England and Roger, almost a century later, wrote that the acculturation of the two *gentes*, the Norman English and the English, was a much more

---

<sup>738</sup> Ibid, i., p. 195.

Accomplished fact. Roger of Wendover did not copy the line Gillingham chose for assimilation, '*gens Normannorum et Anglorum*'; Roger wrote '*gens Anglorum et decus Normannorum*'. Writing in the thirteenth century, he made two significant changes; he listed the only *gens* still in existence, the *Anglorum*, first but he called the other, '*decus Normannorum*', the glory of the Normans'. By the time he wrote in the thirteenth century the *gens Normannorum* had ceased to exist.

For the men who tilled the soil and kept the flocks and herds, there was little mingling between the peasants of England and the Norman English aristocracy. The differences were socio-economic, ethnic and historical. At the battle of the Standard, the aristocracy could bark orders in the vernacular and the English archers responded well. However after the battle, the peasants returned to their hovels, the merchants to their towns and the aristocracy to their manors. They might all fight for kith and kin together in 1138, but they were still disparate *gentes*.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1

*Early Yorkshire Charters*, ed. by William Farrar, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Ballytine, Hanson & Co., 1914)  
Vol 1. No. 33

#### 1. Charter of William I for Archbishop Aeldred

Calendar

No. 33

##### William I in favour of Aldred, Archbishop of York (1066-9).

Willelm kyng gret mine eorlas 7 ealle mine thegnas on than sciran thaerEaldred arcebiscop haefth land ofer 7 land inne freondlice 7 ic kythe eow that ic wille he beo his biscoprices weorthe 7 his socne, tolles 7 teames, binnan burh 7 butan, ofer his men 7 ofer his manna land on mine socne, swa full 7 swa forth swa he firmest haefde on Eadwerdes daege kinges mines maeges on eallan thingan : 7 ic nelle nanan men getholian that ynn fram hande drafe aenig thaera thinga thaes gehennd rihte habbene ah, ne that man him aet aenigan thingan misbeode nenan his manna; 7 gif hit aenig man deth frencisc oder flemisc oder englisc gekythe me fore 7 ic him caede sone fulle bote.

[York Minster, Liber Albus, Part 1, fo. 62 6.]

Note the charter is for the French, the Flemish, and the English *gentes* in that order.

If the charter was in Latin it has been lost.

## Appendix 2

### Charters of King David of Scotland

*The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I, King of Scots, 1123-53, and his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*, ed. by G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 1999).

Robert de Brus

- 1 Earl David confirmed a gift of Robert de Brus (c. 1114) p.53  
16 Grant of Annandale First charter as King of Scots (1124) pp. 61-62  
King David I grants to Robert de Brus Annandale ('Estrahanent') and all the land from the march of (the land of) Dunegal, lord of Nithsdale ('Stranit') as far as the march of (the land of) Ranulf le Meschin, lord of Carlisle and Cumberland. Robert is to hold and have that land and its castle well and honourably, with all those customs which Ranulf le Meschin ever had in Carlisle and his land of Cumberland on the day he had them best and most freely. Scone. 1124 x 1129, probably 1124, soon after 23 April.

#### *The Charters of King David I: Full Texts*

Lawrie, *Charters*, no. 54 (from *Nat. MSS. Scot*, i, no. XIX).

*.D." dei gratia Rex Scott' Omnibus Baronibus suis . 7 hominibus . 7 Amicis<sup>1</sup>. francis . 7 Angi' i salutem. Sciatis me dedisse . 7 concessisse Roberto de Brus Estrahanent. 7 totam terram a diuisa Dunegal de Stranit usque ad Diuisam Randulfi Meschin'. Et uolo . 7 concedo . ut illam terram . 7 suum castellum bene . 7 honorifice . cum omnibus consuetudinibus suis teneat . 7 habeat . Videlicet cum omnibus illis consuetudinibus quas Randulfus Meschin' unquam habuit In Carduill' . 7 In terra sua de Cumberland' illo die in quo unquam meliores. 7 liberiores habuit, t' Eustatio filio Johannis . 7 Hugone de Morvill' . 7 Alano de Perci<sup>4</sup>. 7 Willelmo de Sumervill' . 7 Berengario Inganio . 7 Randulfo de Sules . 7 Will elmo de Morville' . 7 Herui filio Warini 7 yEdmundo Camerario. Apud Sconam.*

Robert de Brus decided a lawsuit with King David (1139 or 1140) p. 90  
78

William Peverel

28 (1126-27) pp. 66-67

Walter de Ghent

29

(1127)

pp. 67-68

Richard prior of *Hestoudeham*

123

(1141-44)

p. 113

*The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I, King of Scots, 1123-53, and his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*, ed. by G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 1999), p. 111.

***Munimenta Mailros***

*Dominus Dei gratia scottorum Episcopis, Abbatibus, Comitibus, Baronibus et probis hominibus suis et omnibus fidelibus suis totius regni sui francis et Anglicis et Scottis et Galwensibus salutem....*

Apparently David still sometimes refers to the inhabitants of Lothian as *Angli*.

### Appendix 3

*Early Yorkshire Charters*, ed. by William Farrar, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Ballytine, Hanson & Co., 1914)  
Vol 1.

100 Richard de Courci      p. 96  
135 Richard de Courci      p. 123  
480 Ilbert de Lasci        p. 368  
481 Roger de Mowbray      pp. 369-70

219 *baronibus Francis et Anglis de Eboraciscira*    1135-40      pp. 281-82



Appendix 4

CXIX.

**Charter of Protection to Priory of Tynemouth,**

A.D. 1138.

3 Dugdale Mon., 313. Ex Regislro quodam S. Albani in Bibl. Cottoniana, fol. 108.

DAVID REX *Scottorum, Episcopis abbatibus comitibus vicecomitibus baronibus et omnibus probis hominibus suis totius terrae suae Francis et Anglis et Scotis et Galwen- sibus salutem.*

*Sciatis me concessisse et dedisse ecclesiae Sanctae Mariae et Sancti Oswini martyris de Tynmutha et fratribus ejusdem loci et dominicis hominibus et rebus ad praedictam ecclesiam pertinentibus et omnibus illis hominibus qui in pace Sanctae Mariae et sancti ejusdem loci in die Sancti Bamabac Apostoli in millesimo centesimo et trigesimo octavo anno ab incarnatione Domini fuerunt, meam pacem in perpetuum de me et omnibus hominibus meis pro anima patris et matris meae et regis Alexandri fratris mei qui pacem Dei et suam firmiter praedictae ecclesiae concessit et pro anima Matildae reginae Angliae sororis meae et animabus antecessorum et successorum meorum Henrico filio meo hanc pacem annuente.*

*Ideo volo et firmiter praecipio ut hanc pacem firmiter possideant et vos eandem eis teneatis, quamdiu ipsi nobis et hominibus nostris pacem tenere voluerint et prohibeo quod nullus eis aut hominibus vel rebus suis super nostram firmam defensionem injuriam vel contumeliam aut vim ullo modo facere praesumat. Et quicumque hanc pacem tenere noluerit sicut ego concedo confirmante de me et Henrico filio meo et nostra familiaritate et nostra amicitia sit omnino alienatus.*

*Praesentibus testibus Gospatrico comite, Hugone de Morevill, et Mansero Marmiun, et Roberto Foliot, et Hugone de Auco, et Hugone Briton. Apud sedem de Norham in Junio.*

**Richard, Prior of Hexham wrote that his own house had a charter from both David and Henry, ‘which are preserved in that church’. RPH, p. 44.**

## Appendix 5

### Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum ii

Walter Espec

1264, 1279, 1312, 1326, 1332-33, 1335-36,  
1357, 1451, 1459, 1463-64, 1491, 1494, 1532, 1541, 1557, 1560-61, 1603-04, 1662, 1679,  
1685, 1740-41, 1756, 1759-60, 1811, 1825, 1891

1357 Walter Espec is to cause Forne to be seised thereof

1532 1557 Walter Espec sheriff

1541 King Henry I commanded that Walter Espec caused it to be done

1604 1662 Henry I mandate to Walter Espec

1679 Notification from King

1685 Precept (writ or warrant)

1825 Precept

1891 Precept

25 Dec 1132 Walter Espec gave land to St Mary of Rievaulx

same date land granted to Rivaulx 9 carucates

1756 Precept by Henry I

Robert de Ferrers

538, 793, 832-33, 1063, 1320, 1326, 1393, 1609, 1677, 1715, 1765, 1969

Alan de Perci

1332 1459 1463

Eustace fitz John

1332 1459 1464 1561

1557 Commanded by King Henry I

Robert de Brus

648, 680, 715, 891, 918, 925-26, 995, 1062, 1241, 1264 n., 1279, 1319, 1335, 1451, 1464,  
1568, 1582, 1586, 1638-39, 1811

David King of Scots

1451

Thurstan  
1463

Walter de Ghent  
1031, 1097-98, 1243, 1623, 1715, 1811, 1895  
1811

1560[1128]  
Notification by Henry I 'rex Anglie' to Walter Espec, Eustace fitz John, and Odard the  
sheriff and all the king's lieges, **French and English**, of Cumberland.

William le Gros, Earl of Aumâle;  
1088  
1102 Confirms gift to Hugh de Lacy to St Peter's, Gloucester

Ilbert de Laschi  
500, 602,678, 1041,1358, 1748 p. 410

Richard de Courci p. 390

Roger de Mowbray  
977 n. 1730, 1935

William de Percy  
995

William de Peverel of Nottingham  
920

## **Appendix 6**

### ***Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* iii**

William le Gros, Earl of Aumâle;

271-72, 402, 437, 583-84, 814 (Sawtry Abbey, Northampton), 921, 944, 981 (York Minster), 992 (York, St Peter's Hospital)

as Earl of York

16, 100, 124, 638, 803, 991 (York, St Peter's Hospital)

Bernard de Balliol

859-60

Robert I de Brus, Lord of Annandale and also Lord of Cleveland; Adam, son of Robert de Brus;

119 (Bridlington Prior, Yorkshire), 337, 942, 985 (Holy Trinity Priory, York)

Richard de Courci;

55-57, 67, 69, 80, 180, 245, 275, 298-99, 318, 393, 418 (Kenilworth Priory, Nottingham), 461, 506, 594, 596, 634, 645, 651, 726, 728-29, 734, 749, 780, 805, 827, 919, 981 (York, Minster and See), 985 (Holy Trinity Priory, York)

Walter Espec, Lord of Hemsley and Lord of Wark-on-Tweed;

255-56 (Durham Cathedral and See), 421, 716, 919, 944

Robert de Ferrers, Earl of Derby and Earl of Nottingham from Derbyshire;

46, 99, 132-33, 271, 387, 944-48.

Ilbert de Lasce, Lord of Pontefract;

46, 621-22, 271, 428, 429, 817

Robert III de Stuteville, Lord of Thirsk;

482

Roger I de Mowbray;

817

William de Percy

583-84, 797, 942, 944

William Peverel of Nottingham.

46, 180, 271, 441, 442, 634-35, 944.

David

328, 377, 393, 410, 429, 629, 634, 899

Henry

46, 410-11, 944

*Franci et Angli* in charters after 1138

4 [1140 or 1142-43]

5 [1139-54]

7 [1136-54]

10 [1139-54]

16 [1139-40]

20 [1133-39]

23 [1135-54]

30 [1136-54]

34 [1140-52]

36 [1139-52]

49 [1154]

68 [1141] Matilda Empress

74 [1136-39]

81 [1135] Duke Henry

85 [1140—41 or 1146-54]

90 [1153-54] Duke Henry

101 [1147-54]

102 [1136-54]

104 [1153-54] Duke Henry

110 [1136-54]

111 [1144] Matilda Empress

114 [1140-41]

115 [1141] Matilda Empress

120 [1136-38]

128 [1154] Duke Henry

130 [1154] Duke Henry

131 [1153-54] Duke Henry

140 [1154] Duke Henry

144 [1138-54]

149 [1143-52] Matilda, Stephen's queen

153 [1136-39]

154 [1136-39]  
155 [1136-39]  
156 [1136-39]  
157 [1135-52] Matilda, Stephen's queen  
162 [1136-45]  
163 [1142-1146]  
169 [1149]  
175 [1135-46]  
176 [1139-54]  
179 [1146]  
182 [1147-1148]  
183 [1148-49]  
184 [1147-52]  
193 [1153]  
203 [1153-54]  
206 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
213 [1136-39] '*suis Francis et Anglis clericis et laicis totius Angli*'  
218 [1136-54]  
219 [1141-44]  
221 [1148-52] Matilda, Stephen's queen  
222 [1148-52] Eustace, Stephen's son  
223 [1148-52]  
229 [1148-52]  
229a [1146-53] Eustace, Stephen's son  
234 [1136-53]  
239b [1135-52] Matilda, Stephen's queen  
240 [1136-52]  
241 [1147-53]  
243 [1136-47] Matilda, Stephen's queen  
244 [1139-54]  
247 [1135-44]  
249 [1136-52]  
252 [1136-54]  
256 [1136-38]  
259 [1141-48] Empress Matilda  
261 [1139-1140]  
262 [1139-1140]  
266 [1144-45]  
273 [1139-40]  
274 [1141] Empress Matilda

275 [1141] Empress Matilda  
276 [1141]  
278 [1135-39]  
270 [1136-39]  
291 [1135-54]  
293 [1139-40]  
296 [1141-42] Empress Matilda  
300 [1148]  
301 [1148-52]  
308 [1139-40]  
309 [1153] Duke Henry  
310 [1153] Duke Henry  
311 listed as 999 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
312 [1137]  
339 [1153] Duke Henry  
342 [1138]  
344a [1135-54]  
346 [1135-39]  
350 [1136-39]  
358 [1148-50]  
362a [1151-53] Duke Henry  
365a [1153-54] Duke Henry  
366 [1141]  
368 [1141] Empress Matilda  
369 [1141-42] Empress Matilda  
370 [1143] Empress Matilda  
371 [1143] Empress Matilda  
372 [1144] Empress Matilda  
377 [1141] Empress Matilda  
378 [141-43] Empress Matilda  
379 [1153] Duke Henry  
388 [1135-39]  
392 [1141] Empress Matilda  
393 [ 1141] Empress Matilda  
394 [1141-1142] Empress Matilda  
399 [1140]  
400 1141] Empress Matilda  
402 [1147-49]  
409 [1151-67] Empress Matilda  
410 [1139-40]

413 [1135-54]  
418 [1136-38]  
420 [1149-50] Duke Henry  
427 [1148-53]  
428 [1135-41]  
429 [1141] Empress Matilda  
432 [1154-63] Empress Matilda  
437 [1140-44]  
438 [1153] Duke Henry  
439 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
442 [1136-41] or [1146-54]  
445 [1135-39]  
447 [1135-54]  
452 [1139040]  
455 [1149]  
459 [1153] Duke Henry  
460 [1145]  
462 [1150-51] Duke Henry  
469 [1136-39]  
471 [1146]  
473 [1139]  
475 [1136-39]  
477 [1139-40]  
479 [11390-40]  
482 [1136-41 04 1146-48]  
483 [1139-46]  
491 [1153] Duke Henry  
492 [1153] Duke Henry  
494 [1146]  
495 [1154] Duke Henry  
497 [1141] Empress Matilda  
501 [1147-52]  
507 [1140-46] 508 [1139-46]  
509 [1139-46] Matilda. Stephen's queen  
510 [probably 1139-46]  
511 [1147-1148]  
512 [1147-1148] Matilda, Stephen's queen  
514 [1147-54]  
517 [1135-54]  
518 [probably 1141] Empress Matilda



520 [1140-54]  
522 [1135-39]  
526 [1139-40]  
538 [1139-52]  
542 [1145-47]  
558 [1135-40]  
561 [1135-54]  
565 [1139-54]  
568 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
569 [1153-54] William, Stephen's son  
574 [1153] Duke Henry  
577 [1144-54]  
581 [1141] Empress Matilda  
582 [1153] Duke Henry  
583 [1154]  
584 [1154] Duke Henry  
586 [1136-40]  
587 [1141-5] Empress Matilda  
588 [1139-45]  
597 [1141] Empress Matilda  
611 [1136-53]  
612 [1136-53]  
619 [1135-39]  
621 [1136-39]  
622 [1136-39]  
625 [1135-54]  
626 [1136-40]  
627 [1139-40]  
629 [1141] Empress Matilda  
630 [1141-42] Empress Matilda  
632 [1142-48] Empress Matilda  
633 [1149-52]  
634 [1141] Empress Matilda  
635 [1141] Duke Henry  
637 [1136-40]  
638 [1138-39]  
640 [1138-9]  
641 [1135-48]  
645 [1141-42] Empress Matilda  
646 [1141] Empress Matilda

648 [1141] Empress matilda  
649 [1139-40 or 1142-48]  
651 [1141-42] Empress Matilda  
652 [1135-54]  
656 [1136-41]  
660 [1140-54]  
662 [1136-46]  
666 [1149] Duke Henry  
667 [1139]  
685 [1136-39]  
686 [1136-39]  
690 [1139-40]  
694 [1146 r 1147]  
699 [1141] Empress Matilda  
701 [1141] Empress Matilda  
702 [1141-47] Empress Matilda  
703 [1144-47] Empress Matilda  
704 [1147 or 1149] Duke Henry  
706 [1150-51] Duke Henry  
712 [1135-39]  
718 [1135-39]  
722 [1136-40]  
736 [1146]  
740 [1139-54]  
743 [1139-52]  
756 [1136-54]  
757 [1139-45]  
758 [1135-54]  
760 [1147-48]  
761 [1138-39 or 1148-54]  
767 [1135-45]  
769 [1135-48]  
784 [1136-39]  
785 [1136-54]  
786 [1136-39]  
787 [1139]  
788 [1139]  
789 [1139]  
795 [1149]  
798 [1148-52]

814 [1147-53]  
820 [1141] Empress Matilda  
821 [1141] Empress Matilda  
823 [1153] Duke Henry  
824 [1148-57] Empress Matilda  
828 [1139-54]  
830 [1139-52]  
835 [1139-54]  
836 [1150-51] Empress Matilda  
837 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
839 [1141-48] Empress Matilda  
841 [1153] Duke Henry  
842 [1139-54]  
844 [1140-45]  
855 [1140-43]  
856 [1136-52]  
858 [1140 or 1142-43]  
860 [1147-54]  
865 [1153-54]  
866 [1154]  
875 [1153] Duke Henry  
876 [1135-48]  
878 [1135-51]  
879 [1135-54]  
890 [1139-52]  
894 [1136-54]  
897 [1141] Empress Matilda  
899 [1141] Empress Matilda  
900 [1154] Duke Henry  
902 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
909 [1154-59] Empress Matilda  
911 [1141] Empress Matilda  
912 [1153-54] Duke Henry  
913 [1140-43]  
929 [1138-39]  
932 [1135-52]  
938 [1149-52]  
939 [1152]  
940 [1151-52]  
941 [1151-52]

954 [1136-39]  
955 [1135-41]  
957 [1147-52]  
958 [1147-54]  
960 [1135-52]  
961 [1140-43]  
969 [1144-52]  
971 [1135-54]  
973 [1135-39]  
974 [1135-54]  
976 [1136-39]  
981 [1138-43]  
986 [1136-40]  
989 [1136-39]  
990 [1136-39]  
991 [1140]  
993 [1154]

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

Aelred of Rievaulx: *The Historical Works*, ed. by Marsha Dutton and trans. by Jane Patricia Freeland (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2005).

‘Introduction: A Mirror of Twelfth-Century England’, p. 1-37.

‘Lament for David, King of Scots’, pp. 45-70;

‘The Genealogy of the English Kings’, pp. 71-122;

‘The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor’, pp. 125-243 and

‘The Battle of the Standard in the Time of King Stephen’, pp. 247-69.

‘Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (60 B.C. – A. D. 1042)’ in *English Historical Documents*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, 12 vols, 2nd edn (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) i. (c. 500-1042), pp. 145- 260.

‘Anglo Saxon Chronicle (1042-1154)’ in *English Historical Documents*, ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway, 12 vols, 2nd edn, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979), ii. (1042-1189), pp. 103-215.

*Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1174-1328: Some Selected Documents*, ed. and trans. by E. L. G. Stones, (London: Nelson, 1965).

*Annales de Monte Fernandi*, ed. by Aquila Smith (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1842).

*Annales Monastici*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series, 36, 5 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1864-69).

I. De Margram Theokesberia (Tewkesbury)

ii. Annals of Tewkesbury

II. De Wintonia (Winchester) et Waverleia (Waverley)

i. Annals of Winchester

ii. Annals of Waverly

III. De Dunstaplia (Dunstable) et Bermundeseia (Bermondsley)

i. Annals of Dunstable

IV. De Oseneia (Osney)

i. Annals of Osney

ii. *Chronicon vulgo dicgtum Thomae Wykes*

iii. *Annales Prioratus de Wignornia*

*The ‘Annals of Multyfarnham: Roscommon and Connacht Provenance’*, ed. and trans. by Bernadette Williams (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2012).

Anonymous, *The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. by Frank Barlow, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Anonymous, 'Bishop Thurstan, and the King of Scots, A Ballad', in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*, ed. by Thomas M. Evans, (London: T. Evans, 1784), iv. pp. 86-93.

Anonymous, 'The Battle of Cuton Moor', in *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*, ed. by Thomas M. Evans, (London: T. Evans, 1784), iv. pp. 93-111.

*Antiquitates Celto-Normanniae: Containing the Chronicle of Man and the Isles*, ed. by J. Johnstone, (Copenhagen, 1786).

*Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. and trans. by Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).

Carlyle, Thomas, 'On History', in *Works of Thomas Carlyle*, ed. by H. D. Traill, 5 vols (New York, NY: AMS Press, 1969).

*Cartularium Abbathiae de Rievallie*, ed. by C. J. Atkinson, Surtees Society 83 (Durham: Andrews, 1889).

*The Charters of David I: The Written Acts of David I, King of Scots, 1123-53, and his son Henry, Earl of Northumberland, 1139-52*, ed. by G. W. S. Barrow (Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 1999).

*Chronica de Mailros, E Codice Unico*, in *Bibliotheca Cottoniana Servata, Nunc Iterum in Lucem Edita, Notulis Indiceque Aucta (Edinbrugi: Typis Societastis Edinburgensis, 1835).*

*The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, ed. and trans. by Eleanor Searle (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980).

*Chronicle of Kings of Mann and the Isles=Recortys reeaghyn Vannin as ny hEllanyn*, Latin transcription and English trans. by George Broderick; Manx trans. by Brian Stowell; and The British Museum (Edinburgh: G. Broderick, 1973).

*The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition*, 1. Introduction and Facsimile, ed. by Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007).

*The Chronicle of Melrose from the Cottonian Manuscript. Faustina B. IX in the British Museum*, ed. by A. O. Anderson and M. O. Anderson (London: Percy Lund, Humphries, 1936).

*Chronicles of the Picts, chronicles of the Scots, and other early memorials of Scottish history* ed. by William Forbes Skene (Edinburgh: H. M. General Register House, 1867).

*Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. by R. Howlett, Rolls Series, 82, 4 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1884-1890).

I. William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum* books I-IV.

II. William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum* book V.

ii. Etienne de Rouen, '*Draco Normannorum*'.

III. *Gesta Stephani Regis Anglorum*.

i. Hexham, Richard of, *Historia de gestis regis Stephani et bello de standardii* (1135-39)

ii. Ailred of Rievaulx, *Relatio de Standardo*.

IV. Chronicle of Robert de Torigni, 1890.

*Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson *The Church Historians of England*, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1858).

*Chronicon Coenobii Sanctae Crucis and Chronicon Anglo-Scoticum*, ed. by Robert Pitcairn (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1888).

*The Church Historians of England*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson 8 vols (London: Seeley, 1856)

3-2, Simeon of Durham, *Simeon of Durham's History of the Kings of England*

4-1, John, Prior of Hexham, *The History of the Church at Hexham*, pp. 3-32.

4-1, Richard, Prior of Hexham, *The Acts of King Stephen, and the Battle of the Standard by Richard, Prior of Hexham, from A. D. 1135 to A. D. 1139*, pp. 35-58.

4-1, *Chronicle of Holyrood*, pp. 61-75.

4-1, *The Chronicle of Melrose*, pp. 79-242.

4-2, *The History of William of Newburgh*, pp. 398-672.

4-2, *The Chronicle of Robert de Monte*, pp. 673-813.

5-1, *Chronicle of the Isle of Man*, pp. 385-405.

'Cnut's Letter to the People of England (1019-1020)', in *English Historical Documents*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, 12 vols, 2nd edn (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) i. c. 500-1042).

'Cnut's Letter to the English (1020)', Elaine Treharne, *Living through Conquest: The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

'The Coronation Charter of Henry I (5 August 1100)', *English Historical Documents*, ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway, 2nd edn, 12 vols (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) ii. 1042-1189, pp. 432-34.

*Descriptive Catalogue of Materials Relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland to the End of the Reign of Henry VII*, ed. by Thomas Duffus Hardy, 2 vols 1066-1200 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1865).

Dudo of St Quentin, *De Moribus et Actis Primorum Normanniae Ducum, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, ed. by Jules Lair (Caen: Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865).

- Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans*, trans. by Eric Christiansen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998).
- Early Scottish Charters; Prior to A. D. 1153; collected, with Notes and an Index*, ed. by Archibald C. Lawrie (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1905).
- Early Sources of Scottish History, A. D. 500 to 1286*, trans. by Alan Orr Anderson, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1922).
- Early Yorkshire Charters*, ed. by William Farrar, 4 vols (Edinburgh: Ballytine, Hanson and Co., 1914).
- Eadmer, *History of Recent Events in England, Historia Novorum in Anglia*, trans. by G., Bosanquet (London: Cresset Press, 1964).
- Eadmer, *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia, et opuscula duo de vita Sancti Anselmi et quibusdam miraculis ejus*, ed. by Martin Rule, Rolls Series, 81 (London: Public Record Office, 1884).
- Encomium Emmae Reginae*, ed. and trans. by Alistair Campbell (London: Royal Historical Society, 1949).
- Fitz Nigel, Richard, *Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. by Charles Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).
- Flodoard, *Chronique de Flodoàrd de l'An 919 a l'An 976 avec un Appendice de Quelques Années*, ed. by Clair Bandevile (Reims: Regnier, 1855).
- Gaimar, Geoffrey, *Estoire des Engleis*, ed. by Ian Short (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
- Gervase of Canterbury, *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. by W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 2 vols (London: London Record Office, 1880).
- Geoffrey of Monmouth: *The History of the Kings of Britain*, ed. by, M. D. Reeve (Woodbridge, Boydell, 2007).
- Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William Jumieges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni*, ed. and trans. by Elisabeth M. C. Van Houts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992).
- Gesta Stephani Regis Anglorum et Ducis Normannorum*, ed. and trans. by K. R. Potter (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).
- Gildas, *Gildae Sapiientis de Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*, ed. by Theodor Mommsen, (Munich: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1898; repr. 1981).
- Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, ed. and trans. by Joseph Stevenson, (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1838).



- Grammaticus, Saxo, *The First Nine books of the Danish History*, ed. by Frederick York, Powell (London: Nutt, 1894).
- Guy, Bishop of Amiens, *The Carmen de Hastingae Proelio of Guy, Bishop of Amiens*, ed. and trans. by Frank Barlow (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).
- Guy, Bishop of Amiens, *Carmen de Hastingae Proelio*, ed. by Catherine Morton and Hope Muntz (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
- Henry of Huntingdon, *The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon*, trans. by Thomas Forester (London: Bohn, 1853).
- Henry of Huntingdon, *Henrici Archidiaconi Huntendunsis, Historia Anglorum*, ed. by Thomas A. Arnold, Rolls Series 74 (London: Public Record Office, 1879).
- Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by Diana Greenway Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores Antiqui: Ex Vetustis Manuscriptis, Nunc primum in lucem editi* (London: Jacobi Flesher, 1652).
- The Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. by James Raine, Rolls series, 71, 3 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1879-94).
- Incipit Descriptio Serlonis Monarchi, fratris Radulphi, Abbatis de Parcho, de bello inter Regem Scotiae et Barones Angliae* in Lawrence of Durham, *Dialogi Laurentii Dunelmensis Monachi ac Prioris*, ed. by James Raine (Durham: Andrews and Company, 1880), pp.74-76.
- Inventio et miracula Sancti Vulfranni* ed. by J. Laporte (Rouen: Lainé, 1938).
- John, Prior of Hexham, 'Prior John's Continuation of the Chronicle of Simeon', *The Priory of Hexham Its Chroniclers, Endowments, and Annals*, ed. by James Raine, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Andrews and Company, 1864).
- John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. by Reginald R. Darlington and Patrick McGurk, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995).
- John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*, trans. by Thomas Forester (London: Bohn, 1854).
- John Milton, *Works*, ed. by Frank Allen Patterson (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1931-38).
- Lawrence of Durham, *Dialogi Laurentii Dunelmensis Monachi ac Prioris*, ed. by James Raine (Durham: Andrews and Company, 1880).

*The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*, ed. and trans. by Agnes Jane Roberts, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925).

Leland, John, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* (Oxford: Sheldon, 1709).

*Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard (London: Longman, 1858).

I. *La Estoriue de Seint Aedward le Rei*

II. *Vita Beati Edvardi Regis et Confessoris*

III. *Vita Eaduardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium Requiescit*.

Map, Walter, *De Nugis Curialium (Courtier's Trifles)*, trans. by Frederick Tupper and William Bladen Ogle (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1924).

Map, Walter, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. by Montague R. James, Christopher N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983).

Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. by Henry Richards Luard, Rolls Series 57, 2 vols (London: Longman & Co., 1874).

*Monumenta Historica Britannica, or Materials from the History of Britain, from the Earliest Period*, ed. by H. Petrie, and John Sharp (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1848).

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. and trans. by Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975).

'Pipe Roll 31 Henry I: The Account of Gloucestershire (1130)', *English Historical Documents*, ed. by David C. Douglas and George W. Greenaway, 12 vols, 2nd edn, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) ii. 1042-1189, pp. 611-14.

*Radulphi de Dicito ducani Londoniensis Opera Historica*, ed by William Stubbs, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1876).

Ranulf de Glanvill, *Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Angliae (Treatise on the laws and customs of the Kingdom of England)* (London: J. White and E. Brook, 1780).

*Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum 1066-1154*, ed. by H. A. Cronne and H. W. C. Davis, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

*Regista Regum Scottorum, I, The Acts of Malcolm IV, King of Scots 1153-1165: Together with Scottish Royal Acts Prior to 1153 not Included in Sir Archibald Lawrie's 'Early Scottish Charters'*, ed. by G. W. S. Barrow, 8 vols (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1960).

Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houeden*, ed. by William Stubbs, Rolls Series, 51, 3 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1868-71).

Roger of Hoveden, *The Annals of Roger of Hoveden. Comprising the History of England and of Other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201*, ed. by Henry T. Riley, 2 vols (London: Bohn, 1853).

Roger of Wendover, *Rogeri de Wendover Chronica; sive, Flores historiarum*, ed. by Henry O. Coxe, 4 vols (London: Sumptus Societatis, 1841-42).

Roger of Wendover, *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History Comprising the History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235*, trans. by J. A. Giles, 2 vols (London: Bohn, 1849).

*Satirical Poets and Epigrammatists of the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Thomas Wright, 2 vols Rolls Series, 79 (London: Public Records Office, 1872).

*Scottish Annals from Anglo-Saxon Chroniclers A.D. 500 to 1286*, trans. by Alan Orr Anderson, 2 vols (London: David Nutt, 1908).

*Scottish Historical Documents*, ed. and trans. by Gordon Donaldson (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1970).

*Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History From the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward the First*, ed. by William Stubbs, 9th edn (Oxford: Clarendon; rev. by H. W. C. Davis, 1921).

Stewart, William, *The bulk of the cronicles of Scotland; or, A metrical version of the history of Hector Boece*, ed. by William B. Turbull, 3 vols (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1865).

*Symeonis Monarchi Opera Omnia II: Historia Regum A. D. 616-1129*, ed. by T. Arnold, Rolls Series 75, 2 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1882-85).

Wace, *The History of the Norman People: Wace's Roman du Rou*, trans. by Glyn. S. Burgess (Rochester: Boydell, 2004).

Walter Daniel: *The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. by Michael Powicke, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950).

Walter of Coventry, *Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria: The Historical Collections of Walter Coventry*, ed. by William, Stubbs, 2 vols (London: Longman, 1872-1873).

*The Waltham Chronicle: the Account of the Discovery of Our Holy Cross at Montacute and its Conveyance to Waltham*, ed. and trans. by Leslie Watkiss and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007).

William of Malmesbury, *The Historia Novella*, ed. and trans. by K. R. Potter (London: Nelson, 1955).

William of Malmesbury, *Historia Novella: the Contemporary history*, ed. and trans. by Edmund King and K. R. Potter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

William of Malmesbury, *The Vita Wulfstani*, ed. by Reginald R. Darlington (London: Camden Society, 1928).

William of Newburgh, *The History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. by P. G. Walsh, and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1998).

William of Poitiers, *Gesta Guillelmi*, ed. and trans. by Richard Henry Carless Davis and Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

*Willelmi Malmesbriensis monachi De gestis regum Anglorum libri quinque; Historiae novella libri*, ed. by William Stubbs Rolls Series 90, 2 vols (London: Public Record Office, 1887-9).

Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, 'The Sermon of the Wolf to the English' ('*Sermo Lupo ad Anglo*'), in *English Historical Documents*, ed. by Dorothy Whitelock, 12 vols, 2nd edn (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1979) i. c. 500-1042, p. 931.

## **Secondary Sources**

*A History of Northumberland: Issued under the Direction of the Northumberland County History Committee, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, & Company Limited, 1897).

Ainsworth, Peter, 'Contemporary and Eyewitness Histories', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskoph Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 249-76.

Aird, William M., 'Northern England or Southern Scotland? The Anglo-Scottish Border in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries and the Problem of Perspective', in *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000-1700*, ed. by John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Thrupp: Sutton, 1997), pp. 27-39.

Aird, William M., 'Northumbria and the Making of the Kingdom of the English', in *Nations in Medieval Britain*, ed. by Hirokazu Tsurushima (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), pp. 45-60.

Aird, William M., ‘“Sweet Civility and Barbarous Rudeness’: a View from the Frontier. Abbot Ailred of Rievaulx and the Scots’ in *Imagining Frontiers: Contesting Identities*, ed. by S. G. Ellis and L. Klusáková (Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007), pp. 59-77.

Albu, Emily, *Normans in their Histories: Propaganda, Myth and Subversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2001).

Albu, Emily, ‘(Review of) Amanda Jane Hingst, *The Written Word: Past and Present in the Work of Orderic Vitalis* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009)’, *American Historical Review*, 115 (2010), 1204.

Albu, Emily, ‘The Normans and the Making of the kingdom of England’, in *Nations in Medieval Britain*, ed. by Hirokazu Tsurushima (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), pp. 61-70.

Anderson, Carolyn, ‘Narrating Matilda, ‘Lady of the English,’ in the *Historia Novella*, the *Gesta Stephani*, and Wace’s *Roman de Rou*: The Desire for Land and Order’, *Clio*, 29 (1999), 47-67.

Ansbacher, Heinz L. and Rowena R. Ansbacher, eds. *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler - A Systematic Presentation in Selections from his Writings* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1956).

Appleby, John T., *The Troubled Reign of King Stephen* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1969).

Ayton, Andrew, ‘Arms, Armour, and Horses’ in *Medieval Warfare: A History*, ed. by Maurice Keen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 186-209.

Bachrach, David, S. ‘Conforming with the Rhetorical Tradition of Plausibility: Clerical Representation of Battlefield Orations against Muslims, 1080-1170’, *International History Review*, 26, (2004), 1-19.

Bachrach, David S., *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300-1215* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).

Bagge, Sverre, ‘Ethics, Politics and Providence in William of Malmesbury’s *Historia Novella*’, *Viator*, 41 (2010), 113-32.

Bagley, J. J., *Historical Interpretation: Sources in English Medieval History 1066-1450* (New York, NY: St. Martin’s Press, 1972).

Baker, Derek, ‘Ailred of Rievaulx and Walter Espec’, *Haskins Society Journal*, 1 (1989), 91-98.

Bailey, F. G., *The Need for Enemies: A Bestiary of Political Forms* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Bainton, Henry, 'Cultural Identity in the *Estorie des Engleis*' in *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England, c. 1100-c. 1500*, ed. by Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (York: York Medieval Press, 2009).

Barlow, Frank, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church*, (London: Longman, 1979).

Barlow, Frank, *The Feudal Kingdom of England 1042-1216*, 5th edn (London: Longman, 1999).

Barlow, Frank, 'Roger of Howden', *EHS*, 65 (1950), 352-60.

Barlow, Frank, *William Rufus*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983).

Barrett, C. R. B., *Battles and Battlefields in England* (London: A. D. Innes, 1896).

Barrow, G. W. S., *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980).

Barrow, G. W. S., 'Frontier and Settlement: Which Influenced Which? England and Scotland, 1100-1300', in *Medieval Frontier Societies*, ed. by Robert Bartlett and Angus MacKay (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 3-21.

Barrow, G. W. S., *The Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church, and Society*, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003).

Barrow, G. W. S., *Kingship and Unity: Scotland, 1000-1306* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1981).

Barrow, G.W.S., *Scotland and its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London: Bloomsbury Academic Press, 1992).

Barrow, G.W.S. 'The Scots and the North of England', in *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. by E. King (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 231-53.

Barth, Frank, 'Introduction', in *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organization of cultural differences* ed. by F. Barth, (London: Allen & Urwin, 1969), pp. 9-38.

Bartlett, Robert, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000).

Bartlett, Robert, *Gerald of Wales* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).

Bartlett, Robert, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31 (2001), 39-56.

Bartlett, Robert, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).

Barthélemy, Dominique, *Le chevalerie de la Germanie antique à la France du xii<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 2007).

Bates, Cadwallader John, *The History of Northumberland* (London: Elliot Stock, 1895).

Bates, David, 'Kingship, government, and political life to c.1160' in *The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries 1066-c. 1280*, ed. by Barbara Harvey, *The Short Oxford History of the British Isles*, ed. by Paul Langford (Oxford: Oxford University, 2001), pp. 69-98.

Bates, David, *The Normans and Empire*, The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford during Hilary Term 2010 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Beech, George, 'The Participation of Aquitanians in the Conquest of England 1066-1100', in ANS 9, ed. by R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1986), pp. 1-24.

Beeler, John, *Warfare in England, 1066-1189* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966).

Bennett, Matthew, 'The Impact of 'Foreign' Troops in the Civil Wars of King Stephen's Reign', in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 96-113.

Berry, John W., 'Marginality, stress and ethnic identification in an acculturated Aboriginal community', *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1, (1970), 240-52.

Berry, John W. Rudolf. Kalin and Donald Taylor, *Multiculturalism and Ethnic Attitudes in Canada* (Ottawa, CA: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1977).

Black, Winston, 'Henry of Huntingdon's Lapidary Rediscovered and his Anglicanus Ortus Reassembled', *Journal of Medieval Studies*, 68 (2006), 43-68.

Blacker, Jean, *The Faces of Time: Portrayal of the Past in Old French and Latin Historical Narrative of the Anglo-Norman Regnum* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1994).

Blakely, Ruth Margaret, *The Brus Family in England and Scotland: 1100-1295* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005).

Blair, Peter, *An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Bliese, John R. H., 'Aelred of Rievaulx's Rhetoric and Morale at the Battle of the Standard, 1138', *Albion*, 20 (1988), 543-56.

Bliese, John R. E., 'The Courage of the Normans—A Comparative Study of Battle Rhetoric', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 35 (1991), 1-26.

Bliese, John R. E., 'Deliberative Oratory in the Middle Ages: The Missing Millennium in the Study of Public Address', *The Southern Communication Journal*, 59 (1994), 273-83.

Bliese, John R. E., 'Leadership, Rhetoric and Morale in the Norman Conquest of England', *Military Affairs*, 52 (1988), 23-38.

Bliese, John R. E., 'Rhetoric and Morale: a Study of Battle Orations from the Central Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 15 (1989), 201-26.

Bliese, John R. E., 'Rhetoric Goes to War: The Doctrine of Ancient and Medieval Manuals', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 24 (1994), 105-30.

Bliese, John R. E., 'Saint Cuthbert and War', *Journal of Medieval History*, 24 (1998), 215-41.

Bliese, John R. E., 'When Knightly Courage May Fail: Battle Orations in Medieval Europe', *Historian*, 53 (1991), 489-504.

Bloch, Marc, *Feudal Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1964).

Bochner, Stephen, 'The Social Psychology of Cross-cultural Relations, in *Cultures in Contact: Studies in Cross-cultural Interaction*, ed. by Stephen Bochner (Oxford: Pergamon, 1982), pp. 5-44.

Bolton, Timothy, *Cnut the Great* (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2017)

Borrie, Wilfred, *The cultural integration of immigrants: A survey based upon the papers and proceedings of UNESCO Conference held in Havana April 1956* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1959).

Bosma, Ulbe, Gijs Kessler and Leo Lucassen, 'Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective: An Introduction', in *Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. by Ulbe Bosma and others (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), pp. 1-20.

Bourhis, Richard. Léna Möise, Stéphane Perrault and Sacha Sénécal, 'Towards an Interactive Acculturation Model: Social Psychological Approach, *International Journal of Psychology*, 32 (1997), 369-86.

Bracey, Jeana R., Mayra Y. Bamáca and Andriana J. Umaña-Taylor, 'Examining Ethnic Identity and Self-Esteem Among Biracial and Monoracial Adolescents', *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 33 (2004), 123-32.

Bradbury, Jim, 'Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154' in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late English and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by M. Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 182-93.



- Bradbury, Jim, *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53* (Thrupp: Sutton, 2011).
- Breisach, Ernest, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern*, 3rd edn (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007).
- Brett, M., *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).
- Brett, M., 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by R.H.C. Davis and M.H. Keen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 101–26.
- Brooke, C. N. L., *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Brown, R. Allen, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (New York, NY: Cromwell, 1968).
- Brown, Warren, *Violence in Medieval Europe, The Medieval World*, ed. by Julia Smith (Harlow: Pearson, 2011).
- Burne, Alfred Higgins, *The battlefields of England*, 3rd edn (London: Methuen & Co., 1973).
- Burne, Alfred Higgins, *More battlefields of England* (London: Methuen & Co., 1952).
- Burnstein, Eugene and Amiram Vinokur, 'Persuasive Argumentation and Social Comparison as Determinants of Attitude', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13 (1977), 315-32.
- Campbell, James, *The Anglo-Saxons* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1982).
- Campbell, James, 'The United Kingdom of England: The Anglo-Saxon Achievement', in *Uniting the Kingdom? The Making of British History*, ed. by A. Grant and K. J. Stringer (London: Routledge, 1995),
- Carlyle, Thomas, *Works of Thomas Carlyle*, ed. by H. D. Traill, 5 vols (New York, NY: AMS Press, 1969).
- Carocci, Sandro, 'Social Mobility and the Middle Ages', *Continuity and Change*, 26 (2011), 367-404.
- Carpenter, Christine, 'England: the Nobility and the Gentry' in *A Companion to Britain in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by S. H. Rigby (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 261-283.
- Carpenter, David, *The Struggle for Mastery: Britain 1066-1284* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

- Carte, Thomas, *A General History of England: Containing an Account of the first Inhabitants of the Country, and the Transactions in it, from the earliest Times to the Death of King John, A. D. MCCXVI* (London: Thomas A. Carte, 1747).
- Chalmers, George, *Caledonia: A Historical and Topographical Account of North Britain, from the Most Ancient to the Present Time*, 8 vols. (Paisley: Alexander Gardner, 1887).
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).
- Chibnall, Marjorie, '(Review of) Hugh M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans; Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity, 1066-c.1220* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), *The International History Review*, 26 (2004), p. 363.
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest: Issues in Historiography* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1999).
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *The Empress Matilda, Queen Consort, Queen Mother and Lady of the English* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *The Normans* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).
- Chibnall, Marjorie, *The World of Orderic Vitalis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).
- Chrysos, Evangelos, 'The Empire, the *gentes* and the *regna*', in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Clanchy, M. T., *England and Its Rulers 1066-1272*, 2nd edn (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998).
- Clanchy, Michael T., *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066 to 1307*, 3rd edn (Chichester: Wiley-Blackell, 2013).
- Clark, Cecily, 'Women's Names in Post-Conquest England Observations and Speculations', *Speculum*, 53 (1978), 223-51.
- Clark, Cecily, and Elizabeth Williams, *Women in Anglo-Saxon England and the Impact of 1066* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984).
- Cokayne, G. E., *Complete Peerage of England Scotland Ireland Great Britain and the United Kingdom*, 14 vols. 2nd edn (Stroud: Sutton, 2000).
- Comeau, Paul-André, 'Acculturation or Assimilation: Method of analysis and tentative measures of Franco-Ontarians', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 2 (1969), 158-72.
- Cook, Terrence E., *Separation, Assimilation, or Accommodation: Contrasting Ethnic*

*Minority Policies* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003).

Corner, David, 'The Earliest Surviving Manuscripts of Roger of Howden's *Chronica*', *EHS*, 98 (1983), 297-310.

Cosgrove, Richard A., 'A Usable Past History and Politics of National Identity in Late Victorian England', *Parliamentary History*, 27 (2008), 30-42.

Cragoe, Carol Davidson, 'Reading and Rereading Gervase of Canterbury', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 145, (2001), 40-53.

Crane, Susan, 'Anglo-Norman Cultures in England, 1066-1460' in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 33-51.

Cronne, Henry Alfred, *1135-54, Anarchy in England, The Reign of King Stephen* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1970).

Crosby, Everett U., *The King's Bishops: The Politics and Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066-1216* (NY, NY: Macmillan, 2013).

Crosfield, A., *The History of North-Allerton, in the county of York. To which is added a description of the Castle-Hills* (York: J. Langdale, 1791).

Crouch, David, *The English Aristocracy, 1070-1272: A Social Transformation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011).

Crouch, David, 'Geoffrey de Clinton and Roger, Earl of Warwick: New Men and Magnates in the Reign of Henry I', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 55 (1982), 113-23.

Crouch, David, 'Normans and Anglo-Normans: A Divided Aristocracy?', in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by David Bates and Anne Curry (London: Hambledon Press, 1994), pp. 51-67.

Crouch, David, *The Image of Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300* (London: Routledge, 1992).

Crouch, David, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (New York, NY: Longman, 2000).

Crownie, Emma, 'The Normans as Patrons of English Religious Houses, 1066-1135', in *ANS* 28, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill (1995), pp. 47-62.

Dalton, Paul, 'Allegiance and Intelligence in King Stephen's Reign', in *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. by Paul Dalton and Graeme J. White (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2008), pp. 80-97.

Dalton, Paul, 'Civil War and Ecclesiastical Peace in the Reign of King Stephen' in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 53-76.

Dalton, Paul, *Conquest, Anarchy, and Lordship: Yorkshire 1066-1154* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Dalton, Paul, 'The Governmental Integration of the Far North, 1066-1199', in *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000-1700*, ed. by John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Thrupp: Sutton Press, 1997), pp. 14-26.

Dalton, Paul, and John C. Appleby, *Outlaws in Medieval and early Modern England: Crime, Government and Society, c. 1066 – c. 1600* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Danforth, Loring, *The Macedonian Conflict, Ethnic Nationalism in a Transitional World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995),

Davies, R. R., *Domination and Conquest: The Experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Davies, R. R., '(Review of). Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. by Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)', *Medium Aevum*, 66 (1997), 320.

Davies, R. R., *The First English Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles 1093-1343, The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term, 1998* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Davies, R. R., *The Matter of Britain and the Matter of England: Inaugural Address Delivered before the University of Oxford on 29 February 1996* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Davis, R. H. C., 'The Authorship of the Gesta Stephani', *EHR*, 77 (1962), 209-32.

Davis, R. H. C., *King Stephen 1135-1154*, 3rd edn (London: Longman, 1990).

Davis, R. H. C., *The Normans and Their Myth* (London: Thomas and Hudson, 1976).

Davis, R. H. C., 'What Happened in King Stephen's Reign, 1135-54', *History*, 49 (1964), 1-12.

Davis, William Carless, 'A Contemporary Account of the Battle of Tinchebrai', *EHR*, 24 (1909), 728-32.

DeAragon, RáGena C., 'Dowager Countesses, 1066-1230,' *ANS* 17 (1995), 87-100.

- Deliyannis, Deborah Mauskopf, *Historiography in Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- Denholm-Young, N., (Review of) *The Chronicle of Melrose. Studies in Economics and Political Science, No. 100* by Allan Orr Anderson, Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson, and William Croft Dickinson, *Medium Ævum*, 5 (1936), 129-132.
- Denholm-Young, N. 'Thomas de Wykes and His Chronicle', *EHR*, 61 (1946), 157-79.
- Douglas, David C., *The Norman Achievement, 1050-1100* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969).
- Douglas, David C., *The Norman Fate* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1976).
- Douglas, David C., *William the Conqueror* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1964).
- Duncan, Archibald A. M., *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1975).
- Duncan, Archibald A. M., *The Kingship of the Scots. 842-1292; Succession and Independence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002).
- Duncan, H. G., *Immigration and Assimilation* (Boston, MA: D. C. Heath, 1933).
- Dutton, M., 'A Mirror for Twelfth-Century England', in *Aelred of Rievaulx: The Historical Works*, ed. by M. Dutton (Kalamazoo. Cistercian Press, 2005), pp. 1-39.
- Elton, Geoffrey, *The English* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992).
- Farmer, Dom Hugh, O. S. B., 'William of Malmesbury's Life and Works', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 13 (1962), 39-54.
- Fell, Christine, *Women in English England* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1985).
- Fenton, Kristen A., 'Writing Masculinity and Religious Identity in Henry of Huntingdon', in *Religious Men and Masculine Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by P. H. Cullen and Katherine J. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2013), pp. 64-77.
- Fleming, Robin, 'Domesday Book and the Tenurial Revolution', *ANS* 9, ed. by R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), pp. 87-102.
- Fleming, Robin, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Fonnesberg-Schmidt, Iben, *The Popes and the Baltic Crusades: 1147-1254* (Boston, MA: Brill, 2007).

Freeman, Edward A., *A Short History of the Norman Conquest of England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1880).

Freeman, Edward A., *The History of the Norman Conquest, Its Causes and Its Results*, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon, 1867-79).

Freeman, Elizabeth, 'Meaning and Multi-Centeredness in (Postmodern) Medieval Historiography: the Foundation History of Fountains Abbey', *Parergon*, 16 (1999), 43-84.

Freeman, Elizabeth, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150-1220* (Turnout, BE: Brepols, 2002).

Galbraith, V. H., *Historical Research in Medieval England*, The Creighton Lecture in History, 1949 (London: University of London, 1951), pp. 1-46

Galbraith, V. H., *Roger Wendover and Matthew Paris*, David Murray Lecture II, 1944 (Glasgow: Glasgow University, 1970), pp. 5-48.

Garnett, George, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Garnett, George, 'Franci et Angli: The Legal Distinctions between Peoples after the Conquest' ANS, 8, ed. by R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1985), pp. 109-37.

Geary, Patrick, 'Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages', *Medieval Perspectives*, 3 (1988), 1-17.

Geary, Patrick J., *The Myth of Nations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

Geller, Ernst, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983).

Gem, Richard, 'England and the Resistance to Romanesque Architecture', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill, Christopher J. Holdsworth, and Janet L. Nelson (Woodbridge Boydell, 1989), pp. 129-139.

Gillingham, John, 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 5 (1992), 392-409.

Gillingham, John, 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism', in *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*, ed. by John Gillingham (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), pp. 3-18.

Gillingham, John, 'Civilizing the English? The English Histories of William of

Malmesbury and David Hume', *BIHR*, 74 (2001), 17-43.

Gillingham, John, 'Conquering the Barbarians: War and Chivalry in Britain and Ireland', *Haskins Society Journal*, 4 (1992), 67-84.

Gillingham, John, 'The Foundations of a Disunited Kingdom' in *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*, ed. by John Gillingham (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000), p. 93-109.

Gillingham, John, 'Henry of Huntingdon and the Twelfth-Century Revival of the English Nation', in *Concepts of National identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. by S. Forde, L. Johnson and A Murray, (Leeds: Leeds Studies in English, 1995), pp. 75-101.

Gillingham, John, 'A Historian of the Twelfth-century Renaissance and Transformation of English Society, 1066-ca. 1200', in *European Transformations, the Long Twelfth Century*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (Notre Dame IN: Notre Dame University, 2012), pp. 45-74.

Gillingham, John, 'Problems of Integration within the Lands Ruled by the Norman and Angevin Kings of England', in *Fragender Politischen Integration in Mittelalterlichen Europa*, ed by Werner Maleczek (Ostifilden, DE: Thorbecke, 2005), pp. 85-135.

Gillingham, John, 'A Second Tidal Wave? The Historiography of English Colonization of Ireland, Scotland and Wales in the 12th and 13th Centuries', in *Historiographical Approaches to Medieval Colonization of East Central Europe: a Comparative Analysis against the Backdrop of other European Inter-ethnic Colonization Processes in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Jan M. Piskorski (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 2002), pp. 303-327.

Gillingham, John, 'Slaves of the Normans? Gerald de Barri and the Early Regnal Solidarity in Early Thirteenth-Century England', in *Law, Laity and Solidarity: Essays in Honour of Susan Reynolds*, ed. by Pauline Stafford, Janet L. Nelson and Jane Martindale (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 160-71.

Gillingham, John, 'Women, Children and the Profits of War' in *Gender and Historiography: Studies in the Earlier Middle Ages Honour of Pauline Stafford*, ed. by J. L. Nelson, S. Reynolds (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2012), pp. 61-74.

Glidden, Aelred, 'Aelred the Historian: The Account of the Battle of the Standard', in *Erudition at God's Service*, ed. by J. R. Sommerfeldt (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), pp. 175-84.

Given-Wilson, Chris, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Hambledon, 2004).

- Godfrey, John, *The English Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962).
- Goetz, Hans-Werner, 'Introduction', in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 1-11.
- Goodich, Michael, 'Biography 1000-1300', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskoph Deliyannis (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 353-85.
- Grainge, William, *The Battles and Battlefields of England, From the Earliest Times to the End of the Great Civil War* (London: A. Hall and Co., 1854).
- Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c.1307* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974).
- Grant, Alexander, 'The Triumph of Scotland', in *The Making of Britain: The Middle Ages*, ed. by L. M. Smith (New York, NY: Schocken, 1985), pp. 72-73.
- Green, John Richard, 'Blending of Conquerors and Conquered', in *Readings in English History*, ed. by John Richard Green (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1879), pp. 62-69.
- Green, Judith, 'Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1066-1174', in *England and her Neighbours 1066-1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. by Michael Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Ronceverte, 1989), pp. 53-73.
- Green, Judith A., 'Aristocratic Loyalties on the Northern Frontier of England, c. 1100-1174' in *the Twelfth Century England*, ed. by D. Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), pp. 83-100.
- Green, Judith A., 'Aristocratic Women in Early Twelfth-Century England', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, ed. by C. Warren Hollister, Proceedings of the Bouchard Conference on Anglo-Norman History 1995 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), pp. 59-83.
- Green, Judith, *The Aristocracy of Norman England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Green, Judith, 'King Henry I and Northern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 17 (2007), 35-55.
- Green, Judith, 'Unity and Disunity in the Anglo-Norman State', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 63 (1989), 15-34.
- Greenwald, Ronald, 'Henry of Huntingdon: Schemer or Dupe?', *Public Heritage Institute*



at Regis College, 1 (2012), 131-36.

Greenway, B. F. Harvey and M. Lapidge (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50 (2000), 135.

Greenway, Diana, 'Authority, Convention and Observation in Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*', ANS 18, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), pp. 105-21.

Greenway, Diana, 'Henry of Huntingdon and the Manuscripts of His *Historia Anglorum*', ANS 9, ed. by R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987), pp.103-26.

Guenée, Bernard, 'L'Historiographie par les mots' in *Le Metier d'historien au moyen age*, ed. by Bernard Guenée (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne 1977).

Guthrie, William, *A General History of Scotland: From the Earliest Accounts to the Present Time*, 10 vols (Edinburgh: Robinsion and Roberts, 1767).

Halporn, James, and Martin Ostwald, and Thomas Rosenmeyer, *The Meters of Greek and Latin Poetry* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963).

Hammond, Matthew, 'Ethnicity and the Writing of Medieval Scottish History', *Scottish Historical Review*, 85 (2006), 1-27.

Hanning, Robert W., *The Vision of History in Early Britain: From Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1966).

Harvey, Barbara, 'Conclusion', in *The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, ed. by *The Short Oxford History of the British Isles*, ed. by Paul Langford (Oxford: Oxford University, 2001), pp. 243-64.

Haskins, C. H., *The Normans in European History* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1915).

Hastings, Adrian, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*, The 1996 Wiles Lectures given at The Queen's University of Belfast (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Hastings, Thomas, *The British archer, or, Tracts on archery* (London: R. Ackerman, 1831).

Hatcher, John and Mark Bailey, *Modeling in the Middle Ages: The History and Theory of England's Economic Development* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Heather, Peter, *Empires and Barbarians* (London: Macmillan, 2009).

Hechter, Michael, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National*

*Development, 1536-1996* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).

Hingst, Amanda Jane, *The Written Word: Past and Present in the Work of Orderic Vitalis* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009).

Holdsworth, Christopher J., 'War and Peace in the Twelfth Century: The Reign of Stephen Reconsidered' in *War and Peace in the Middle Ages*, ed. by B. P. McGuire (Copenhagen, DK: C. A. Reitzels Forlag, 1987), pp. 67-93.

Hollister, C. Warren, '1066: "The Feudal Revolution"', *American Historical Review*, 73 (1968), 708-23.

Hollister, C. Warren, *Henry I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

Hollister, C. Warren, *The Military Organization of Norman England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).

Hollister, C. Warren, 'Recent Trends in Anglo-Norman Scholarship: The New Political History', *Albion*, 14 (1998), 254-57.

Holmes, Richard, *Britain at War: famous British Battles From Hastings to Normandy, 1066-1944* (Irvington, NY: Hylas Publishing, 2004).

Holt, John C., *Colonial England 1066-1215* (London: Hambledon, 1997).

Hoorens, Vera, 'Self Favouring Biases, Self-Presentation and the Self-Other Asymmetry in Social Comparison', *Journal of Personality*, 63 (1995), 793-817.

Horobin, Gordon W., 'Adjustment and Assimilation: The Displaced Person', *Sociological Review*, 5 (1957), 239-54.

Hughes, Geoffrey, *Political Correctness: A History of Semantics and Culture* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).

Hunik, Nimmi, *Ethnic Minority Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991).

Hunt, Chester L., and Lewis Walker, *Ethnic Dynamics: Patterns of Intergroup Relations in Various Societies* (Homewood, IL: 1974).

Hyams, Paul, 'The Common Law and The French Connection', ed. by R. Allen Brown in *ANS* iv. (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1982), pp. 77-92.

James, Edward, *Europe's Barbarians: AD 200-600* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2009).

Jewell, Helen, *Women in Medieval England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press,

1996).

Jones, W. R., 'England against the Celtic Fringe: A Study in Cultural Stereotypes', *Cahiers d'histoire Mondiale: Journal of World History*, 13 (1971), 155-171.

Jotischky, Andrew and Keith Stringer, 'Introduction' in *Norman Expansion: Connections, Continuities and Contrasts*, ed. by Andrew Jotischky and Keith Stringer (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 1-8.

Kapelle, William E., *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and its Transformation 1000-1135* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

Keats-Rohan, K. S. B., 'The Bretons and the Normans of England, 1066-1154: the Family, the Fief and the Feudal Monarchy', *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies*, 36 (1992), 42-78.

Keats-Rohan, K. S. B., *Domesday People; A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in English Documents, 1066-1166: I, Domesday Book* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999).

Keats-Rohan, Katherine S. B., 'William I and the Breton Contingent in the Non-Norman Conquest of England 1060-1087', in *ANS*, 13, (1990) ed. by Marjorie Chibnall, pp. 157-72.

Keegan, John, *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo, and the Somme* (New York: Penquin, 1983).

Keen, Maurice, *Medieval Warfare: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Kersken, Norbert, 'High and Late Medieval National Historiography', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskoph Deliyannis (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002), pp. 181-215.

Keynes, Simon, and 'The Declining Reputation of King Ethelred the Unready', in *English History: Basic Readings*, ed. by David A. Pelteret (London: Garland Publishing, 2000), pp. 157-190.

King, Edmund, *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

King, Edmund, *King Stephen* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).

King, Edmund, 'King Stephen and the Anglo-Norman Aristocracy', *History*, 59 (174), 180-194.

LaFaromboise, Teresa Hardin, L. K. Coleman, and Jennifer Gerton, 'Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory', *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, (1993), 395-412.

- Lamplough, Edward, *Yorkshire Battles* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co, 1891).
- Langdale, Thomas, *A Topographical History of Yorkshire* (Northallerton: Thomas Langdale, 1822).
- Larson, Laurence Marcellus, *Canute the Great: 995 (circ.)-1035 and the rise of Danish Imperialism during the Viking Age* (London: G. P. Putnam, 1912).
- Lawrence, James, *Warrior Race: A History of the British at War* (NY, NY: St. Martin's Press, 2003).
- Lawrence-Mathers, Anne, *Manuscripts in Northumbria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).
- Lavelle, Ryan 'Anglo-Saxonists, Æthelred II and a Rolling Millennium—1978-2014, and Beyond', *English Historical Studies*, 95 (2014), 721-32.
- Lawrence-Mathers, Anne E., 'John of Worcester and the Science of History' *Journal of Medieval History*, 39 (2013), 255-74.
- Leadman, Alex D. H., *Proelia Eboracensia: Battles Fought in Yorkshire: Treated Historically and Topographically* (London: Bradbury, Agnew, & Co. Limd., 1891).
- Leadman, Alex D. H., 'The Battle of the Standard', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 10 (1889), 375-387.
- Le Patourel, John, *The Norman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).
- Lewis, Christopher P., 'The Domesday Jurors', *Haskins Society Journal*, 5 (1993), 17-44.
- Lewis, Christopher P., 'Early Earls of Norman England', in *ANS*, 13, ed. by Marjorie Chibnall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990), pp. 207-23.
- Leyser, Henrietta, *Medieval Women: A Social History of Women in England 450-1500* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995).
- Linton, Ralph 'The Distinctive Aspects of Acculturation', in *Acculturation in Seven American Tribes*, ed. by Ralph Linton (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, (1963), pp. 501-20.
- Llobera, Josep R., 'A Comment on Hastings's *The Construction of Nationhood*', *Nations and Nationalism*, 9 (2003), 15-17.
- London, Herbert I. 'Liberalising the White Australia Policy: Integration, Assimilation, or Cultural Pluralism', *Australian Outlook*, 21 (1967), 338-46.
- Loud, G. A., 'The Gens Normannorum – Myth or Reality?' *ANS*, 4, ed. by R. Allen

Brown (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1981), pp. 104-16.

Loyn, Henry, 'Abbots of English Monasteries in the Period Following the Norman Conquest', in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by David Bates and Ann Curry (London: Hambledon, 1994), pp. 95-103.

Loyd, Lewis C., *The Origins of some Anglo-Norman Families* (Leeds: Harleian Society, 1951).

Lynch Michael, *Scotland: A New History*, 2nd edn (London: Pilmco 1992).

Mackie, J. D., *A History of Scotland*, 2nd edn (New York, NY: Dorset Press, 1978).

Mathisen, Ralph W., 'Becoming Roman, Becoming Barbarian': Roman Citizenship and the Assimilation of Barbarians in the Late Roman World, in *Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. by Ulbe Bosma and others (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), pp. 191-217.

Matthew, Donald, *Britain and the Continent 1000-1300* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005).

Matthew, Donald, 'Durham and the Anglo-Norman Word, in *Anglo-Norman Durham: 1093-1193* ed. by David Rollason, Margaret Harvey, and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994), pp. 1-22.

McCarthy, Michael R., H. R. T. Summerson, and R. G. Annis, *Carlisle Castle: A Survey and Documentary History*, English Heritage Archaeological Report no. 18 (London: *Historic Buildings & Monuments Commission for England*, 1990).

Melve, Leidulf, '“The Revolt of the Medievalists”. Directions in recent Research on the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Journal of Medieval History*, 32 (2006), 231-52.

Mitchison, Rosalind, *A History of Scotland*, 3rd edn (London: Routledge, 2002).

Mooers, Stephanie L., 'Familial Clout and Financial Gain in Henry I's Later Reign', *Albion*, 3 (1982), 268-91.

Mooers, Stephanie L., 'Patronage in the Pipe Roll of 1130', *Speculum*, 59 (1984), 287-307.

Morgan, Philip, 'The Naming of Battlefields in the Middle Ages' in *War and Society in Medieval and Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Diana Dunn (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), pp. 34-53.

Morillo, Stephen, *Warfare under the Anglo-Norman Kings* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1994).

Myers, David G., 'Polarizing Effects of Social Comparison', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 14 (1978), 554-63.

Newman, Charlotte A., *The Anglo-Norman Nobility in the Reign of Henry I: The Second Generation* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

Newman, Charlotte A., 'Family and Royal Favour in Henry I's England', *Albion*, 3 (1982), 292-302.

Noble, Thomas F. X. 'Introduction: Romans, barbarians, and the transformation of the Roman Empire', in *From Roman Provinces to Medieval Kingdoms*, ed. by Thomas F. X. Noble (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-27.

O'Brien, Bruce R., *Reversing Babel Translation Among the English during an Age of Conquests c. 800 to c. 1200* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2011).

Oliver, Lisi, *The Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

Oman, Charles, *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols (London: Methuen & Co, 1924), i. A.D. 378 – 1515.

Oram, Richard D., 'David I and the Scottish Conquest and Colonisation of Moray', *Northern Scotland*, 19, (1999), pp. 1-19.

Oram, R., *David I: The King who Made Scotland* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004).

O'Sullivan, Deirdre, 'Normanising the North: The Evidence of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture', *Medieval Archaeology*, 55 (2011), 163-91.

Palgrave, Francis, *The History of England and Normandy*, 4 vols (London: Macmillan, 1864).

Partner, Nancy, 'Henry of Huntingdon: Clerical Celibacy and the Writing of History', *Church History*, 42 (1973), 467-75.

Partner, Nancy, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

Pattison, John, 'Integration versus Apartheid in Post Roman Britain: A Response to Thomas et al. (2008)', *Human Biology*, 83 (2011), 715-33.

Pelteret, David, *Slavery in Early Medieval England from the Reign of Alfred until the Twelfth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell. 1995).

Pine, L. G., *Sons of the Conqueror; Descendants of Norman Ancestry* (Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle, 1973).

Pizarro, Joaquin Martinez, 'Ethnic and National History ca. 500-1000', in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Deborah Mauskoph Deliyannis (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2002), pp.

43-87.

Planché, J. R., *The Conqueror and his Companions* (London: Tinsley, 1874).

Pohl, Walter, 'Conceptions of Ethnicity in Early Medieval Studies', in *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings*, ed. by Lester K. Little and Barbara H. Rosenwein (Malden, MA: Brill, 1998), pp.15-24.

Pohl, Walter, 'Frontiers and Ethnic Identities: Some Final Considerations' in *Borders, Barriers and Ethnogenesis Frontiers in Late Antiquities and the Middle Ages*, ed. by Florin Curta, (Turnhout, BE: Breopolis, 2005), pp. 255-65.

Pohl, Walter, 'Telling the difference: Signs of ethnic identity', in *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-900*, ed. by Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1998), pp.17-69.

Poo, Mu-chou, 'To Become Chinese: Cultural Consciousness and Political Legitimacy in early Medieval China (220-681)', in *Migration and Membership Regimes in Global and Historical Perspective*, ed. by Ulbe Bosma and others (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2013), pp. 169-89.

Poole, Austin Lane, *From Domesday book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

Power, Eileen, and M. M. Postan, *Medieval Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

Powicke, F. M., 'Notes of the Compilation of the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris', *Modern Philology*, 38 (1941), 301-17.

Prestwich, Michael, 'War and Finance in the Anglo-Norman State', *TRHS*, 5<sup>th</sup> series 4 (1954), pp. 19-43.

Prestwich, J. O., 'Military intelligence under the Norman and Angevin Kings, in *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. by George Garnett and John Hudson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1-30.

Prestwich, Michael, *Armies and Warfare in the Middle Ages: The English Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

Ramsay, James Henry, *The Foundations of England: or Twelve Centuries of British History (B. C. 55- A. D. 1154)*, 2 vols (London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1898).

Ramsay, James H., 'The Strength of English Armies in the Middle Ages', *EHS*, 29 (1914), 221-227.

- Ransford, Rosalind, 'A Kind of Noah's Ark: Aelred of Rievaulx and National Identity', in *Religion and National Identity*, ed. Stuart Mews, Studies in Church History, 51 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), xviii., 137-46.
- Ray, Roger D., 'Medieval Historiography through the Twelfth-Century: Problems and Progress of Research', *Viator*, 5 (1974), 33-59.
- Ray, Roger D., 'Orderic Vitalis and His Readers', *Studia Monastica*, 14 (1972), 17-33.
- Rex, Peter, *1066: A New History of the Norman Conquest* (Stroud: Amberley, 2009).
- Renan, Ernest, '*Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?*' (Paris, FR: Levy, 1882).
- Rex, Peter, *The English Resistance: The Underground War against the Normans* (Stroud: Tempus, 2004).
- Richardson, F. M., *Fighting Spirit: A Study of the Psychological Factors of War* (London: Leo Cooper, 1978).
- Richardson, H. G. and G. O. Sayles, *The Governance of Mediaeval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh: University Press, 1963).
- Rigg, A. G., *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature: 1066-1422* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Ritchie, R. L. G., *The Normans in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1954).
- Rollason, David, *Northumbria, 500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Rollason, David, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
- Round, John Horace, *Feudal England: Historical Studies on the XIth and XIIth centuries* (London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1895).
- Rudmin, Floyd, 'Catalogue of Acculturation Constructs: Descriptions of 126 Taxonomies, 1918-2003', in *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, ed. by W. J. Lonner and others (Bellingham WA: Western Washington University, Center for Cross-Cultural Research, 2003), pp. 1-45.
- Russell, Frederick H., *Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- Sanders, G. S. and R. S. Baron, 'Is Social Comparison Irrelevant for Producing Choice Shifts?', *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13 (1977), 303-14.



Sanders, I. J., *English Baronies: A Study of their Origin and Descent 1086-1327* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960).

Sawyer, Peter, '1066-1086: A Tenurial Revolution?' in *Domesday Book: A Reassessment*, ed. by Peter Sawyer (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), pp. 71-85.

Saywell, J. L., *The History and Annals of Northallerton, Yorkshire* (London: Simpkins, Marshall & Co, 1885).

Schumann, John H., 'Social Distance as a Factor in Second Language Acquisition', *Language Learning*, 26 (1976), 137-67.

Schumann, John H., 'Research on the Acculturation Model of Second Language Acquisition', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7 (1986), 379-92.

Scott, Walter, *The Poetical Works of Walter Scott: Complete in One Volume* (Frankfort, DE: Broenner, 1826).

Scott, Walter, 'Marmion, A Tale of Flodden Field' in *The poetical works of Sir Walter Scott: complete in one volume: with all his introductions and notes, also various readings, and the editor's notes*, Second Canto (Edinburgh: Robert Cadwell, 1848).

Senter, Donovan. 'Acculturation among New Mexico villagers in Comparison to Adjustment Patterns of other Spanish speaking Americans', *Rural Sociology*, 10 (1945), 31-47.

Sharpe, Richard, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Brepols, BE: Tunhout, 2001).

Sharpe, Richard, *Norman Rule in Cumbria: 1092-1136* (Carlisle: Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, 2006).

Short, Ian, 'Language and Literature', in *A Companion to The Anglo-Norman World*, ed. by Christopher Harper Bill and Elisabeth van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 191-213.

Short, Ian, 'Bilingualism in Anglo-Norman England', *Romance Philology*, 33 (1980), 467-79.

Short, Ian, 'Patrons and Polyglots: French Literature in Twelfth Century England', in *ANS 14*, ed. by Marjorie Chibnall (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 229-49.

Simmons, Clare A., *Reversing the Conquest: History and Myth in Nineteenth Century British Literature* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990).

Simpson, A. W. B., 'The Laws of Ethelberht', in *On the Laws and Customs of England*,

ed. by Morris Arnold and others (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1981).

Skene, William Forbes, *Celtic Scotland: A History of Ancient Alban*, 3 vols, (Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas, 1876-80).

Smith, Anthony D., *The Ethnic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Smith, Anthony D., 'Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Nationalism', *International Affairs*, 72 (1996), 445-58.

Smith, Anthony D., *The Nation in History Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000).

Sobecki, Sebastian I., *The Sea and Medieval English Literature* (Rochester, NY: Brewer, 2008).

Sommerfeldt, John, *Aelred of Rievaulx: Pursuing Perfect Happiness* (New York, NY: Newman, 2005).

Sønnesyn, Sigbørn Olsen, *William of Malmesbury and the Ethics of History* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012).

Southern, R. W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing. 1. Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth' *The Sense of the Past*, *TRHS*, 5<sup>th</sup> Ser. 20 (1970), 173-96.

Southern, R. W., 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing. 4. The Sense of the Past', *TRHS*, 5<sup>th</sup> Ser. 23 (1973), 243-63.

Southern, Richard W., *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970).

Spiegel, Gabrielle M., 'Genealogy and Function in Medieval Historical Narrative', *History and Theory*, 22 (1983), 43-53.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M., *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, 1997).

Squire, Aelred, *Aelred of Rievaulx* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1972).

Stafford, Pauline, 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Identity and the Making of England', *Haskins Society Journal*, 19 (2007), 28-50.

Stafford, Pauline, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in the Eleventh Century* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993).

Stafford, Pauline, *Unification and Conquest: A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London: Edward Arnold, 1989).

Stafford, Pauline, 'Women and the Conquest', *TRHS*, 6<sup>th</sup> Ser. (1994), 221-49.

Stenton, Doris Mary, *The English Woman in History* (London: George Allen and Urwin, 1957).

Stenton, F. W., *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).

Stenton, Frank M., 'English Families and the Norman Conquest', *TRHS*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ser., 26 (1944), 1-12.

Storelli, Xavier, 'Les Harangues De La Bataille De L'étendard (1138)', *Médiévales* 57, (2009), 15-32.

Strickland, Matthew, *The Great Warbow: from Hastings to Mary Rose* (Thrupp: Sutton, 2005).

Strickland, Matthew, 'Securing the North: Invasion and the Strategy of Defence in Twelfth-Century English Warfare', in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 208-29.

Strickland, Matthew, *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066-1217* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Stringer, Keith, *The Reign of Stephen: Kingship, Warfare, and Government in Twelfth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1993).

Stringer, Keith, 'State-Building in Twelfth Century Britain: David I, King of Scots, and Northern England', in *Government, Religion and Society in Northern England 1000-1700*, ed. by John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Thrupp: Sutton, 1997), pp. 40-62.

Taft, Ronald, 'The Role of Personality of the Mediator' in *The Mediating Person: Bridges between Cultures*, ed. by Stephen Bochner (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1981), pp. 53-88.

Tait, James, 'John Horace Round', *EHR*, 43 (1928), 572-77.

Taylor, J., *Medieval Historical Writing in Yorkshire* (York: St. Anthony's Press, 1961).

Thierry, Augustin, *Historie de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* (Paris, Furne et Ciel, 1851).

Thierry, Augustin, *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans*, ed. by J. Arthur Price (London: J. M. Dent, 1907).

Thierry, Augustin, 'Battle of the Standard', in *Readings in English History*, ed. by John Richard Green (New York, NY: Harper & Brothers, 1879), pp. 70-75.

Thomas, Hugh M., *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity, 1066-c.1220* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Thomas, Hugh, 'The Significance and Fate of the Native English Landholders of 1086', *English Historical Review*, 118, (2003), 303-333.

Thomas, Hugh M., *Vassals, Heiresses, Crusaders, and Thugs* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993).

Thompson, Kathleen, 'Affairs of State: the illegitimate children of Henry I', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29 (2003), 129-51.

Thomson, Rodney M., *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003).

Thomson, Rodney M., 'William of Malmesbury and the Latin Classics Revisited', in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. by Tobias Reinhardt, Michael Lapidge and J. N. Adams, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 129 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 383-93.

Tolliver, Hazel, 'Plautus and the State of Gods in Rome', *The Classical Journal*, 48 (1952), 49-57.

Tout, T. F., 'Wales and the March during the Barons' War, 1258-1267', in *Historical Essays by Members of the Owens College, Manchester*, ed. by T. F. Tout and James Tait (London: Longmans, Green, 1902), pp. 76-136.

Tout, T. F., *The Place of the Reign of Edward II in English History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1914).

Truax, Jean A., 'A Time for Peace: Aelred of Rievaulx and the End of the Anglo-Norman Civil War', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 46 (2011), 171-87.

Tsurushima, Hirokazu, 'Introduction: What do we mean by 'Nations' in Early Medieval Britain?' in *Nations in Medieval Britain*, ed. by Hirokazu Tsurushima, (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2010), pp. 1-18.

Turner, Ralph, *Men Raised from the Dust: Administrative Service and upward Mobility in Angevin England* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

van Houts, Elisabeth, 'Historical Writing' in *A Companion to the Anglo-Norman World*, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill and Elisabeth van Houts (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 113-21.

van Houts, E. M. C., *History and Family Traditions in England and the Continent, 1000-1200* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

van Houts, Elisabeth, 'The Memory of 1066 in Written and Oral Traditions', in *ANS 19*, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill, (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), pp. 167-79.

Vander Zanden, James W., *American Minority Relations* (New York, NY: Ronald Press 1963).

Vaughan, Richard, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1958).

Vaughan, Richard, 'The Past in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 12 (1986), 1-14.

Velázquez, Isabel, 'Pro patriae gentisque Gothorum statv' in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), pp. 161-217.

Verbruggen, J. E., *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe during the Middle Ages: from the Eighth-Century to 1340*, trans. by Sumner Willard and R. W. Southern, 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997).

von Clausewitz, Carl, *On War*, ed. and trans. by Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976).

Walker, David, 'Cultural Survival in an Age of Conquest', in *Welsh Society and Nationhood: Historical Essays presented to Glanmor Williams*, ed. by R. R. Davies and others (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1984), pp. 35-50.

Walker, David, *The Normans in Britain* (Cambridge, MA, 1995).

Wallace-Hadrill, John Michael, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent: The Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1970* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).

Walter, Paul, Jr., *Race and Culture Relations* (New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1952).

Ward, John O., 'Orderic Vitalis as Historian in the Europe of the Early Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Parergon*, 31 (2014), 1-26.

- Warren, W. L., *Henry II*, 3rd edn (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
- Weiler, Björn, 'Matthew Paris on the Writing of History', *Journal of Medieval History*, 35 (2009), 254-78.
- Werner, K. F., 'Völker und Regna', in *Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Reichs- und Nationsbildung in Deutschland und Frankreich*, ed. C. Bruhl and B. Schneidmüller, *Historische Zeitschrift Beiheft N.F. 24* (München: R. Oldenburg, 1997), pp. 15-44.
- West, Francis James, 'The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest?' *History*, 84 (1999), 219-36.
- Whitaker, T. D., *A History of the Original Parish of Whalley and Honour of Clitheroe* (London: Routledge, 1872).
- Williams, Ann, 'Cockles amongst the Wheat': Danes and English in the Western Midlands in the First Half of The Eleventh Century', *Midland History*, 11 (1986), 1-22.
- Williams, Ann, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995).
- Wilson, R. W., *Early Middle English Literature* (London: Methuen, 1968).
- Winkler, Emily A., 'England's Defending Kings in Twelfth-Century Historical Writing', in *Haskins Society Journal*, ed. by Laura L. Gathagan and William North, 25 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2014), pp. 147-63.
- Withers, Charles, W. J., 'Writing in Geography's History: *Caledonia*, Networks of Correspondence and Geographical Knowledge in the Late Enlightenment', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 120 (2004), 33-45.
- Woolf, Alex, 'Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England' in *The Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by N. J. Higham (London: Boydell, 2007), pp. 115-129.
- Wormald, Patrick, 'Bede. Beowulf, and the Convention of English Aristocracy', *Bede and English England*, ed. by R. T. Farrell (Oxford: *British Archaeological Reports*, 1978).
- Wormald, Patrick, 'The *Leges Barbarorum*: Law and Ethnicity in the Post-Roman West', in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdom in the Transformation of the Roman World*, ed. by Hans-Werner Goetz, Jorg Jarnut and Walter Pohl (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2003), pp. 21-53.
- Wyatt, David, *Slaves and Warriors in Medieval Britain and Ireland, 800-1200* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 2009).

Yorke, Barbara, *The Conversion of Britain: 600-800* (London: Pearson, 2006).

Yorke Barbara, *Kings and Kingdom of Early Anglo-Saxon England*, (London: Sealby, 1990).

Young, Peter and John Adair, *Hastings to Culloden* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1964).

### **Unpublished Doctoral Thesis**

Georgi, David, *Language Made Visible: The Invention of French in England after the Norman Conquest* (unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia University, 2008).

Hunter, Linsey Forsyth, *Charter Diplomats and Norms of Landholding and Lordship between the Humber and the Forth, c. 1066-c. 1250* (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2012).

McGuigan, Neil, *Neither Scotland nor England: Middle Britain c.850-1150* (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2015).

McKinney, Windy A., 'Creating a *gens Anglorum*: Social and Ethnic Identity in Anglo-Saxon England through the Lens of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*' (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of York, Centre for Medieval Studies, 2011).

Rozier, Charles Colin, *The Importance of Writing Institutional History in the Anglo-Norman Realm, c.1060-c.1142, with special reference to Eadmer's Historia Novorum, Symeon of Durham's Libellus de exordio, and the Historia Ecclesiastica of Orderic Vitalis* (unpublished PhD Thesis, Durham University, 2013).

Shelley, Percy van Dyke, *English and French in England 1066-1100* (unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1921).

Slitt, Rebecca, *Aristocratic Male Friendship in the Anglo-Norman World, 1000-1300* (unpublished PhD Thesis, Fordham University, 2008).

### **Conferences**

Freeman, Elizabeth, 'The Many Functions of Cistercian Histories, using Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo* as a Case Study', *The Medieval Chronicle Proceedings of the 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrecht, 13-16 July 1996*, 124-132.

Green, Judith, 'The Norman Edge: North Britain', presented at 'Power and Acculturation in the Norman World' at Lancaster University, 15 December 2011.

Lewis, Christopher P., 'Profiling English Landed Society' presented at The Haskins Society at Boston College', 2011 <http://www.medievalists.net/2011/11/04/profiling-english-landed-society-in-1066/>

Power, Daniel, 'Norman Identity and the Identity of Normandy, c. 1000-1300', presented at 'Power and Acculturation in the Norman World', Lancaster University, 16 December 2011

## Websites

The Archer's Guide

<https://www.archerylibrary.com/books/guide/>

Cicero, Marcus Tullius, Orations against Catiliina

Cicero, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes In Catilinam, Oratio In L. Catilinam Prima*, l. 2,

<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/cat.shtml>

Clark, Matthew, The Bloody Battles that Shaped Yorkshire History.

[http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/12906158.The\\_bloody\\_battles\\_that\\_shaped\\_Yorkshire\\_s\\_history/](http://www.yorkpress.co.uk/news/12906158.The_bloody_battles_that_shaped_Yorkshire_s_history/)

Digitised Manuscripts Royal\_MS\_14\_C\_VII.

[http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal\\_MS\\_14\\_C\\_VII](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_14_C_VII)

Helmerichs, Robert, an editor of Fordham University's ORB: On-line Reference Book for Medieval Studies. The Rollonid Principality

[www.the-orb.net/encyclop/high/normandy/normhist/n10th2-6.html](http://www.the-orb.net/encyclop/high/normandy/normhist/n10th2-6.html)

Map of the Mediterranean Sea (1v); Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* (2r–393r), incorporating St Godric's hymn to the Blessed Virgin Mary (150v: Boffey 2988); *De gestis regis Arthuri* (393r–395r).

[http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo\\_library/libweb/action/dlDisplay.do?docId=IAMS040-001102726&vid=IAMS\\_VU2](http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/dlDisplay.do?docId=IAMS040-001102726&vid=IAMS_VU2).

Manuscript Miniatures CCC MS.26 *Chronica Majora*

<http://manuscriptminiatures.com/4454/8413/>

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography:

Serlo <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/>



