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ABSTRACT

Analyses of medieval crusade have highlighted the ways in which participants expressed multifaceted martial, ecclesiastical, regional and gendered expressions of identity. Much of contemporaries' consideration and display of 'crusading identity' took place far away from the battlefield. This paper examines an element of crusading identity manifest in the Kingdom of Scotland – a region that produced numerous crusaders and benefactors of the Military Orders, and yet has seldom featured as a centre-point for crusade studies. This article focuses on crusaders’ practice of settling disputes and displaying their magnanimity within their community, ahead of their departure. Using Earl Patrick II of Dunbar (d 1248) and Robert de Brus (d 1295) as case studies, the article argues that their preparations for holy war are indicative of a strong awareness of the subtleties of wider Latin Christian crusading culture among Scotland’s nobility.

INTRODUCTION

In 1248, Jean de Joinville, a nobleman from Champagne in France, summoned his peers, vassals and neighbours to dine with him over a week-long feast before he embarked on crusade. At the end of the festivities, on the Friday, Jean spoke to his guests:

My lords, I am going away overseas and I do not know if I will return. So if I have done you any wrong, come forward, and I will right it for each of you in turn, as I would usually do for anyone who has a claim to make against me or my people.

He went on to explain:

I settled these claims on the advice of all the men of my lands, and, so that I might not exert any undue influence, I withdrew from the meeting and followed all their recommendations unquestioningly (Joinville 2008: 174).

Joinville recalled these events prior to the Seventh Crusade (1248–54) many decades after the fact. He wrote his Vie de Saint Louis in the early 14th century to celebrate the life of King Louis IX of France (d 1270) and glorify the crusade where Joinville had joined the king (Smith 2006). His text offers a uniquely direct insight into lay perspectives and ideals regarding crusade. Contrived ‘departure scenes’ are hardly unusual in the medieval literature surrounding holy war (Jordan 2002; Spencer 2019: 160–4). However, Joinville describes a convincing scene, in which preparations were not only pragmatic, but also highly ritualised. He was conscious that his kin and community would remember him by the manner of his departure, and so he wished to fully embody (or at least be remembered as) the ideal, spiritually cleansed and moral pilgrim.

By the 13th century, displays of repentance had become a hallmark of crusading culture among royalty. King Louis IX of France began elaborate attempts to root out corruption.
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from his government ahead of his first crusade (Jordan 1979: 51–63). Likewise, King Henry III of England (d 1272) started the ritual of taking his crusade vows in 1250 by first standing before a crowd in London and begging their forgiveness for his transgressions and unlawful acts (Mesley 2019: 284). We might ask, therefore, how widespread these changing attitudes towards settling disagreements (and, crucially, displaying contrition) were among the broader elite and nobility of 13th-century western Europe. Joinville’s text gives us a rare glimpse, but how representative is he of his Latin contemporaries?

This paper seeks to explore medieval elite ideals surrounding crusade preparations, and displays of contrition, using case studies from 13th-century Scotland. The circumstances of Scottish noblemen’s provision for crusade will be examined and orientated within a wider cultural landscape of crusading models. The aim of this study is twofold: firstly, to highlight the importance for crusaders to address feuds, from a practical, spiritual and chivalric angle; secondly, to demonstrate the close observance of Latin crusading culture among some of Scotland’s nobility – an element of lay piety that is often overlooked, in studies both on the culture of crusade and on that of medieval Scottish nobility more generally.

SCOTLAND AND CRUSADE

Alan MacQuarrie’s work in the 1980s firmly highlighted the breadth of landowners from the medieval Kingdom of Scotland who ‘took the cross’ (McRoberts 1969; MacQuarrie 1981, 1985). Individuals from this kingdom appeared on campaigns from the outset of crusading in the 1090s, throughout expeditions to the Holy Land in the 12th and 13th centuries, and in other theatres of crusading warfare – notably in Iberia and the Baltic – in the 14th century and beyond. Although, compared to France or England, a relatively minor number of Scottish landowners went on crusade, the appeal of the movement to this group has never been in question (Ditchburn 2005: 206). More recently, Kathryn Hurlock has contextualised Scottish crusading within that of the wider enthusiasm felt in the British Isles during the High Middle Ages (Hurlock 2013).

The development and patronage of the Military Orders – such as the Knights Templar and Hospitaller – within Scotland have also merited some close study. These orders’ properties in Scotland formed part of the English langue, that is, they were organised and managed from the orders’ headquarters in London (Nicholson 1999: 50–6; McNiven 2013 23–38: Fawcett 2016). Nevertheless, the interests of 12th- and 13th-century Scottish royalty in the Mendicant and Military Orders is patent, and it has even been suggested that the Order of St Lazarus was first introduced to the British Isles in the mid-12th century via Scotland (Marcombe 2004: 34; MacLellan 2017; Bibby 2020). Undoubtedly, the draw of holy war was felt in Scotland, as it was in many kingdoms.

That said, the attitudes and sense of crusading identity felt by the laity in Scotland have often proven difficult to characterise. The field of crusade scholarship has highlighted numerous crusading identities that were at play in the Middle Ages; the knightly classes, for example, approached crusade with a mind on regional, dynastic, class-based and gendered concerns, to name a few (Paul 2012: 165–70; Vander Elst 2017: 75–9; Tamminen 2018; Hodgson et al 2019). The lack of contemporary narrative sources from medieval Scotland, written by laypeople who participated in crusade, compounds the problems in assessing the ways in which these elements informed attitudes across the kingdom. There is some 13th-century Gaelic poetry set within a crusading context (Clancy 1998: 270), and scholarship suggests that numerous Anglo-Scottish landowners were exposed to a variety of epic and song that circulated the francophone world, which either lauded or lampooned the chivalric models within crusade. Indeed, the capacity of Scottish landholders to connect and identify with the wider Norman world is clear (Stringer 2022). Unfortunately, these poetic or lyrical sources offer little in the way of direct and complex insight into the feelings of the Scottish elite.

There is, however, a comparatively rich corpus of charters written by Scotland’s nobles
when preparing for crusade. These sources provide a unique perspective on crusaders’ dealings, and their concerns during their final months before setting off. Studies of cartularies and charter material have unearthed a vast array of information on the motivations that surrounded (and the funding of) crusade (Bull 1993; Slack & Feiss 2001; Constable 2008: 73–89; Power 2014; Drell 2015). It is worth bearing in mind that there is no crusader for whom records have survived in totality, which give a complete picture of their preparations (Lloyd 1988: 154; Tyerman 1988: 189). Indeed, as with all surviving European charters, Scottish cartulary evidence does not necessarily present unaltered facsimiles of original medieval records (Tucker 2019). That said, reading these sources through the prism of texts like that of Jean de Joinville helps to highlight Scottish nobles’ appreciation for wider Latin Christian approaches towards crusade preparation – particularly the focus on the settling of feuds and legal quarrels.

PATRICK II, EARL OF DUNBAR

Patrick II, Earl of Dunbar (d 1248) was a contemporary of Jean de Joinville and, like his French counterpart, he too desired to join King Louis IX on crusade. Patrick was not alone in this – something of a burst of Scottish interest in crusade happened at this time, with others such as William de Lindsay and Thomas de Normanville, as well as the Master of the Templars in Scotland, all taking the cross (Hurlock 2013: 73).

In studying Patrick’s fundraising and preparations, it appears that he made some fascinating considerations for munificence, over strict financial gain. In mid-1247, the earl granted Melrose Abbey a stud farm (*equicium*) in Lauder, in the Scottish Borders: the monks offering 100 marks to Patrick and 20 marks to his son – no doubt to help cover his expenses (*Liber de Melros* I, 204–5, no. 230; Hamilton 2003: 350–1, no. 15). Patronising the monks of Melrose, on the eve of crusade, was no happenstance. An earl could offload assets to any number of private buyers or religious houses.

The decision to approach Melrose for capital is particularly interesting, given their past dealings. A charter made between either Patrick II or his son and Melrose Abbey indicates some intergenerational quarrels over land boundaries along Dere Street. The text’s preamble explained the context for this particular ‘Earl Patrick’ to seek peace:

[I]n the dispute between Earl Patrick of Dunbar and the monks of Melrose over the contents of the agreement made between the earl’s father [referring to Patrick I or II] and the monks concerning the road to Lauder by the causeways and Malcolm’s Road, eventually, in the interests of peace and wishing to avoid future controversy … (Hamilton 2003: 348–9, no. 14).

Evidently, some ill-will existed between the monks and Patrick II, which was either unsettled at the time he left on crusade, or only recently eased. Certainly, in April 1248, the monks were pursuing litigation against Patrick at a *curia regis* in Berwick, concerning land in Hassington (Hamilton 2003: 28, 352–4, nos 16–17). Either way, Patrick’s grant to the monks before his crusade may be interpreted as a gesture of reconciliation. Crucially, in his grant of the stud farm, Patrick II ensured that money was paid to his son and heir. Evidently, he was keen on drawing a line under his family’s dealings with Melrose – something which, again, may point to Patrick II’s perceived need to leave with a ‘clean slate’, so to speak.

Engaging a Cistercian house like Melrose at this time would have had added significance. Christoph Maier has shown that this religious order was especially interested in commemorating deceased crusaders (Bolton 1992; Maier 1997: 633; Jamroziak 2013; Bennett 2021: 32–5). Although Patrick II’s charter with Melrose does not include any requests for prayers, his attention to the Cistercians is telling.³ He also drafted a generous confirmation charter for Coldstream Priory, another Cistercian house. Elsa Hamilton tentatively dated this charter to the time of Patrick’s departure on crusade, in part because the scribe’s hand is similar to others of this later
point in Patrick’s earldom (Hamilton 2003: 28, n108). Admittedly, these were large monastic institutions that would have had many meaningful dealings with a powerful earl, and so their relationship (and breakdowns therein) is more transparent in the sources. Still, it does seem that settling discord and augmenting remembrances were crucial points to those concerned.

It would have been imperative for crusaders to perceive that God was on their side before they left. Nevertheless, limiting these sorts of transactions with the Church to the spiritual is not a wholly nuanced approach. We should also consider these actions as displays of good lordship and an awareness that religious and lay communities would remember a crusader’s departure acutely if they failed to return. Megan Cassidy-Welch has pointed out that many people involved in crusade displayed a sense of ‘preparatory memory’ (Cassidy-Welch 2019: 18–41) – an attempt to ensure commemoration of the event of crusade while it was yet to fully unfold – and it seems Patrick II was no different.

In 1248, while en route to join Louis IX, Patrick II died of disease at Marseilles (Hamilton 2010: 202–12). Though he had not made it to the Holy Land, dying while ‘signed with the cross’ was still considered highly significant. This was another opportunity for remembrance and the mitigation of old quarrels. When reporting the earl’s death, the chronicler and monk of St Albans Abbey, Matthew Paris (d 1259), explained that Patrick II had ‘unjustly harassed’ the monks of Tynemouth Priory, a cell of St Albans Abbey. Yet, Paris noted that Patrick’s body was brought back from France, to be buried at Tynemouth (Luard 1872–83, vol 4: 41). The organisation of an earl’s burial in a religious house would often have come with accompanying gifts for that house, and a string of arrangements. Patrick may have organised this prior to his departure, again, as a move towards reconciliation following his disagreement with the monks of Tynemouth – whether it was indeed entirely a ‘harassment’ on his part or not. Alternatively, some of the earl’s kin or members of his retinue may have organised this permanent demonstration of remorse – whatever the circumstances, it appears to have been in keeping with Patrick’s attitudes around the time of his pilgrimage. This sort of ‘image management’ would not have been unusual for any contemporary nobleman, and may have been part of a more general sense among elite Scots to maintain reputation. However, the crusading context of Patrick’s restitutions are suggestive.

Patrick’s family also appear to have felt a deep need to develop commemorations, while his crusade was still unfolding. In 1247, Christiana de Brus – Patrick II’s widowed stepmother – founded a hospital of Trinitarian brothers in Dunbar during the preparations (MacQuarrie 1985: 47–8). The Trinitarians were an order established to help pay the ransoms of Christian captives in the Holy Land. Louis IX of France was enamoured by this order: he brought the Master of the order with him on the Seventh Crusade (Flannery 2011: 137). Christiana’s act can be viewed as a lasting celebration of family commitment to holy war, a prepared commemoration, which not only celebrated Patrick II’s martial crusade, but also her spiritual support. The charter states that this foundation was made with Patrick’s ‘assent’ and blessing (Harvey 1916: 8–9, no. 14). Numerous laywomen, with close connections to crusaders, entered or founded religious houses as their kinsmen departed for crusade (or died on it). Scholars often consider these moves to be clear declarations of spiritual support for crusade and attempts to ensure the commemoration of the dead (Thompson 1991: 176; Lester 2009: 356–7; Reynolds 2021: 260–1). Here again, the Dunbar family demonstrated their adherence to wider societal mores regarding crusading culture.

Upon the earl’s death, his son inherited the earldom as Patrick III – he too engaged with his father’s crusade in a manner to keep good relations with old adversaries. In 1251, Patrick III began confirming his father’s acts. In particular, he confirmed the grants that Patrick II had made to Melrose (Hamilton 2003: 355, no. 18). Confirmations of a deceased person’s grants usually involved commemorative ritual, such as a recital of their significant deeds. Nicholas Paul has argued that crusade would have been a critical topic of discussion in these moments (Paul 2012: 29). It is likely that Patrick III was interested
in the ritual side of confirmation, given that he, unusually, chose to confirm a sale, something he did not strictly need to do. Commemorating his father and drawing attention to the manner of his death was a means for Patrick III to display his links to a chivalric ideal, while ensuring that he smoothed the feathers of the monks of Melrose as his father had intended. Indeed, if the charter drafted by an ‘Earl Patrick’, which referred to the disagreement regarding Dere Street, was in fact written by Patrick III, then his confirmation of Patrick II’s sale was very much in the spirit of atonement.

ROBERT DE BRUS

Earl Patrick was not alone in his benevolence on the eve of crusade. When King Louis IX of France chose to attempt a second crusade (1270–1), it drew the attention of Prince Edward of England (later King Edward I, d 1307), who took a crusade vow in 1268. Edward, along with his brother Edmund, would lead contingents to serve under Louis, and a slew of knights from around the British Isles flocked to join Edward and his brother (Beebe 1975; Lloyd 1984). One such noble was Robert de Brus, 5th Lord of Annandale (d 1295), the so-called ‘competitor’. For the following two years, those who had taken the oath to go on crusade were quickly making preparations and setting things in order.

Robert, however, had a longstanding disagreement with King Alexander III of Scotland concerning the advowsons and benefits of the churches of Annandale during the vacancy of the see of Glasgow. Effectively, Alexander had challenged Robert’s hold on these rights. On 28 March 1270, this intractable disagreement was suddenly resolved, when Robert acknowledged that the rights and franchises belonged to the king, and the latter promised not to infringe upon Robert’s lands in Annandale (Neville & Simpson 2012: 112, no. 73).

This was a moment of forgiveness on both sides and a demonstration of goodwill. For Alexander this was an opportunity to display kingly humility before a penitent crusader. For Robert, there was perhaps more of an imperative to ensure that his family and lands were not intruded upon by his opponents during his absence (or death). It is important to appreciate, however, that by the 13th century, there were many stringent legal protections for noble crusaders, their families and property, many of which were enforced by the papacy (Park 2018; Wiedemann 2022: 128). With that in mind, we should interpret crusaders’ attempts to seek resolutions with their rivals at home not just as a means for security. After all, anyone who infringed upon these liberties was liable to be excommunicated. Kings were by no means beyond the reproach of 13th-century popes and could be excommunicated, as King John of England was (Hill 2022: 3; Wiedemann 2022: 199–218). That said, Felicity Hill reminds us that even if the papacy chose to excommunicate an individual in the British Isles, there could be logistical problems in actually reckoning with that person and achieving a resolution (Ferguson 1997: 63, 115; Hill 2022: 159–60). Likewise, although past popes had written directly to noble crusaders in Scotland to acknowledge their status, we might question whether the papacy had the structures in place (or the impulse) to actively pursue individuals in Scotland who infringed upon crusaders’ rights. Nevertheless, the overarching point stands – Robert de Brus’s contemporary society would have understood the moral and spiritual turpitude in encroaching upon the property of crucesignati (those ‘signed with the cross’).

Displays of benevolence like Robert’s must be considered as, in part, an act of conformity to a crusading ideal as well as a pragmatic measure. Indeed, the modern phrase to ‘be the bigger man’ may apply well to these demonstrations of chivalric, masculine lordship at the outset of crusade – these acts of resolution may have been born not only of a spirit of genuine contrition, but also from a desire to be seen to be the more magnanimous party. Ultimately, for Robert and his counterparts, this was a way to heighten the prestige associated with the crusader’s journey.

Robert’s experiences on the expedition itself are, unfortunately, not well documented. He travelled with the English contingent, which
eventually made it to the crusader army’s siege of Tunis. This portion of the campaign was an unmitigated disaster for the Latins. Robert would have been exposed to the worsening conditions and disease that were rife in the camp – huge numbers of the participants died of it, including Louis IX himself (Lower 2018). Following the collapse of the siege, Lord Edward led the English contingent (and with it, Robert) to the Holy Land, where they helped rebuild the defences around the city of Acre (Lloyd 1984), before their eventual return west.

This crusade formed a backdrop to another of Robert de Brus’s attempts at resolution. While returning via France, he visited the Cistercian abbey of Clairvaux around 1273. He issued a charter, witnessed by his crusading retinue, in which he gifted land in Annandale to the monks, asking them to keep candles lit at the shrine of St Malachy in return – a figure who, it was believed, had cursed Robert’s ancestors (Migne 1879: 1759–60, no. 9; MacQuarrie 1985: 58–9; Flanagan 2015: 303–4). For Latin Christians, crusading held opportunities to travel widely and experience foreign lands and shrines (Spacey 2021: 352–3). Robert used this opportunity very tactically to right past wrongs. To speculate, there may have been a perception that the monks of Clairvaux would have been more likely to assist Robert in atoning for his ancestor’s misfortune, given that he was a crusader returning with his vow fulfilled. Perhaps when Robert left Scotland, he did so with this prospect already in mind, intending on swiftly capitalising on his newly attained prestige status as a crusader to seek resolutions, even intergenerational ones.

These displays of ideal crusading ethos did not occur in a void, or outside of peers’ knowledge. It is critical to emphasise that other crusaders from the Kingdom of Scotland, and from within Robert’s own family, joined this campaign. These individuals would have looked up to the elder Robert for guidance, and/or proved to be competition for earning the most esteem in this endeavour. Robert’s own sons, Robert the Younger (d 1304) and Richard de Brus (d 1287), also joined this crusade (Beebe 1975: app A, 144; Blakely 2005: 81–2). Father and sons travelled in separate retinues, both to and from the Holy Land, perhaps heightening any sense of rivalry. Other prominent noblemen – David I, Strathbogie Earl of Atholl and Adam of Kilconquhar, Earl of Carrick – also joined this crusade, and died on the expedition (MacQuarrie 1985: 57–8; Bower 1993–8, vol 5: 377). Their preparations and actions before crusade may also have been known to each other. Unfortunately, scant records have survived on their arrangements.⁸

**ATONEMENT WITHIN CONTEXT**

The actions of these Scottish nobles indicate that they were well attuned to the wider concepts circulating in Latin Christendom regarding holy war. However, these concepts were broad, to put it mildly. Crusading was a means to expiate personal sin, and many who took the cross did so to cleanse themselves of past wrongdoing. Logmaðr Guðrøðarson, King of the Isles, for instance, is thought to have joined a crusade, perhaps in the early 12th century, supposedly because of the shame of having disfigured his brother (Parsons 2019: 277–8). However, by the later 12th and 13th centuries, atoning for personal sin was considered a means to help actualise the goals of crusade itself (Tessera 2001: 84; Guard 2013: 178; Claverie 2016). It was within this context that crusaders, their kinfolk and wider Latin Christian society sought to appease God and their communities, while showing themselves to be conforming to model behaviour.

Looking at similar case studies from England, for instance, reveals that those wider communities certainly took notice of penitent actions ahead of crusade. William de Mandeville III, Earl of Essex (d 1189), for example, refused to confirm his father’s grants on Walden Priory, leading to a deep-seated resentment on both sides (Greenway & Watkiss 1999: 50–3). In 1176, while preparing to join Philip I, Count of Flanders on crusade, William took the opportunity to settle his disagreement (for a generous gift of cash from the monks) (Greenway & Watkiss 1999: 175–7, no. 3). The anonymous chronicler of Walden Priory – a contemporary of Earl William – was
keen to note that the earl had included gifts, perhaps to cement his apology: ‘before he set out on his pilgrimage he had already presented us with a fine chasuble, many silken cloths, and some hangings to adorn the church’ (Greenway & Watkiss 1999: 58–9).

In a similar case, the Lincolnshire landowner Hamo II Pecche (d 1241) was plagued by troubles that followed his father’s preparations for the Third Crusade (1189–92); the latter’s complex funding arrangements and mortgages led to decades of litigation (Tyerman 1988: 216). From the 1220s–1230s, Hamo fought bitter court battles with the abbot of Ramsey Abbey, regarding lands in Over (Cambridge) that the latter believed Hamo’s father had promised the monks (Hart 1884–93, vol 1: 123–7, nos 33–4). Despite the lawsuits that dogged his father’s crusade preparations, Hamo decided to embark on a pilgrimage of his own, joining the Barons’ Crusade (1239–41). In June 1236, Richard, Earl of Cornwall, Gilbert Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, John le Scot, Earl of Chester and many other nobles and knights took the cross in a planned ceremony, and if Hamo was not physically there, he soon joined their ranks (Luard 1872–83, vol 3: 368–9; Lower 2005: 45). Sometime during June–July 1237, Hamo came to court and quitclaimed his and his heirs’ rights to the lands in Over, and the abbot of Ramsey accepted Hamo and his family into the monks’ prayers in perpetuity (Hart 1884–93, vol 1: 127, no. 34a). Here again is a classic example of a crusader seeking diplomatic resolutions before embarking on the journey, and the affected party (Ramsey Abbey) reciprocated in a way that would ensure this act was remembered for years if not generations. Much like Patrick II, Earl of Dunbar, Hamo died while on crusade and his retinue brought his body back to the British Isles for burial and memorialisation at a religious community he had engaged: Barnwell Priory (Clark 1907: 48).

Those who did not take an active part in crusade itself would have observed and appreciated the forthright way that disputes were being settled by crucesignati and may have even taken steps to right their own wrongs, too. It is not impossible that the crusading fervour that developed during preparations for large-scale passagia gave rise to outbursts of remorse. For example, it is interesting to note that Gospatrick III, Earl of Dunbar attempted to settle the decades-old tensions concerning his father’s grant of the church at Edrom to Durham Abbey, in 1147; the rights to this church were bitterly contested by Crowland Abbey (Donnelly 1997: 55–6; Hamilton 2007: 14). Gospatrick chose to do this the same year that crusaders in Scotland and England were busily preparing for the Second Crusade (1147–50) and their expedition to Iberia (Phillips 2007: 136–67). Furthermore, King David I of Scotland (d 1153) confirmed other grants that Gospatrick made to Coldingham Priory in 1147, and he tellingly dated his confirmation as having been made ‘the year in which the king of France (Louis VI) and many Christians travelled to Jerusalem’ (Lawrie 1905: 139–40). Proving a connection between timing and motivations is difficult, but the correlation is intriguing.

CONCLUSIONS

Preparing for crusade was a lengthy and complex affair, filled with legal, practical, spiritual and ceremonial considerations. In the months before departure, crusaders undertook numerous acts that, in the medieval mind, blended all these elements – mixing ritual and quasi-religious concepts with matter-of-fact dealings. This meant that the settlement of disagreements (and the memory of those resolutions) became a deeply meaningful act. Despite the wide appeal of crusade itself, the extent to which repentance formed a shared culture among the nobility and knightly classes of Latin Christendom remains to be fully determined. For example, the rituals surrounding the settlement of feuds between lay people ahead of crusade, of the kind found in Jean de Joinville’s description, are less clear. The surviving evidence highlights lay crusaders’ mediation with religious houses. This is primarily because ecclesiastical cartularies have survived in greater abundance compared to the charters between laity. However, medieval holy war undoubtedly gave rise to a penitential climate.
This study has demonstrated that some 13th-century Scottish nobility held an affinity with these practices, in clear relation with the crusading ideals that rippled across western Europe. Scotland’s elite had a deeper appreciation for the nuances of crusade culture than has been previously considered. By engaging with the ceremonial aspects of holy war, Scottish participants demonstrated to their local communities – as well as to their foreign counterparts that they would meet on the pilgrimage – that they embodied all facets of the wider movement.

Keith Stringer observed that the cross-border Vescy family had a profoundly personal sense of ownership of their crusading traditions and patronage of the Carmelites (an order recently introduced from the Kingdom of Jerusalem). As he put it, they ‘self-consciously viewed Latin Christendom in small-world terms’ (Stringer 1999: 212). Perhaps in this paper’s study too, those who entered crusade in the spirit of contrition were attempting not only to embody an ideal, but also to link their local communities and religious houses with the movement as whole, bringing the culture of crusade to the Kingdom of Scotland itself.
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NOTES

1 This ideal did not necessarily appear fully formed. Stephen Bennett has pointed out that during the Third Crusade (1189–92) very few crusaders (he identified only one) resolved disputes with religious houses within the context of their pilgrimage (Bennett 2021: 50–1). See also the work of Stephen Spencer regarding crusaders’ attitudes to humility (Spencer 2019: 30–5).


3 Patrick II was not alone in patronising the monks of Melrose before crusade. Thomas de Normanville is known to have joined the same crusade as Patrick, and he too made a grant to the monks in 1250, before he left (Liber de Melros I, 304–5, no. 342).

4 MacQuarrie identifies Christiana as the wife of Patrick II, but she is now known to have been married to Patrick I, Earl of Dunbar (d 1232), with whom she had no issue (Beam et al 2019: no. 5989).

5 Christiana may have had a wider family connection to crusade that helped to motivate her to make this foundation. Her grandfather, Alan FitzFlaad, steward of Dol, may have been a First Crusader (1095–9) (MacEwan 1988: 232). Geoffrey Barrow hypothesised that Christiana’s father, Walter FitzAlan, had been a participant on the Second Crusade (1147–50) – Walter was conspicuously absent
from King David I’s court during the 1140s and later founded Paisley Abbey, unusually dedicating it to St James – sometimes taken as indicative of a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella (Barrow 1999: 35). MacQuarrie argued convincingly that Christiana’s brother Alan may have joined the Third Crusade (1189–92) (MacQuarrie 1985: 29–30).

An example from neighbouring England highlights this culture in action. In 1218, cardinal Guala Bicchieri, the papal legate, took the trouble to involve himself in a legal dispute between a humble crusader in Lincolnshire and the latter’s neighbours, concerning a toft in Saltfleetby and a 16 pence annual rent (Vincent 1996: 75–7, no. 99). The cardinal only sought to fight the crusader’s case because of his protected status as a crucisignatus.


David Strathbogie and his wife Isabel of Chilham did get a licence to mortgage her estate in Chingford (Essex), and later pledged it to the Knights Templar for 40 pounds (CPR 1266–72: 422–3; Gervers 1996: 18). Yet, it is unclear if David resolved any ongoing tensions with individuals or institutions.

ABBREVIATIONS


REFERENCES


ASKING FOR FORGIVENESS AS AN ASPECT OF CRUSADE


Lawrie, A C (ed) 1905 Early Scottish Charters. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons.


Tamminen, M 2018 Crusade Preaching and the Ideal Crusader. Turnhout: Brepols.


