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The genealogy of the king of Scots as charter and panegyric

Dauvit Broun

When we think of genealogies in medieval Scotland our minds might turn at once to Gaelic, the Celtic language that was spoken in the Middle Ages from the southern tip of Ireland to the northernmost coast of Scotland. This is not unnatural. Texts that trace the ancestry of a notable individual generation by generation survive in their hundreds from the medieval Gaelic world. They are found today almost exclusively in late-medieval Irish manuscripts. Some genealogies originated in collections made as early as the tenth century. Presumably there were once many Scottish manuscripts containing genealogies, too. A reason why they would not have survived is that, in the Scottish kingdom during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Gaelic learned orders who would have had a primary interest in writing and copying this material declined in significance and ceased to participate in Gaelic literate culture. This chapter will open with a brief survey of medieval genealogical texts relating to the Scottish kingdom, followed by a closer discussion of the limited number that are known to have existed between about 995 and 1250. Thanks to some recent insights about the physicality of texts, and the example of Bengali copper charters, a new approach to this material will be developed that offers a fresh perspective on the role of genealogy as a written expression of kingship and lordship.

I

What are genealogies?

Gaelic genealogies in the central and later Middle Ages typically trace the descent of an individual through a number of significant figures who serve to establish his identity. If, for example, the genealogy is of the ruler of Cenél nGabráin (‘Kindred of Gabrán’), then Gabrán, from whom Cenél nGabráin are named, will feature in his genealogy, along with all Gabrán’s supposed ancestors. The Gaelic learned orders who wrote and preserved these texts developed a sophisticated fictional scheme which showed how every major kindred in the Gaelic world was related to each other, and ultimately to biblical ancestors. This meant that it was notionally possible for an individual’s genealogy to be taken generation by generation back to ‘Adam son of the living God’. One example of this (noted below) runs to over 140 generations. In practice it appears that someone only had their genealogy written out during their lifetime if they held a position of authority. Only the most important would have had their pedigree traced deep into past. The only texts of Scottish genealogies that are known from about 750 to about 1350 are those of kings. There are earlier, more extensive genealogies relating to Dál Riata (a kingdom roughly equivalent to modern Argyll in the west of Scotland and the north of Antrim in Ireland): one is a tract on the ‘four chief kindreds of Dál Riata’, datable to about 730 or 733; another is a complex text that includes material that may be from the seventh century.

1 I am extremely grateful to Joanna Tucker for commenting on this and discussing it with me as it was being written, for numerous key points, and for invaluable suggestions for its improvement. All errors are my own.
2 See below, XXX.
4 The genealogy of William the Lion noted under (3) in the summary below.
5 Studies of genealogies focus chiefly on understanding changes involving significant ancestors rather than on the conventions governing the choice of individuals at the head of a pedigree. For an exception (limited to the study of a single tract) see Dauvit Broun, ‘Cethri prímchenéla Dáil Riata revisited’, in Sacred Histories: a Festschrift for Máire Herbert, ed. J. Carey, K. Murray and C. Ó Dochartaigh (Dublin, 2015), 63–72.
7 See below, XXX.
Apart from this complex text, all Scottish genealogies take the form ‘A son of B son of C’ and so on, with the most recent person (‘A’) ‘heading’ the genealogy. Every link in the chain is male. There was, however, a lone woman in the line of descent of the kings of Scots. Her fate in copies of the Scottish royal genealogy is instructive. If we take David I (king of Scots, 1124–1153) as our starting point, his ancestry (in medieval Gaelic) is: Dabíth mac Maíl Choluim meic Donnchada meic Beithóice ingen Maíl Choluim meic Chinaeda …, ‘David son of Mael Coluim (Malcolm III, ruled 1058–1093) son of Donnchad (Duncan I, 1034–1040) son of Bethóc daughter of Mael Coluim (Malcolm II, 1005–1034) son of Cinaed (Kenneth II, 971–995) …’. You will look in vain, however, for Bethóc in all versions of the genealogy but one. It was so unusual to have a woman as one of the generations in a genealogy that her naming was avoided by saying either ‘Donnchad (Duncan I) grandson of Mael Coluim (Malcolm II)’, or ‘Donnchad son of the daughter of Mael Coluim’. The next step was to deny the possibility of her existence by saying ‘Donnchad (Duncan I) son of Mael Coluim (Malcolm II)’ (as in the text edited and translated in the Appendix), or by converting her into a male by reading meic ingen, ‘of the son of the daughter’ as meic Fingen, ‘son of Fingen’. These changes were evidently made by scribes who were so used to writing an undisturbed sequence of male names that they were moved to ‘correct’ the text in this way.

Summary of medieval genealogical texts relating to the Scottish kingdom

Genealogies have in the past tended to be regarded as primarily an oral form which was occasionally committed to writing. Donnchadh Ó Corráin, however, in his seminal work on the vast genealogical corpus in Irish manuscripts, has argued compellingly that these should be understood as accumulations of written material transmitted over many centuries. In this chapter the ultimate focus will be on the exact nature of genealogy at its smallest scale as something written on parchment.

The genealogical texts traceable to Scotland in the Middle Ages can be grouped as follows:

1. The earliest texts: the two early tracts on Dál Riata which have been mentioned already.
2. Genealogies of kings of Scots in Gaelic found in Irish manuscripts. These all derive ultimately from a collection that also included the two early tracts on Dál Riata. This will be discussed in more detail in due course.
3. A copy of the genealogy of William the Lion (1165–1214) back to Adam ‘son of the living God’. This formed part of a collection of miscellaneous historical pieces relating to the Scottish kingdom compiled during the reign of William the Lion. Although the genealogy is ostensibly in Latin, the names are spelt according to medieval Gaelic conventions from Mael Coluim mac

8 ‘Bethoc’ in the earliest version of the genealogy in (5) in the summary, below (incorporated into the Imagines Historiarum of Ralph of Diss). The name might have originated as beith, ‘birch-tree’ (see eDIL s.v. 2 beith at dil.ie/5595, accessed 14 February 2016), plus óc; ‘young’.
11 See also below, XXX.
12 See section IV, below.
13 A critical edition of the first 97 generations is in Dauvit Broun, The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (Woodbridge, 1999), 176–180; for the whole text see Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson, Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland, 2nd edn (Edinburgh, 1980), 256–8.
Donnchada (Malcolm III onwards (1058–1093). The rendering of Mael Coluim’s son David I (1124–1153) as ‘Dauid’, however, is perfectly plausible as a medieval Gaelic spelling.\textsuperscript{15} It is possible, therefore, that this was originally a Gaelic text headed by David I.

(4) A version related to this, but with names often badly garbled.\textsuperscript{16} This is found (i) from Fergus son of Erc to Noah in the \textit{Original Chronicle} written in Scots verse by Andrew of Wyntoun sometime between 1408 and 1424;\textsuperscript{17} (ii) in Latin, from Fergus son of Erc to Adam, in the commonplace book of James Gray, secretary of two archbishops of St Andrews in the late fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{18}

(5) A Latin genealogy headed originally by David I with names rendered so that they could be pronounced by someone unfamiliar with medieval Gaelic spelling conventions.\textsuperscript{19} It survives because it was incorporated into a number of historical works: (i) the \textit{Imagines Historiarum} of Ralph of Diss (d. c. 1200), where it is updated to William the Lion, and runs back to Noah;\textsuperscript{20} (ii) as an addition to the account of Alexander III’s inauguration in \textit{Gesta Annalia} I, where it runs from Alexander back to the legendary first king of Scots in Scotland;\textsuperscript{21} and (iii) in book V chapter 50 of Fordun’s \textit{Chronica Gentis Scotorum}, running from David I to Noah. It is said to have been taken from a copy that belonged to Cardinal Walter Wardlaw, bishop of Glasgow (d.1387).\textsuperscript{22}

(6) Finally, there are a number of genealogies in Gaelic of Highland kindreds of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Some are found among the great corpus of genealogies in Irish manuscripts.\textsuperscript{23} The most important extant copy is a discrete collection found on the first folio of Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates’ MS 72.1.1.\textsuperscript{24} a manuscript written by Dubhghall Albanach mac mhic Cathail in Ormond (in the south of Ireland) in 1467 (hence its designation as ‘MS 1467’).\textsuperscript{25} Martin MacGregor has shown that a significant part of this collection can be dated to about 1400, and that it had passed through the hands of a MacLachlan historian before reaching Dubhghall Albanach.\textsuperscript{26} In ‘MS 1467’ the first item is the genealogy of the king of Scots, headed by David I (1124–1153), derived ultimately from a collection of Scottish genealogies in Ireland (discussed below). This acts as a stem which most of the other genealogies join.

\textsuperscript{15} eDIL s.v. \textit{Dauith} at dil.ie/14769 (accessed 14 February 2016).


\textsuperscript{17} Broun, \textit{The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots}, 96 and n.40. For Wyntoun’s version of the genealogy see F. J. Amours (ed.), \textit{The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun}, 6 vols, Scottish Text Society (Edinburgh, 1903–1914), vol. ii, 114–17, 210–13, 349, 351.

\textsuperscript{18} Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Adv. 34.7.3, ff.17v–19r. For Gray, see Anderson, \textit{Kings and Kingship}, 64.

\textsuperscript{19} Broun, \textit{The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots}, 180–1; Broun, ‘Gaelic literacy’, 190–1.

\textsuperscript{20} Edited in Broun, ‘The most important textual representation of royal authority’.

\textsuperscript{21} Edited in Broun, \textit{The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots}, 183–7.


\textsuperscript{23} W. D. H. Sellar, ‘MacDonald and MacRuari pedigrees in MS 1467’, \textit{Notes and Queries of the Society of West Highland Island Historical Research} 29 (March 1986), 122–39.

\textsuperscript{24} See Máire and Ronnie Black’s description and transcription at http://www.1467manuscript.co.uk/index.html (accessed 16 February 2016). at 131–2.


New perspectives
Donnchadh Ó Corráin has characterised genealogies as ‘socio-cultural instruments devised to serve social ends: title, inheritance, status in church and in secular society’.27 There is a potential overlap here with charters as records of landholding and lordship, and with panegyric poetry praising a patron’s position, power and prestige. Genealogy, charter, and praise poetry, however, were distinct types of text. The inclusion of genealogy and panegyric in the copper charters of Bengal has no parallel among medieval Scottish (or European) documents. Was there potential, however, for genealogies to perform functions similar to charters and panegyric? These are new questions which arise directly out of comparison with the Bengali copper charters. This has the potential to offer a fresh perspective on material that is familiar to historians of the medieval Gaelic world.

The main task of this chapter is to identify genealogical texts originating in Scotland. This will, of necessity, focus on the genealogy of the king of Scots. This will suffice for considering the potential for crossover from panegyric to genealogy. The idea that genealogy might share aspects of a charter, however, will hinge on seeing them not only as primarily written rather than oral, but also as a form of writing with a physical dimension that no longer survives. This is the most fundamental and challenging fresh perspective to arise from the comparison with Bengali copper charters. Its roots, however, lie not only in recognising the potential importance of studying texts as objects, but in recent work where the physical evidence becomes an inherent feature of our approach to text.28

The physical dimension of charters can readily be appreciated. Bengali copper charters are manifestly artefacts as well as texts. Scottish (and European) charters were artefacts, too. Indeed, their authenticity was enhanced by their existence as individual sheets of parchment with seals attached; by the thirteenth century this was essential if they were to have legal force.29 There was no requirement, of course, for genealogies to be on single sheets of parchment, or for them to be sealed. It seems natural therefore to discuss them simply as texts—all the more so given that they only survive in collections within manuscript-books. How might it be useful, therefore, to think of genealogies as having a physical dimension? Joanna Tucker in her work on what she has termed ‘complex cartularies’ has shown the value of keeping in the foreground the fact that writing had simultaneously a physical and textual presence.30 As a result, it is not only individual charters on their original sheet of parchment which have a physical dimension that needs to be taken into account; she has shown that charters in the fundamentally different context of a complex cartulary also benefit from being understood within the dynamic of their physical setting. Joanna Tucker’s method will not be used directly in this chapter to investigate the nearest genealogical equivalent of cartularies—namely the manuscripts that include collections of genealogies. Instead her insights into the value of keeping the

---

27 Ó Corráin, ‘Creating the past’, 189.
28 Elena Pierazzo and Peter Stokes, ‘Putting the text back into context: a codicological approach to manuscript transmission’, *Codicology and Palaeography in the Digital Age* 2, ed. F. Fischer, C. Fritze and G. Vogeler (Norderstedt, 2011), 397–430, at 401–20, summarise a range of work that shows that, ‘in order to say “what a text really is”, one must deal with the physical embodiment of that text’ (p.420). They highlight the need for an editorial or analytical methodology that integrates the physical evidence as an inherent feature of the text. Although their focus is on digital representations of text, the need is general. This integration has been achieved more recently by Joanna Tucker in her methodology for analysing complex cartularies: see below.
29 For an awareness of this aspect of charters I have benefitted specifically from Joanna Tucker’s insights on the relationship between cartularies and archives of originals arising from her research on thirteenth-century Scottish cartularies (see next note). I am extremely grateful to her for discussions about this.
30 Joanna Tucker, ‘Scotland’s earliest cartularies’, paper delivered at the International Medieval Congress, Leeds, on 6 July 2015. This lies at the heart of the new methodology that she has developed for analysing complex cartularies at the outset of her ongoing Ph.D. research on thirteenth-century Scottish cartularies as a source for documentary consciousness. I am extremely grateful to Joanna Tucker for sharing this with me. Her methodology takes us beyond the current limits of codicology and textual criticism. J. Peter Gumbert, ‘Codicological units: towards a terminology for the stratigraphy of the non-homogeneous codex’, *Segno e Testo* 2 (2004), 17–42, is an important discussion of the significance of combining an awareness of text and manuscript, but focuses on codicology; compare also Dauvit Broun, ‘Editing the Chronicle of Melrose’, and ‘Charting the chronicle’s physical development’, in Dauvit Broun and Julian Harrison, *The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey: a Stratigraphic Edition*, vol. 1, *Introduction and Facsimile Edition* (Woodbridge, 2007), 29–39, 125–73, where the focus is on what this offers for editing a text. Joanna Tucker’s methodology in analysing complex cartularies is the first occasion where both dimensions are fully integrated and given equal weight.
physicality of text constantly in mind will be applied to think afresh about the smallest constituent elements of the corpus of genealogies, reaching beyond the level of earlier collections of material to individual items such as the brief tract on the ‘four chief kindreds of Dál Riata’, and the genealogy of the king of Scots.

II

The genealogy of the king of Scots in practice

In records of donations of land in medieval Scotland the donor’s identity was given with little fuss. Their name plus a simple designation, such as a title or patronymic, was sufficient. Yet every secular individual of high status would have been acutely aware of their ancestry. In some cases this is apparent in their surname. That of Robert de Brus lord of Annandale, for example, drew attention to the family’s origin in Bruis (now Brix) on the Cotentin peninsula in western Normandy. From the thirteenth century onwards ancestry could be displayed in heraldic designs. As far as records of landholding were concerned, however, it was irrelevant. Indeed, once lordship came to be defined primarily as holding ‘land’ rather than leading a kindred, genealogy ceased to be the principal written form of explaining and upholding the highest authority in local and regional society.

Kingship was different. On the one hand, the king’s name in charters was regularly reduced to its initial letter. The opening words of a charter of David I (1124–1153), for example, would often be D. rex Scot’ (Latin Dauid rex Scottorum, ‘David king of Scots’). On the other hand, the king’s genealogy was no mere statement of family prestige. It served to define royal authority itself. In a contemporary account of Alexander III’s inauguration on 13 July 1249, it is said that, once he had been enthroned, consecrated, and all the lords had spread their cloaks at his feet,

… a certain highland Scot [i.e., the king’s poet], kneeling suddenly before the throne, greeted the king in the mother tongue, bowing his head, saying: Bennachd Dé, ri Alba, Allanach mac Alexanndair meic Uilleim meic Énri meic Dabíth (‘Blessings of God, king of Scots, Alexander son of Alexander son of William son of Henry son of David’), and by proclaiming in this way read the genealogy of the kings of Scots to the end.32

It was not enough simply to hail the new king by his name. Each generation of his ancestry, father to son, had to be announced ‘to the end’. In this way he was recognised as the living embodiment of the ancient royal line not simply due to his ancestry (which, before primogeniture, would have been a quality shared by other potential kings), but because he was now enthroned and in full possession of the kingdom.34

31 Ruth M. Blakely, The Brus Family in England and Scotland 1100–1295 (Woodbridge, 2005), 5–6. At p. 7 it is explained that the connection with Brix was not apparently maintained for many generations after the first of the family, Robert de Brus (d. 1142) arrived in Britain.
32 ...quidam Scotus montanus ante thronum subito genuflectens materna lingua regem inclinato capite salutavit dicens: Benach de Re Albane Alexander mac Alexander mac Uleyham mac Henri mac Dauid, et sic pronunciando regum Scottorum genealogiam usque in finem legebat. (In the translation the indiscriminate use of nominative forms in the genealogy has been emended.) For a discussion of the sources, see Dauvit Broun, Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain from the Picts to Alexander III (Edinburgh, 2007), 170–9, and esp. 177–8 for a reconstruction of the account quoted here. See also A. A. M. Duncan, The Kingship of the Scots 842–1292. Succession and Independence (Edinburgh, 2002), 133–50, esp. 147–9. See also John Bannerman, ‘The king’s poet and the inauguration of Alexander III’, Scottish Historical Review 68 (1989), 120–49, who identifies the ‘highland Scot’ reciting the genealogy as the ollam ríg, ‘king’s poet’.
33 In the later Middle Ages in Ireland hailing the ruler’s surname served essentially the same function as reading the genealogy in Alexander III’s inauguration: see Katharine Simms, From Kings to Warlords. The Changing Political Structure of Gaelic Ireland in the Later Middle Ages (Woodbridge, 1987), 32–5.
34 Primogeniture (at its simplest) meant that succession was by the eldest son of the previous king; this was not firmly established until 1201 (or 1205, when David earl of Huntingdon, King William the Lion’s younger brother, recognised William’s under age son, Alexander, as heir to the throne). See Dauvit Broun, ‘Contemporary perspectives on Alexander II’s succession: the evidence of king-lists’, in The Reign of Alexander II, 1214–49, ed. Richard D. Oram (Leiden, 2005), 79–98. Although primogeniture usually meant that there was no doubt about succession to the throne, this was not always the case: see Duncan, The Kingship of the Scots 842–1292, XXX–XXX. For an understanding of how succession to kingship operated previously, see Charles-Edwards, Early Welsh and Irish Kinship, XXX–XXX.
It is impossible to know how many (if any) royal inaugurations before 1249 featured the reading out of the king’s genealogy from a scroll. The only other indication that this occurred is the seal of Scone Abbey. This is devoted to a depiction of a royal enthronement, including someone holding what could be a scroll. The seal is almost certainly a portrayal of Alexander III’s inauguration, which took place in the cemetery of Scone Abbey; if so, it is evidently independent of the written account. It has been argued that the ceremony included new elements that, in the face of the pope’s denial of coronation and anointment, served to emphasise the novel idea of sovereign kingship. If the detail of Alexander III’s inauguration was regarded at the time as unusual, then this could help to explain why it was depicted so vividly in prose and on Scone Abbey’s seal. Be this as it may, it is difficult to see how reading out the king’s genealogy would have been one of the new elements that made up for the lack of coronation and anointment. Although there is no evidence that this formed part of earlier inaugurations, the balance of probability is that it had been a standard feature for some time. It is conceivable that it was introduced at the point when the kingship was first defined in terms of male lineage when the descendants of Cinaed mac Ailpín monopolised the throne in the early tenth century.

In search of the inaugural genealogy
Unfortunately no scroll with the royal genealogy survives. If this was, indeed, a longstanding feature of the ceremony, however, then it is more than likely that copies were made. Here we should make a distinction between the genealogy when it appears as part of a collection of pedigrees (as in Irish manuscripts), and the genealogy as a standalone text that has been incorporated into a more general historical work. In our hunt for potential copies of the inaugural scroll, the most promising are a couple of texts from the late twelfth century, both of which appear to be updated versions of genealogies that were probably originally headed by David I. These are (3) and (5) in the summary of Scottish genealogical texts given above. It may be recalled that in one the proper names were written according to Gaelic spelling conventions, while in the other the orthography was adapted so that the names could be pronounced by readers unfamiliar with Gaelic. Perhaps the first was derived from a copy of what was read out at David I’s inauguration in 1124. There is no reason to suppose, however, that the ‘adapted’ version was created in order to be read out when David’s successor, Mael Coluim IV (1153–1165), was enthroned. Its earliest appearance is in Ralph of Diss’s own manuscript of his historical works (London, Lambeth Palace MS 8) whose original core (including the genealogy of the king of Scots) can be dated to sometime in late 1185 or early 1186. Ralph of Diss was dean of St Paul’s Cathedral, London (1180–ca 1200), and had no apparent links with Scotland or any particular interest in Scottish history. Could Ralph have found it in the archive of St Paul’s? It is conceivable that it reached there through Robert de Sigillo, bishop of London (1141–1150), who had close links with David I. They were both prominent supporters of Matilda, daughter of Henry I, and

36 Broun, Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain, 172–3. The seal survives attached to a document of 1296, but could be significantly earlier. It has been argued that the shields under the earls who placed Alexander III on the throne identify them as the earls of Strathearn and Atholl, and that the scene is therefore a depiction of John Balliol’s inauguration of 1292: G. W. S. Barrow, ‘Observations on the coronation stone of Scotland’, Scottish Historical Review 76 (1997), 115–21, at 116–17. The shield attributed by Barrow to the earl of Atholl, however, corresponds with an extant representation of the arms of Colbán, earl of Fife (1266–c.1270): Duncan, The Kingship of the Scots 842–1292, 136–7 and 137 n.40. Barrow’s observation that the seal’s design seems later in date than 1249 could be met by supposing that it was created sometime later (perhaps based on a written account?).
37 Broun, Scottish Independence and the Idea of Britain, 179–82.
38 Dauvit Broun, ‘Ireland and the beginning of Scotland’ (forthcoming).
39 Broun, The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots, 175–87.
40 XXX, above.
41 Broun, ‘The most important textual representation of royal authority’.
42 The genealogy is on f.107va32–b28. According to my unpublished analysis of manuscript, the earliest part of the manuscript was written 1 December 1185 × 10 March 1186.
her son Henry II, in the struggle for the English throne following Henry I’s death in 1135. Robert is known to have been on a diplomatic mission to David I in Scotland in 1140. It is not too fanciful, therefore, to suppose that Robert was given a copy of David I’s genealogy at some point while on official business. Be this as it may, the chief point of interest is that the names have been adapted at some stage during David I’s reign so that they can be read aloud by someone ignorant of Gaelic spelling conventions. This suggests that there were other occasions, apart from the royal inauguration itself, when the genealogy might have been read out in a public forum.

Although this adaptation for a non-Gaelic context is hardly likely to have been produced originally for the benefit of the king’s poet, it may have been used in later inaugurations. It was the main text known in Scotland after 1249, surviving in two versions (mentioned in (5) in the summary of texts given above): one in Book V chapter 50 of Fordun’s *Chronica Gentis Scotorum* (datable to 1384 × 1387), and the other added to the account of Alexander III’s inauguration itself in *Gesta Annalia*. It was also used to provide the chronological backbone of the history of the Scots from their ancient origins to the (then) present day, datable to 1285, that was Fordun’s principal source. The text in Gaelic orthography, by contrast, can only be traced in Scotland in two damaged versions that were probably derived from an exemplar kept at St Andrews; its survival in more recognisable form is thanks entirely to a manuscript produced in northern England around 1360. It is possible, therefore, that when the king’s poet read the genealogy in Gaelic in 1249, the names on the scroll were in the new orthography. There is no doubt that he spoke Gaelic; it is less clear, however, that he would have been proficient in reading or writing Gaelic using the long established spelling conventions that were shared with Gaelic literati in Ireland.

III

The corpus of genealogies in Irish manuscripts

How unusual was the genealogy of the king of Scots as an individual pedigree on a single sheet of parchment? The main context where genealogies survive today is when they were written down in their hundreds in a few major Irish manuscripts. These contain much more than pedigrees of the type ‘A son of B son of C’ (and so on); for example, some include tracts on whole kingdoms as well as a few king-lists and genealogical poems. The earliest extant manuscript with an impressive collection of genealogical material is Oxford, Bodleian MS Rawlinson B. 502, produced in Leinster in the second quarter of the twelfth century. A little later is another Leinster manuscript (known appropriately as ‘The Book of Leinster’)—Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1339 (H.2.18), plus Killiney, Franciscan House of Studies, MS A.3)—written in various stages during the second half of the twelfth century. Later manuscripts have even more extensive genealogical collections, including some earlier material omitted from the twelfth-century manuscripts. The most impressive are the ‘Book of Lecan’ (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23.P.2 (535) plus Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1319 (H.2.17)), written in northern Connacht in the early fifteenth century, and the ‘Book of

---

44 Broun, ‘The most important textual representation of royal authority’.
45 XXX, above.
47 See (4) in the summary of texts: XXX, above.
48 See above, n.XXX.
49 All copies of this version use Latin *filius* for Gaelic *mac*, but it would have been simple for a Gaelic speaker to make the translation, either when writing the copy on the scroll, or when reading it out.
51 The genealogies are edited in *Corpus Genealogiarum Hiberniae*, vol. 1, ed. M. A. O’Brien, with intro. by J. V. Kelleher (Dublin, 1976) (hereafter *CGH*, 1). It is sometimes dated to 1130 (Ó Corráin, ‘Creating the past’, 178).
52 Edited in *CGH*, 1, as supplementary to the genealogies of Rawlinson B. 502, and in Anne O’Sullivan (ed.), *The Book of Leinster formerly Lebor na Niachongbála*, vol. vi (Dublin, 1983).
Ballymote’ (Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23.P.12 (536)), written sometime in or between 1383 and 1397, also in northern Connacht. Other late-medieval manuscripts with notable genealogical collections are Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1298 (previously H.2.7) of the second quarter of the fourteenth century, and Oxford, Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 610, written chiefly in 1453 and 1454. The latter has been shown to be largely a copy of a compilation made originally in Armagh in the eleventh century, which was in turn a source for material in Rawlinson B. 502. Unfortunately only the genealogical material in Rawlinson B. 502 and the Book of Leinster have been published in a modern edition. This amounts to 440 pages. It has been estimated that the remaining medieval Irish corpus would fill another four or five volumes of similar proportions. There is also the likelihood that material from lost manuscripts (or parts of manuscripts) is preserved in later compilations.

Scholars working on this corpus have observed how there are many instances of outright contradiction, even within the same genealogical tract. It is not uncommon for these differences to be highlighted in the text itself. This reinforces a fundamental facet of genealogy in a society where kinship is the predominant metaphor for rulership and lordship at any level. They are not primarily statements of biological reality; their chief function was to articulate and explain the relative status of kindreds and kingdoms. Genealogy painted a precise picture of the place of kindreds within a polity (such as a local kingdom), and of the relationships between polities. The propensity for contradiction within the same text has been termed ‘genealogical schizophrenia’, especially where the same family is given alternative ancestries. It should be emphasised, however, that this is primarily a phenomenon of the written tracts rather than reflecting a ruler’s split personality. The professional kindreds who occupied the roles of cleric, poet and lawman (sometimes in combination) formed a literate elite who, through their learning, sanctioned those who held positions of preeminent social authority within a locality (and beyond). It was not unnatural for some of them—perhaps those who were specifically designated as a historian (senchaid)—to keep a meticulous record of the genealogical variants thrown up by ebb and flow of the relationships between kindreds and kingdoms over the centuries. It is in this light that we should read the collection of Scottish genealogical material found in Irish manuscripts. Only once it is understood as a collection will it be possible to consider how some of this material originated, thinking about its earliest elements not simply as text, but as pieces of parchment.

The collection of Scottish genealogies in Irish medieval manuscripts

At its greatest extent the collection of Scottish genealogies consisted of the following (bold indicates items that could have been part of the original collection, which may be dated to sometime between 995 and possibly 1005).

57 CGH, I (see n. XXX above).
58 CGH, I, p.ix. The final example of a version of the corpus is the magnus opus of Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (d.1671), the last of the historians who belonged to the medieval learned orders. The edited text runs to over 1,000 pages in its modern edition: The Great Book of Irish Genealogies, ed. Ó Muraíle, vols. I–III.
59 For example, Nollaig Ó Muraíle has shown that Mac Fhirbhisigh’s version of the collection of Scottish genealogies was based partly on a lost section of the Book of Úi Mhaine: Nollaig Ó Muraíle, ‘Leabhar Úa Maine alias Leabhar Úi Dhubhagáin’, Éigse 23 (1989), 167–95.
61 Thomas Charles-Edwards, ‘The context and uses of literacy in early Christian Ireland’, in Literacy in Medieval Celtic Societies, ed. Huw Pryce (Cambridge, 1998), 62–82, at 70–4, emphasises that in the early middle ages kindreds included lords and also poets, judges or clerics. Ó Corráin, ‘Creating the past’, 188–9, emphasises that, in the central middle ages, clerics could also be poets and historians.
63 For a more detailed textual analysis, see Dauvit Broun, ‘The genealogical ‘tractates’ associated with Miniugud Senchusa her nAlban’, Northern Scotland, 26. This volume (nominally for 2006) has yet to be published. This includes material from NLS Adv. MS 72.1.1 (‘MS 1467’), f.1a1–b28, as well as in medieval Irish manuscripts.
1. *Míniugud senchusa fher nAlban* (‘Explanation of the history of the men of Alba’), a particularly contradictory account of the genealogies of Dál Riata (an early medieval kingdom roughly equivalent to Argyll in western Scotland and part of Antrim in northern Ireland). It focused on three *cenél* (‘kindreds’): Cenél nGabráin (‘kindred of Gabrán’), Cenél Loain (‘kindred of Loarn’) and Cenél nOengusa (‘kindred of Óengus’). The text also contains surveys of military strength and ‘houses’. It seems to include material from as early as the seventh century; its title, however, helps to confirm a suspicion that it assumed its current form no earlier than the tenth century, when the Scottish kingdom began to be referred to regularly in Gaelic as *Alba*.

2. **Genealogy of Causantín mac Cúiléin (King Constantine III) (995–997)** in the standard ‘A son of B son of C’ form. Causantín was descended from Aed (d.878), son of Cinaed mac Ailpín (d.858); the text also included the branch of the royal dynasty descended from Cinaed mac Ailpín’s son, Causantín (King Constantine I, d.876). Fourteen generations down from Causantín the genealogy arrives at Gabrán, eponym of Cenél nGabráin. It then proceeds for a further thirty-four generations.

3. **Genealogy of King David I (1124–1153)**; it originally began, however, with David’s great-great-grandfather, Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (1005–1034) (King Malcolm II). An edition and translation is given in the Appendix. This is the same below Cinaed mac Ailpín as in the genealogy of Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III), except for three differences. One is that the eponym of Dál Riata is given as Eochaid Riata rather than as Cairpre Rí Fota (Cairpre ‘Tall King’), as in Causantín’s genealogy. Another is that the section between Eochu (or Eochu Muinremar (Gabrán’s great-great-grandfather) and the eponym of Dál Riata (Eochaid Riata) has been rewritten. (This will be examined closely in due course.) Finally, there are statements about where a few other major kindreds in the Scottish kingdom join the royal genealogy. For example, after twelve generations of Mael Coluim’s pedigree, we find:

   - son of Eochu Buide
     The descendants of One-eyed Fergus son of Eochu Buide (that is the people of Gowrie) and the descendants of Maimed Conall son of Eochu Buide (that is the men of Fife) at this point meet the royal line (that is the descendants of Cinaed son of Ailpín).
   - son of Aedán

   This will be discussed shortly.

4. **Cethri prímchenéla Dáil Riatai, ‘the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata’**, datable to either 730 or 733. This consisted of:
   - An introductory couple of sentences;
   - A branch of Cenél nGabráin. The tract presumably originally contained a stem genealogy of Cenél nGabráin—almost certainly a pedigree of Eochaid son of Eochu, king of Dál Riata, d.733—but this would have repeated what had just been given in (2) and (3), the genealogies of Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III) (995–997) and (originally) Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (1005–1034) (Malcolm II), who were descendants of Eochaid son of Eochu; it would have been natural, therefore, for a scribe to omit it.

---

64 The date 1005 hinges on the assumption that the royal genealogy was rewritten putatively for the inauguration of Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (see below), and that therefore the version headed by Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III) would no longer have been current.
67 Not originally part of the collection: see below, XXX.
68 *Ríg Fotai* (genitive of Ri Fotai) would have sounded like *Riata* because the *F* was silent.
69 David N. Dumville, ‘*Cethrì Primchenèla Dàil Riata*’, *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 20 (2000), 170–91; Broun, ‘*Cethrì Primchenèla Dàil Riata revisited*’.
70 Broun, ‘*Cethrì Primchenèla*’, 66–8.
(c) A stem genealogy of Cenel Loairn (headed by Ainbcellach, d.719, and king of Dál Riata 697–698).
(d) A branch genealogy of Cenel Loairn (headed by Morgán, who is otherwise unknown).
(e) A genealogy of Cenél Comgaill.
(f) A genealogy of Cenél nOengusa.

5.  (a) A genealogy of Mael Snechta (d.1085), son of Lulach (king of Scots, 1057–1058) (see Figure 1, below).
    (b) A branch headed by Mac Bethad (Macbeth, king of Scots, 1040–1057), a cousin of Lulach.

No manuscript has all these items; all except for the branch headed by Mac Bethad (5b), however, are found together in this order in the Book of Ballymote and the Book of Lecan.\(^71\)

The original core of the collection (no earlier than 995) was (2) the genealogy of Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III) (995–997) and (4) Cethri prímenenéla Dáil Riata, ‘the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata’, datable to either 730 or 733. The reason for combining these was presumably because the kings of Scots traced their ancestry to the most prominent of the four chief kindreds: Cenél nGabráin. It is possible that the collection also originally contained (1) Míniugud senchusa fher nAlban (‘Explanation of the history of the men of Alba’). The genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034), but later with his great-great-grandson, David I—(3) above—was inserted at some point between 1005 and about 1130 (the date of the earliest manuscript: Rawl. B. 502). Another addition before about 1130 was (5), the genealogy of Mael Snechta (d.1085) with a branch headed by his cousin Mac Bethad (Macbeth, king of Scots, 1040–1057).

The collection is, first-and-foremost, a witness to the scholarship of Irish historians. Although none of the manuscripts include the collection in its entirety, the scribes who wrote and supervised the copying and editing of this material saw it as part of the huge corpus of genealogies which they assembled for future reference. The Scottish material, however, formed only an exceptionally tiny part of the overall corpus that they curated. An important insight into the nature of the collection is revealed by the genealogy headed by Mael Snechta with a branch headed by Mac Bethad (Macbeth) (see Figure 2). The accession of Mac Bethad in 1040 brought a new family to power in Scotland, albeit for only a short period: Mac Bethad was succeeded in 1057 by his cousin, Lulach, who was Mael Snechta’s father. Lulach was killed a few months later by Mael Coluim (Malcolm) III (1058–1093), son of Donnchad (Duncan I); Donnchad had reigned between 1034 and 1040. In order to include this new royal kindred in the collection, however, a genealogy has been constructed by splicing together a couple of pedigrees in the tract on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata datable to about 730 or 733.\(^72\)

---

\(^71\) The branch headed by Mac Bethad is found in highly reduced versions of the collection in Rawl. B. 502 and the Book of Leinster (CGH, I, 330), as well as in ‘MS 1467’: http://www.1467manuscript.co.uk/transcript%20all%20recto.html (accessed 16 February 2016).

\(^72\) This was first noted in H. M. Chadwick, Early Scotland: The Picts, the Scots and the Welsh of Southern Scotland (Cambridge, 1949), 96 n.1.
This suggests that whoever sought to update the Scottish collection did not have access to the text of Mac Bethad’s genealogy that belonged to the king’s poet (and which may have been read out at his inauguration). The simplest explanation is that the collection was already in Ireland, and that the genealogy was concocted by an Irish historian in order to show where he thought the new royal kindred fitted into the overall scheme represented by the other Scottish pedigrees. He decided to make the connection as remote as possible by identifying Mac Bethad and Mael Snechta as descendants of

---

73 It is also found in the Book of Leinster, but the first six names are illegible: CGH, i, 329. Legibility is also an issue for the copy in NLS Adv. MS 72.1.1 (‘MS 1467’), f.1a2–23: see the transcription by Máire and Ronnie lack at http://www.1467manuscript.co.uk/transcript%20all%20recto.html (accessed 17 February 2016). For the facsimile edition of the Book of Lecan and Book of Ballymote, see n. XXX, below.

74 mac, ‘son’ (genitive meic).

75 See n.XXX for edition and commentary.

76 Omitted in the Books of Ballymote and Lecan, but present in Rawl. B. 502 f.162e6 and in the branch headed by Mac Bethad (f.162e23–27; also in the Book of Leinster: CGH, i, 329–30), an in ‘MS 1467’ (apparently as ‘mornaill’): http://www.1467manuscript.co.uk/transcript%20all%20recto.html (accessed 17 February 2016).

77 Most MSS have either ‘Mongan’ or ‘Mogan’ (the Book of Ballymote has ‘r’ added): Dumville, ‘Cethri Prîmenetha’, 179–80. Insular ‘r’ can readily be misread as ‘n’.

78 Omitted in Rawl B. 502, but present in the Book of Leinster (CGH, i, 329) as well as in ‘MS 1467’: http://www.1467manuscript.co.uk/transcript%20all%20recto.html (accessed 17 February 2016).

79 There is no reason to doubt that the final ‘l’ was originally present. Some manuscripts also render the minims of ‘m’ as ‘n’: Dumville, ‘Cethri Prîmenetha’, 179–80.

80 An alternative form of Ruaidr (genitive).

81 Evidently a variant of Ainbcellach, with ‘n’ mistaken for insular ‘r’. Ainbcellach son of Ferchar Fota (d.719) was king of Dál Riata (697–698).
Loarn, eponym of Cenél Loairn, one of the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata. The only information he seems to have had from Scotland was Mael Snechta’s and Mac Bethad’s line of descent from a certain Ruaídrí mac Domnaill, Mac Bethad’s grandfather. The rest of the genealogy before Ruaídrí’s father, Domnall, has been created by adding the branch pedigree of Cenél Loairn in the tract on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata on top of the stem pedigree (as shown in the underlined names in Figure 1). The fact that this constructed genealogy begins with Mael Snechta, son of the last king of this short-lived dynasty (Lulach, 1057–1058), and was tacked onto the end of the collection, also suggests that this attempt at updating was made rather late in the day more with the intention of making sense of the family’s success in the past rather than as a reflection of current political reality. Although it is tempting to read Mael Snechta’s genealogy as evidence that he may have been regarded as king of Scots, this is not a necessary inference, given the academic nature of the genealogical collection—all the more so if the genealogy was added to the collection after Mael Snechta’s death. Mael Snechta and Mac Bethad were included because they represented the past, and what this might mean for the future, not because either of them was regarded as king of Scots when the genealogy was first created.

IV
Identifying fresh material from Scotland in the 990s or early eleventh century

This raises the pressing question of how far the collection relates to anything written or copied by anyone in the Scottish kingdom in the tenth or eleventh centuries. As it stands it would appear to be essentially an academic exercise by Irish scholars. There is no specific reason not to regard the original collection consisting (at most) of Miniuigud Senchusa fier nAlban, the genealogy headed by Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III), and the tract on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata, as an assemblage created in Ireland, even though its constituent parts presumably originated at some point in Scotland. Only Causantín’s genealogy would have been a fresh text from Scotland in the 990s. This is focused solely on the royal dynasty descended from Cinaed mac Ailpín (d.858), and gives no information on any other leading kindreds within the kingdom. There is also a question-mark about whether all the genealogy as it stands was current in Scotland itself in the 990s. It extends deep into prehistory, with more than two-thirds devoted to the ancestry of Gabrán, eponym of Cenél nGabráin, one of the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata. It is possible that most of Gabrán’s ancestors were copied from the stem pedigree for Cenél nGabráin in the tract of about 730 or 733 on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata, rather than from the text of Causantín’s pedigree transmitted from Scotland.

Be this as it may, there is less doubt that the second version of the royal genealogy in the collection, headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cínaeda (Malcolm II) (but updated to David I), is fully a text acquired directly from Scotland after the collection had first taken shape. The most obvious indication that it is a later insertion is that Mael Coluim was more recent than Causantín, and so would be expected to have stood at the beginning of the first pedigree if it had originally been part of the collection rather than being treated as a branch. Secondly, Mael Coluim’s genealogy shows a number of leading kindreds in the kingdom as joining the main stem. Again, this would normally be found in the lead pedigree, not a subsidiary one. Given the propensity of scholarly collections to

82 In Rawl. B. 502 (f.162e1) Mael Snechta’s genealogy is titled Item ríg Alban, ‘Likewise, of the king of Scotland’ (it follows the genealogy headed by Mael Coluim mac Cínaeda which has the rubric Genelach ríg Alban, ‘Genealogy of the king of Scotland’): CGH, 1, 329. In the Book of Leinster Mael Snechta’s genealogy is titled Genelach Clainde Lulaig, ‘Genealogy of the kindred of Lulach’. Clann Lulaig (i.e., descendants of Mael Snechta’s father) must refer to a generation or two after Mael Snechta himself: for branch pedigrees in a collection headed by someone deceased who represents an unnamed living descendant, see Broun, ‘Cethri prímenéla Dáil Ríta revisited’, 68–72. It is possible that Mael Snechta’s genealogy (with the branch headed by Mac Bethad) was added during the lifetime of Oengus son of the daughter of Mael Snechta who, like Mael Snechta, was king of Moray. He was killed at the Battle of Stracathro in 1130.

83 There is no independent evidence, of course, for what Causantín’s pedigree looked like before it was included in the collection. If (for the sake of argument) it ran no further than a couple of generations beyond Gabrán, eponym of Cenél nGabráin, but by contrast the pedigree of Eochaid son of Eochu (d.733)—omitted because it repeated Causantín’s—gave Gabrán’s descent deep into prehistory, then the scribe who recognised that these pedigrees overlapped might naturally have transferred the descent of Gabrán from Eochaid’s pedigree to Causantín’s. It is possible, therefore, that Gabrán’s ancestry in Causantín’s pedigree is a text written about 730, not 995.
nourish contradictions, it is no surprise that the genealogy headed by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) has been added despite creating some untidiness. The text of this genealogy (updated to David I) is given below in the Appendix as it is found in the Book of Lecan and the Book of Ballymote, the earliest manuscripts to include the information on where leading Scottish kindreds join the main stem. Here, it seems, we have a genealogy that was not evidently created as part of a scholarly collection. At the same time it was more than a plain pedigree, but included statements about where a few kindreds joined the royal genealogy. Let us look at this in more detail.

A genealogical text of 1005 × 1034 from the Scottish kingdom

It will be recalled that genealogies were not so much records of biological reality as statements about the relative standing of leading kindreds. Seen in this light, this text can be read as a snapshot of the balance of power within the Scottish kingdom at some point during Mael Coluim’s reign (1005–1034). Rather than being written as an academic record of the past, it is a portrayal of current political reality, with fictional interconnections to the fore. The ‘royal line’ (in rígrad) is itself identified in the text as *Clann Chineada meic Ailpín*, ‘descendants of Cinaed mac Ailpin’ (d.858), who is portrayed in the genealogy as a descendant of Gabrán (and therefore of the Cenél nGabráin). The closer a family’s relationship to the royal kindred, the more powerful it is likely to have been.

A genealogical text of 1005 × 1034 from the Scottish kingdom

84 The pedigree was almost certainly longer originally: as it stands it stops where it would have become identical with the first royal pedigree headed by Causantín mac Cuiléin (Constantine III). There is a formal possibility that it was abbreviated in other ways when added to the collection (probably) in Ireland. Perhaps the other kindreds had pedigrees of their own (as in the tract on the ‘four chief kindreds of Dál Riata’) rather than merely mentioning where they joined the main stem. Whoever added the text to the collection, however, presumably did so when copying out the other items, in which case they would have been happy to leave the ‘four chief kindreds’ as a series of pedigrees rather than merely stating where they joined the royal genealogy. Overall, it is likely that, apart from the truncation of the pedigree itself to avoid overlap with the one headed by Causantín mac Cuiléin (Constantine III), the text of the genealogy originally headed by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034) had become part of the collection.


86 The evidence for identifying Strathern with descendants of Comgall (i.e., Cenél Comgaill) is a tract on the mothers of saints where Culross is described as ‘in Strathern in Comgellaig’: Padraigh Ó Riain, *Corpus Genealogiarum Sanctorum Hiberniae* (Dublin, 1985), §722.106.

87 If we follow W. J. Watson in taking Gabranaig to be Gowrie: W. J. Watson, *The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1926), 112.

88 Bannerman, *Studies in the History of Dalriada*, 41, 48. For the possible significance of the epithets ‘One-eyed’ and ‘Maimed’ as signalling that these kindreds were excluded from the kingship, see below, n.[109].

Through this genealogy we can glimpse how the highest levels of social authority were conceptualised by the learned orders. The kingship is identified with a particular leading kindred: Clann Chinea de meic Ailpín (the descendants of Cinaed mac Ailpín, d.858). Fife is identified with its leading kindred, and Gowrie probably likewise. It may be assumed that this was true of every province, although Comgellaig/Strathearn might be an exception in the text.90 Only Fife, Gowrie and Strathearn, however, are linked directly to the royal line in the genealogy. These form a cluster in the southern third of what was regarded as the kingdom ‘proper’.91 The remainder (or perhaps only those provinces in the ‘northern half’) are generalised as being related to the royal line a little more distantly. All in all, each level of leadership is represented as a kindred, allowing a distinction to be made between an inner core of named provinces and the rest. As such, the genealogy gave written expression not only to provincial authority, but to a favoured relationship between the king and the heads of some provinces. This could potentially have had practical consequences though offering preferential treatment (for example, in arrangements for in the levying of common obligations or compulsory hospitality (coinnmed)).92

Genealogical texts on single sheets of parchment?
It goes without saying that this is fundamentally different from a charter as a written expression of the relationship between the king and major lords, especially those with whom he was particularly close. It is useful, nonetheless, to consider this further by thinking of genealogies as more than simply texts. It will be recalled that a charter was a single text on its own piece of parchment, with a seal attached. It might subsequently be copied into a roll or book; in origin, however, it had to exist as a sheet of parchment. All the genealogies discussed in this chapter survive only in manuscript books. Did they, too, once exist as single pieces of parchment? The genealogy of Alexander III certainly existed on a scroll read out at his inauguration. If the material in Irish manuscripts originated on single sheets, can the context of their production be surmised?

Let us consider first the collection of Scottish genealogies. It is possible to envisage this existing on its own originally as a single sheet of parchment. But this is hardly necessary: by its nature, it is easier to imagine it forming part of a larger collection of the kind known to have once existed in the tenth century.93 This could have been part of a manuscript compendium of other material, too, rather than exclusively a booklet or codex of genealogies. The genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034), however, is different. The most likely way to explain its curious position in the collection is to suppose that it arrived in Ireland on its own as a single sheet of parchment.94 Should we imagine that this is how the other material in the collection of Scottish genealogies began life? The tract on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata and the genealogy of Causantín mac Cuiléin (Constantine III) (995–997) can readily be conceived as written originally on single pieces of parchment. If so, why would they have been produced?

In the case of the genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim (Malcolm II), its presumed existence on a single sheet of parchment enabled it to travel to whoever copied it into the collection of Scottish material. This raises the possibility that its primary purpose was for the convenience of exchanging information between members of the learned orders. If this was so, however, it was not particularly effective for those who took an interest in the collection of Scottish genealogies (presumably) in Ireland. The need to construct a genealogy for Mael Snechta and MacBethad from the collection’s own texts could suggest that the flow of information on single sheets of parchment was limited. Alternatively, it could be inferred that scholars were able to find what they needed in the corpus itself if they wished to update their collection, recasting existing material to this end.

90 It has been argued elsewhere that the head of a province’s leading kindred held the position of mormaer, who led the province when there was a threat to its peace and security: Dauvit Broun, ‘Statehood and lordship in ‘Scotland’ before the mid-twelfth century’, Innes Review 66 (2015), 1–71, at 19–32, 59–67.
92 Broun, ‘Statehood and lordship in ‘Scotland’ before the mid-twelfth century’, 31 and n.117.
93 See above, XXX.
94 Admittedly if it came as part of a collection whose material was otherwise identical to what was already there, then only it would have been copied. This would be a fairly remarkable coincidence, however.
If a genealogy like that headed originally by Mael Coluim (Malcolm II) could have originated as a single sheet of parchment that was not produced simply with scholarly exchange in mind, then one context comes to mind: the reading out of the genealogy from a scroll at the king’s inauguration. But the text as we have it is more than a simple pedigree. Could the inaugural genealogy have included statements about where kindreds that were currently closest to the kingship joined the main stem? It will be recalled that those who were singled out in this way were the leading kindreds of Fife and Gowrie, as well as (implicitly) Strathearn. It may not be a coincidence that Strathearn, Gowrie and Fife are the provinces nearest to Scone, the inauguration site. This mention of leading kindreds could have disappeared as a feature in the twelfth century when lordship was no longer expressed primarily in terms of kinship. On the other hand, it is conceivable that the text originated as Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda’s (Malcolm II’s) inaugural genealogy as a plain pedigree that has later been glossed with the statements about where these other kindreds joined the main stem.95

Is there any other hint that this might have been an inaugural genealogy, with or without the links to other kindreds? If it could be shown to have had a panegyric element, then this would at least suggest that its original context was a public occasion.

V

Genealogy as panegyric?96

One obvious way that kings and lords are likely to have been aware of genealogy is through the poems sung in their honour. Their descent from significant ancestors could have been highlighted, especially those who were celebrated in literature. In this minimal sense genealogy overlapped with panegyric textually as well as (potentially) in being produced for a patron. There was also an opportunity for an element of panegyric to appear in the generations between these significant ancestors. In literature it was not necessary, of course, to use known personal names when creating a character: for example, Fróech mac Idaith, ‘Heather son of (?)Wild Cherry Tree’, who is the central figure in the tale Táin Bó Fraích (‘The Cattle-raid of Fróech’), is plainly an invention.97 There was an opportunity for similar freedom when creating a series of names in a genealogy. It was possible, therefore, for an ancestor to be fashioned who, through their patently manufactured name, highlighted a particularly praiseworthy quality. For example, meic Tréin meic Rothréin, ‘son of Strong son of Very Strong’, appears in the remoter parts of the pedigree of the kings of Ulster in Oxford, Bodleian MS Laud Misc. 610.98

The section of the royal genealogy between Eochaid/Eochu Muinremar and the imagined eponym of Dál Riata (known as either Eochaid Riata or Cairpre Ri Fota) provided an opportunity to compile a series of fictional ancestors that related exclusively to the Scottish kingship. Beyond Eochaid Riata/Cairpre Ri Fota the ancestry was shared with other Gaelic polities. In the pedigree of Causantín mac Cúileán (Constantine III) the names in this section are fairly unremarkable. The only noteworthy feature is that three are given epithets: Fergus Ulach (‘Bearded Fergus’), Fiachu Táth Mál (‘Fiachu Annexing Prince’), and Fedlimid Lámdóit (‘Fedlimid Fist hand’).99 In the standalone genealogy in Gaelic orthography originally headed by David I, this section has been largely rewritten, with some more striking epithets and what appears to be invented names. Once some simple misreadings have been corrected (signalled by angled brackets), the text reads:100

95 For an indication that no particular significance may have been attached during a king’s reign to the actual scroll used at his inauguration, see below, XXX.  
96 All references to eDIL (electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language) in this section were accessed during February 2016.  
97 As suggested by David Greene, cited in Fergus Kelly, ‘The Old Irish tree-list’, Celtica 11 (1976), 107–24, at 115 n.3.  
98 CGH, 1, 322, n.w, where it is also noted that in the Book of Leinster this is meic Trír meic Rothrír, with triar (‘trio’) replacing trírn (‘strong’). This may be translated (rather awkwardly) as ‘son of Trio son of Very Trio’.  
100 Broun, The Irish Identity of the Kingdom of the Scots, 177.
filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii filii

It has to be admitted that not all of this is readily intelligible. Occasional help is offered by the version adapted to be read out by someone unfamiliar with Gaelic orthography, as well as by the version in Irish manuscripts (edited and translated in the Appendix). Even so, there are a few names where the interpretation depends on the assumption that there was a panegyric intention. A possible translation of the new section following Eochaid (or Eochu) Múinremar (with medieval Gaelic names in normalised spelling in the nominative) is:

son of True Óengus (Óengus Fír)
son of Dreams Feidlimid (Feidlimid Aislingid)
son of Beautiful(?) Óengus (Óengus Búaidgnige)
son of Long-hair Feidlimid (Feidlimid Ruaimnech)
son of Ancient Cormac (Sen Chormaic)
son of Effective(?) Wealth (Crod Lúth)
son of Handsome Top(?) (Find Féice)
son of Fierce Teeth (or Fierce Maimed) (Aicher Cír/Cerr)
son of Eochu Glorious Upper-arm(?) (Eochu Án Dóit)
son of Fiachra Battle Prince (Fiachra Cath Mál)

101 The only Latin from David I onwards in the text is *filii*, genitive of *filius*, ‘son’.
102 ‘Óengusaphir’ MS.
103 ‘Fedilinthe’ MS.
104 ‘Óengusabuiding’ MS.
105 ‘Fedilintheruamnaich’ MS (Anderson has ‘Fedilinther Uamnach’: *Kings and Kingship*, 2nd edn, 257).
107 ‘Achircir’ MS.
108 ‘Achachantoit’ MS.
110 eDIL s.v. aislindid at dil.ie/24988; related to aislinde (‘vision’, ‘dream’).
111 Óengus Buaídgnaige is a variant of búaídgnaige, ‘beautiful (?)’: see eDIL s.v. búaídgnaige at dil.ie/7235. This seems plausible for ‘Buid<ni>g’; in the earliest manuscripts of the genealogy adapted into a non-Gaelic orthography it is rendered ‘Butini’ or ‘Buthini’ (see Broun, ‘The most important textual representation’): I take ‘t(h)in’ to represent *dgn* (with palatalised g). It appears as ‘Buaidnich’ or ‘Buaidnid’ (presumably for Buaidnid’) in the genealogy of David I in the Appendix.
112 I am grateful to Thomas Clancy for suggesting *ruaimnech* in eDIL s.v. *ruaimnech* at dil.ie/35623.
113 O’Brien regarded the nominative form as uncertain (CGH, i. 571). I cannot account for the final syllable in ‘luide’; found in all versions of this genealogy, *lúid* would be acceptable as a genitive form of *lúth*, meaning ‘vigour’, ‘power’, ‘energy’, and has a wide semantic range based on this: see eDIL s.v. *lúth* at dil.ie/31131.
114 This is ‘Findachai’ in the in the version of the genealogy adapted to be read by someone ignorant of Gaelic orthography (with the second f silent due to lenition). A possible interpretation is *féice*, which (as applied to people) means ‘acme’, ‘apex’ or ‘summit’: eDIL s.v. *féice*, *féic* at dil.ie/21457.
115 The possibility that the epithet is *Cir* rather than *Cerr* rests on the reading ‘Akirkirre’ (i.e. *Achir Cire*) in the version of the genealogy adapted to be read by someone ignorant of Gaelic orthography: see Broun, ‘The most important textual representation’. I am grateful to Thomas Clancy for pointing out to me that a person called Acher Cerr is mentioned in the *Dindshenchas* (‘place-name lore’) poem on Liamain (stanza 11): http://www.ucc.ie/celt/online/T106500C/text007.html (accessed 1 March 2016).
116 ‘Echach Antoit’ in the Appendix. *Dóit* involves emending the text; note, however, ‘Andoth’ in the version adapted to be read by someone ignorant of Gaelic spelling conventions. *Dóit* is a variant of doé, ‘upper arm’, ‘hand’: see eDIL s.v. 1 doé or dil.ie/17513.
Many of these epithets and invented names can readily be recognised as referring to kingly attributes: ‘truth’, battle-worthiness, wealth, beauty and striking physical appearance. It is possible, therefore, to find ways of reading these names (albeit a little awkwardly in some cases) as highlighting physical and personal qualities that could, when recited, have served as a form of panegyric to the king whose genealogy this was. It could have been rewritten to enhance the impact of the genealogy as a statement of kingship specifically with the royal inauguration in mind.

This putatively panegyric section is also found in the collection of Scottish material in Irish manuscripts in the genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034). This means that both versions appeared in the collection: the unremarkable version in the genealogy of Causantín mac Cúiléin (Constantine III) (995–997), followed by the potentially more panegyric version in the genealogy headed by Mael Coluim (and subsequently updated to David I, edited and translated below). If we could be sure that the older version in the genealogy headed by Causantín mac Cúiléin was part of Causantín’s genealogy as known in the Scottish kingdom, then it would seem likely that this section was rewritten sometime between the beginning of Causantín’s reign in 995 and the end of Mael Coluim’s in 1034. (Indeed, it would be tempting to suggest that the occasion was either the inauguration of Mael Coluim in 1005 or his predecessor, Cinaed mac Duib, in 997.) It will be recalled, however, that it is possible that this part of Causantín’s genealogy could have originated in the tract on the four chief kindreds of Dál Riata. Be this as it may, it is striking that, in Irish manuscripts of this genealogy (updated to David I), some epithets are lost, a generation omitted, and invented names changed or garbled (see the edition in the Appendix). It seems doubtful that this hypothetically panegyric element was recognised as such by the Irish historians who copied it. Perhaps this is because the genealogy was treated differently depending on its context. The panegyric element may have been understood and appreciated when the pedigree was read as part of an inauguration, but was unexpected and readily overlooked when treated as part of an academic assemblage of genealogical material.

VI

Genealogy as charter?

On the face of it a genealogy and a charter have nothing in common. This is only true, however, if we think of them as texts without taking account of their physical context. The genealogy of the king of Scots was a text written on a piece of parchment that was read out once the king had been placed in full possession of the kingdom. This is what happened at the inauguration of Alexander III in 1249, it is likely on the face of it to have been a feature of earlier inaugurations, too. The genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) is likely to have been on a piece of parchment of its own. The rewriting of a section no later than 1005, apparently in order to give it a panegyric element proclaiming royal qualities embedded in the king’s ancestry, could be explained as an attempt to enhance the genealogy’s significance as part of the ceremony of inauguration. Charters were also produced as a single sheet of parchment. In some cases the witnesses appear to have been added ‘on site’ when the ceremony giving full possession of land had occurred; presumably the text of the

---

117 See, for example, Kim McCone, *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature* (Maynooth, 1990), 121–4. Long hair was an attribute of kingship in Merovingian France: see J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings and Other Studies in Frankish History* (London, 1962). Rúaimnech, however, refers to a single long hair. By contrast, the epithets of the eponyms of Clann Fergusa Guill and Clann Chonaill Chirr (who branch off from the main stem in the genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II)): see above, XXX)—‘One-Eyed’ and ‘Maimed’—mark them out (and their descendants) as unfit for kingship. The inappropriateness of cerr (‘maimed’), however, would be compromised if *Aicher Cerr* was intended (in the ‘rewritten’ section) rather than *Aicher Cir*. It is not unknown as the epithet for a king in the early Christian period. A notable example is Aed Cerr (d.595), progenitor of Uí Máil kings of Leinster: T. M. Charles-Edwards, *Early Christian Ireland* (Oxford, 2000), 622. Another is Connad Cerr, probably a joint-king, who led Dál Riata to victory in 627 and was killed in battle in 629: T. M. Charles-Edwards, trans., *The Chronicle of Ireland*, 2 vols (Liverpool, 2006), II, 134 (627.1) and 135 (629.1). He was probably a descendant of Comgall (eponym of Cenél Comgaill) (see Charles-Edwards, *The Chronicle of Ireland*, II, 135 n.4), who after the next generation were excluded from the kingship.

118 See above, XXX.
charter recording the transaction that had just been completed was read out for the witnesses and all those present to hear. It may be suspected that such a feat of memory would have been expected. It has been suggested, for example, that the extended versified Irish king-lists written in the eleventh century were composed for students to memorise: John Carey, The Irish national Origin-Legend: Synthetic Pseudohistory, Quiggin Pamphlet no.1 (Cambridge, 1994), 20; see also Peter J. Smith, ‘Early Irish historical verse: the evolution of a genre’, in Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: Texts and Transmission, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Dublin, 2002), 326–41, at 326–7.

Not all charters were like this: some were drawn up long after the event. On the face of it, therefore, there were some functional similarities between the genealogy of the king of Scots and at least some charters. Both were produced to be taken to a ceremony establishing someone in a position of authority (albeit on very different scales), and both were read out when lawful possession had been solemnised. The texts themselves would also have been largely predictable—the charter with its regular structure and oft-repeated phrases; the genealogy tracing the same royal ancestry, with only the new king’s name and as many of his immediate ancestors as were needed before reaching the trunk of the pedigree that was common to all kings of Scots.

There were also functional differences. A charter was treated as a unique physical object in a way that the genealogy would not have been. A charter’s authenticity depended on its seal, which was attached to the original single sheet. It could also be verified by the witnesses who were named in the text; they, however, were expected to testify to the authenticity of the charter as a piece of parchment, not as a copy. The genealogy, by contrast, would not have had to be sealed or witnessed. It will be recalled that those who held positions of preeminent social authority in the Gaelic world before the mid-twelfth century were legitimated by the learning of professional kindreds who occupied the roles of cleric, poet and lawman. The inaugural scroll would have been regarded as authoritative from the mere fact that this would have been read out by a member of the learned orders. It is important to stress, however, that the genealogy was not recited from memory (either as prose or verse).

Although authenticity did not rest chiefly with the scroll as a physical object, it may be suspected that it served to emphasise the authority of the person reading it out. It would have highlighted the genealogy’s basis in the overall scheme of historical learning that was sustained and nurtured in manuscripts. This, in turn, would have drawn attention to the specialist knowledge on which the legitimacy of the political order depended, expressed through genealogies.

All in all, in both the genealogy of the king of Scots and a charter relating to lordship over land, a sheet of parchment was produced for reading out in a public forum. Both involved a degree of specialised literate knowledge—the scribe familiar with the structure and phraseology of charters, and the historian (senchaid) at home in the corpus of genealogies. In the charter, however, its authenticity focused on the physical object; in the genealogy the display of specialised learning was the key. The novelty of charters as the primary way of expressing lordship was not because single sheets of parchment had hitherto played no role at all in legitimising social authority; it was because the artefact itself was now paramount, rather than the specialist knowledge of the person who read it out. As such, the use of single sheets of parchment to validate the exercise of social power could become much more widely used, extending far beyond the domain of kingship itself. The potential of writing in recording property-rights was already evident in the notes of transactions written into whatever spaces were available in gospel books. Some (if not all) were written straight into the codex; their potency as records depended on their presence in a sacred book, not as a piece of parchment—the antithesis of a charter.

With the increasing use of charters in Scotland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a wider range of property and privileges were safeguarded by single sheets of parchment.

120 Broun, ‘The presence of witnesses’, 266–70.
121 It may be suspected that such a feat of memory would have been expected. It has been suggested, for example, that the extended versified Irish king-lists written in the eleventh century were composed for students to memorise: John Carey, The Irish national Origin-Legend: Synthetic Pseudohistory, Quiggin Pamphlet no.1 (Cambridge, 1994), 20; see also Peter J. Smith, ‘Early Irish historical verse: the evolution of a genre’, in Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: Texts and Transmission, ed. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Dublin, 2002), 326–41, at 326–7.
This, in turn, brought a fundamental change in the broader framework of legitimising social authority through literate specialist knowledge. Neither genealogies nor charters existed in isolation. A genealogy gained significance from the fact that, in the hands of a historian (senchaid), it showed where a head of kindred belonged in a nexus of relationships that embraced the entire Gaelic world. Because kinship was a central principle in the regulation of society, genealogy was regarded as part of a single body of written traditional knowledge—seachas—that embraced both history and law. Charters as individual texts had no capacity to call to mind a similar source of authority. As a single sheet of parchment, however, it could be taken for confirmation or verification by a higher authority such as the king or the pope. In this way, legitimising the exercise of social power moved away from the domain of the learned orders and began to form a hierarchy of its own in which king and pope stood at the apex of increasingly distinct spheres of authority—each with its own body of law.

VII

Rethinking genealogies?
The corpus of Gaelic genealogies in Irish manuscripts can readily be recognised as consisting of a myriad of brief texts that have been, to a greater or lesser extent, adapted and edited by the medieval scholars who incorporated them into their collections. In this chapter a novel approach to these original items relating to the Scottish kingdom has been developed, inspired by Joanna Tucker’s insight into the value of thinking about documents in their physical context whatever that may be, and not only when this gave them legal force (as in the case of sealed charters). The obvious difficulty is that, whereas complex cartularies exist as manuscripts that have had material added to them by generations of scribes, and are therefore open to being studied in a way that combines their textual and physical facets, not one genealogy survives as a single sheet of parchment. Another problem is that not all genealogies would have started life on their own individual sheet of parchment. The genealogy of Mael Snechta (d.1085) with a branch headed by Mac Bethad (1040–1057), for example, would appear to have been created by the scholarly compilers of this material in the process of updating their collection. Its physical setting from the outset was a manuscript booklet or codex. The genealogy of the king of Scots, however, certainly existed as a separate piece of parchment in 1249. The apparent rewriting of a section in order to give it a panegyric quality has been taken to suggest that reading out the genealogy could have been a part of the ceremony of inaugurating a king in 1005 (if not earlier). Could the production of individual genealogies on single sheets have been a more widespread practice, either as part of royal inaugurations, or in other forums where such a display of literate historical learning might have occurred?

Looking at the corpus as a whole, it has been observed by Donnchadh Ó Corráin that the range of genealogies narrows dramatically after the ninth century. This suggests that only the pedigrees of those who were potentially or actually kings were chiefly of interest. Ó Corráin argued compellingly that this was associated with what he termed ‘the emergence of a narrower, more powerful, and more exclusive lordly class’ between the tenth and twelfth centuries who took on surnames as a way of distinguishing themselves from the wider group to which they belonged. Scottish examples of these narrower kindreds at the highest level include Clann Chinaeda meic Ailpín, the descendants of Cinaed mac Ailpin (d.858) who monopolised the kingship from 900 to 1034, and Clann Lulaig, the descendants of Lulach (king of Scots 1057–1058), a lineage that may have been destroyed when it

---


123 For discussion of the senchaid in a legal context, see Fergus Kelly, ‘An Old-Irish text on court procedure’, Peritia 5 (1986), 74–106, at 93–4, where he observes that ‘custodian of tradition’ is a more appropriate translation of the term. The main corpus of written legal material in Gaelic (Old Irish) from the early middle ages was known as Senchas Már, the ‘great senchas’; senchas (later, senchus) could also refer to genealogies, as in Míniugud Senchusa fher nAlban (see above, XXX.)


125 Ó Corráin, ‘Nationality and kingship in pre-Norman Ireland’, 33.
was only two generations deep—its leader falling in battle in an attempt to oust David I in 1130.126 In this context the significance of genealogies would have changed from articulating a dense network of relationships to becoming chiefly a way of connecting rulers with only the more prominent remote ancestors who served to define their kingship. The genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034), with linkages to only a few leading kindreds, could be seen in this light.

An even more dramatic example is the genealogy of Domnall son of Ardgar son of Lochlann in Rawl. B. 502 and that of his grandson, Muirchertach, in the Book of Leinster.127 Domnall (d.1121) and Muirchertach (d.1166) were rulers of Cenél nEogáin in northern Ireland and kings of Ireland. They were also heads of a narrow lineage, Meic Lochlainn, ‘sons of Lochlann’, descended from Domnall’s grandfather, Lochlann. Their genealogies survive in near-contemporary copies: it may be recalled that Rawl. B. 502 was produced only a few years after Domnall’s death, and that the Book of Leinster can be dated to about the time of Muirchertach’s death.128 Both genealogies trace the ancestry of Meic Lochlainn back to Aed Findliath (d.879), ruler of Cenél nEogáin and king of Ireland. The four generations between the eponymous Lochlann and Aed Findliath are, however, different in each. It seems that the only family relationships that mattered were within the dynasty itself descended from Lochlann. Their ancestry, traced in different ways, established their identity as rulers of Cenél nEogáin, which in turn sanctioned their claim to be kings of Ireland and pre-eminent in the Gaelic world. Both genealogies, therefore, served only as a potent display of kingship legitimised by specialist historical knowledge. Their function, therefore, was similar to that of the genealogy of the king of Scots read out at the royal inauguration.

There is, of course, no evidence that either or both the Mac Lochlainn genealogies were created on single sheets of parchment to be read out on public occasions. Both survive only in the academic context of manuscripts containing the corpus of genealogies. In that sense they are no different from the genealogy of Mael Snechta (d.1085) with a branch headed by Mac Bethad (1040–1057); it may be recalled that, after three generations below Mac Bethad, it too was a scholarly construct. In that instance its place in the collection of Scottish material—tacked on at the end—suggests that it was created for the sake of maintaining the collection itself, not for Mael Snechta or Mac Bethad; indeed, they may well both have been dead by then.129 The genealogies of Domnall and Muirchertach Mac Lochlainn, however, are more akin to the genealogy read at the inauguration of the king of Scots. It may be recalled that the genealogy headed originally by Mael Coluim mac Cinaeda (Malcolm II) (1005–1034) was probably copied into the collection of Scottish genealogies from a single sheet of parchment. It is unlikely to be the only one to have arrived into the corpus of genealogies in this way. Although there is no way to tell how many of the genealogies of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries originated as distinct sheets of parchment, the possibility should be kept open that reading out the king’s genealogy at their inauguration was not unique to the king of Scots. This identification of kingship explicitly with the specialist literate knowledge of the historian could be seen as establishing a special relationship between kingship and the authority invested in senchas, the totality of traditional learning, law as well as history. If reading out the genealogy was a feature of other royal inaugurations, then this development could be seen as representing an important aspect of the consolidation and expansion of royal power in this period that has been noted by Donnchadh Ó Corráin.130

At the outset of this chapter it was noted that the inclusion of genealogy and panegyric in the copper charters of Bengal has no parallel among medieval Scottish (or European) documents. In this chapter it has been argued that, in the case of the genealogy of the king of Scots, a panegyric dimension to the text was introduced by 1005; it was also suggested that, as a piece of parchment read out when lawful possession had been established, the genealogy also had some similarities to a charter. The chief significance of the genealogy in the ceremony, however, was to highlight the pivotal role of traditional literate learning in authenticating kingship—a role enhanced by the

126 See n.XXX, above.
127 CGH, I, 175.
128 See above, XXX.
129 See above, XXX.
130 Ó Corráin, ‘Nationality and kingship in pre-Norman Ireland’, 22–32.
panegyric element as well as by reading from a scroll. In general terms it was the special function of
the learned orders to legitimise the social order. In Scotland this source of authority was associated
particularly with the king of Scots, perhaps from as early as the tenth century; the same may have
been true of other major kings in the Gaelic world in this period. In her chapter in this book Joanna
Tucker has drawn attention to the contrast between kings becoming exclusively the donors of Bengali
copper charters on the one hand and, on the other hand, the widening range of charter-donors in
twelfth- and thirteenth-century Scotland.\footnote{Joanna Tucker, ‘Recording boundaries in Scottish documents in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries’, XXX.}
It is possible, therefore, that the intensifying link between
kingship and traditional literate learning suggested by reading out the royal genealogy from a scroll at
a king’s inauguration has similarities with the intimate ties between \textit{brāhmaṇas} and kings that were
immortalised in the copper charters. Perhaps, therefore, it is the genealogy of the king of Scots, rather
than Scottish charters, that offers the closest parallel with Bengali copper charters in terms of the
relationship between specialist practitioners and the social authority which they represented—a
relationship in which distinctions between genealogy, panegyric and charter could become less
significant as ways of reinforcing the exercise of power in particular contexts.

VIII

\textbf{Appendix: Genealogy of David I (1124–1153) in the Scottish collection in Irish manuscripts.}

Book of Lecan (f.119r/109r; facsimile 110ra19–b13), collated with the Book of Ballymote (f.85r; facsimile
149a7–b3). Contractions expanded silently; minor orthographical variants have not been noted; capitalisation
and length-marks are editorial.\footnote{In the notes the Book of Ballymote is \textit{BB} and the Book of Lecan is \textit{Lec}.}

\begin{verbatim}
Dauith
  mae Mailcholuim\footnote{Lec; \textit{om.BB}}
  meic Dondchaid
  meic Mailcolain\footnote{Lec; \textit{om.BB}}
  meic Cinaetha
  meic Mailcholuim\footnote{Lec; \textit{om.BB}}
  meic Domnaill
  meic Cunsantin
  meic Cinaeda
  meic Ailpin
  meic Echach
  meic Aeda Find
  meic Echach
  meic Domangoirt
    \textit{<I> sunn condrecaid Cenél nGabráin 7 Cenél Comgaill}
  meic Domnaill Briec
  meic Echach Buidhe\footnote{\textit{om.BB}}
    \textit{<1> sunn condrecaid Cland Feargusa Guill meic Echach Buidi .i. Gabranaich 7 Cland(a)\footnote{\textit{Clanna} Lec; \textit{Clann} BB.}
                 Conaill Chirr meic Echach Buidi .i. Fir \textit{<Fh>}ibe\footnote{\textit{Ibe} BB\textit{Lec}.} fris in rígraid .i. Clann Chinaeda meic
                 Ailpin
    meic Aeda\footnote{\textit{om.BB}}
      \textit{<1> sund condreacaid Cland Echach Buidi fri léithrind Conaing don leth tuaid\footnote{\textit{don leth tuaid} Lec.; \textit{om.BB}.}} meic Aedan
    meic Gabran
\end{verbatim}
meic Domangoirt
meic Feargusa Moir
meic Erc

Translation:
David146
son of Mael Coluim147
son of Donnchad148
son of Mael Coluim149
son of Cinaed150
son of Mael Coluim151
son of Domnall152
son of Cunsantín153
son of Cinaeda154
son of Ailpin155
son of Eochu156
son of Aed Find157
son of Eochu158
son of Domangart159

<142 sund condrecaid Cenél Loairn meic <Eirc> 143 7 Cenél nAengusa 7 Cenél nGabráin 7 Cenél Comgaill
meic Echach Munreamair
meic Aengusa
meic Feidlimid Aislingthi
meic Aengusa Buaidnich144
meic Feidlimid
meic Senchormaic
meic Laith Luaitthi
meic Aithir
meic Echach Antoit
meic Fiachach145 Táthmáil et reliquum

<143 Eirc BB; Echach Lec.
144 Lec; Buaidn BB.
145 Lec; Fiach BB.
146 David I, king of Scots / ñAlban, 1124–1153.
147 Malcolm III, king of Scots / ñAlban, 1058–1093.
148 Duncan I, king of Scots / ñAlban, 1034–1040. His mother Bethóc daughter of Mael Coluim (Malcolm II), has been omitted. Donnchad (Duncan I) was son of Crinán, ab (‘abbot’) of Dunkeld.
149 Malcolm II, king of Scots / ñAlban, 1005–1034.
150 Kenneth II, king of Scots / ñAlban, 971–995.
151 Malcolm I, king of Scots / ñAlban, 943(?)–954.
152 Donald II, king of Scots / ñAlban, 889(?)–900.
153 Constantine I, king of Scots / rex Pictorum (‘king of the Picts’), 862–876.
154 Kenneth I, king of Scots / rex Pictorum (‘king of the Picts’), 842(?)–858.
155 There are no contemporary references to Ailpin.
156 There are no contemporary references to Eochu (or Eochaid).
son of Eochu Buide.\textsuperscript{161}

Descendants of One-eyed Fergus son of Eochu Buide (that is the Gabranaig\textsuperscript{162}) and Descendants of Maimed Conall son of Eochu Buide (that is the men of Fife) at this point meet the royal line (that is Descendants of Cinaed son of Ailpín).\textsuperscript{163}

son of Aedán\textsuperscript{164}

Descendants of Eochu Buide meet at this point with the apical-link\textsuperscript{165} of Conaing, of the northern half,\textsuperscript{166} son of Aedán

son of Gabrán\textsuperscript{167}

son of Domangart\textsuperscript{168}

son of Fergus Mór\textsuperscript{169}

son of Erc

Cenél Loairn meic Eirc and Cenél nOengusa and Cenél nGabráin and Cenél Comgaill meet at this point

son of Eochu Muinremar

son of Oengus

son of Feidlimid Aislingthech

son of Oengus Buidech

son of Feidlimid

son of Sen Chormac

son of ‘Lath Luaithe’\textsuperscript{170}

son of ‘Aithir’\textsuperscript{171}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Freckled Donald’. Died in 642 as king (probably as king of Dál Riata): Charles-Edwards, \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland}, II, 143 (642.1). This is the earliest king whose death is reasonably certain to have been recorded contemporaneously in the lost ‘Chronicle of Iona’ (whose text was incorporated into the ‘Chronicle of Ireland’).
\item Eochaid Buide (‘Yellow-[haired] Eochaid’) said to have died as king in 629: Charles-Edwards, \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland}, II, 135 and n.4 (629.4). Eochaid and Eochu became interchangeable in extant manuscripts.
\item Possibly meaning ‘Gowriefolk’, i.e. people of Gowrie, one of the provinces north of the Forth.
\item ‘Children of Cinaed son of Ailpín’ (Kenneth I, 842(?)–858).
\item Said to have died as king in 606: Charles-Edwards, \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland}, 124 (606.2).
\item \textit{Leithrind} has been taken to mean ‘half-share’ (e.g., in Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson, \textit{Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland}, 2nd edn (Edinburgh, 1980), 163). A possible example is \textit{ar ba lethrand do Dál Chéit do Dál Bardéini: CGH}, I, 377. It has been pointed out, however, by Donnchadh Ó Corráin (in his review of J. Bannerman, \textit{Studies in the History of Dalriada}, in \textit{Celtica} 13 (1980), 168–82, at 179) that it is found as \textit{léithrind} (nominative) in a genealogical text relating to the Aigillia in \textit{CGH}, I, 140: \textit{Is ón Chonall dano atát Léithrind Conaill for Dobla. Ónd Ailill Léithrind Ailella. Ón Lócán Léithrind Lócáin. Ón Damán Láech Húi Damáin 7 Húi Guassai}. This rules out \textit{leth}, ‘half’, as the first syllable. Ó Corráin regards it as a term for a division of a kindred. I take \textit{léithrind} to be a form of \textit{leithriu/lethrend} (I am very grateful to Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh for this suggestion). It could have the sense of a fixed point for an attachment: see eDIL s.v. \textit{leithriu} at \href{dil.ie/29854}{dil.ie/29854} (accessed 11 February 2016). It is used of the part of the harp from which the strings are drawn, and perhaps the line to which the hangings of a horse’s trappings are attached; note also \textit{fidlethrenn}, ‘a wooden clog which is attached to foot of an animal to prevent it straying’ (a compound of \textit{fid}, ‘wood’: eDIL s.v. \textit{fid} at \href{dil.ie/21999}{dil.ie/21999}, accessed 11 February 2016), and eDIL s.v. \textit{leithrigid} at \href{dil.ie/29852}{dil.ie/29852}, ‘restrain’ (accessed 11 February 2016). A fixed point for an attachment could be an appropriate metaphor for a genealogical link. This brings to mind the division into halves north and south of the Mounth. Unfortunately it is all too likely to have been a medieval editor’s attempt to explain \textit{léithrind as leth rann}, ‘half-share’.
\item Eponym of Cenél nGabráin, who is said to have died in 560: Charles-Edwards, \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland}, 124 (560.2).
\item Appears as Domangart son of Ness in the ‘Chronicle of Ireland’, whose death is noted in 505 with an alternative given of 507: Charles-Edwards, \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland}, II, 85 (505.2, 507.3). Domangart is ‘son of Mac Nisse’ in the earliest genealogical tract relating to Dál Riata, datable to either about 730 or 733: see Broun, \textit{Cethri prímchenéla}.
\item It would appear that Fergus has been intruded into the genealogy instead of Mac Nisse. If he was originally Fergus son of Erc, reputed to have given Armoy in northern Ireland to St Patrick, then he was possibly intruded in the early tenth century when the new royal dynasty descended from Cinaed mac Ailpin had close ties with the kings of the northern Úi Néill, patrons of Armagh (the chief church of St Patrick). None of the later names appear outside genealogical texts.
\item See above, XXX, for a discussion of this name.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
son of Eochu Antoit
son of Fiachu Tathmál, and the rest.

171 See above, XXX, for a discussion of this name.