



Tucker, J. (2019) Understanding Scotland's medieval cartularies. *Innes Review*, 70(2), pp. 135-170. (doi:[10.3366/inr.2019.0226](https://doi.org/10.3366/inr.2019.0226))

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/202624/>

Deposited on: 06 November 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Understanding Scotland's medieval cartularies¹

Abstract: The medieval cartulary is well known as a major source for documents. This article takes Scotland as a case study for examining how the understanding of medieval cartularies has been shaped by those works extensively used by researchers to access cartularies and their texts—in a Scottish context this is principally the antiquarian publications and modern catalogues. Both pose their own problems for scholars seeking to understand the medieval cartulary. After an in-depth examination of these issues, a radical solution is offered which shifts the attention onto the manuscripts themselves. Such an approach reveals those extant cartularies to be fundamentally varied, and not an exclusive 'category' as such. This in turn allows historians to appreciate the dynamic nature of them as sources for documents, and to eschew the deeply embedded tendency to see the cartulary simply as a copy of a medieval archive.

Keywords: Cartularies; charters; medieval manuscripts; antiquarian editions; modern catalogues.

For many historians, consulting texts that have been preserved in a medieval cartulary will be a familiar experience. For medieval Scotland, the historian is in a relatively fortunate position: subject-specific catalogues have been compiled that identify all known examples of cartularies (both surviving and lost); most texts from the surviving medieval cartularies have been published in print already, and now most of these publications are freely accessible online; and much of the laborious work involved in assigning dates to those undated texts in the manuscripts has been undertaken and is widely available through databases and calendars.² A significant proportion of Scotland's cartulary manuscripts, moreover, will soon be digitised and freely available online.³

Despite such efforts to publish, catalogue, date and study these manuscripts and their contents since the nineteenth century, our understanding of the cartulary has arguably become less precise, and even confused. This article will address why this is, with particular consideration given to the influence of antiquarian publications and modern catalogues of cartularies. Both bodies of work have shaped how cartularies are accessed, how they are used, and how they are viewed as a source for the medieval period. There is no doubt that both continue to be invaluable for historians. In order for them to be used more effectively, however, there is a need for a much shaper awareness of their character, particularly in terms of how they relate to the cartulary manuscripts, which have themselves become somewhat obscured from view. The result is a new approach to the very idea of 'the cartulary', one in which the manuscript plays more of a leading role.

This article is not intended as a rallying cry for the production of new editions and catalogues of Scotland's medieval cartularies; instead, it is a call for a new way of working with the existing printed resources, one that is grounded in an awareness of the medieval cartulary as a dynamic manuscript that could take a variety of forms. The key observations and conclusions are significant for any historian engaged in working with texts derived from cartularies, not just those from Scotland. Scotland is a particularly pertinent case study, however, because its scholarly infrastructure of editions, catalogues

¹ This article is an outcome of a series of research workshops which ran from March 2018 to March 2019, funded by the Royal Society of Edinburgh (*Researching and Curating Active Manuscripts: Scotland's Medieval Cartularies*, award no. 60266). I would like to acknowledge the contribution that these discussions have made to this article's thinking, particularly the realisations about the nature of the catalogues and publications of medieval cartularies. I am grateful to all of the participants of these workshops for their input. I am particularly indebted to Dauvit Broun for his role in this project, and for his invaluable comments on numerous drafts of this article. Any remaining errors or oversights are my own responsibly.

² All of these publications and resources will be discussed below.

³ A project is currently underway that will see the medieval cartularies in the National Library of Scotland's Advocates' Manuscripts collection (at least 23 items) digitised in the coming year (2019–20). See below, p. XXX, n. 78.

and dating of texts is one of the most comprehensive of any medieval kingdom. As a result, the impact of foregrounding the manuscripts in order to understand ‘the cartulary’ is all the more apparent, allowing them to be appreciated as selective and individual works in their own right and not just as preservers of otherwise lost texts.

Antiquarian club publications of cartularies from Scotland

The natural starting point for working with any medieval cartulary or its texts is the most recent printed edition. Very often, this will be a volume produced by an antiquarian club or society well over a century ago. In Scotland from the second quarter of the nineteenth century, newly-established ventures such as the Bannatyne Club, Maitland Club, Spalding Club, Grampian Club, Abbotsford Club, and the Scottish History Society took up the task of editing and printing large numbers of medieval manuscript sources.⁴ It is important to recognise at the outset the variety of practice found in these volumes: some were based on collections of original single-sheet documents derived from a particular medieval archive;⁵ others took copies from an archive as their main sources (including medieval cartularies or sometimes early modern transcriptions compiled by an antiquarian);⁶ some were a mixture of original documents and copies;⁷ and others still were simply a collection of documents from different sources relating in some way to the history of the volume’s subject.⁸ What might be considered the ‘club publications’ must, therefore, be understood to be an amorphous corpus.⁹ The discussion which follows will deal only with those publications that were based to some extent on medieval cartulary manuscripts.

In the context of this publishing work, Scotland’s ecclesiastical cartularies were given special prominence (especially those held at that time in the Faculty of Advocates’ Library).¹⁰ This was in part

⁴ For a broad history of these clubs, see Marinell Ash, *The Strange Death of Scottish History* (Edinburgh, 1980), 59–86. For the Bannatyne Club specifically, see Alasdair Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club and the publication of Scottish ecclesiastical cartularies’, *SHR* 85 (2006), 202–33.

⁵ In only a few cases have the extant collections of originals been substantial enough for a separate publication. Notable examples are those for Holyrood Abbey, North Berwick Priory, Inchaffray Abbey, Inchcolm Abbey, and Coupar Angus Abbey, respectively: *Liber Cartarum Sancte Crucis*, ed. C. Innes (Edinburgh, 1847); *Carte Monialium de Northberwic*, ed. C. Innes (Edinburgh, 1847); *Charters, Bulls and Other Documents relating to the Abbey of Inchaffray*, ed. W. A. Lindsay, J. Dowden and J. M. Thomson (Edinburgh, 1908) [hereafter *Inchaff. Chrs.*]; *Charters of the Abbey of Inchcolm*, ed. D. E. Easson and A. Macdonald (Edinburgh, 1938); and *Charters of the Abbey of Coupar Angus*, ed. D. E. Easson (Edinburgh, 1947). Those extant documents relating to Coldingham Priory were published as the appendix to J. Raine, *The History and Antiquities of North Durham* (London, 1852).

⁶ Publications based on medieval cartulary manuscripts can be found in Appendix A. Publications based on early modern transcripts of cartularies or originals include those relating to the earls of Lennox or Beaulieu Priory (both based on eighteenth-century transcripts produced by Walter McFarlane), the Panmure family (based on Henry Maule’s eighteenth-century transcript of the family’s muniments), or Coupar Angus Abbey (based on Sir James Balfour’s seventeenth-century *Breviarium*), respectively: *Cartularium Comitatus de Levenax*, ed. J. Dennistoun (Edinburgh, 1833); *The Charters of the Priory of Beaulieu*, ed. E. C. Batten (London, 1877); *Registrum de Panmure*, ed. J. Stuart (Edinburgh, 1874); and *Rental Book of the Cistercian Abbey of Cupar Angus*, ed. C. Rogers, 2 vols (London, 1879–80) [hereafter *C. A. Rent.*].

⁷ The most extensive example of this is the publication for Melrose Abbey: *Liber Sancte Marie de Melros*, ed. C. Innes, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1837). According to the *Tabula*, the number of texts derived from originals is 468 out of 610 (77%). (The source for no. 400 is not given, so it has been excluded from these calculations.)

⁸ For example, those publications relating to Sciennes Priory, May Priory, Kinloss Abbey, and Crosraguel Abbey, respectively: *Liber Conventus S. Katherine Senensis Prope Edinburgum*, ed. J. Maidment (Edinburgh, 1841); *Records of the Priory of the Isle of May*, ed. J. Stuart (Edinburgh, 1868); *Records of the Monastery of Kinloss*, ed. J. Stuart (Edinburgh, 1872); and *Charters of the Abbey of Crosraguel*, ed. F. C. Hunter Blair, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1886).

⁹ This distinction is not always made clear by modern scholars, however. It is not obvious, for example, that the list of ‘nineteenth-century publications’ included by Alasdair Ross covers many different kinds of publications, not only those relating to cartularies: Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, 226–7 (Appendix 2, Table 1). Note the distinction Ross made, however, between the publications at 207–8 (quoted below, p. XXX, n. 22).

¹⁰ One of the letters published by Alasdair Ross (from Alexander Pringle to David Laing in 1855) captures the particular significance awarded to the cartularies by the Bannatyne Club members: ‘My chief regret would be the

because very few significant collections of original single sheets from a medieval archive survive.¹¹ The earliest volume based on a cartulary manuscript was the ‘Register of Paisley Abbey’ (*Registrum Monasterii de Passelet*), published by the Maitland Club in 1832.¹² The editor in this instance was one of the most prolific of the era, Cosmo Innes.¹³ The work of these Scottish clubs and societies is notable in the extent of their coverage of the cartularies derived from medieval religious houses’ archives: it appears that all of the monasteries and cathedrals in Scotland which are known to have a surviving medieval cartulary were the subject of an antiquarian publication of some sort.¹⁴ By contrast, many cartularies for English monastic houses are being published for the first time in this century.¹⁵

The problems these volumes present to historians today are notorious, especially among cartulary scholars.¹⁶ For Scotland, Alasdair Ross’s influential article in 2006 brought many of these issues directly into the foreground specifically in relation to the Bannatyne Club publications.¹⁷ The main problems Ross highlighted can be summarised as follows: the order of the printed texts usually does not resemble the arrangement found in the manuscripts; there are examples where the printed texts have been altered or ‘improved’ silently after collating different manuscript versions; and the later-medieval documents have often been abridged in order to save space.¹⁸ Most troublesome of all, according to Ross, was the historians’ reading of these publications as if they were the manuscripts themselves. For too long historians had ‘been guilty of accepting these published cartularies uncritically’.¹⁹ Instead, he argued, the Bannatyne Club’s publications ought to be appreciated as new, even ‘artificial’, creations.

To interrogate these issues further, and to really understand the nature of these publications, it is necessary to delve into the volumes themselves. In Appendix A, 26 publications by antiquarian clubs and societies have been identified which used at least one cartulary manuscript as a source.²⁰ These

discontinuance of the chartularies and other monastic records, for the perpetuation of which we had done more than any other similar association.’ Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, 225, Appendix 1, letter A.

¹¹ See above, n. 5. St Andrews Cathedral Priory’s largest collection of original charters, for example, have not all been published (they survive as part of NLS Adv. MS 15.1.18), whereas its medieval cartulary (NRS GD45/27/8) was one of the earliest publications by the Bannatyne Club in 1841 (*St A. Lib.*: see Appendix A, no. 4).

¹² See Appendix A, no. 1.

¹³ For Cosmo Innes’ life and work, see Richard A. Marsden, *Cosmo Innes and the Defence of Scotland’s Past, c. 1825–1875*.

¹⁴ This is not to say that all of the cartulary manuscripts were used as a source in the relevant publication. The main omission is Arbroath Abbey’s sixteenth-century cartulary (BL Add. MS 33245), which was not known to the editors of *Arb. Lib.* (see Appendix A, no. 15), and therefore texts from this manuscript remain unpublished. There are other institutions (not monasteries or cathedrals) and families from Scotland with medieval cartularies of some sort which were not the subject of a publication: examples include King’s College Aberdeen, Turriff Hospital, and Elgin Hospital, and the families of Bruce, Scrymgeour and Seton. (All of these examples are listed in the most recent catalogue of Scotland’s cartularies, produced in 2010 and introduced below.)

¹⁵ Examples of cartularies published in the twenty-first century (either in full or as a calendar) include *The Cartulary of Alvingham Priory*, ed. Jill Redford (Woodbridge, 2018); *The Cartulary of Binham Priory*, ed. Johanna Margerum, Norfolk Record Society 80 (Exeter, 2016); *The Latin Cartulary of Godstow Abbey*, ed. Emilie Amt (Oxford, 2014); and *The Cartulary of Byland Abbey*, ed. Janet Burton (Woodbridge, 2004). Redford and Margerum’s editions were initially the subject of PhD theses in 2010 and 2005, respectively.

¹⁶ Some of the most significant criticisms came as part of a new wave of cartulary scholarship in the 1990s. An early and often-cited critique is Patrick J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994), 83, who stated: ‘When editing cartularies, most nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors have ignored the organization of the cartularies themselves, attempting instead to present all the charters and documents of a given institution in a chronological order regardless of provenance and organization in the cartularies or tradition books themselves. In other words, most scholarly attention has focused on eliminating the cartulary itself in order to provide transparent windows into the original archives of an institution.’

¹⁷ Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, 202–33.

¹⁸ He illustrated these problems in relation to the Moray publication: Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, 217–23. Building on Alasdair Ross’s observations, Richard Marsden has discussed these editorial practices in relation to Cosmo Innes in particular: see Marsden, *Cosmo Innes*, 131–48.

¹⁹ Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, 203.

²⁰ In one case (the collegiate church of Crail), the publication is in fact an English calendar of the manuscript with ‘abstracts’ of each text rather than transcriptions.

volumes are among the most accessible for studying many aspects of medieval Scotland.²¹ Despite their relatively uniform design and editorial style, there are significant differences in the character of these volumes. One of the most important distinctions is in terms of how many manuscripts were included. For the 26 publications relating to Scotland, this might best be conceptualised initially as a spectrum: at one end are those volumes which were based on a single cartulary manuscript; at the other extreme are those which took in an array of manuscript sources (including cartularies, original charters, and later transcriptions of documents).²² A further question is how the editor decided to arrange the texts themselves. Of those publications based on a single cartulary manuscript, several do represent the order as found in the manuscripts; others rearranged their source's contents to some extent (whether by simply moving around a few texts, or reordering whole sections of the cartulary so that the earliest portion came first, or following the sequence of texts in the cartulary's earliest part but then rearranging the order of the later additions). Of those based on multiple manuscript sources, usually the texts were arranged chronologically, though sometimes a more mixed plan was followed (partly chronological, partly thematic). In order to discover the true nature of an individual publication and its principal sources, its preface and *Tabula* have to be studied in some detail.²³ Table 1 gives the results from a survey of this question.

²¹ Those which contain pre-1314 charters or royal charters from 1314 to 1371 are used, for example, as sources in *People of Medieval Scotland: 1093–1371*, Amanda Beam, John Bradley, Dauvit Broun, John Reuben Davies, Matthew Hammond, Neil Jakeman, Michele Pasin, Alice Taylor, with others (Glasgow and London, 2018) <<https://www.poms.ac.uk>> [hereafter PoMS].

²² Examples of these two extremes might be St Andrews Cathedral Priory's publication (based on one surviving cartulary manuscript) and Aberdeen Cathedral's publication (drawing together about nine different manuscripts, including various cartularies). Both Alasdair Ross and Richard Marsden recognised that the Bannatyne Club publications are each based on different numbers of manuscript sources: Ross, 'The Bannatyne Club', 207–8; Marsden, *Cosmo Innes*, 135. Alasdair Ross created a two-fold classification: 'true cartularies' ('published either wholly or mostly from medieval manuscript-collections of documents relating to a single religious foundation') and 'artificial cartularies' ('completely or almost completely assembled from scratch, using numerous different sources of documentary material'). My discussion and distinctions differ from both Ross and Marsden, not least in including publications not edited by Cosmo Innes and by clubs other than the Bannatyne Club.

²³ In the future, it would be extremely valuable to have a single catalogue of those extant manuscript sources derived from each medieval Scottish archive (including cartularies but also originals and later transcripts).

Table 1: Manuscript sources used for the antiquarian publications of cartularies

| <i>Manuscript sources</i> | <i>Arrangement of texts</i> | <i>Subject (with date of publication)</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|---|--|---|--------------|
| Based on one cartulary manuscript | Texts printed in the order of the manuscript | Paisley Abbey (1832); St Andrews Cathedral Priory (1841); Balmerino Abbey (1841); Lindores Abbey (1841); Our Lady's College, Glasgow (1846); ²⁴ Dryburgh Abbey (1847); Cambuskenneth Abbey (1872); Crail Collegiate Church (1877); Coldstream Priory (1879); Stirling Chapel Royal (1882); St Nicholas' Parish Church, Aberdeen (1888–92). | 11 |
| | Some sections of the manuscript rearranged | Elgin Cathedral (1837); ²⁵ Dunfermline Abbey (1842); Kelso Abbey (1846); Inchaffray Abbey (1847); Newbattle Abbey (1849); Brechin Cathedral (1856); Soutra Hospital (1861); Lindores Abbey (1903). | 8 |
| Based on multiple manuscript sources (including at least one cartulary) | Texts arranged in a single, chronological sequence | Scone Abbey (1843); Glasgow Cathedral (1843); Earldom of Morton (1853); St Giles' Parish Church, Edinburgh (1859). | 4 |
| | Texts arranged in a mixed order | Melrose Abbey (1837); ²⁶ Aberdeen Cathedral (1845); Arbroath Abbey (1848–56). | 3 |

Most of the publications were, therefore, essentially based on a single cartulary manuscript (eighteen out of 26). These might justifiably be thought of as an 'edition'. A significant number of others, however, incorporated material from multiple manuscripts derived from the same archive, particularly original charters, later cartularies, and later transcripts. It is fair to say that the volumes themselves do not advertise this distinction particularly clearly. This can be explained, however, if we re-orientate how we conceptualise the volumes and the work of their editors. Perhaps the most accurate approach is to regard each volume as based on the archive of a particular institution or family; these, not the manuscripts, are the primary subjects of the volumes, even in cases where only one manuscript is involved.²⁷ There are a very small number of exceptions where more than one publication was produced for a single archive, perhaps because a manuscript was discovered and published at a later stage (as in

²⁴ There are in fact two almost identical manuscripts underlying this publication for Our Lady's College, which was 'printed from the more perfect of two contemporary copies': *St Mary Lib.*, p. xi. Full reference details for each publication can be found in Appendix A.

²⁵ The name of this 'subject' is potentially confusing: the archive which the manuscripts relate to was at Elgin Cathedral; the publication itself, however, prefers to refer to the diocese, which was Moray. This publication is also particularly complex in terms of its sources. There is one principal cartulary that is being 'edited' (NLS Adv. MS 34.4.10), though its contents have been re-arranged and printed in sections, and sometimes its texts are supplemented by another manuscript (NLS Adv. MS 34.4.9) 'on the rare occasions where it offered a manifest improvement on the text of its original': *Moray Reg.*, p. iv. See also Ross, 'The Bannatyne Club', 217–23.

²⁶ It will be recalled that the majority of texts in Melrose Abbey's publication were derived from originals, with the remainder printed from cartularies and other copies: see above, p. XXX, n. 7.

²⁷ This approach chimes with how the leading editor of the time viewed the publications. In a series of lectures on medieval Scottish records printed in 1872 but first delivered in 1868–9, Cosmo Innes grouped Scotland's ecclesiastical institutions according to whether their cartularies had been printed or not or were lost. The implication is that, for Innes, an ecclesiastical house had a single register, and this was either printed or not. Cosmo Innes, *Lectures on Scotch Legal Antiquities* (Edinburgh, 1872), 191–3.

the case of Lindores Abbey) or because one volume was produced for the cartulary and one for the originals (as in the case of Inchaffray Abbey).²⁸

The editorial work and decisions can therefore be cast in a new light once it is recognised that the publications are primarily about particular communities or families and are based on the surviving material from their archives. The end goal was to make available (to a small audience mainly comprising the club membership, it should not be forgotten) the main documentary texts for that medieval community or family.²⁹ Each editor was well aware of the landscape of medieval and also early modern manuscript sources for their subject. Their task was to collect together these disparate materials and assemble them into a coherent form, utilising whatever manuscripts were available to a greater or lesser extent. The printed texts they produced, which lack the critical apparatus integral to any modern edition, symbolise the particular editorial style established by these clubs. What these editors achieved should not, however, be overlooked or undervalued. Establishing a chronological arrangement for the texts even roughly was no simple feat, given that many are undated.³⁰ Moreover, it should be recognised that much of the editorial labour came in writing the volume's preface. These are usually extensive, often up to one hundred pages, offering a substantial history of the community or family as informed by the documents within the volume. Very often these prefaces remain an important point of reference for the history of a particular community or family.

The antiquarian club publications can now be more precisely understood as primarily based on a family or institutional archive. The result of this kind of 'editing' was, in many cases, not so much an 'edition' of a manuscript but a new creation that might even go so far as to 'tidy up' the texts and their order. This was precisely the point of arrival for Alasdair Ross. Central to Ross's criticisms of Cosmo Innes' method was an expectation that the publications were, or should have been, essentially print versions of the real manuscripts. As we have seen, however, this expectation was not shared by the editors of the volumes themselves.

To pursue this dichotomy, it is useful to consider the scholarly conventions used in referring to these publications. From the beginning, this has clouded the relationship between the print publications and the medieval manuscripts. Table 2 illustrates that the published volumes are mostly entitled *Registrum* ('Register') or *Liber* ('Book'); other terms were introduced for the later publications ('*Cartularium*', and the English equivalents 'Chartulary' and 'Register'). The terms *Registrum* and *Liber* have become particularly embedded today since scholars have become accustomed to short forms and abbreviations of the titles. This is not unnatural given how lengthy the full titles can be, and the fact that they are mostly in Latin. But the full titles do bear consideration. These are set out in Appendix A

²⁸ Lindores Abbey's two cartularies were published in 1841 (*Lind. Lib.*: see Appendix A, no. 6) and in 1903 (*Lind. Cart.*: see Appendix A, no. 26) after the latter's 'rediscovery' in the 1880s: see Thomas Dickson, 'Notice of the register of Lindores Abbey, a thirteenth century Scottish MS. on vellum, in the library at Caprington Castle, Ayrshire', *PSAS* 20 (1886), 148–59. Inchaffray Abbey's cartulary was published in 1847 (*Inchaff. Lib.*: see Appendix A, no. 14) and its originals in 1908 (*Inchaff. Chrs.*).

²⁹ Marinell Ash notes that, for the Bannatyne Club, the original idea was that each member would receive two copies of the publications and any extras would be sold on to the general public: Ash, *Strange Death*, 62. Some of the volumes contain a reference to the number of copies that were printed. The Paisley publication (*Pais. Reg.*), for example, states on one of its opening pages: 'The Impression of this Edition is limited to Eighty Copies, of which this is No. ' followed by a space ('39' is added to the copy I have consulted). The Aberdeen publication (*Abdn. Reg.*) notes: '525 copies printed' (the copy I have consulted is apparently 'No. 262'). The minutes printed at the front of the Arbroath publication (*Arb. Lib.*, 1) state that the committee had resolved 'that a limited impression upon a different paper, not to exceed One Hundred Copies, be provided for Subscribers'.

³⁰ As far as is known, the earliest example of a scholar arranging a Scottish archive into a chronological sequence of documents was Father Thomas Innes' work in the 1690s on the Glasgow Cathedral archive while it was in Paris. Grant Simpson and Bruce Webster, 'The archives of the medieval church of Glasgow: an introductory survey', *The Bibliothek* 3 (1962), 195–201; Grant Simpson, 'Letters of Father Thomas Innes about the archives of the church of Glasgow', *Innes Review* 13 (1962), 62–70. Cosmo Innes evidently had not known about Thomas Innes' two-volume work when he published the cathedral's muniments in 1843, though Thomas Innes' sequence was indirectly, through other early modern transcripts of his work, the basis for the order of texts in the 1843 publication. Simpson and Webster also thought that Thomas Innes' volumes had been lost. Both have now been located: the first is AUL SCA MS JB 1/7; the second is Paris, Irish College, MS 3, vol. 2.

for each of the 26 publications. The volume for Elgin Cathedral (which is published as relating to the diocese, Moray), for example, is generally known by its short form, *Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis* ('Register of the Bishopric of Moray'). It is then abbreviated, like many volumes, to what is essentially an English translation: '*Moray Reg.*'³¹ Its full title, however, is more revealing as to the nature of the volume: *Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis. E pluribus codicibus consarcinatum circa A.D. MCCCC. Cum continuatione diplomatum recentiorum usque ad A.D. MDCXXIII* ('Register of the Bishopric of Moray. From many codices sewn together around A.D. 1400. With a continuation of the latest documents up to A.D. 1623').

Table 2: Terminology in the main titles of the antiquarian publications

| <i>Main title term</i> | <i>Subject (with date of publication)</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|------------------------|---|--------------|
| <i>Registrum</i> | Paisley Abbey (1832); Elgin Cathedral (1837); Dunfermline Abbey (1842); Glasgow Cathedral (1843); Aberdeen Cathedral (1845); Newbattle Abbey (1849); Earldom of Morton (1853); Brechin Cathedral (1856); St Giles' Parish Church, Edinburgh (1859); Soutra Hospital (1861); Cambuskenneth Abbey (1872). | 11 |
| <i>Liber</i> | Melrose Abbey (1837); St Andrews Cathedral Priory (1841); Balmerino Abbey (1841); Lindores Abbey (1841); Scone Abbey (1843); Kelso Abbey (1846); Our Lady's College, Glasgow (1846); Dryburgh Abbey (1847); Inchaffray Abbey (1847); Arbroath Abbey (1848–56). | 10 |
| Chartulary | Coldstream Priory (1879); Lindores Abbey (1903). | 2 |
| Register | Crail Collegiate Church (1877); Stirling Chapel Royal (1882). | 2 |
| <i>Cartularium</i> | St Nicholas' Parish Church, Aberdeen (1888–92). | 1 |

Of the 26 publications relating to cartularies, almost equal numbers are entitled *Registrum* and *Liber*. As far as can be seen, there was no distinguishing criteria for whether the publication was considered a 'book' or a 'register'. Evidently, these terms were applied somewhat arbitrarily.³² This picture of fluidity is further emphasised by the volumes' full titles, and also by the running headers used within the body of the publications. Dryburgh Abbey's volume, for example, is based on a single manuscript but the title is ambiguous about whether the volume was principally conceived of as a *Liber* or a *Registrum*: *Liber S. Marie de Dryburgh. Registrum cartarum abbacie Premonstratensis de Dryburgh* ('Book of St Mary of Dryburgh. Register of charters of the Premonstratensian abbey of Dryburgh'). A later title page then describes the work as *Liber S. Marie de Dryburgh* (at pp. 1 and 3). The running header above the texts, however, labels it *Registrum de Dryburgh*. Arbroath Abbey's publication, which draws together texts from several cartularies, is entitled *Liber Sancte Thome de Aberbrothoc. Registrorum abbacie de Aberbrothoc* ('Book of St Thomas of Arbroath. Registers of the abbey of

³¹ A list of these abbreviations can be found in PoMS under 'Abbreviations of sources in the database: <<https://www.poms.ac.uk/information/reference-information/abbreviations-of-sources/>> (accessed 19 July 2019). PoMS follows the conventional abbreviations for the publications as set out in 'List of abbreviated titles of the printed sources of Scottish history to 1560', *SHR* 42 Supplement (1963), i–xxxii. In the PoMS bibliography, only the short forms of each title are given for the publications.

³² Only one potential pattern is discernible which is that the four publications for a bishopric with a secular chapter (Aberdeen, Moray, Glasgow and Brechin) are *Registrum*, but various monastic cartularies are equally entitled *Registrum* (Paisley, Dunfermline, Newbattle and Cambuskenneth).

Arbroath'), but the running titles label the volumes *Registrum de Aberbrothoc*.³³ Plainly, these terms were fully interchangeable in this context.³⁴

St Andrews Cathedral Priory publication's terminology is another complex example, despite being a relatively straightforward case of an 'edition' based closely on a single manuscript. Its full title is: *Liber Cartarum Prioratus Sancti Andree in Scotia. E registro ipso in archivis baronum de Panmure hodie asservato* ('Book of Charters of the Priory of St Andrew in Scotland. From the register today preserved in the archives of the barons of Panmure'). Just before the *Tabula*, there is a subtitle page which reads: *Registrum siue Liber Cartarum Prioratus Sancti Andree in Scotia*. The running titles then settle on *Registrum Prioratus Sancti Andree*. Here, then, is as clear a message as could be that there was no hard rule for whether the published version of a cartulary was deemed to be a *Liber* or a *Registrum*.

This unstable terminology also extends to the cartulary manuscripts themselves. In the prefaces to the volumes, the manuscripts are usually described as a 'register', though they might also be called a 'chartulary', 'volume', 'compilation', '*liber*' or 'record'. Now, this is not to chastise the nineteenth-century editors for sloppy language. In fact, the impression is that their choice of word was as much an aesthetic one, avoiding over-use of the same term in a single sentence.³⁵ A parallel can be found in the way the documents are interchangeably referred to as 'charters', 'muniments', 'documents', 'deeds', or 'writs'. In further defence of the editors, medieval cartularists themselves did not routinely give titles to their work, nor is there a single term used in medieval sources to describe what we now call 'cartularies': general terms such as *liber* and *registrum* are far more common than *cartularium*.³⁶

This is not the place to survey all uses of the term 'cartulary' in Scottish historiography, but the important point is that the instability of the terminology in relation to the medieval cartulary long precedes the nineteenth century editors.³⁷ What can be observed is that 'register' was for a long period

³³ There are two volumes for the Arbroath publication. The first is subtitled *Pars prior: Registrum Vetus, munimentaue eidem coetanea complectens. 1178–1329* ('The first part, comprising the Old Register, and contemporary muniments to the same [abbey], 1178–1329'). The second is subtitled *Pars altera: Registrum Nigrum necnon libros cartarum recentiores complectens. 1329–1536* ('The second part, comprising the Black Register and also the more recent books of charters, 1329–1536').

³⁴ It is not clear, of course, who made the decisions about the text for the running headers. Mostly, they do reflect the publication's main title. Those that are consistent in both their main title and header are the publications relating to Paisley Abbey, Elgin Cathedral, Dunfermline Abbey, Glasgow Cathedral, Aberdeen Cathedral, Newbattle Abbey, Brechin Cathedral, St Giles' parish church, Soutra Hospital, Cambuskenneth Abbey, Balmerino Abbey, Lindores Abbey's 1841 volume, Scone Abbey, and Our Lady's College, Glasgow. Those whose header is different to their main title (usually swapping the word to one that appears in their subtitle) are the publications relating to Melrose Abbey (*Liber* in the main title, *Munimenta* in the header), St Andrews Cathedral Priory (*Liber, Registrum*), Kelso Abbey (*Registrum, Liber*), Dryburgh Abbey (*Liber, Registrum*), Inchaffray Abbey (*Liber, Registrum*), Arbroath Abbey (*Liber, Registrum*), and Coldstream Priory (*Chartulary, Carte*).

³⁵ For example, see the introduction in *Pais. Reg.*, p. xviii (my italics): '... the *chartulary* of Paisley presents one important distinction and superiority over the greater part of the *registers* of religious houses, in embodying the whole of the deeds recorded ...'. Another example of interchangeable terminology is in the introduction in *Moray Reg.*, p. iv (my italics): 'They have been printed from the older *register*; and the later *chartulary* has only been used on the rare occasions where it offered a manifest improvement on the text of its original.'

³⁶ The fact that the corpus of medieval cartularies developed without a single name has been pointed out in Monique Bourin, 'Conclusion', in *Les cartulaires méridionaux. Actes du colloque organisé à Béziers les 20 et 21 septembre 2002 par le Centre historique de recherches et d'études médiévales sur la Méditerranée occidentale*, ed. Daniel Le Blévec (Paris, 2006), 253–68, at 256. For the infrequency of *cartularium*, see *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, s.v. *cartularium* (*cartularium*) <<http://clt.brepolis.net/dmlbs>> (accessed 23 July 2019).

³⁷ To offer just a few examples in relation to cartularies from Scotland, in 1434 the notary public who copied Coldstream Priory's acts into a cartulary referred to it as a *liber* (see *Cold. Cart.*, p. 44; Appendix A, no. 23). James Balfour of Denmilne (d. 1657) referred to Coupar Angus Abbey's book of charters as the abbey's *Antiquum Registrum* (see *C. A. Rent.*, pp. 319–52). Perhaps the best example of this fluid terminology is Father Thomas Innes' descriptions of Glasgow Cathedral's two medieval cartularies in the 1690s, calling the older one *Vetus*

the favoured term, both for the manuscripts themselves and also later for the publications of them. A turning point is perceptible from the second half of the nineteenth century when an increasing number of printed volumes were entitled (often in English) ‘Chartulary of X’.³⁸ The gradual firming up of this term ‘cartulary’ has led eventually to a clearer sense of it as representing a distinct type of medieval manuscript, separate from the ‘register’.³⁹ Against this backdrop of fluid terminology, it is not hard to see why the lines between the printed volumes and the manuscripts have remained blurred—scholars might refer to both as a ‘cartulary’ or as a ‘register’.⁴⁰ In a Scottish context, this situation has created a particular tension in the longstanding project the *Syllabus of Scottish Cartularies*.⁴¹ Each syllabus is essentially a calendar of the relevant printed publication, summarising and dating (or assigning a date-range to) the texts.⁴² In a sense, they are like English-language versions of the *Tabula* of each volume, with more precise dates. So far, a syllabus exists for around twenty subjects.⁴³ The conflict of terminology is immediately captured in the series’ title: the *Syllabus of Scottish Cartularies* might most naturally be read as relating to the medieval manuscripts, not the publications, which may or may not be based on a single cartulary manuscript.⁴⁴ Ian Cunningham’s awareness of this tension is revealed on a few occasions where he notes at the outset of a syllabus that ‘this is not a cartulary’ or similar.⁴⁵

Cartularium seu Registrum Ecclesie Glasguensis and the more recent one *Registrum Novum Ecclesie Glasguensis vulgo dicto The Rede Buke* (such comments can be found in the margins of AUL SCA MS JB 1/7).

³⁸ Examples of these publications include: *Chartulary of the Cistercian Priory of Coldstream*, ed. C. Rogers (London, 1879); *Cartularium Ecclesiae Sancti Nicholai Aberdonensis*, 2 vols, ed. J. Cooper (Aberdeen, 1888–92); *The Blackfriars of Perth: The Cartulary and Papers of their House*, ed. R. Milne (Edinburgh, 1893); and *The Chartulary of Lindores Abbey*, ed. J. Dowden (Edinburgh, 1903). A related phenomenon is those collections produced by William Fraser for lay families that did not involve a medieval cartulary manuscript as such but whose volume’s title evoked this idea, such as *The Cartulary of Colquhoun of Colquhoun and Luss*, ed. W. Fraser (Edinburgh, 1873), and *The Cartulary of Pollok-Maxwell*, ed. W. Fraser (Edinburgh, 1875).

³⁹ In an important article in 1987, Trevor Foulds noted that: ‘The word ‘cartulary’ has only gained more widespread currency in relatively recent times, though the word is not of recent invention’. He continued by noting that the ‘distinction between the terms ‘cartulary’ and ‘register’ has not always been maintained’ and the terminology of early-modern antiquarians had served to confuse matters. Foulds argued that such a distinction existed in reality between cartularies and registers: ‘nevertheless, when the manuscript is a cartulary and not a register, the term ‘register’ should be resisted or at least disclaimed by an editor’. Trevor Foulds, ‘Medieval cartularies’, *Archives* 18, no. 77 (1987), 3–35, at 5–6.

⁴⁰ Note the discussion in W. W. Scott, ‘The register of Paisley Abbey: a reappraisal’, in *The Monastery and Abbey of Paisley*, ed. John Maldon (Glasgow, 2000), 149–60, where the printed publication and the manuscript are interchangeably referred to as the ‘register’ (such as at 156). By contrast, see the comments in Ross, ‘The Bannatyne Club’, at 207–9, where the publications themselves are actually referred to as ‘published cartularies’.

⁴¹ This project began in the mid-1960s sponsored by the Scottish Medievalists. See Ian Cunningham, ‘Syllabus of Scottish Cartularies’, *Monastic Research Bulletin* 1 (1995), 11. The *Syllabus* was initiated by Donald Watt and John Todd and key contributors have been Ian Cunningham (who also coordinated the series), W. W. Scott, Norman Shead, and more recently Matthew Hammond, who has taken on the role of steering series 2.

⁴² Much of this work summarising and dating the documents for the syllabus is now available online via PoMS <<https://www.poms.ac.uk/>>.

⁴³ Each syllabus is not strictly a ‘publication’ as such, and so providing dates for their completion is not straightforward (some contain dates on their front page, others do not). Eleven institutions and families are the subject of their own volume, and nine have been bunched together into one volume named ‘Small cartularies’. A list of the available syllabuses can currently be found at <<https://scottishmedievalcharters.wordpress.com/scottish-cartularies/>> (accessed 26 July 2019). There are plans to move these materials to a new Scottish Medievalists website in the near future.

⁴⁴ The new series attempts to make this relationship with the printed publications clearer, with the subtitle *Series Two: Calendars of Printed Scottish Cartularies*.

⁴⁵ The Beaully syllabus (compiled in 1995, published as one of the ‘Small cartularies’) states: ‘This is not strictly a cartulary but publication of a set of transcripts by/for Walter Macfarlane’. The Crossraguel syllabus (compiled in 1995, published as one of the ‘Small cartularies’) states: ‘This is not a cartulary but a collection of charters’. The Holyrood syllabus (compiled in 2001) states: ‘Not a cartulary’. Another contributor who picked up on this issue was John Todd who noted at the outset of the North Berwick Priory syllabus (compiled in 1994) that it was ‘not in Davis’, as if there was an expectation that it might be, even though the source in this case was a collection of single sheet originals and not a cartulary as such. (For ‘Davis’, see further below.)

These ambiguities are about more than simply imprecise language inherited from the nineteenth century. They reflect a deeply entrenched assumption that the medieval cartulary manuscript was essentially a handwritten version of these nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions. While this is not a quirk limited to the Scottish scholarship, it may be that the ambiguities run particularly deep in this context, precisely because of the preponderance of antiquarian publications. The near-comprehensive coverage they achieved has brought significant levels of access to Scotland's corpus of surviving cartularies and their texts; but simultaneously they have, in a sense, constructed a wall around the manuscripts themselves. To peer over the wall, to observe the reality of the manuscripts, affords a very different view of the corpus and its contours. This is especially important in any context where scholars rely on these publications to act as 'editions' of the manuscripts. It is worth returning again to Ross's warning, as quoted above: 'Historians have, however, in their gratitude perhaps been guilty of accepting these published cartularies uncritically.'⁴⁶ Ross's cautions have taken us a long way in understanding that the publications should not be assumed to represent a given cartulary manuscript. But there is further ground to cover still in separating out the *publications* from the *manuscripts* themselves, recognising both as distinct creations that must be taken on their own terms.

It is all too easy to level criticisms at the nineteenth-century volumes, denouncing them as misleading. A careful eye to the editors' methods, however, allows us to appreciate that their aim was not strictly to produce 'editions' of manuscripts but to make accessible in print the medieval archives relating to particular institutions and families, in whatever form these survived. The editors, in other words, had a more flexible approach to the 'cartulary' than has been recognised by modern critics. One of the deepest impressions left by the volumes was perhaps how the medieval cartulary manuscripts were used, and what this subliminally communicated about their status: primarily as repositories for document texts. Charter texts bring with them a wealth of information about local people and places, and about the development of the medieval kingdom and its laws.⁴⁷ The cartulary's main value for the historian lay, therefore, in the texts that it preserved. Within this mindset, the manuscript itself has already become somewhat invisible. For cartulary studies, the defining legacy of these volumes was therefore arguably the cartulary manuscript's silent disappearance from general view.

Modern catalogues of cartularies from Scotland

One context in which the cartulary manuscripts themselves are placed centre stage is in catalogues. Since at least the eighteenth century, scholars have been surveying and describing the corpus of cartularies and other similar materials that survive from medieval Scotland.⁴⁸ The most intensive effort to produce a catalogue was undertaken by Godfrey Davis (d. 1997) who, in 1958, published *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue*.⁴⁹ This was a significant milestone for cartulary studies

⁴⁶ Ross, 'The Bannatyne Club', 203.

⁴⁷ This was emphasised by Cosmo Innes in his series of lectures on medieval Scottish records: Innes, *Lectures on Scotch Legal Antiquities*, 188–9 and 190–3. The charter's main value lay, he argued, in reconstructing local territorial history; for understanding 'dealings' such as sales, exchanges and settlements; for accessing 'juridical styles' from a time prior to formularies; and for the preservation of specific texts of significance. For a very similar view of the charter's, and therefore the cartulary's, value to scholarship, see William Angus, 'Charters, Cartularies and deeds, 1094–1700', in *An Introductory Survey of the Sources and Literature of Scots Law by Various Authors*, Stair Society 1 (Edinburgh, 1936), 259–73.

⁴⁸ William Nicholson, *The Scottish Historical Library, containing a short view of most of the writers, records, registers, law-books, etc. which may be serviceable to the undertakers of a general history of Scotland, down to the union of the two kingdoms in K. James the VI* (London, 1702), 210–28; George Mackenzie, *The Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation, with an abstract and catalogue of their works, their various editions, and the judgement of the learn'd concerning them*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1708–22), i, 466–70; Thomas Phillips, *Index to Cartularies Now or Formerly Existing Since the Dissolution of Monasteries* (Medio-Montanis, 1839), 42; W. B. D. D. Turnbull, *Fragmenta Scoto-Monastica* (Edinburgh, 1842), 3–15. See also Cosmo Innes' lists of cartularies printed, not yet printed, and lost: Innes, *Lectures on Scotch Legal Antiquities*, 191–3.

⁴⁹ This catalogue was evidently a long time in the making since the preface to the 1958 edition states (p. vii): 'More than a quarter century has elapsed since medievalists first began to discuss the making of this book'. The

and for charter scholarship generally. Davis' *Short Catalogue* lists around 1,344 manuscripts produced by and for religious houses and lay families across Great Britain. By the mid-1990s, it had become clear that 'the Davis', as it had come to be known, was in need of an update.⁵⁰ In 2000 it was announced that a second edition was being planned, led by the British Library.⁵¹ The new edition was published a decade later in 2010, entitled *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain and Ireland*, revised by Claire Breay, Julian Harrison and David M. Smith.⁵² It is this version that will be most familiar to medieval historians and manuscript curators today. As well as generally updating the existing contents of the catalogue, the new edition's main innovation was to add cartularies from Ireland and from 'secular corporations' (all in England), bringing the total number of manuscripts to over 2,000.⁵³ The Davis remains an essential starting point for identifying a particular cartulary, for surveying the corpus as a whole, or for identifying a modern archive's current holdings.

'Davis 2010' is divided into four parts, only the first two of which were originally part of 'Davis 1958': cartularies of religious houses (covering monasteries, cathedral chapters, hospitals, military orders, parish churches, and university colleges), secular cartularies (covering various lay families), cartularies of secular corporations (essentially boroughs, towns and cities), and cartularies of Ireland.⁵⁴ The chronological scope of Davis' catalogue of 'medieval cartularies' essentially includes manuscripts produced up to the sixteenth century, though a few seventeenth-century manuscripts are included as items as well.⁵⁵ This might reflect the extent to which cartularies are associated with monastic houses in particular, with the Reformation acting as a natural end point. It makes for an interesting point of contrast that the corpus of French cartularies is generally extended up to the Revolution in the eighteenth century.⁵⁶

Table 3 presents the number of cartularies relating to Scotland given in both editions. It reveals an expansion of the corpus after 1958, particularly in relation to lay cartularies. The ten 'secular cartularies' in Davis 2010 are for five different families (the Bruces, Douglasses, Scrymgeours, Setons, and earls of Lennox). The 98 for religious houses cover 47 institutions all of which were founded before the Scottish

dust-jacket notes that Davis himself began work on it in 1949. Godfrey Davis was the Deputy Keeper at the British Museum from 1961 to 1972, and secretary of the Historical Manuscripts Commission from 1972 to 1982.

⁵⁰ A few updates were noted soon after the catalogue's initial publication in 1958, and then with increasing frequency in the 1990s. The most significant of these notices for the Scottish cartularies were as follows: Anon., 'Scottish Cartularies', *SHR* 38 (1959), 172–4; John Durkan, 'Missing cartularies: the Thomas Innes evidence', *Innes Review* 22 (1971), 110–11; and Ian C. Cunningham, 'Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: amendments and additions to the Scottish section of Davis', *Monastic Research Bulletin* 3 (1997), 1–7. For other updates to the catalogue, see the notices published in the *Monastic Research Bulletin* in 1996 (by Philippa Hoskin), in 1997 (by Nicholas Vincent), in 1998 (by Nicholas Vincent), and in 1999 (by Nicholas Vincent and by Rosemary Hayes).

⁵¹ Claire Breay, 'Godfrey Davis, Medieval Cartularies: a second edition', *Monastic Research Bulletin* 6 (2000), 39–40.

⁵² Full references for the two publications are as follows: *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue*, ed. G. R. C. Davis (London, 1958); *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. G. R. C. Davis, revised by Claire Breay, Julian Harrison and David M. Smith (London, 2010). For ease, these volumes will be referred to here as 'Davis 1958' and 'Davis 2010', respectively.

⁵³ The numbering remained the same in Davis 2010, with new items slotted in using decimal points (e.g., a new item between 1116 and 1117 became 1116.1). Other, more subtle changes included restructuring the format of the entries (with standard headings for date, decoration, copies, editions, bibliography and provenance); adding a new preface; adding eight illustrative plates; and translating the manuscript measurements into metric. The introduction remained essentially the same as that written for the 1958 version (except with footnotes rather than references in the text).

⁵⁴ In Davis 2010, the cartularies of Scotland's religious houses are given at pp. 227–42 (nos. 1110–1185.3). The secular cartularies of England, Scotland and Wales are given collectively at pp. 243–83, with a condensed list of those relating to Scotland at p. 295 (nos. 1208.1, 1234.2–1234.7, 1279, 1318.3, 1320.1).

⁵⁵ Those examples of seventeenth-century manuscripts relating to Scottish institutions and families listed in Davis 2010 are no. 1116.1 (King's College, Aberdeen), no. 1130.2 (Coldingham Priory), no. 1169 (Melrose Abbey), and no. 1320.1 (Seton, earl of Winton). Early-modern antiquarian transcripts of collections are treated as 'copies' under the relevant item, rather than as separate entries in their own right.

⁵⁶ See, for example, the main equivalent catalogue of cartularies from France: Henri Stein, *Bibliographie générale des cartulaires français ou relatifs à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1907), *passim*.

Reformation, including monasteries, cathedrals, collegiate churches, chapels, universities, parish churches and hospitals. Both editions included references to manuscripts described as ‘destroyed’ and ‘untraced’, where a manuscript is known to have existed but its whereabouts is unknown.⁵⁷ If these items are removed, then Davis 1958 listed 69 surviving cartulary manuscripts from medieval Scotland, and Davis 2010 increased this to 92.

Table 3: Total number of cartulary manuscripts relating to Scotland listed in Davis, *Medieval Cartularies*

| | <i>Davis 1958</i> | <i>Davis 2010</i> |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Cartularies of religious houses | 76 | 98 |
| Secular cartularies | 1 | 10 |
| Total (all) | 77 | 108 |
| Total (surviving)⁵⁸ | 69 | 92 |

The initial purpose of Davis’ catalogue was to act as a basic finding aid for cartularies from Great Britain, many of which were thought to be obscured from historians. The dust-jacket to Davis 1958 paints a vivid picture of a field that was ‘fog-ridden, filled with Will-o’-the-Wisps, and bogged with half-truths’. It then lays out the catalogue’s four aims: to identify what cartularies existed and where; to describe them; to give their post-Dissolution history (essentially identifying their former owners); and to establish the relationship between cartularies (presumably meaning those for the same families or institutions). A skim through the contents of Davis 2010 gives the immediate impression that in compiling the catalogue Davis cast his net very wide indeed: the section for Scotland’s religious houses, for example, includes manuscripts which are described even in the catalogue itself as protocol books, inventories (sometimes in the form of a roll), registers made by commendators, notarial transsumpts and rentals, as well as an entry book, a Gospel book (with property records copied within), and a letter book.⁵⁹ This begs the question: what, in Davis’ eyes, was a cartulary?

In his introduction to the catalogue Davis outlined a general picture of how cartularies were broadly conceptualised: ‘Cartularies are registers of muniments, that is to say of the title-deeds (*carte*), charters of privilege (*privilegia*) and other documents which are kept by landowners as evidence of their personal or corporeal rights.’⁶⁰ Davis then sketched out a number of ‘types’ of cartulary: general and special cartularies, ‘cartularies of rights, privileges, etc.’, chronicle-cartularies, cartularies in Gospel books, and inventories.⁶¹ The heading ‘other registers etc.’ was given separately: these, Davis explained, had not been included systematically as they were too numerous, though they were occasionally referred to when deemed useful.⁶² It would appear, therefore, that Davis perceived a distinction between

⁵⁷ In both Davis 1958 and Davis 2010 the one cartulary described as ‘destroyed’ is no. 1136 (for Culross Abbey). In Davis 1958, the ‘untraced’ cartularies are nos. 1132, 1135, 1166, 1175, 1176, 1185, and 1279. In Davis 2010, the ‘untraced’ cartularies are nos. 1132, 1135, 1138.1, 1141.1, 1143, 1151.1, 1151.2, 1155.1, 1157, 1162.1, 1172.1, 1176, 1181.1, 1185, and 1185.1. Comparing the two lists, the following can be deduced: in the time between the two editions, three cartularies had been found or identified (no. 1166 (Isle of May/Pittenweem Priory), no. 1175 (St Andrews Cathedral Priory) and no. 1279 (earldom of Lennox)); two had been lost or could no longer be identified in 2010 (no. 1143 (grants by the commendators of Dunkeld Cathedral) and no. 1157 (Inchaffray Abbey register of leases)); five remained lost or destroyed (nos. 1132, 1135, 1136, 1176, 1185); and new references to nine ‘untraced’ manuscripts were added (nos. 1138.1, 1141.1, 1151.1, 1151.2, 1155.1, 1162.1, 1172.1, 1181.1, 1185.1).

⁵⁸ These figures exclude those items described as ‘untraced’ or ‘destroyed’.

⁵⁹ Examples of these are as follows: notarial protocol books (nos. 1152, 1152.1, 1154, 1155); inventories in the form of rolls (nos. 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1234.3, 1234.4, 1234.5, 1234.6); commendator registers (nos. 1123, 1142, 1143, 1160, 1161, 1169); notarial transsumpts (nos. 1136.1, 1158, 1159, 1185.3); rentals (nos. 1148, 1153, 1181); the entry book (no. 1170); the Gospel book (no. 1137); and the letter book (no. 1177).

⁶⁰ Davis 2010, p. xiv.

⁶¹ Davis 2010, pp. xv–xvii.

⁶² Davis 2010, p. xvii: ‘The brief references which have been necessary to many of them [the ‘other registers etc.’], because they have at some stage of their history been wrongly described as cartularies, because they have

‘cartularies’ (of which there were many ‘types’) and ‘registers’ as a more general category. The 1958 book’s dust-jacket speaks more directly to this basic distinction: it notes that the edition ‘cites about 1,350 manuscripts of which some 900 are cartularies; the remainder round off the picture in some essential way’. The catalogue is, therefore, self-consciously inclusive of some of these ‘other registers’.

When we turn to the catalogue itself, we find that Davis’ cartulary typologies have not been used to strictly define each item. In the section on Scotland’s religious houses, several manuscripts are referred to as a ‘general cartulary’ but otherwise a scattering of descriptions are used, including simply a ‘cartulary’, a ‘fragment’ of a cartulary, an ‘inventory’, or some kind of ‘transumpt’ or ‘authenticated transcript’. Some are also described as a kind of ‘register’ (whether of writs or leases, or compiled for the commendators, or a composite or miscellaneous register). The array of terms used to describe the manuscripts in the catalogue is illustrated in Appendix B. Davis’ typologies and also his descriptors for each manuscript might best be viewed, therefore, as more like general impressions than strict classifications or criteria for inclusion. His own sense of what constituted a cartulary may seem precise, but the reality appears to be somewhat less cut and dried.

Before proceeding with this observation, it is important to look back to Davis 1958 to examine Davis’ original work on its own terms. Here, a fundamental difference can be revealed. In the 1958 edition, paragraph marks (¶) can be found throughout the catalogue followed by the words ‘Other registers etc.’. These marks are then followed by numbered items. An example might be Melrose Abbey, under which is listed two regular items (nos. 1167 and 1168), followed by the heading ¶ *Other registers etc.*, under which is listed two more items, both sixteenth-century registers of the commendators (nos. 1169 and 1170). Another example is Glasgow Cathedral’s two medieval cartularies (nos. 1150 and 1151), which were separated from two ‘other registers’: a sixteenth-century rental and a notary’s protocol book (nos. 1152 and 1153). There are many other cases like this, where Davis plainly communicated this core distinction to the reader.⁶³ He did not, therefore, consider the commendators’ registers or protocol books or rentals to be cartularies *per se*. Following this approach, some institutions are in fact given with an initial note ‘no cartulary recorded’, followed by an item or items headed ¶ *Other registers etc.* Coldingham Priory’s entry, for example, states ‘no cartulary recorded’ followed by ¶ *Other registers etc.*, and a list of four inventory rolls (nos. 1127–30). In a similar way, both Holyrood Abbey and Jedburgh Abbey have ‘no cartulary recorded’ but are included in the catalogue because of their sixteenth-century commendator records.⁶⁴ A community might be included, therefore, even if they had no cartulary as such but other relevant manuscripts were available that were useful for the historian to know about. Appendix B lists those cartularies given in Davis 1958 when the ‘other registers’ (and the untraced manuscripts) are stripped away: 37 in total for 25 institutions.

An illustration of this method is the monastery of Deer in Aberdeenshire. It is included in Davis 1958 with the note ‘no cartulary recorded’. Under ‘other registers’ is given CUL Ii.6.32, otherwise known as ‘The Book of Deer’. The logic here was, presumably, that while no cartulary was known to exist for the monastery as such, anyone interested in the archive of Deer might want to be informed that this Gospel book contained property records, added in Gaelic in the first half of the twelfth century.⁶⁵ No scholar would think of the Book of Deer as a typical cartulary by any stretch. But Davis’ method is

descents which throw light on the fate of cartularies now lost, or because they have similar claims to a place in the picture to be presented here, should consequently not be regarded as complete.’

⁶³ Of those institutions listed under Scotland’s religious houses in Davis 1958, twenty out of 38 have ‘other registers’ of some kind: these are Aberdeen Cathedral, Arbroath Abbey, Coldingham Priory, Coupar Angus Abbey, Deer Abbey, Dunfermline Abbey, Holyrood Abbey, Holy Trinity collegiate church, St Giles’ parish church, Leith Hospital, Glasgow Cathedral, Inchaffray Abbey, Inchcolm Abbey, Jedburgh Abbey, Lincluden collegiate church, May Priory, Melrose Abbey, St Andrews Cathedral, Scone Abbey, and Torphichen preceptory. ‘Other registers’ can be found in the secular cartularies section too, though less frequently and not for the one Scottish family in Davis 1958 (the earls of Lennox).

⁶⁴ The eight institutions which are described as having ‘no cartulary recorded’ but which have been included in Davis 1958 because ‘other registers’ were known to exist are Coldingham Priory, Deer Abbey, Holyrood Abbey, Leith Hospital, Inchcolm Abbey, Jedburgh Abbey, Lincluden collegiate church, and Torphichen preceptory.

⁶⁵ Dauvit Broun, ‘The property records in the Book of Deer as a source for early Scottish society’, in *Studies on the Book of Deer*, ed. Katherine Forsyth (Dublin, 2008), 313–60, at 327–49.

clear: his aim was not to construct a definitive list of those manuscripts that he considered ‘cartularies’ strictly defined, but to produce a guide to the relevant materials and resources for anyone interested in the archives of a particular family or religious institution. The Deer example also, however, illustrates a tension in Davis’ explanation if not his method, since ‘cartularies in Gospel books’ are singled out in the introduction as a specific ‘type of cartulary’, with the Book of Deer explicitly given as an example.⁶⁶ Again, this suggests that the typologies should be taken lightly as impressions, not hard and fast classifications.

A significant change was introduced in Davis 2010. The original paragraph marks and sub-headings indicating ‘no cartulary recorded’ and ‘other registers, etc.’ were removed.⁶⁷ It is not unnatural, therefore, to see each item in Davis 2010 as a reference to a cartulary, all with an equal status. Without the sub-headings to differentiate, the catalogue naturally reads as though Davis thought that the cartulary was a very ill-defined manuscript indeed, including protocol books, notarial transumps, rentals, commendators books, Gospel books, and inventory rolls. While this is not exactly the case, what these items did all have in common for Davis was their association with charter texts. This opens up the possibility that what was originally guiding Godfrey Davis was not a clear view of the cartulary as a distinct ‘type’ of manuscript but a broader picture of manuscripts containing copies of document texts or property records (or occasionally abridgements or inventories). If access to material derived from an archive was the goal of the *Short Catalogue*, then his inclusion of many varied manuscripts under ‘other registers, etc.’ can readily be understood. Assorted material such as Deer’s Gospel book, or Coldingham Priory’s inventory rolls of their archive, or Holyrood Abbey’s registers by the commendators, have all been offered a place in the catalogue because of the direct relationship they have to property records.

This approach is not dissimilar to the nineteenth-century editors, whose work also revolved around the idea of the cartulary as a collection of document texts. Both also did so primarily through the lens of the holders of the medieval archives—the families or institutions from whose archives the document texts were derived.⁶⁸ It is perhaps worth remembering that finding lists of cartularies such as the Davis are particularly important in a context where many cartularies remain unpublished and so their existence and their contents are less well known. Indeed, his descriptions routinely note the presence of certain kinds of document in each manuscript, with many described as ‘containing royal, papal and episcopal charters *passim*’.⁶⁹ This also gives a context to why early modern transcriptions of all or part of the cartularies are noted as further sources of material.⁷⁰

G. R. C. Davis’ wealth of experience with cartulary manuscripts is perhaps unrivalled even today, and his catalogue represents a highly significant piece of work and an indispensable guide.⁷¹ It is important, however, not to read the full list as a single statement of Davis’ view of the cartulary. Instead,

⁶⁶ Davis 2010, p. xvi, n. 20. This tension can also be seen in the case of Coldingham Priory which is said to have ‘no cartulary’ but is included because of four inventory rolls (nos. 1127–1130). This contrasts with Davis’ typologies since ‘inventories’ are given as a ‘type’ of cartulary in the introduction.

⁶⁷ This subtle difference was not noted by reviewers of Davis 2010. See, for example, John S. Moore’s review in *Economic History Review* 64 (2011), 671–2; David X. Carpenter’s review in *EHR* vol. 126, no. 523 (2011), 1511–12; and Katherine Christensen’s review in *The Historian* 73 (2011), 864–6.

⁶⁸ The way the printed volumes are presented in the catalogue is notably different: in Davis 2010 the editions appear under each item (i.e., per manuscript); in Davis 1958 they were listed either under the manuscript where only one item was given for an institution, or under the institution or family heading if there was more than one manuscript listed (i.e., per archive). In other words, Davis 1958 perhaps appreciated that the printed volumes were often based on multiple manuscript sources derived from a single archive.

⁶⁹ See, for example, the descriptions of nos. 1117, 1125, 1126, 1138, 1150 and 1168.

⁷⁰ Regular note is also made in the catalogue of where there are examples of illumination or coloured lettering. This is something that may have been of particular interest to the cataloguer, suggesting Davis had this context in mind as well.

⁷¹ It is perhaps worth noting that Davis’ own knowledge seems to have related mainly to English cartularies, probably as a result of his position as Deputy Keeper at the British Museum (1961–72). The illustrative examples he cites in the introduction, for instance, are mostly English monastic cartularies. Only two from Scotland are cited: Coldstream Priory’s cartulary in the British Library (no. 1131: Davis 2010, p. xviii, n. 31) and the Book of Deer (no. 1137: Davis 2010, p. xvi, n. 20).

‘the Davis’ is best understood as a handlist for identifying copies and other records of charters produced by particular communities or families. Like the antiquarian publications, it provides another route to the cartulary manuscripts themselves. While the 2010 edition will no doubt remain the main point of reference for years to come, it still pays to return to the original work which can offer a different perspective, one closer to Davis’ own conception of the cartulary’s function and use.

Approaching a new understanding of Scotland’s medieval cartularies

It should now be clear that in order to fully appreciate the achievements of the antiquarian publications and the Davis catalogue, their work needs to be seen in relation to each project’s original intentions and scope. While both attempted to provide historians with a certain level of access to the manuscripts and their texts, unless the work is read in context the medieval cartulary can in fact become obscured rather exposed. Assessing the virtues and limitations of this scholarly work is much easier to do when the nature of the manuscript itself that is being ‘edited’ or catalogued is realised.

Gaining a handle on the cartulary manuscripts themselves is not so straightforward, however. Despite any impression of uniformity that might be gauged from the editions, catalogues or general studies, the medieval cartulary is in fact an inherently complex and dynamic object. Recent scholarship has emphasised the extent to which they were not simply transcripts of an archive, and instead the scribes were being selective in what they copied and deliberate in how they ordered it, though their logic is not always clear. In other words, the cartulary is now conceptualised as a kind of ‘text’ in its own right.⁷² The cartulary is best understood, therefore, as essentially a creative, personal and responsive activity that differed depending on time, place, or archival environment. It is for this reason that the corpus or ‘genre’ of cartularies is so varied, and tends to defy definition.

Let us explore this further by considering Scotland’s extant cartulary manuscripts. The closest thing to a coherent list of Scotland’s cartularies might seem to be that provided by Davis 1958, as given in Appendix B. This list of 37 manuscripts excludes anything described as ‘other register’ and anything that was ‘untraced’ at the time. What remains is something of a mixed bag, however. There is significant variety in the basic look and size of each manuscript, let alone in the details of how and when they were compiled, the number of scribes involved, when they were bound into their current form, and what kinds of texts they contain and in what order. Paisley Abbey’s cartulary, for example, is a sixteenth-century, single-scribe work on paper; Dunfermline Abbey’s cartulary contains dozens of scribes working from the mid-thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, and the manuscript probably existed unbound for a long part of this period; Cambuskenneth Abbey’s is an authenticated transcript produced by a notary in 1535, with ornate illuminations;⁷³ and Newbattle Abbey’s cartulary was mainly the work of one scribe in the mid-fourteenth century but was also added to soon after by new scribes.⁷⁴ There is, in other words, no ‘standard cartulary’. This variety is not a Scottish affectation: cartularies from elsewhere in Britain and Ireland as well as the continent exhibit a very similar assortment of features. What can be said about the list of manuscripts in Appendix B, however, is that they are all manuscript books which contain predominantly copies of document texts from a particular archive.⁷⁵ Many include other material in addition (such as contents lists, records of taxations, or documents derived from other

⁷² One of the most extensive summaries of this field is Pierre Chastang, ‘Cartulaires, cartularisation et scripturalité médiévale: la structuration d’un nouveau champ de recherche’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 49 (2006), 21–31. An early example of this way of thinking in relation to English cartularies is demonstrated in Foulds, ‘Medieval Cartularies’. A more recent and larger-scale study which views the cartulary as a text that reflects contemporary perceptions of the abbey’s social networks is Emilia Jamrozziak, *Rievaulx Abbey and its Social Context, 1132–1300: Memory, Locality, and Networks* (Turnhout, 2005).

⁷³ The Cambuskenneth cartulary manuscript was also once sealed by the king’s great seal, though only the cords now remain.

⁷⁴ Shelf marks for each of these cartularies can be found in Appendix B.

⁷⁵ There are examples beyond Scotland where the cartulary took the form of a roll. French examples from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries are currently being investigated as part of the *Agence Nationale de la Recherche* ‘Rotulus’ project (2019–2021), directed by Jean-Baptiste Renault at the Université de Lorraine: see <<https://crulh.univ-lorraine.fr/content/anr-rotulus>>.

archives) and some scribes did not transcribe the full document text (such as the Dryburgh Abbey scribe, who notoriously omitted the witness lists).

How can this varied corpus, and the medieval cartulary in general, be best understood, therefore? A natural temptation might be to break down the list of manuscripts into further groups (such as Davis' 'types'), or to seek criteria that would help to slim down the corpus to only the most 'true' cartularies. But this would appear to miss an essential point: that, for contemporaries, there was no single idea of what their cartulary should look like towards which every scribe was working. Instead of seeking to define and constrain this multifarious corpus, a fundamentally new working method is needed.

One place to start is by abandoning any notion of the medieval cartulary as an exclusive 'category' of manuscript, corresponding to a set corpus that can be precisely delineated. Instead, 'the cartulary' could be understood as something more flexible and open, as a concept for exploring a single phenomenon: the act of copying documents in the medieval period. This was clearly an activity that manifested in a range of ways, and was undertaken independently by many different communities and individuals in relation to their own archives across the Middle Ages. Instead of wrestling with a single definition or a single means of understanding the medieval cartulary, this approach allows us to embrace the varied corpus as a virtue, offering as it does an insight into the different creative responses to the activity of copying documents. By re-orientating what we understand 'the cartulary' to represent, we can arrive at a broader vision of these manuscripts that also chimes with the more diffuse corpus presented in the Davis 2010 catalogue.

Seen in this light, the essential diversity in the corpus of manuscripts we call 'cartularies' becomes a point of real interest, especially their physical and material differences. To make the most of this, new methodologies are required that help to establish the particular nature and history of each individual cartulary: from its initial creation to its later additions and binding.⁷⁶ Focusing on the materiality of the cartulary also encourages us to see them in relation to other kinds of medieval manuscript, rather than as an exclusive category. Cartularies can, for example, display remarkably similar physical characteristics to commonplace books, miscellanies and annalistic chronicles.⁷⁷ Such parallels are difficult to observe, however, if taking the antiquarian publications as the sole point of reference, which prioritise the texts over the manuscript's materiality. Foregrounding the manuscript itself, and its physicality in particular, affords an opportunity to re-assess what we consider to be the key characteristics of a cartulary, and what its chief value is to historians.

Essentially, therefore, this approach recommends making the manuscript more central to the way we approach their texts. This has implications for any study involving a corpus of medieval charters found wholly or partially in cartularies, but it also applies to those cases where a cartulary is only being consulted for a single text which just so happens to be preserved in a cartulary. Alasdair Ross has already warned against an uncritical reliance on the texts in publications without recourse to the manuscripts. The process of consulting a cartulary manuscript's texts will become far more feasible in future with the increasing pace of digitisation of medieval manuscripts generally. For Scotland in particular, there is currently a large-scale digitisation of the cartularies in the National Library of Scotland's Advocates' Manuscripts collection, which will make digital images freely available for at least 23 manuscripts: this equates to 50% of those manuscripts given in Appendix B, and around 25% of the 92 extant manuscripts listed in Davis 2010 (see Table 3).⁷⁸ But the central problem runs much deeper than simply checking that the nineteenth-century publications have accurate transcriptions. To really understand a text's creation and survival, it must be seen in its manuscript context. For working

⁷⁶ A new methodology for analysing multi-scribe cartularies is developed in Joanna Tucker, *Reading and Shaping Medieval Cartularies: Multi-scribe Manuscripts and their Patterns of Growth. A study of the earliest cartularies of Glasgow Cathedral and Lindores Abbey* (Woodbridge, 2020).

⁷⁷ Similarities can be found in relation to their multi-scribe character and their flexible design as potentially unbound manuscripts. These themes are developed in Tucker, *Reading and Shaping Medieval Cartularies*.

⁷⁸ The 23 cartulary manuscripts in Davis 2010 that are part of the NLS Adv. MS collection are as follows (with those in Appendix B in bold): nos. **1111**, 1114, **1118**, 1120, **1124**, **1126**, **1134**, **1138**, **1139**, 1148, **1149**, **1162**, **1165**, **1167**, **1171**, **1172**, **1173**, **1174**, 1178, **1179**, **1180**, **1182** and **1184**. At the time of writing, the digital images of these cartularies were due to be published online by the end of 2020.

with cartulary texts, what survives, when, where and why can only be understood once the decisions of the individual cartularists are appreciated in context: which scribe copied the text, when were they working, did they add many texts or a one-off, where on the page and in the gathering did they copy it, how did they represent the text visually, how selective was the cartulary as a whole, and when was it put together and bound into a single volume? A study based on, for example, Dunfermline Abbey's charters or the charters of the earls of Fife must be aware at the outset of the nature of the source base to which we have access, and for cartularies especially this means their unpredictability and selectivity. The manuscript context must therefore be central not only to how we work with charter texts in cartularies but to how we think about the medieval cartulary and its contents. Although the cartulary is so much more dynamic than simply being a preserver of charter texts, this is the dominant interpretation encouraged by the most extensively used resources for studying cartularies from Scotland. For their scribes, however, often these manuscripts were active, living objects that existed alongside, and were distinct from, their archive of documents.

Conclusion

The wealth of resources available for studying Scotland's medieval cartularies puts researchers who use them in a unique position of advantage—this includes a subject-specific catalogue of all known extant and lost cartularies ('the Davis'); an extensive range of publications of their texts; calendars relating to many of the publications (the *Syllabus of Scottish Cartularies*); a free online database providing the most recent publication references, dates and English summaries of the document texts ('PoMS'); as well as free access in the near future to digitisations of many of Scotland's medieval cartularies (those in the Advocates' Manuscripts collection in the National Library of Scotland). Any scholar with an interest in cartularies will no doubt draw upon all of this work in different ways, whether for identifying the relevant manuscripts, for transcriptions of particular texts, for the extensive histories they provide for their subject, for images of the manuscript's pages and binding, or for identifying and dating the texts. It will be a long time before any of these resources are replaced, if at all, by new editions, catalogues, databases, or digital images. It is essential, therefore, that we approach each on their own terms and with a deep awareness of how they relate to the cartulary as a medieval phenomenon rather than as a modern category.

By conducting a detailed analysis of the most widely used resources for working with cartularies, this article has highlighted some of the ambiguities and assumptions that have become embedded and are particularly problematic for developing an understanding of the cartulary. The antiquarian publications, for example, can be said to encourage an alluring picture of uniformity in terms of what the cartulary is, what it contains, and what its value is to historians. The most recent Davis catalogue, on the other hand, might suggest that the term 'cartulary' can be applied very generously to all sorts of manuscripts, and that as a concept the cartulary is only vaguely understood by modern scholars. In a Scottish context, enduring issues are in a large part because of our reliance on the 'editions', which are remote from the manuscripts themselves. It has been suggested here that this distance has created further false illusions, not just in our terminology but in our overall conception of the cartulary itself.

Rather than try to tighten our definition of the medieval cartulary, to construct a single, coherent corpus and patrol its boundaries, the idea of the cartulary could instead be understood as a more dynamic concept, in such a way that responds to the shape of the 'corpus' as it stands. The cartulary might be seen as essentially a starting point for engaging with a wide landscape of documentary material produced by communities and individuals throughout the Middle Ages. For such an approach to be successful, however, we must return to the manuscripts themselves and see them in their own terms, not through those lenses fashioned in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to which we have become so accustomed.

Appendix A: Publications relating to Scotland's medieval cartularies

Only publications by an antiquarian club or society which involve a medieval cartulary manuscript as a source have been included in this survey. This means that publications which only concern original charters, or are based on an early modern transcript of a cartulary, have been excluded.⁷⁹ The main source for identifying the relevant publications is David and Wendy B. Stevenson, *Scottish Texts and Calendars: An Analytical Guide to Serial Publications* (Edinburgh, 1987). By focusing on publications by the major clubs and societies this list includes those publications most extensively used by historians. The list does not, however, represent all extant cartulary manuscripts: not all manuscripts were used as sources in the publications, and a few remain unpublished today.⁸⁰ There are also issues in terms of what is considered a 'cartulary manuscript' in this context: there are some published manuscripts included in the Davis catalogue, for instance, that are examples of the more disparate 'other registers'.⁸¹ These have not been included here.

The table is structured by the publication's 'subject' (the source of the archive, in other words, whether an institution or a family). Only one, Lindores Abbey, is listed twice on account of its unique status as the subject of two separate publications, one for each cartulary (one was published in 1841, the other was rediscovered in the 1880s and was published in 1903). Multi-volume publications are counted as one (that is, those for Melrose, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Kelso, Arbroath, Morton, Brechin, and St Nicholas' parish church, Aberdeen). Distinct works printed as one physical volume, by contrast, are counted separately (that is, the Abbotsford volume of 1841 which contains publications for both Balmerino and Lindores). In one case, there are two distinct works within the same volume relating to two subjects (the Dominican Friars and Our Lady's College, Glasgow) but only one part is based on a cartulary (that for Our Lady's College). The titles given in the table reflect the version on the fullest title page of the work. Subtitles to the separate volumes have been given where these offer an insight into their content. The short forms of the publication titles are those established in 'List of abbreviated titles of the printed sources of Scottish history to 1560', *SHR* 42 Supplement (1963), i–xxxii (note that these are the shorter versions given in square brackets, not the primary abbreviations that are given).

| | <i>Subject</i> | <i>Full title</i> | <i>Short form of title</i> | <i>Editor</i> | <i>Publisher</i> | <i>Year of publication</i> |
|----|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. | Paisley Abbey | <i>Registrum Monasterii de Passelet. Cartas privilegia conventiones aliaque munimenta complectens. A domo fundata A.D. MCLXIII usque ad A.D. MDXXIX. Ad fidem codicis M.S. in Bibliotheca Facultatis Juridicae Edinensis servati nunc primum typis mandatum.</i> | <i>Pais. Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Maitland Club | 1832 |
| 2. | Melrose Abbey | <i>Liber Sancte Marie de Melros. Munimenta vetustiora monasterii Cisterciensis de Melros.</i> | <i>Melr. Lib.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1837 |
| 3. | Elgin Cathedral (Moray) | <i>Registrum Episcopatus Moraviensis. E pluribus codicibus consarcinatum circa A.D. MCCCC. Cum</i> | <i>Moray Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1837 |

⁷⁹ See above, p. XXX, nn. 5 and 6.

⁸⁰ See above, p. XXX, n. 14.

⁸¹ This includes those manuscripts listed in Davis 1958 for Coldingham, Deer, Holyrood, Inchcolm, or Lincluden collegiate church.

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------|
| | | <i>continuazione diplomatum recentiorum usque ad A.D. MDCXXIII.</i> | | | | |
| 4. | St Andrews Cathedral Priory | <i>Liber Cartarum Prioratus Sancti Andree in Scotia. E registro ipso in archivis baronum de Panmure hodie asservato.</i> | <i>St A. Lib.</i> | T. Thomson | Bannatyne Club | 1841 |
| 5. | Balmerino Abbey | <i>The Chartularies of Balmerino and Lindores now first printed from the original MSS in the library of the Faculty of Advocates. (Subtitle page: Liber Sancte Marie de Balmorinach.)</i> | <i>Balm. Lib.</i> | W. B. D. D. Turnbull | Abbotsford Club | 1841 |
| 6. | Lindores Abbey (1) | <i>The Chartularies of Balmerino and Lindores now first printed from the original MSS in the library of the Faculty of Advocates. (Subtitle page: Liber Sancte Marie de Lunderis.)</i> | <i>Lind. Lib.</i> | W. B. D. D. Turnbull | Abbotsford Club | 1841 |
| 7. | Dunfermline Abbey | <i>Registrum de Dunfermelyn. Liber cartarum abbacie Benedictine S. S. Trinitatis et B. Margarete regine de Dunfermelyn.</i> | <i>Dunf. Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1842 |
| 8. | Scone Abbey | <i>Liber Ecclesie de Scon. Munimenta vetustiora monasterii Sancte Trinitatis et Sancti Michaelis de Scon.</i> | <i>Scone Liber</i> ⁸² | [C. Innes] ⁸³ | Bannatyne Club and Maitland Club | 1843 |
| 9. | Glasgow Cathedral | <i>Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis. Munimenta ecclesie metropolitane Glasguensis. A sede restaurata seculo ineunte XII ad reformatam religionem.</i> | <i>Glas. Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club and Maitland Club | 1843 |
| 10. | Aberdeen Cathedral | <i>Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis. Ecclesie cathedralis Aberdonensis regesta que extant in unum collecta.</i> | <i>Abdn. Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Spalding Club and Maitland Club | 1845 |
| 11. | Kelso Abbey | <i>Registrum Cartarum Abbacie Tironensis de Kelso, 1113–1567.</i> | <i>Kel. Lib.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1846 |
| 12. | Our Lady's College, Glasgow | <i>Liber Collegii Nostri Domine. Registrum ecclesie B. V. Marie et S. Anne infra muros civitatis Glasguensis MDXLIX. Accedunt munimenta Fratrum Predicatorum de Glasgu. Domus Dominicane apud Glasguenses carte que supersunt MCCXLIV–MDLIX.</i> | <i>St Mary Lib.</i> | J. Robertson | Maitland Club | 1846 |

⁸² This volume is not given a shorter form in the *SHR*'s 'List of abbreviated titles'. PoMS, on the other hand, refers to *Scone Lib.*

⁸³ For the identification of Cosmo Innes as the editor, see Ross, 'The Bannatyne Club', 210, note 38.

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|
| 13. | Dryburgh Abbey | <i>Liber S. Marie de Dryburgh. Registrum cartarum abbacie Premonstratensis de Dryburgh.</i> | <i>Dryb. Lib.</i> | W. Fraser | Bannatyne Club | 1847 |
| 14. | Inchaffray Abbey | <i>Liber Insule Missarum. Abbacie canonicorum regularium B. Virginis et S. Johannis de Inchaffery registrum vetus. Premissis quibusdam comitatus antique de Stratherne reliquiis.</i> | <i>Inchaff. Lib.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1847 |
| 15. | Arbroath Abbey | <i>Liber S. Thome de Aberbrothoc. Registrorum abbacie de Aberbrothoc.</i> Volume 1: <i>Pars prior. Registrum vetus, munimenta que eidem coetanea complectens, 1178–1329.</i> Volume 2: <i>Pars altera. Registrum nigrum necnon libros cartarum recentiores complectens, 1329–1536.</i> | <i>Arb. Lib.</i> | C. Innes and P. Chalmers | Bannatyne Club | 1848–56 |
| 16. | Newbattle Abbey | <i>Registrum S. Marie de Neubotle. Abbacie Cisterciensis Beate Virginis de Neubotle chartarium vetus. Accedit appendix cartarum originalium, 1140–1528.</i> | <i>Newb. Reg.</i> | C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1849 |
| 17. | Earldom of Morton | <i>Registrum Honoris de Morton. A series of ancient charters of the earldom of Morton with other original papers in two volumes.</i> Volume 1: <i>Original papers.</i> Volume 2: <i>Ancient charters.</i> | <i>Mort. Reg.</i> | T. Thomson, A. Macdonald and C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1853 |
| 18. | Brechin Cathedral | <i>Registrum Episcopatus Brechinensis. Cui accedunt cartae quamplurimae originales.</i> Volume 1: <i>Registrum.</i> Volume 2: <i>Appendix cartarum.</i> | <i>Brech. Reg.</i> | P. Chalmers and C. Innes | Bannatyne Club | 1856 |
| 19. | St Giles' parish church, Edinburgh | <i>Registrum Cartarum Ecclesie Sancti Egidii de Edinburgh. A series of charters and original documents connected with the church of St Giles Edinburgh, MCCCXLIV – MDLXVII.</i> | <i>St Giles Reg.</i> | D. Laing | Bannatyne Club | 1859 |
| 20. | Hospital of Soutra, Holy Trinity collegiate church, and other collegiate churches in mid-Lothian | <i>Registrum Domus de Soltre. Necnon Ecclesie Collegiate S. Trinitatis prope Edinburgh etc. Charters of the Hospital of Soltre, of Trinity College, Edinburgh, and other collegiate churches in mid-Lothian.</i> | — | D. Laing | Bannatyne Club | 1861 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|
| 21. | Cambuskenneth Abbey | <i>Registrum Monasterii S. Marie de Cambuskenneth, A.D. 1147–1535.</i> | <i>Camb. Reg.</i> | W. Fraser | Grampian Club | 1872 |
| 22. | Crail collegiate church | <i>Register of the Collegiate Church of Crail, with introductory remarks by the Rev. Charles Rogers, LL.D.</i> | <i>Crail Register</i> | C. Rogers | Grampian Club | 1877 |
| 23. | Coldstream Priory | <i>Chartulary of the Cistercian Priory of Coldstream with relative documents.</i> | <i>Cold. Cart.</i> | C. Rogers | Grampian Club | 1879 |
| 24. | Stirling chapel royal | <i>History of the Chapel Royal of Scotland with the Register of the Chapel Royal of Stirling, including details in relation to the rise and progress of Scottish music, and observations respecting the Order of the Thistle.</i> | — | C. Rogers | Grampian Club | 1882 |
| 25. | St Nicholas' parish church, Aberdeen | <i>Cartularium Ecclesiae Sancti Nicolai Aberdonensis.</i> | <i>St Nich. Cart.</i> | J. Cooper | Spalding Club | 1888–92 |
| 26. | Lindores Abbey (2) | <i>The Chartulary of Lindores Abbey, 1195–1479. Edited from the original manuscript at Caprington Castle, Kilmarnock, with translation and abstracts of the charters, illustrative notes, and appendices, by the Right Rev. John Dowden, D.D., bishop of Edinburgh.</i> | <i>Lind. Cart.</i> | J. Dowden | Scottish History Society | 1903 |

Appendix B: List of ‘Davis 1958’ extant cartulary manuscripts relating to Scotland

The table lists the items given in the 1958 version of G. R. C. Davis’ *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain: A Short Catalogue*, excluding those items described there, under a paragraph mark (¶), as ‘other registers’, and also removing those that were ‘untraced’ or ‘destroyed’. The result is a list of Scotland’s cartulary manuscripts extant in 1958 as more strictly conceived by Davis. The most prominent omission is St Andrews Cathedral Priory’s cartulary, which was ‘untraced’ at the time but was then ‘rediscovered’ in the 1960s when it was deposited in the Scottish Record Office, now the National Records of Scotland (NRS GD45/27/8).

The subjects in this table follow the alphabetical order as given in Davis. The ‘descriptions’ are extracted from the summaries of each manuscript in Davis 1958. They reinforce the variety of this corpus in reality, and the fact that Davis’ ‘typologies’ (and the distinction with ‘registers’) were not as cleanly applicable as his introduction might suggest. The shelf marks have been derived from the 2010 catalogue in order to give the most up to date references. In two cases (the Glasgow Cathedral cartularies) the manuscripts have moved since 2010 and so their more recent shelf marks have been given. As for the dates, it should be borne in mind that those given by Davis were usually derived from the date of the contents, rather than the date that the cartulary scribes were working, which could be much later than the texts that they copied.⁸⁴ For a few of the manuscripts, Davis was able to be more specific because the cartulary scribe had internally dated their work (such as in the cartularies of Cambuskenneth Abbey, Coldstream Priory, and Elgin Hospital). In order to provide an overall impression of this information, the dates given by Davis for each manuscript have been expressed broadly as centuries.

| | <i>Subject</i> | <i>Davis number</i> | <i>Manuscript shelf mark</i> | <i>Description in Davis</i> | <i>Davis date (by century)</i> |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Aberdeen Cathedral | no. 1110 | AUL MS 247 | Composite register | 14 th –16 th |
| 2. | | no. 1111 | NLS Adv. MS 16.1.10 | Composite misc. register | 14 th –16 th |
| 3. | | no. 1112 | AUL MS 249 | Cartulary | 15 th –16 th |
| 4. | | no. 1113 | AUL MS 248 | Cartulary | 16 th |
| 5. | Aberdeen, St Nicholas’ parish church | no. 1116 | Aberdeen City Archives, St Nicholas Cartulary | Register | 15 th –16 th |
| 6. | Arbroath Abbey | no. 1117 | Dundee City Archives GD130/25/17 | Fragments | 13 th –14 th |
| 7. | | no. 1118 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.2 | Cartulary | 14 th |
| 8. | | no. 1119 | BL Add. MS 33245 | Register | 16 th |
| 9. | Balmerino Abbey | no. 1124 | NLS Adv. MS 34.5.3 | Cartulary | 14 th |
| 10. | Brechin Cathedral | no. 1125 | NRS GD45/13/301 | General cartulary | 16 th |
| 11. | Cambuskenneth Abbey | no. 1126 | NLS Adv. MS 34.1.2 | Authenticated transcript | 16 th |
| 12. | Coldstream Priory | no. 1131 | BL Harley MS 6670 | General cartulary | 15 th |

⁸⁴ This is established by the new methodology in Tucker, *Reading and Shaping Medieval Cartularies*.

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 13. | Crail collegiate church | no. 1134 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.6 | Transcript | 16 th |
| 14. | Dryburgh Abbey | no. 1138 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.7 | Cartulary | 15 th |
| 15. | Dunfermline Abbey | no. 1139 | NLS Adv. MS 34.1.3A | Composite register | 13 th –16 th |
| 16. | Edinburgh, Holy Trinity collegiate church | no. 1144 | Edinburgh City Archives SL152/8/1 | Misc. register | 16 th |
| 17. | Edinburgh, St Giles' parish church | no. 1146 | NRS GD45/13/123 | Register | 14 th –15 th |
| 18. | Elgin Hospital | no. 1149 | NLS Adv. MS 34.7.2 | Authenticated copies | 16 th |
| 19. | Glasgow Cathedral | no. 1150 | AUL SCA MS JB 1/3 | General cartulary | 13 th –15 th |
| 20. | | no. 1151 | AUL SCA MS JB 1/4/1 | Transcript | 15 th |
| 21. | Glasgow, Our Lady's College | no. 1154 | Glasgow City Archives D-TC2/22/1 | Notarial copy | 16 th |
| 22. | | no. 1155 | Glasgow City Archives D-TC2/22/2 | A second copy of no. 1154 | 16 th |
| 23. | Inchaffray Abbey | no. 1156 | Private owner | General cartulary | 15 th |
| 24. | Kelso Abbey | no. 1162 | NLS Adv. MS 34.5.1 | General cartulary | 14 th |
| 25. | Lindores Abbey | no. 1164 | Private owner | General cartulary | 13 th –15 th |
| 26. | | no. 1165 | NLS Adv. MS 34.7.1 | Cartulary | 16 th |
| 27. | Melrose Abbey | no. 1167 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.11 | Part of a cartulary | 13 th |
| 28. | | no. 1168 | BL Harley MS 3960 | Cartulary | 15 th |
| 29. | Moray, Elgin Cathedral | no. 1171 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.10 | Composite register | 13 th –16 th |
| 30. | | no. 1172 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.9 | — ⁸⁵ | 16 th |
| 31. | Newbattle Abbey | no. 1173 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.13 | General cartulary | 14 th |
| 32. | Paisley Abbey | no. 1174 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.14 | General cartulary | 16 th |
| 33. | Scone Abbey | no. 1179 | NLS Adv. MS 34.3.29 | General cartulary | 14 th |
| 34. | | no. 1180 | NLS Adv. MS 34.3.28 | Uncompleted cartulary | 15 th –16 th |
| 35. | Soutra Hospital | no. 1182 | NLS Adv. MS 34.4.1 | Cartulary | 14 th |
| 36. | | no. 1183 | Edinburgh City Archives SL12/10 | Notarial transcript | 16 th |
| 37. | Stirling chapel royal | no. 1184 | NLS Adv. MS 34.1.5 | Register | 16 th |

⁸⁵ No general term is given for this manuscript, only that it is 'The Red Book'.