

UHI Research Database pdf download summary

'Be at peace with God and me':

MacInnes, Iain A.

Published in:

Peacemaking and the Restraint of Violence in High Medieval Europe

Publication date:

2023

The Document Version you have downloaded here is:

Peer reviewed version

[Link to author version on UHI Research Database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

MacInnes, I. A. (2023). 'Be at peace with God and me': Violence, War, and Royal Responses to Insurrection in Medieval Scotland, c.1100–1286 . In L. Taylor, & S. Leboutteiller (Eds.), *Peacemaking and the Restraint of Violence in High Medieval Europe* (pp. 65-85). (Studies in Medieval History and Culture). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

- 1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
- 2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- 3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

3. 'Be at peace with God and me'

Violence, War, and Royal Responses to Insurrection in Medieval Scotland, c. 1100–1286

Iain A. MacInnes

Abstract

Scotland's twelfth- and thirteenth-century kings have often been portrayed as bloodthirsty individuals, dealing ruthlessly with all who rebelled against their rule. But this is too simplistic a representation of the complex range of options open to, and utilised by, Scottish monarchs in this period. Indeed, the possibility remained open for all but a few individuals to surrender and return to the allegiance of the king and the wider Scottish political community. This chapter argues that it was the process of submission that ensured that both sides saw the benefits of such an arrangement and that most rebels did not suffer violent repercussions. While the ritual of submission became more complicated over time, it was an increasingly well-recognised path to conflict resolution between lord and man that replicated similar approaches in contemporary kingdoms across Europe.

Twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland was a kingdom still in development. Its kings, though representatives of the increasingly long-reigning Canmore dynasty, did not rule without challenge.¹ Just as in other parts of Europe, rivals to the throne from within the extended royal *familia* challenged the succession in pursuit of their own interests, while noble opponents confronted increasing centralisation in the policies of the crown and its supporters.² The dominant historiographical view of the Scottish royal response to such

¹ For rebellions against the Canmore monarchs, see McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*; McDonald, 'Rebels without a Cause'; McDonald, *Kingdom of the Isles*; McDonald, 'Monk, Bishop, Impostor, Pretender'; McDonald, 'Old and New in the Far North'; McDonald, 'Soldiers Most Unfortunate'; Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams'; Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"'; Topping, 'Harald Maddadson'; Oram, 'David I'; Grant, 'Province of Ross'; Cowan, 'Caithness in the Sagas'; Crawford, 'Earldom of Caithness'; Duncan, 'Roger of Howden and Scotland'.

² For comparative European examples, see Weiler, 'Kings and Sons'; Rosenthal, 'The King's "Wicked Advisers"'; Kagay, 'Structures of Baronial Dissent'; Strickland, 'Against the Lord's Anointed'; Strickland, 'The Barons' War'; Kagay, 'The Treason of Center and Periphery'; Hermanson, 'How to Legitimate Rebellion';

insurrection is that it was bloody, violent, and repressive. Historians have argued that this period witnessed a ‘chronicle of carnage’ against those who rebelled against the crown and that it was a time of unashamedly bloodthirsty and brutal behaviour, when ‘the road to success for the Canmore kings was littered with the corpses of their enemies’.³

Recent work has suggested that Scotland only became less violent over time, with the thirteenth century the point at which it ‘caught up’ with European practice more broadly.⁴ I have argued elsewhere that this is a misleading representation of royal violence against those who opposed Scotland’s kings, and it is born out of two principal assumptions.⁵ The first assumption is that specific examples of ‘extreme’ royal violence represented a more general crown policy towards those who defied the Canmore monarchs.⁶ The second is that the Celtic regions of the British Isles were places where Anglo-Norman legal normalcy and ‘civilisation’ did not take hold as early as they did in England.⁷ For Scotland at least, this latter assumption is arguably far too simplistic, and the former is simply not the case. Scottish kings used a variety of tools and mechanisms to deal with insurrection in Scotland. One of the principal means was the ritual of submission, which was used to allow rebels a pathway back into the political fold and to reintegrate them into the contemporary polity.

Of particular interest regarding analysis of rituals of submission is Gerd Althoff’s work on ‘satisfaction’ and medieval conflict resolution.⁸ In his analysis of satisfaction as a mechanism of ending conflict in the Holy Roman Empire, he demonstrates that ‘a highly developed tactic of amicable conflict resolution, with established forms and responsibilities, marks the other

Orning, ‘Conflict and Social (Dis)order’; Bagge, ‘Structure of Political Factions’; Warner, ‘Rituals, Kingship and Rebellion’.

³ Cowan, ‘The Historical Macbeth’, 134–35; McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 140, 172.

⁴ Neville, ‘Royal Mercy’; Neville, ‘Royal Pardon in Scotland’.

⁵ MacInnes, ‘Royal Punishment of Rebels’.

⁶ For examples of this view, see McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 82, 92, 100–2, 140, 172; Ross, ‘Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams’, 41; Barrow, ‘MacBeth and Other Mormaers of Moray’, 122; Oram, ‘Introduction’, 41; Cowan, ‘The Historical Macbeth’, 134–35; McGlynn, *By Sword and Fire*, 5; McDonald, ‘Soldiers Most Unfortunate’, 110; Gillingham, ‘Killing and Mutilating Political Enemies’, 121.

⁷ For this assumption, see Gillingham, ‘Conquering the Barbarians’, 54–55, 57; Gillingham, ‘1066 and the Introduction of Chivalry’, 222; Gillingham, ‘Killing and Mutilating Political Enemies’, 114–15, 119, 124; Gillingham, ‘Beginnings of English Imperialism’, 15; McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 139; Westerhof, *Death and the Noble Body*, 117–20.

⁸ Althoff, ‘Satisfaction’.

side of the sword-clanking Middle Ages'.⁹ He demonstrates that the paradigm of a violent medieval period where conflict was only resolved at the point of the sword is too simplistic, and that medieval states utilised a variety of more peaceful means to resolve disputes.¹⁰ In this way it can be argued that Althoff perceives a situation similar to that reflected in the historiography of medieval Scotland in his analyses of the Holy Roman Empire. Still, as Jenny Benham has more recently argued, although the rituals of peacemaking suggested by Althoff demonstrate similarities across time and place, they are very much rooted in the context in which they occurred.¹¹

Moreover, rituals of submission were not solely secular affairs. There was often a religious dimension to the ritual performed, which consciously mimicked the act of penance and reflected elements of the Peace and Truce of God movements.¹² This combination of secular and religious kingship reinforced the positions of those engaged in the process while also strengthening the power of the oaths sworn and the peace agreed.¹³ Scotland displayed an ability to deal with conflict resolution through non-violent means by utilising similar mechanisms of submission and satisfaction. As with Imperial and other European examples, these acts of contrition were at times public affairs, performed before witnesses, and recorded in chronicle sources. Although Benham notes the potential pitfalls of using chronicle records of such events as historical sources, their position as 'official' accounts of the period provides an important view of submission rituals.¹⁴ Such accounts often stress the various principles of the ritual: the act of submission; the rebel's contrition; the magnanimity of the king; and the face-saving enjoyed by both parties as a result of this mechanism.¹⁵ This chapter thus considers the use and nature of submission as it relates to Scottish affairs, and analysis is

⁹ Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 271.

¹⁰ For further and alternative consideration of this broader theme, see Benham, *Peacemaking*.

¹¹ Benham's points of focus as regards the ritual of peacemaking are: where it took place, the symbolic acts of negotiation associated with it, the involvement of envoys, oaths and hostages, and any written peace treaties connected to the event (Benham, *Peacemaking*; see also Benham, 'Anglo-French Peace Conferences'; Benham, 'Walter Map and Ralph Glaber'; Benham, 'Writing Peace, Writing War').

¹² Koziol, 'The Conquest of Burgundy'; Koziol, 'The Problem of Sacrality'.

¹³ Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe*, 180–84; Roach, 'Penance, Submission and *deditio*'.

¹⁴ Benham, *Peacemaking*, 182; Broun, 'New Look at *Gesta Annalia*'; Taylor, 'Historical Writing'; Broun and Harrison, *Chronicle of Melrose Abbey*, 1–28; Broun, 'Creating and Maintaining'; Boardman, 'A People Divided'.

¹⁵ Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 276.

made of the extent to which the Scottish example aligns with European patterns of peacemaking in this period.

The rebellions faced by Scottish kings at this time most often arose in those regions furthest from the king's authority, where autonomous-minded nobles sought to escape the control of Scottish royal overlordship. These were also regions from where royal pretenders sought to raise support in their efforts to seize the throne.¹⁶ Examples of rebels included Somerled of Argyll: a powerful lord in the West Highlands and Islands, and the Irish Sea region, he backed alternative claimants to the Scottish throne and challenged Anglo-Norman expansion into what he perceived as his sphere of influence.¹⁷ Moray and Ross were bases for the rebellious families of MacHeth and MacWilliam, and from these regions they posed arguably the greatest threats Scottish kings faced in this period.¹⁸ To the north, the earls of Orkney and Caithness were also a menace. Haraldr Maddaðarson and his sons played a dangerous game in denying the lordship of both the king of Scots and the king of Norway over their territorial possessions.¹⁹ And in south-west Scotland, the lordship of Galloway erupted in rebellion several times, often as a result of conflict amongst competing branches of the ruling family.²⁰ It was with men and families such as these that Scottish kings were required to negotiate. As indicated, the majority of those who rebelled were able to re-enter the Scottish political mainstream. The principal mechanism through which this was made possible appears to have been the ritual of submission. As Althoff has argued, 'conflicts were ended by means of demonstrative acts, whose function was to give satisfaction to one's adversary and thus eliminate the conflict. Such acts were staged in front of an audience in order to increase the

¹⁶ McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*; McDonald, *Kingdom of the Isles*; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*; Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams'; Oram, 'David I'; Grant, 'Province of Ross'; Crawford, 'Earldom of Caithness'.

¹⁷ Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"', 279–80, 282; McDonald and McLean, 'In Search of Somerled'; McDonald and McLean, 'Somerled of Argyll'; McDonald, 'Rebels Without a Cause'; Marsden, *Somerled*; Woolf, 'Death of Somerled'; Sellar, 'The Origins and Ancestry of Somerled'; Woolf, 'The Origins and Ancestry of Somerled'; Duncan and Brown, 'King of Argyll and the Isles'.

¹⁸ Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"'; Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams'; McDonald, 'Old and New in the Far North'; Oram, 'David I'; Grant, 'Province of Ross'; Oram, *David I*, 89–110.

¹⁹ Topping, 'Harald Maddadson'; Cowan, 'Caithness in the Sagas'; Crawford, 'Earldom of Caithness'; Crawford, 'Norse Earls and Scottish Bishops'; Crawford, *Northern Earldoms*, 240–77.

²⁰ Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*; Oram, 'Family Business'; McDonald, 'Rebels Without a Cause'; McDonald, 'Scoto-Norse Kings'.

binding nature of what had been done or promised.’²¹ Evidence from contemporary Scotland shows that, as elsewhere, submission was a key component in the crown’s armoury when it came to resolving rebellion.

Whether a complex ritual of submission was always a key part of conflict resolution is unclear. A twelfth-century example, referring back to the reign of Malcolm III, suggests its use in some form. The English chronicler, Ailred of Rievaulx, wrote extensively about David I of Scotland and the Scots. Ailred spent several years at the Scottish king’s court, reached the position of steward within the king’s household, and engaged in missionary work in Galloway.²² He was intimately associated with the Scottish royal family and wrote in positive terms about the ‘civilising process’ undertaken by them to reform the ‘barbarous’ people of Scotland.²³ In his *Genealogia regum Anglorum*, Ailred recites a tale, supposedly told to him by David I, of a plot to kill Malcolm III. According to the story, Malcolm uncovered the plot but did not reveal his discovery. Instead, he went out hunting with his household and manipulated the situation to ensure he was left alone with his would-be killer. Malcolm confronted the assassin with his knowledge of the plot, saying:

‘See, you and I are alone together, armed with similar weapons, borne on similar horses. There is no-one to see, there is no-one to hear, there is no-one to bring support to either of us; if therefore you are able, if you dare, if you have the heart, fulfil what you have purposed, render to my foes what you have promised. If you think to slay me, when can you better, more securely, more freely, or in a more manly fashion? [...] Act [...] as a knight, act as a man, and fight man to man, that at least your treason may lack baseness, since it could not lack infidelity.’ So far [the noble] had scarce borne up; and immediately, struck by his words as by a heavy thunderbolt, he fell from his horse, cast aside his arms, and ran to the king’s feet with tears and trembling. And the king said to him, ‘Be not afraid, you will suffer no ill from me.’ And when [the noble] had promised henceforth to be faithful and his friend, giving an oath and naming hostages, in fitting

²¹ Althoff, ‘Satisfaction’, 279. For the theological basis of satisfaction, and its changing nature, see Burns, ‘Concept of Satisfaction’; Rosato, ‘The Interpretation of Anselm’s Teaching’.

²² Aird, ‘Sweet Civility and Barbarous Rudeness’, 59–61, 66–67; Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*, 149–71; Dutton, *Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx*.

²³ Toledo Candelaria, ‘From Reformed Barbarian to “Saint-King”’, 43–51.

time they returned to their friends, telling to no-one what things they had done or said.²⁴

The lengthy monologue ascribed to Malcolm presents him as a brave monarch, facing down his enemy and showing himself willing to reframe the assassination attempt into a one-on-one chivalric confrontation. Indeed, his appeal to the traitor's chivalric identity reflects the Anglo-Norman culture of the period and, as Candelaria argues, positions Malcolm III 'as an active and civilised participant in Norman culture, linking an imagined Scottish past to the reality of David [I]'s kingship'.²⁵

What is most interesting for the purposes of this analysis is the reference to submission and the resolution of this conflict. The traitor plays the role of the supplicant, literally throwing himself at the king's feet to plead for mercy. This is granted by the magnanimous monarch in return for an oath promising that the noble would never again rebel, and for the nomination of hostages who could act as surety for continued good behaviour. These elements replicate in several ways the forms of ritual submission discussed by Althoff and Benham.²⁶ The main difference is the setting: instead of a public demonstration of guilt and repentance, Malcolm III deals with this traitor in a very personal, private manner. It is unclear whether Ailred approved of this form of conflict resolution, but as Candelaria argues, this whole episode is likely a fabrication intended to reflect not on Malcolm III's behaviour, but on that of David I in dealing with his own challengers.²⁷ Reinterpretation of one of these instances of rebellion — that of Angus, earl of Moray, and Malcolm MacAlexander — has shown that this was a serious insurrection that may have continued for several years.²⁸ In spite of its inherent threat, David I largely resolved the rebellion by non-violent means. While Angus of Moray was killed in battle at Stracathro (1130), Malcolm MacAlexander was apparently captured at a later date and imprisoned in Roxburgh Castle.²⁹ His son suffered the same fate

²⁴ 'Epistola De Genealogia Regum Anglorum', in *SAEC*, 113–14.

²⁵ Toledo Candelaria, 'From Reformed Barbarian to "Saint-King"', 47.

²⁶ For further discussion of the use of oaths and hostages, see Benham, *Peacemaking*, 145–55, 156–78.

²⁷ Candelaria, 'Literary Portrayals of King Malcolm III', 47–48.

²⁸ Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"'.

²⁹ *Orderic Vitalis*, vol. 4, 277; *Chron. Melrose*, 69; Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"', 276–79.

after he too was captured by royalist forces.³⁰ Neither case appears to have included a formal submission. Still, there is a parallel to the tale of Malcolm III in that royal magnanimity drives the actions of both kings, and David's use of imprisonment reflects the possibilities open to medieval monarchs that involved non-lethal punishment.

Ailred of Rievaulx was not only able to write with confidence about the Scottish monarchy, but also sought to influence the new king of England. His *Genealogia*, from which the Malcolm III episode is taken, was one of several works he wrote for the future Henry II that were intended as mirrors to influence the new monarch's rule.³¹ In these Ailred stressed the importance of justice, piety, virtue, and humility. Marie Anne Mayeski argues that Ailred considered such traits to be inherited through Henry's royal blood, and it may be that the portrayal of David I was similarly intended to demonstrate a sense of justice inherited from his father, Malcolm III.³² Still, there may also be a hint of criticism implicit in the report that the rebels were dealt with in private, without recourse to a more public ritual. In the *Genealogia*, Ailred noted that 'people hide their vicious deeds in darkness and secrecy and let their virtuous deeds be manifest', and that 'people are drawn to the virtuous person by natural affection'.³³ Kings, then, were required to demonstrate their virtue publicly in order to ensure their continued popularity amongst their subjects. Although the Anarchy was drawing to an end when Ailred was writing, significant unrest still threatened society, and it is therefore unsurprising that Ailred would emphasise the need for public displays of submission and reconciliation.³⁴ Without such, there remained the possibility of renewed conflict, as exhibited throughout the Anarchy, and which would continue to pose a threat to later Scottish kings.

The example of Malcolm III may reflect something of a Scottish proto-ritual of submission. The giving of hostages in cases of formal submission, often in relation to military conquest, but also applicable to a variety of other contexts, was a standard part of early medieval

³⁰ *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 249–50; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 253; Ross, 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh"', 279–80.

³¹ Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*, 130–31, 138–48; Freeman, 'Aelred as a Historian among Historians', 128.

³² Mayeski, 'Secundum Naturam', 221–28.

³³ Mayeski, 'Secundum Naturam', 224.

³⁴ Truax, *Aelred the Peacemaker*, 134–38; Dalton, 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace'; Dalton, 'Geffrei Gaimar's *Estoire Des Engleis*', 442–43.

politics.³⁵ Even then, it seldom existed as the sole indicator of submission. As Adam Kosto argues, ‘submission possessed symbolic value, but it was not a constant value [...]. Like any relationship, submission is marked by multiple rituals, including words, physical gestures, and legal actions.’³⁶ Thus the combination of hostages and oaths of fidelity in the example relating to Malcolm III provides a useful demonstration of this. Further aspects of a formal submission process may be witnessed elsewhere. Somerled of Argyll rebelled in support of Malcolm MacAlexander and remained in revolt for a number of years. Charter evidence records, however, that Somerled had made his peace with Malcolm IV by 1160, the date of the charter being given as ‘the Christmas after peace was made between the king and Somerled’.³⁷ That the meeting of the royal court at which the charter was agreed took place at Christmas may be significant. Paul Dalton has suggested that peacemaking was often staged to coincide with important religious festivals ‘in order to use the religious significance, symbolism, and ritual of these occasions to help facilitate reconciliation’.³⁸ The combination of the act of submission with the religious importance of the Christmas period may, then, have been a deliberate choice on Malcolm IV’s part to reinforce the symbolism of the event.

In a further example, a non-violent resolution was reached, albeit only after Malcolm IV used military force to defeat rebellion in Galloway.³⁹ Defeat forced Fergus of Galloway to seek the king’s peace, which was bought in part by surrendering his son, Uhtred, into the king’s possession. Fergus meanwhile chose — or was forced into — monastic retirement.⁴⁰ These additional elements of submission were not necessarily new, but the combination of them may have been novel. The surrender of Uhtred, Fergus’s son and heir, aligns with Kosto’s suggestion that the practice of taking hostages provided ‘overlap [...with...] other institutions that create bonds, rather than break them’.⁴¹ Uhtred would become the next lord of Galloway, but now as a Norman-influenced noble raised at the royal court. The king would benefit from such an arrangement if Uhtred became a man with whom he could deal more easily in

³⁵ Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 53–77.

³⁶ Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 70.

³⁷ *RRS*, vol. 1, 15, no. 175. Somerled was later said to have earned the epithet ‘sit-by-the-king’, suggesting a return to good standing in the kingdom: *RRS*, vol. 1, 15. This reconciliation with Malcolm IV was not to last, however, and Somerled rebelled again in 1164 before dying in battle at Renfrew: McDonald, ‘Rebels without a Cause’, 169; Woolf, ‘Death of Somerled’.

³⁸ Dalton, ‘Sites and Occasions of Peacemaking’, 18–22.

³⁹ *Chron. Melrose*, 12; *Chron. Holyrood*, 189; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 251; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 259.

⁴⁰ *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 251; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 259; *Chron. Melrose*, 12; *Chron. Holyrood*, 189.

⁴¹ Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 71.

future.⁴² Fergus's entry into monastic retirement may be considered a form of oblation, or a form of exile, both of which were also elements of early medieval submission.⁴³ Monastic exile also had precedent within Scotland. The rebellion led by Bishop Wmund against David I in the 1140s/1150s was a serious threat to the security of the kingdom. At first it was stymied when David I bought off the rebel cleric with the promise of land, but later discord led to Wmund's mutilation and exile at Byland Abbey.⁴⁴ Ailred of Rievaulx, who described the later Galwegian rebellion, may have seen Fergus's monastic retirement as 'an appropriate symbol of the taming of these uncivilised barbarians', just as William of Newburgh celebrated Wmund's enforced exile in northern England.⁴⁵ Althoff has observed, however, that imprisonment and banishment were also well-used examples of 'compensation' paid by those offering satisfaction.⁴⁶

What these early examples demonstrate is that the submission of rebels to Scotland's kings became a more complex event over time. The form of submission, its timing and celebration, and the exactions that could be demanded from the supplicant rebel were varied, and Scottish kings utilised different approaches in different contexts. Submissions in the following decades, however, built upon these foundations and developed into a more clearly ritualised practice. The first example of this progress is again from Galloway. Fergus of Galloway's sons, Uhtred and Gilbert, rebelled following William the Lion's capture at Alnwick in 1174. They took advantage of the king's captivity in England to push back against Scottish royal encroachment in the region, but soon disagreed over who should rule the lordship. Gilbert's followers seized Uhtred, cut out his tongue, blinded and emasculated him, all of which led to his death soon after.

Gilbert's rebellion continued while William the Lion remained in England, but upon the king's return in 1176, the Lord of Galloway was eventually forced to submit. The thirteenth-

⁴² *Chron. Melrose*, 12; *Chron. Holyrood*, 189; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 251; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 259; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 90–91; Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 71.

⁴³ Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 71–75.

⁴⁴ *William of Newburgh*, vol. 1, 105–7; Woolf, 'The Diocese of the Sudreyar'; McDonald, 'Monk, Bishop, Impostor, Pretender'; Anderson, 'Wmund, Bishop and Pretender'.

⁴⁵ Aird, 'Sweet Civility and Barbarous Rudeness', 66. Newburgh in particular appears to have deplored Wmund's involvement, as an ecclesiastic, in secular affairs, an issue he returned to at various points in his work (Gillingham, 'Two Yorkshire Historians', 18).

⁴⁶ Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 272.

century *Gesta Annalia I* reports that Gilbert's submission was facilitated by the intercession of notable persons, including bishops and earls, who were an important part of the process.⁴⁷ The rebel lord of Galloway gave hostages as symbols of his compliance, as well as paying a monetary fine 'to make good the losses he had caused'.⁴⁸ This ritual was repeated as Gilbert also had to submit to Henry II of England, to whom homage was owed as a result of the terms of the Treaty of Falaise (1174), which had secured the release of William the Lion from English captivity.⁴⁹ Gilbert's submission to Henry II was facilitated by King William himself, who acted as intercessor and presented the Lord of Galloway to the English king at Feckenham (Worcester) in 1176. There Gilbert paid homage, a fine of 1,000 marks of silver, and handed over his son Duncan as a hostage to guarantee his good behaviour.⁵⁰ The similarity between the two submissions, and the punishments exacted on Gilbert from each monarch, suggest a process that was increasingly well-used and well-understood on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish frontier.

Peace in Galloway was not to last, however, and in the 1180s Uhtred's son, Roland, rebelled against Gilbert's sons and seized power for himself. Henry II personally took an army north to punish the man who had rebelled against his peace and Roland was forced to submit in 1186.⁵¹ Roland's submission was even more complex than Gilbert's had been. It took two separate groups of intercessors — one Scottish (unsuccessful) and one Anglo-Scottish (successful) — to negotiate with the rebel Galwegian.⁵² Roland also demanded safe conduct and hostages from the mediators before he would appear before the English king. The safe

⁴⁷ *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 261. Althoff notes that mediators were usually men of high rank who had links to both parties involved in the dispute, and were those who 'met with the parties separately, negotiated an appropriate satisfaction with them, and guaranteed that the method suggested for ending the conflict would actually be adopted': Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 272. See also Benham, *Peacemaking*, 117–42.

⁴⁸ *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 323; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 261; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 97. A good deal of this fine 'to regain the king's love' appears to have been paid (see Keefe, 'King Henry II and the Earls', 214, no. 95).

⁴⁹ Broun, 'Britain and the Beginning of Scotland', 116–19; Owen, *William the Lion*, 54–56.

⁵⁰ *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, vol. 2, 105; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 97.

⁵¹ *Chron. Melrose*, 23–24; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 100–2.

⁵² The first mediators were William the Lion and his brother David. However, as Oram argues, William may have been playing a political game and ensured the talks' failure as Henry II worried about Anglo-French relations and rebellion on the continent: Benedict of Peterborough, 'Gesta Henrici II', in *SAEC*, 289–90; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 100–1. The second delegation included King William, David, Hugh de Puiset, bishop of Durham, and Ranulf de Glanvill, the English justiciar: Benedict of Peterborough, 'Gesta Henrici II', in *SAEC*, 290.

conduct in particular is interesting and perhaps suggests the danger in which Roland felt himself to be, although it may also simply have increasingly become a part of the submission mechanism.

The rebel lord of Galloway was brought before Henry II by the mediators, but the English king in turn had his own demands. Roland was ordered to return to the English court to contest his sole possession of Galloway. Roland swore an oath to uphold the agreement entered into with the king and handed over three of his sons as hostages and surety. William the Lion and his brother, David, swore to oppose Roland if he rebelled further against the English king. And the bishop of Glasgow swore that he would excommunicate Roland if he rebelled again.⁵³ Some of these clauses relate to the post-Falaise situation and to William the Lion's incitement of (or at least prevarication in taking action against) Roland's rebellion. However, the clause regarding his appearance before Henry's court may also reflect a change, seen elsewhere in Europe, towards a situation where this was increasingly seen as the ultimate site of conflict resolution.⁵⁴ What these examples indicate is that the process of submission was an evolving mechanism, and indeed may have developed in different ways and at different rates on both sides of the Anglo-Scottish frontier. Still, the mechanism itself was recognised by kings and nobles in both kingdoms and utilised regularly to resolve often very different examples of unrest.

Althoff has suggested that the German experience stressed an important 'ground rule [...that...] satisfaction could be given only once. A participant who continued or resumed hostilities after satisfaction had been given could no longer rely on the hope of reconciliation, and was severely punished'.⁵⁵ Thomas of Galloway, who rebelled in 1235 against Alexander II in pursuit of his father's lordship, may well be a case of someone who was punished in just this fashion. He spent sixty years in captivity as a result of his continued rebellion after peace in Galloway appeared to have been secured by the king, and his example will be discussed in more detail below. Other Scottish repeat offenders appear, however, to have been able to submit more than once. Haraldr Maddaðarson was earl of both Norwegian Orkney and Scottish Caithness. He was in the difficult position of trying to please two feudal superiors in territories that were frontiers between realms as well as peripheral regions at the

⁵³ Benedict of Peterborough, 'Gesta Henrici II', in *SAEC*, 290; Oram, *Lordship of Galloway*, 101.

⁵⁴ Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 280.

⁵⁵ Althoff, 'Satisfaction', 279.

extremity of royal power and control. As such, Haraldr engaged fully in the political machinations of both kingdoms at various times, providing a challenge to royal authority that was met on more than one occasion with a military response. On these occasions, Earl Haraldr was forced to submit to the kings of Scots and of Norway.

He first submitted to William the Lion, c. 1197, in response to the deployment of a royal army into his territory. According to one chronicler, ‘Haraldr came to the feet of the king and placed himself at his mercy [...]. And he swore to the king that he would bring to him all his enemies when the king should return’.⁵⁶ Earl Haraldr was furthermore deprived of half the earldom of Caithness.⁵⁷ He did not, however, produce those captives he had promised, including his son Þorfinnr, and as a result Haraldr was imprisoned by the Scottish king until Þorfinnr was obtained and took his father’s place as a royal hostage.⁵⁸ Haraldr, however, rebelled again and seized back the territory he had lost. As a result of further royal intervention, Earl Haraldr submitted once more c. 1202. Again, this was facilitated by the intercession of important men, including Bishop Roger of St Andrews, who provided the safe conduct under which the earl appeared before the king. Earl Haraldr ‘came to a good understanding with the king’ and was ‘restored to his earldom, on payment of two thousand pounds of silver to the lord king’.⁵⁹ Haraldr, in spite of two periods of rebellion, re-entered the king’s peace as a result of his formal and public submission, and the payment of a large fine — and this peace endured for the rest of his life. Haraldr’s ability to achieve this suggests a good amount of flexibility in the submission mechanism which no doubt depended on the relative strengths of king and rebel at the time of negotiations. Still, the process described here still seems to denote a well-recognised and well-trodden path to conflict resolution that was understood by both parties involved.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Roger of Howden, ‘Chronica’, in *SAEC*, 316–17.

⁵⁷ Topping, ‘Harald Maddadson’, 115–18.

⁵⁸ Roger of Howden, ‘Chronica’, in *SAEC*, 316–17.

⁵⁹ *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 271–72; Althoff, ‘Satisfaction’, 272–73. See also *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 427–29; *Orkneyinga Saga*, 197–98.

⁶⁰ While Earl Haraldr was not punished further, his son was. King William reacted to the earl’s second rebellion by punishing his hostage, Þorfinnr. His eyes were put out and he was castrated, and Þorfinnr died at some point thereafter. Such punishments occurred in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland, and while they may be interpreted as part of the violent paradigm this period is often said to embody, Þorfinnr’s position as a hostage for his father’s behaviour regulated how he was treated. Earl Haraldr’s continued misbehaviour ensured that Þorfinnr was the king’s to do with as he pleased. Scottish chroniclers recognise this when commenting that Þorfinnr’s punishment occurred ‘because his father had broken his word’: *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 419. See also:

Earl Haraldr Maddaðarson's submission to the Scottish king is particularly interesting because he was also involved in a rebellion against the king of Norway. Haraldr aided the rebellion of the Eyjarskeggjar in support of Sigurðr Magnússon in 1192–1194, which ended in defeat for the rebels at the Battle of Florvåg in April 1194.⁶¹ The following year, Earl Haraldr went to Norway to submit to the victorious King Sverrir.⁶² *Sverris saga* recounts in detail the large gathering of important men who met in a churchyard to discuss Earl Haraldr's fate. As appears to have been the case in relation to his Scottish submission seven years later, Haraldr's submission here was a very public and stylised ritual affair.⁶³ He threw himself at the king's feet and upon the king's mercy, and, as the saga recounts:

The king looked round, and was slow to speak; and he said: 'A great attack of war have you made in Norway, since you did raise against this land so strong a party as the Islanders were. And I and my men found that much against our liking. But now the earl has come here, as you may see, and repents of what he has done, and begs now for mercy; and I will give it to him: I shall require of God that he may give me grace, more than I have deserved: and stand yourself up, sir earl, and be at peace with God and me. And I shall declare the terms of agreement between us more at leisure.'⁶⁴

King Sverrir forfeited the lands of all rebels in Orkney and Shetland who had died at Florvåg, and seized Shetland outright from Earl Haraldr. He also demanded his share of fines from Orkney and imposed his own administrators on the earldom.

Imsen has argued that, instead of a 'reconciliation or agreement', this was instead an 'unconditional surrender [...] an unequivocal acceptance of royal superiority'.⁶⁵ This aligns with *Orkneyinga saga*, which describes Earl Haraldr going to Norway to 'surrender' to the

Kosto, *Hostages in the Middle Ages*, 24–25; Benham, *Peacemaking*, 162–65; Davies, *Domination and Conquest*, 57; McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 41.

⁶¹ Imsen, 'Earldom and Kingdom', 66; Topping, 'Harald Maddadson', 115–16.

⁶² 'Sverri's Saga', in *ESSH*, vol. 2, 345–46; *Orkneyinga Saga*, 224; Imsen, 'Earldom and Kingdom', 66–67.

⁶³ For discussion of submission and its terms, see Imsen, 'Earldom and Kingdom', 66–73.

⁶⁴ 'Sverri's Saga', in *ESSH*, vol. 2, 345–46.

⁶⁵ Imsen, 'Earldom and Kingdom', 67.

king and submit to his ‘judgement’.⁶⁶ Certainly King Sverrir appears to have created a piece of political theatre around Earl Haraldr’s submission. As David Brégaint observes, the submission was held before the king’s throne, which was brought outside for this very purpose, and the king sat in majesty surrounded by his *hirð* while the earl knelt at his feet.⁶⁷ The symbolism was not just secular, but invoked the religious imagery of Christ seated in majesty and in judgement — a point that would not have been lost on the assembled Norwegian nobles or on Earl Haraldr. As Brégaint suggests, such public theatre was part of a wider policy by Sverrir of utilising propaganda opportunities to reinforce his right to rule, which was an important consideration for a man who had won his throne through civil war and whose enemies continued to doubt his royal lineage.⁶⁸ It is also tempting to see in an example such as this what Althoff has described as the changing nature of submission in line with the increasing centralisation of the medieval state. Twelfth-century Norway is not, however, a particularly good example of this pattern, for the simple reason that Norwegian kings often did not have the power to behave in such a manner towards their nobles, much less to punish them for acts of rebellion.⁶⁹

It may be argued, however, that the situation in Scotland was different. The cases already discussed demonstrate an increasingly complex ritual that exhibited elements of non-violent punishment alongside royal forgiveness. By the reign of Alexander II (r. 1214–1249), it is possible to argue that a more confident Scottish crown was better able to demand submission and dictate the terms of reconciliation from rebellious subjects. This can be seen in the examples of Thomas of Galloway and Earl Jón Haraldsson of Orkney and Caithness. Defeated in battle in 1235 by royal forces sent to quell the rebellion he had instigated in Galloway, Thomas fled to Ireland. On his return to Scotland, apparently to stir up further unrest, he was met by the bishop of Galloway, the abbot of Melrose and the earl of Dunbar, the three of whom sought to intercede on his behalf and bring him before the king to seek royal pardon for his rebellion.⁷⁰ Unlike previous examples in which rebels were reconciled

⁶⁶ *Orkneyinga Saga*, 224. Crawford suggests that Haraldr’s action of travelling from the safety of his distant earldom to the heart of centralised monarchical power demonstrated in itself his desire to retain his title, even if it meant acknowledging royal overlordship. In return, the crown received lordly recognition of Sverrir’s royal power through the resulting homage and feudal fines: Crawford, ‘Norse Earls and Scottish Bishops’, 130.

⁶⁷ Brégaint, *Vox Regis*, 209–12.

⁶⁸ Brégaint, *Vox Regis*, 103–73.

⁶⁹ Orning, ‘Introduction to Part One’, 36–39; Bagge, *Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom*, 206–15.

⁷⁰ *Chron. Melrose*, 61–62; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 286; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 5, 149–51.

with the king, Thomas of Galloway was instead imprisoned for sixty years in Barnard Castle (Durham). Also unlike earlier examples, his followers appear to have received punishment. The Melrose chronicler wrote that the king ‘extended his peace to as many as came to him; and so the surviving Galwegians, with ropes round their necks, accepted his offer’.⁷¹ This powerfully symbolic submission, with the Galwegians publicly presenting their lives as forfeit to the king before being benevolently forgiven by a just monarch, was a potent demonstration of royal justice. In contrast, Matthew Paris wrote that ‘those whom the king or his supporters took alive, he punished without ransom by an ignominious death. But those who threw themselves upon his mercy he gave up to chains and strict imprisonment until it should be discussed in court what should be done with them’.⁷²

Although very different, both accounts emphasise the right of the king to take retributive action against rebellious subjects. It is also likely that Alexander relied on precedent when dealing with his Galwegian problem. Subsequent to the murder of Bishop Adam of Caithness in 1222, Earl Jón Haraldsson of Orkney and Caithness was forced to submit to the king.⁷³ The earl was required to pay tithes and grant lands to the Church, resign half of his earldom, and go on pilgrimage to Rome.⁷⁴ He was also obligated to avenge the death of the bishop by bringing ‘to the king’s feet within six months the cut-off heads of all those who had taken part in the said crime’.⁷⁵ The earl’s submission appears, therefore, to have been reinforced by something akin to a second ritual submission, this time with the grisly trophy of the heads of the guilty present at the king’s feet. In following these instructions, Jón was given the duty of upholding the king’s law and ensuring that justice was served for the bishop’s murder as part of the terms of his own submission. This ritual reinforced Jón’s allegiance to the crown, as well as visually displaying the force of royal justice to the men of the earldom.

⁷¹ *Chron. Melrose*, 61–62; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 286; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 5, 149–51.

⁷² ‘*Chronica majora*’, in *SAEC*, 342.

⁷³ Bishop Adam of Caithness was killed when his own house was burned down around him. Alexander II took an army north to bring Earl Jón to heel and he eventually submitted: ‘*Annals of Dunstable*’, in *SAEC*, 336–37; *Chron. Melrose*, 57–58; ‘*Icelandic Annals, version C*’, in *ESSH*, vol. 2, 451–52; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 284–85; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 5, 113–15. Earl Jón may have been a repeat offender, like his father, when it came to rebellion: Crawford, ‘*Earldom of Caithness*’, 33; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 274; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 473.

⁷⁴ ‘*Annals of Dunstable*’, in *SAEC*, 336–37.

⁷⁵ ‘*Annals of Dunstable*’, in *SAEC*, 336–37.

Such examples demonstrate the ongoing development of the submission ritual in Scotland over time. The context of royal power and authority had arguably changed in the intervening period, and Alexander II was able to exert power over an increasingly centralised kingdom in which rebellion was dealt with more harshly than in previous years. His predecessors did not appear to have quite such freedom of action. Nonetheless, these various examples show Scotland's kings demonstrating not just royal power, but also their 'good kingship' in healing the political rifts caused by rebellion. They did so in a way that punished the guilty, while at the same time granting forgiveness and allowing for the re-entry of nobles into the political hierarchy, in a way that preserved the dignity of all parties.⁷⁶ Submission worked, then, because it appealed to all involved. It was a middle ground between punishment and surrender, even if the balance of power in later years lay increasingly with the monarch.

The final examples from this period show what occurred when submission was not an option. The MacWilliam family were the fiercest and most consistent opposition faced by the Canmore dynasty during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The MacWilliams possessed a direct claim to the Scottish throne through the children of Malcolm III's first marriage and, as such, they were a constant and direct threat to the MacMalcolm dynasty itself.⁷⁷ As a result, the rebels appear either to have been purposefully denied the possibility of submission, or else chose not to avail themselves of this mechanism.⁷⁸ For example, in 1187 Donald Ban MacWilliam's rebellion was ended by royalist forces in battle in the north of Scotland. MacWilliam was killed on the field and had his head cut off for presentation to King William.⁷⁹ In 1211–1212 the rebellion of Guthred MacWilliam came to an end as a result of betrayal from within his own army. Guthred was led south in chains to be presented to the king, but King William stated 'that he did not want to see him alive, [and so] they beheaded Guthred, dragged him along by the feet and hung him up'.⁸⁰ Further rebellion in 1215

⁷⁶ As Rees Davies argues, noble submission was not a 'grovelling submission. The client must be made to feel that he was being treated as a friend not as a door-mat': Davies, 'Keeping the Natives in Order', 216.

⁷⁷ See McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*; Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams'.

⁷⁸ One potential MacWilliam who may have been treated differently is Bishop Wmund. Woolf has suggested that Wmund claimed similar descent to that of the MacWilliams: Woolf, 'The Diocese of the Sudreyar'.

⁷⁹ *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, vol. 2, 8; translation in *SAEC*, 295. See also *Chron. Melrose*, 25; *Chron. Holyrood*, 193; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 263–64.

⁸⁰ *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 465–67. This description of events is recorded in Walter Bower's fifteenth-century account, and no other Scottish chroniclers comment on this execution. The more contemporary English *Barnwell Chronicle* states that Guthred was defeated in battle, after which he was 'hanged on the gallows':

resulted in defeat for another Donald Ban MacWilliam and the rebels once more had their heads cut off for presentation to Alexander II.⁸¹ Then, once more, rebellion in 1230 resulted in another defeat, this time for Gillescop MacWilliam, who appears to have been executed by decapitation.⁸² This final rebellion was capped by the ritual execution of Gillescop's infant daughter who was reportedly executed by having her head smashed against Forfar market cross.⁸³

It thus appears that the example of the MacWilliams and the aftermath of their insurrections have come to define this period as one in which opponents of the crown faced particularly violent royal punishment in Scotland. However, the cases discussed earlier in this chapter demonstrate that submission was a recognised and well-used means of dealing with rebels, and that it functioned in a largely non-violent fashion. Not all those who submitted preserved their freedom, but they all retained their heads and their lives. The question, then, is why the MacWilliams were treated differently. Their desire to seize the throne certainly appears to have singled them out as being particularly dangerous, and the support they garnered for such a project, particularly in the north of the country and in Ireland, emphasised the threat they posed. However, there may be an additional reason why they were never given the opportunity to submit: they were too inherently dangerous to be allowed back into the Scottish political community, if they were ever really a part of it in the first place.

The MacWilliams held a somewhat peculiar position within medieval Scottish society. Historians have argued that the MacWilliam claim to the throne came through their descent from King Duncan II, and that their ancestors were the neglected and passed-over remnant of the sons of Malcolm III's first marriage. Indeed, their immediate predecessor, William fitz Duncan, appears to have held a position of some importance at the Scottish court during the reigns of Alexander I and David I, potentially as heir-designate while both remained childless.⁸⁴ However, the succession of Malcolm IV to the throne of his grandfather

'Barnwell Chronicle', in *Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria*, vol. 2, 206. See also McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 41–42; Ross, 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams', 30–31.

⁸¹ *Chron. Melrose*, 40–41; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 278.

⁸² 'Chronicle of Lanercost', in *ESSH*, 471; *Chron. Fordun*, vol. 2, 285–86; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 259; *Chron. Bower*, vol. 5, 143–45.

⁸³ 'Chronicle of Lanercost', in *ESSH*, 471.

⁸⁴ Woolf, 'The Diocese of the Sudreyar', 173; Oram, *Domination and Lordship*, 64; McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 62.

reinforced the use of primogeniture through the sons of Malcolm III's second marriage and effectively removed the descendants of Duncan II from the succession. While it has been suggested that William fitz Duncan was compensated with lands for withdrawing his claim to the throne, his heirs appear not to have seen the benefits of such an arrangement represented in their status.⁸⁵ The MacWilliams were not earls, nor did they hold particular prominence amongst the greater lords of Scotland. Their position rested solely on their descent from Duncan II. As a result, they perhaps lacked the access to noble intervention on their behalf which appears to have been a principal element in negotiating the terms and circumstances of submission observed in the examples already discussed.⁸⁶ They may also have been denied physical access to the king to enable any such submission, as the case of Guthred MacWilliam at least suggests.

The deaths of other MacWilliams in combat may indicate that there were other situations in which they were denied the opportunity to submit, and could suggest a Scottish royal policy of refusal to accept their surrender on the battlefield. If the MacWilliams recognised this situation, their only response may have been to argue for the righteousness of their cause. Although contained in a much later account, Bower notes that in c. 1211 Guthred MacWilliam besieged a royal castle in Ross.⁸⁷ Bower wrote that Guthred 'was just on the point of capturing it, when the garrison within lost their nerve and surrendered it of their own accord to save their lives, if nothing else. This Guthred granted them'.⁸⁸ The behaviour recorded here appears to reflect chivalric conduct in the treatment of an enemy.⁸⁹ The acceptance of surrender, at the very point of victory, and the mercy shown to the garrison suggests that Guthred intended to portray himself not as a rebel, but as a warrior equal to the defenders. As a conscious chivalric display, this may have been intended to emphasise how Guthred and his forces felt about their cause, positioning their actions in its support as legitimate. Arguably, similar action was taken by Scottish 'rebels' against England's kings after the commencement of the Wars of Independence.⁹⁰ The Scottish crown, of course, thought of the MacWilliams differently and this view, coupled with their apparent lack of

⁸⁵ Woolf, 'The Diocese of the Sudreyar', 173; Oram, *Domination and Lordship*, 64, 103.

⁸⁶ Benham, *Peacemaking*, 132–37.

⁸⁷ *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 465–67; Owen, *William the Lion*, 106.

⁸⁸ *Chron. Bower*, vol. 4, 465–67.

⁸⁹ Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, 208–23.

⁹⁰ Strickland, 'Law of Arms'.

access to the mechanisms of submission, may have forced the MacWilliams into a corner. Their rebellions turned into all-or-nothing affairs. It was to be the crown or death.

The example of the MacWilliams remains exceptional, however. For many other Scots who rebelled, even those who did so more than once, a return to the political fold remained a possible, or even likely, outcome. They may have lost land, money, or their freedom as a demonstration of their remorse, but they remained alive, with the potential to reclaim much that they had lost during the years that followed their defeat. Their ability to surrender and return to the Scottish political fold was made possible through the medium of formal and ritualised submission. Scottish kings, like their counterparts in Norway, England, and the Holy Roman Empire, recognised and utilised this mechanism to ensure that a balance was struck between punishment and forgiveness, royal vengeance, and royal magnanimity.⁹¹ The success of the Canmore monarchs was not, as one historian has argued, ‘achieved by blunt force and military might, and [...] through mercilessly crushing rivals and liquidating adversaries’.⁹² It was instead secured by a variety of means, principal of which was the formal submission of the rebellious lord to his king. Even in this period, for the majority of such men, a return to the king’s peace was an attainable and honourable outcome.

Reference List

Primary sources

‘Annals of Dunstable’. In *Annales Monastici*. ed. Henry R. Luard, vol. 3, 3–408. London: Rolls Series, 1864–1869.

‘Barnwell Chronicle’. In *Memoriale Fratris Walteri de Coventria*. ed. William Stubbs, vol. 2, 196–279. London: Rolls Series, 1872–1873.

Chron. Bower = Walter Bower. *Scotichronicon*. ed. Donald E. R. Watt et al., 9 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1987–1988.

Chron. Fordun = Johannis de Fordun. *Cronica Gentis Scotorum*. ed. William F. Skene, 3 vols. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871–1872.

Chron. Holyrood = *A Scottish Chronicle known as the Chronicle of Holyrood*. ed. Marjorie O. Anderson. Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1938.

⁹¹ For discussion of the need for kings to balance their displays of magnanimity and violence, see Strickland, *War and Chivalry*, 248–51; McGrath, ‘Politics of Chivalry’, 68–69; Neville, ‘Royal Pardon in Scotland’, 567–69.

⁹² McDonald, *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland*, 172.

Chron. Melrose = Mediaeval Chronicles of Scotland: The Chronicle of Melrose (from 1136 to 1264) and the Chronicle of Holyrood (to 1163). ed. Joseph Stephenson. Dyfed: Llanerch Enterprises, 1988.

Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene. ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols. London: Rolls Series 1868–1871.

The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis. ed. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968–1980.

ESSH = Early Sources of Scottish History A.D. 500 to 1286. ed. Alan O. Anderson, 2 vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1922.

Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis. ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. London: Rolls Series, 1867.

Orkneyinga Saga: The History of the Earls of Orkney. trans. Hermann Pálsson and Paul Edwards. London: Penguin Books, 1978.

RRS = Regesta Regum Scottorum. Vol. 1, *The Acts of Malcolm IV.* ed. Geoffrey W. S. Barrow. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1960.

SAEC = Scottish Annals from English Chronicles, A.D. 500 to 1286. ed. Alan O. Anderson. London: David Nutt, 1908.

William of Newburgh. *The History of English Affairs.* ed. Peter G. Walsh and M. J. Kennedy, 2 vols. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988–2007.

Secondary literature

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. Steven G. Ellis and Lud’ a Klusáková, 59–76. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 2007.

Althoff, Gerd. ‘Satisfaction: Peculiarities of the Amicable Settlement of Conflicts in the Middle Ages’. In *Ordering Medieval Societies: Perspectives on Intellectual and Practical Modes of Shaping Social Relations*, ed. Bernhard Jussen, trans. Pamela E. Selwyn, 270–84. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Anderson, Alan O. ‘Wimund, Bishop and Pretender’. *Scottish Historical Review* 7, no. 25 (1909): 29–36.

Bagge, Sverre. *From Viking Stronghold to Christian Kingdom: State Formation in Norway, c. 900–1350.* Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2010.

Bagge, Sverre. ‘The Structure of the Political Factions in the Internal Struggles of the Scandinavian Countries During the High Middle Ages’. *Scandinavian Journal of History* 24, no. 3–4 (1999): 299–320.

- Benham, Jenny. *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Benham, Jenny. 'Writing Peace, Writing War: Roger of Howden and Saxo Grammaticus Compared'. In *Historical and Intellectual Culture in the Long Twelfth Century: the Scandinavian Connection*, ed. Mia Münster-Swendsen, Thomas Heebøll-Holm and Sigbjørn Olsen Sønnesyn, 272–94. Durham: Institute of Medieval and Early Modern Studies, 2016.
- Benham, Jenny. 'Walter Map and Ralph Glaber: Intertextuality and the Construction of Memories of Peacemaking'. In *Citation, Intertextuality and Memory in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Vol. 2, *Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Culture*, ed. Giuliano Di Bacco and Yolanda Plumley, 6–17. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013.
- Benham, Jenny. 'Anglo-French Peace Conferences in the Twelfth Century'. In *Anglo-Norman Studies XXVII: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2004*, ed. John Gillingham, 52–67. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Barrow, Geoffrey W. S. 'MacBeth and other Mormaers of Moray'. In *The Hub of the Highlands: The Book of Inverness and District*, ed. Loraine Maclean, 109–22. Edinburgh: Inverness Field Club, 1975.
- Boardman, Stephen I. 'A People Divided? Language, History and Anglo-Scottish Conflict in the Work of Andrew of Wyntoun'. In *Ireland and the English World in the Late Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Robin Frame*, ed. Brendan Smith, 112–29. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Brégaïnt, David. *Vox Regis: Royal Communication in High Medieval Norway*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Broun, Dauvit. 'Britain and the Beginning of Scotland'. *Journal of the British Academy* 3 (2015): 107–37.
- Broun, Dauvit. 'Creating and Maintaining a Year-by-Year Chronicle: the Evidence of the Chronicle of Melrose'. In *The Medieval Chronicle VI*, ed. Erik Kooper, 141–52. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Broun, Dauvit, and Julian Harrison. *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: A Stratigraphic Edition*. Vol 1, *Introduction and Facsimile Edition*. Woodbridge: Scottish History Society, 2007.
- Broun, Dauvit. 'A New Look at *Gesta Annalia* Attributed to John of Fordun'. In *Church, Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Early Renaissance Scotland: Essays Presented to Donald Watt on the Occasion of the Completion of the Publication of*

- Bower's Scotichronicon*, ed. Barbara E. Crawford, 9–30. Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1999.
- Burns, J. Patout. 'Concept of Satisfaction in Medieval Redemption Theory'. *Theological Studies* 36, no. 2 (1975): 285–304.
- Cheyette, Fredric L. 'Suum cuique tribuere'. *French Historical Studies* 6, no. 3 (1970): 287–99.
- Cowan, Edward J. 'The Historical Macbeth'. In *Moray: Province and People*, ed. W. David H. Sellar, 117–41. Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1993.
- Cowan, Edward J. 'Caithness in the Sagas'. In *Caithness: A Cultural Crossroads*, ed. John R. Baldwin, 25–44. Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 1982.
- Crawford, Barbara E. *The Northern Earldoms: Orkney and Caithness from A.D. 870 to 1470*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2014.
- Crawford, Barbara E. 'Norse Earls and Scottish Bishops in Caithness: A Clash of Cultures'. In *The Viking Age in Caithness, Orkney and the North Atlantic*, ed. Colleen E. Batey, Judith Jesch and Christopher D. Morris, 129–47. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993.
- Crawford, Barbara E. 'The Earldom of Caithness and the Kingdom of Scotland, 1150–1266'. In *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland*, ed. Keith J. Stringer, 25–43. Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985.
- Dalton, Paul. 'Geffrei Gaimar's *Estoire Des Engleis*, Peacemaking, and the "Twelfth-Century Revival of the English Nation"'. *Studies in Philology* 104, no. 4 (2007): 427–54.
- Dalton, Paul. 'Sites and Occasions of Peacemaking in England and Normandy, c. 900–c. 1150'. In *Haskins Society Journal XVI*, ed. Stephen Morillo and Diane Korngiebel, 12–26. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Dalton, Paul. 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign'. *Viator* 31 (2000): 79–120.
- Davies, Robert Rees. "'Keeping the Natives in Order": The English King and the "Celtic" Rulers 1066–1216'. *Peritia* 10 (1996): 212–24.
- Davies, Robert Rees. *Domination and Conquest: The Experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100–1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Duncan, Archibald A. M. 'Roger of Howden and Scotland, 1187–1201'. In *Church Chronicle and Learning in Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*, ed. Barbara E. Crawford, 135–59. Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1999.
- Duncan, Archibald A. M. *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1978.

- Duncan, Archibald A. M., and A. L. Brown. 'Argyll and the Isles in the Earlier Middle Ages'. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 90 (1956–7): 192–220.
- Dutton, Marsha L., ed. *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167)*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Eickles, Klaus van. 'Gendered Violence: Castration and Blinding as Punishment for Treason in Normandy and Anglo-Norman England'. *Gender and History* 16 (2004): 588–602.
- Freeman, Elizabeth. 'Aelred as a Historian among Historians'. In *A Companion to Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167)*, ed. Marsha L. Dutton, 113–46. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Gates, Jay Paul, and Nicole Marafioti, eds. *Capital and Corporal Punishment in Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2014.
- Geary, Patrick J. 'Living with Conflicts in Stateless France: A Typology of Conflict Management Mechanisms, 1050–1200'. In *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages*, ed. Patrick J. Geary, 125–61. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Gillingham, John. 'Two Yorkshire Historians Compared: Roger of Howden and William of Newburgh'. In *Haskins Society Journal XII*, ed. Stephen Morillo, 15–38. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Gillingham, John. '1066 and the Introduction of Chivalry into England'. In *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*, 209–31. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Gillingham, John. 'The Beginnings of English Imperialism'. In *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*, 3–18. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Gillingham, John. 'Conquering the Barbarians: War and Chivalry in Britain and Ireland'. In *The English in the Twelfth Century: Imperialism, National Identity and Political Values*, 41–58. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Gillingham, John. 'Killing and Mutilating Political Enemies in the British Isles from the Late Twelfth to the Early Fourteenth Century: A Comparative Study'. In *Britain and Ireland, 900–1300: Insular Responses to Medieval European Change*, ed. Brendan Smith, 114–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Grant, Alexander. 'The Province of Ross and the Kingdom of Alba'. In *Alba: Celtic Scotland in the Middle Ages*, 88–126. East Linton: John Donald, 2000.
- Hermanson, Lars. 'How to Legitimate Rebellion and Condemn Usurpation of the Crown: Discourses of Fidelity and Treason in the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus'. In *Disputing Strategies in Medieval Scandinavia*, ed. Kim Esmark et al., 107–40. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013.

- Hollister, C. Warren. 'Royal Acts of Mutilation: The Case against Henry I'. *Albion* 10 (1978): 330–40.
- Imsen, Steinar. 'Earldom and Kingdom: Orkney in the Realm of Norway 1195–1379'. In *The Faces of Orkney: Stones, Skalds and Saints*, ed. Doreen J. Waugh, 65–80. Edinburgh: Scottish Society for Northern Studies, 2003.
- Kagay, Donald J. 'The Treason of Center and Periphery: The Uncertain Contest of Government and Individual in the Medieval Crown of Aragon'. *Mediterranean Studies* 12 (2003): 17–35.
- Kagay, Donald J. 'Structures of Baronial Dissent and Revolt under James I (1213–76)'. *Mediaevistik* 1 (1988): 61–85.
- Keefe, Thomas K. 'King Henry II and the Earls: The Pipe Roll Evidence'. *Albion* 13, no. 3 (1981): 191–222.
- Kuefler, Matthew S. 'Castration and Eunuchism in the Middle Ages'. In *Handbook of Medieval Sexuality*, ed. Vern L. Bullough and James A. Brundage, 279–306. New York: Garland, 1996.
- Kosto, Adam J. *Hostages in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Koziol, Geoffrey. 'The Conquest of Burgundy, the Peace of God, and the Diplomas of Robert the Pious'. *French Historical Studies* 37, no. 2 (2014): 173–214.
- Koziol, Geoffrey. 'England, France, and the Problem of Sacrality in Twelfth-Century Ritual'. In *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Thomas N. Bisson, 124–48. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.
- MacInnes, Iain A. "'A somewhat too cruel vengeance was taken for the blood of the slain": Royal Punishment of Rebels, Traitors and Political Enemies in Medieval Scotland, c. 1100–c. 1250'. In *Treason: Medieval and Early Modern Treachery, Betrayal and Shame*, ed. Larissa Tracy, 119–43. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Marsden, John. *Somerled and the Emergence of Gaelic Scotland*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2005.
- Mayeski, Marie Anne. 'Secundum Naturam: The Inheritance of Virtue in Aelred's *Genealogy of the English Kings*'. *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 37, no. 3 (2002): 221–28.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. 'Old and New in the Far North: Ferchar Maccintsacairt and the Early Earls of Ross, c. 1200–1274'. In *The Exercise of Power in Medieval Scotland, c. 1200–1500*, ed. Steve Boardman and Alasdair Ross, 23–45. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. *Outlaws of Medieval Scotland: Challenges to the Canmore Kings, 1058–1266*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2003.

- McDonald, R. Andrew. “‘Soldiers Most Unfortunate’”: Gaelic and Scoto-Norse Opponents of the Canmore Dynasty, c. 1100–c. 1230’. In *History, Literature, and Music in Scotland, 700–1560*, ed. R. Andrew McDonald, 93–119. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. ‘Rebels Without a Cause? The Relations of Fergus of Galloway and Somerled of Argyll with the Scottish Kings, 1153–1164’. In *Alba: Celtic Scotland in the Middle Ages*, 166–86. East Linton: John Donald, 2000.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. *The Kingdom of the Isles: Scotland’s Western Seaboard, c. 1100–c. 1336*. East Linton: John Donald, 1997.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. ‘Scoto-Norse Kings and the Reformed Religious Orders: Patterns of Monastic Patronage in Twelfth-Century Galloway and Argyll’. *Albion* 27, no. 2 (1995): 187–219.
- McDonald, R. Andrew. ‘Monk, Bishop, Impostor, Pretender: The Place of Wimund in Twelfth-Century Scotland’. *Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness* 58 (1992–1994): 247–70.
- McDonald, R. Andrew, and Scott A. McLean. ‘Sommerled of Argyll: A New Look at Old Problems’. *Scottish Historical Review* 71 (1992): 3–22.
- McDonald, R. Andrew, and Scott A. McLean. ‘In Search of Sommerled — King of Argyll and the Isles’. *Scottish Tradition* 16 (1990–1991): 1–17.
- McGlynn, Sean. *By Sword and Fire: Cruelty and Atrocity in Medieval Warfare*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2008.
- McGrath, Kate. ‘The Politics of Chivalry: The Function of Anger and Shame in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Historical Narratives’. In *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White*, ed. Belle S. Tuten and Tracey L. Billado, 55–69. Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.
- Meens, Rob. *Penance in Medieval Europe, 600–1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Neville, Cynthia J. ‘The Beginnings of Royal Pardon in Scotland’. *Journal of Medieval History* 42, no. 5 (2016): 559–87.
- Neville, Cynthia J. ‘Royal Mercy in Later Medieval Scotland’. *Florilegium* 29 (2012): 1–31.
- Oram, Richard D. *Domination and Lordship Scotland 1070–1230*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Oram, Richard D. ‘Introduction: An Overview of the Reign of Alexander II’. In *The Reign of Alexander II, 1214–49*, ed. Richard D. Oram, 1–48. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Oram, Richard D. *David I: The King Who Made Scotland*. Stroud: Tempus, 2004.

- Oram, Richard D. *The Lordship of Galloway*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2000.
- Oram, Richard D. 'David I and the Scottish Conquest and Colonisation of Moray'. *Northern Scotland* 19 (1999): 1–20.
- Oram, Richard D. 'A Family Business? Colonisation and Settlement in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Galloway'. *Scottish Historical Review* 72, no. 2 (1993): 111–45.
- Owen, D. D. R. *William the Lion 1143–1214: Kingship and Culture*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997.
- Orning, Hans Jacob. 'Conflict and Social (Dis)order in Norway, c. 1030–1160'. In *Disputing Strategies in Medieval Scandinavia*, ed. Kim Esmark et al., 45–82. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Orning, Hans Jacob. 'Introduction to Part One'. In *Disputing Strategies in Medieval Scandinavia*, ed. Kim Esmark et al., 31–44. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Roach, Levi. 'Penance, Submission and *deditio*: Religious Influences on Dispute Settlement in Later Anglo-Saxon England (871–1066)'. *Anglo-Saxon England* 41 (2012): 343–71.
- Rosato, Andrew. 'The Interpretation of Anselm's Teaching on Christ's Satisfaction for Sin in the Franciscan Tradition from Alexander of Hales to Duns Scotus'. *Franciscan Studies* 71 (2013): 411–44.
- Rosenthal, Joel T. 'The King's "Wicked Advisers" and Medieval Baronial Rebellions'. *Political Science Quarterly* 82, no. 4 (1967): 595–618.
- Ross, Alasdair. 'The Identity of the "Prisoner of Roxburgh": Malcolm Son of Alexander of Malcolm MacEth?' In *Fil súil nglais — A Grey Eye Looks Back: A Festschrift for Professor Colm Ó Baoill*, ed. Sharon Arbuthnott and Kaarina Hollo, 269–82. Brig o' Turk: Clann Tuirc, 2007.
- Ross, Alasdair. 'Moray, Ulster, and the MacWilliams'. In *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, Warlords and Warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200–1600*, ed. Seán Duffy, 24–44. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007.
- Sellar, W. David H. 'The Origins and Ancestry of Somerled'. *Scottish Historical Review* 45, no. 2 (1966): 123–42.
- Skinner, Patricia. "'Better off dead than disfigured?'" The Challenges of Facial Injury in the Premodern Past'. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26 (2016): 25–41.
- Skinner, Patricia. 'Visible Prowess?: Reading Men's Head and Face Wounds in Early Medieval Europe to 1000 CE'. In *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, ed. Larissa Tracy and Kelly DeVries, 81–101. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Strickland, Matthew. 'In coronam regiam commiserunt iniuriam: The Barons' War and the Legal Status of Rebellion, 1264–1266'. In *Law and Power in the Middle Ages. Proceedings of the Fourth Carlsberg Academy Conference on Medieval Legal History*,

- ed. Per Andersen, Mia Münster-Swendsen and Helle Vogt, 171–98. Copenhagen: DJOF Publishing, 2008.
- Strickland, Matthew. ‘A Law of Arms or a Law of Treason? Conduct in Edward I’s Campaigns in Scotland, 1296–1307’. In *Violence in Medieval Society*, ed. Richard W. Kaeuper, 39–78. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.
- Strickland, Matthew. *War and Chivalry: The Conduct and Perception of War in England and Normandy, 1066–1217*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Strickland, Matthew. ‘Against the Lord’s Anointed: Aspects of Warfare and Baronial Rebellion in England and Normandy 1075–1265’. In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy: Essays in Honour of Sir James Holt*, ed. George Garnett and John Hudson, 56–79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Taylor, Alice. ‘Historical Writing in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Scotland: the Dunfermline Compilation’. *Historical Research* 83, no. 220 (2010): 228–52.
- Toledo Candelaria, Marian. ‘From Reformed Barbarian to “Saint-King”: Literary Portrayals of King Malcolm III Canmore (r. 1058–93) in Scottish Historical Narratives, c. 1100–1449’. PhD diss., University of Guelph, 2018.
- Topping, Patrick. ‘Harald Maddadson, Earl of Orkney and Caithness, 1139–1206’. *Scottish Historical Review* 62 (1983): 105–20.
- Tracy, Larissa, ed. *Castration and Culture in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2013.
- Tracy, Larissa, and Jeff Massey, ed. *Heads Will Roll: Decapitation in the Medieval and Early Modern Imagination*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Truax, Jean. *Aelred the Peacemaker: The Public Life of a Cistercian Abbot*. Collegeville, PA: Liturgical Press, 2017.
- Warner, David A. ‘Rituals, Kingship and Rebellion in Medieval Germany’. *History Compass* 8, no. 10 (2010): 1209–20.
- Weiler, Björn. ‘Kings and Sons: Princely Rebellions and the Structures of Revolt in Western Europe, c. 1170–c. 1280’. *Historical Research* 82, no. 215 (2009): 17–40.
- Westerhof, Danielle. *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008.
- White, Stephen D. ‘From Peace to Power: The Study of Disputes in Medieval France’. In *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther Cohen and Mark B. de Jong, 203–18. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- White, Stephen D. “‘Pactum [...] Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium.’” The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France’. *American Journal of Legal History* 22, no. 4 (1978): 281–308.
- Woolf, Alex. ‘The Song of the Death of Somerled and the Destruction of Glasgow in 1153’. *Journal of the Sydney Society for Scottish History* 14 (2013): 1–11.
- Woolf, Alex. ‘The Origins and Ancestry of Somerled: Gofraid mac Fergusa and “The Annals of the Four Masters”’. *Mediaeval Scandinavia* 15 (2005): 1–15.
- Woolf, Alex. ‘The Diocese of the Sudreyar’. In *Ecclesia Nidrosiensis, 1153–1537: søkelys på Nidaroskirkens og Nidarosprovinsens historie*, ed. Steinar Imsen, 171–81. Trondheim: Tapir, 2003.