THE LORDSHIP OF GALLOWAY, C. 1000 TO C. 1250

Richard D. Oram

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St. Andrews

1989

Full metadata for this item is available in
Research@StAndrews:FullText
at:
http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
http://hdl.handle.net/10023/2638

This item is protected by original copyright

THE LORDSHIP OF GALLOWAY

c. 1000 TO c. 1250

THESIS FOR THE DEGREE OF PhD

RICHARD D. ORAM

ST. ANDREWS 1988

BIBLIOTHECA UNIVERSITATIS ANDREANÆ

I, Richard Duncan Oram, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 100,000 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

date 3rd November 1988 signature of candidate [redacted]

I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance No. 12 in October 1983 (month, year) and as a candidate for the degree of PhD in October 1983 (month, year); the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between 1983 (year) and 1988 (year).

date 3rd November 1988 signature of candidate [redacted]

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of St. Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

date 3 November 1988 signature of supervisor [redacted]

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

date 3rd November 1988 signature of candidate [redacted]

CONTENTS

FRONTISPIECE Galloway in the Middle Ages iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS v - ix

CHAPTER ONE : Early Lords and the Origin of the Lordship 1 - 25

CHAPTER TWO : i. Fergus 26 - 68

ii. Fortune's Wheel : The Career of Fergus C. 1130-61 69 - 96

CHAPTER THREE : Division and Recovery 97 - 145

CHAPTER FOUR : The Heirs of Alan 145 - 176

CHAPTER FIVE : i. Colonisation and Conquest : The Anglo-Scottish Settlements of Galloway 177 - 217

ii. The Division of Power, 1235 218 - 232

iii. The Physical Remains of Lordship 233 - 251

CHAPTER SIX : i. A Spiritual Counterpart : The Galwegian Church C. 1000 - 1250 252 - 295

ii. The Structure and Administration of the Diocese 296 - 321

CHAPTER SEVEN : People, Land and Society 322 - 392

CONCLUSION 393 - 96

FAMILY TREE 397

LIST OF MAPS

1 CASTLES AND FORTIFICATIONS 398
2 GALLOWAY PARISHES c. 1275 399 - 400
3 DABHACH - DAVOCH 401
4 CEATHRAMH 402
5 PHEIGHINN, LETHPHEIGHINN AND FAIRDEAN 403
6 AIRIGH 404
7 BORELAND 405

BIBLIOGRAPHY 406 - 30

GALLOWAY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

KEY
⊕ CHIEF MONASTIC CENTERS.
● MAIN FORTRESSES OR TOWNS.
BOUNDARY OF THE LORDSHIP
WESTERN BOUNDARY OF DESNES IOAN
-200- 200ft contour.
0 5 10 15 20 25 MILES
CARRICK
NITHSDALE
GLENKEN
DESNES
DESNES IOAN
FARINES
THE RHINNS
THE MACHARS
SOULSEAT
GLENLUCE
R. LUCE
WIGTOWN
R. CREE
WHITHORN
CRUGGLETON
R. FLEET
TONGLAND
KIRKCUDBRIGHT
R. DEE
DUNDRENNAN
BUITTLE
R. URR
SWEETHEART
R. NITH
DUMFRIES
200ft
200

Abstract

The recorded history of the lordship under the House of Fergus lasted from only c.1130 to 1234, but its origins lie in the fusion of the various peoples settled there by c.1000. A blend of Celtic and Germanic groups created a hybrid culture that had more in common with Man and the Isles than mainland Scotland. Galwegian attitudes to and relationship with Scotland before c.1130 are unclear, but ties with York and Man had greater value than Scottish claims to overlordship. The emergence of a powerful line of rulers kept the ambitions of the Crown in check, but any divisions in their ranks were exploited by the Scots. Close family links with the Plantagenet kings provided a counterbalance to Scottish interference, but brought English overlordship instead. This had the side-effect of securing the separation of the see of Whithorn from the Scottish Church.

Marriage and kinship ties brought the lords political power in Scotland, England and Man, and control of estates outwith the lordship. This in turn led to the closer integration of Galloway into Scotland as its rulers gained high office in the kingdom. Thus the lords developed a dual character as Anglo-Scottish baron and Celtic chieftain. Introduction of Normanised colonists and the development of 'feudal' military tenures fostered this transition and eroded regional particularism. Integration was accelerated by elimination of the male line and partition between heiresses married into Anglo-Norman families. Division broke the power of Galloway, weakened the influence of its new rulers over the Galwegians and gave the Crown the control for which it had long striven.

Acnowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to David Corner, who first suggested this topic to me in May 1982; to Professor Nicholas Brooks who steered the project through its first years; and to Professor Donald Watt and Doctor Barbara Crawford who saw it to its belated conclusion.

Thanks are also due to Drs Norman and Simone MacDougall, Dr Chris Given-Wilson, Miss Anne Kettle, Miss Lorna Walker, Dr Colin Martin, Mr James Kenworthy, Dr Nick Dixon, Dr Veronica Smart, Professor Donald Bullough, Professor Christopher Smout and Professor Roy Owen for their freely-given advice, support and assistance over the years; to Peter Hill and my many friends and colleagues at the Whithorn excavation; to Daphne Brooke, whose eye for detail made me rethink many points; to Geoffrey Stell for his comments on the archaeology and architecture of the region; to Bill and Sheila Cormack and Jack Scott of the Dumfries and Galloway Society; Mr Collin of the Stewartry Museum for his assistance in securing permission to carry out field surveys at Dunrod; to Flight Lieutenant Haggerty RAF, whose generous provision of air photographs helped in the selection of sites surveyed, and to the commander of the artillery range at Dunrod for permission to work there; and to Ken Fraser of the University Library for his unstinting willingness to seek out and secure the most obscure references.

A special debt of thanks must go to Ronald Cant, who has always been willing to discuss queries and has acted as Devil's Advocate on many doubtful points.

To my friends in St.John's House, notably Christine McGladdery, Seymour House, Lindsay Macgregor, Giles Dove, Ann Johnson, Constance Schummer, Alice and Alicia Correa, Rob Whiteman and Bruce (I've got two degrees) Gordon, I express my appreciation for their tolerance - though my enthusiastic eulogising of Alan of Galloway wore even this thin!

And finally to my family, flatmates and friends, who have all waited a very long time to see this threat to the world's forests laid to rest.

List of Abbreviations

Sources

Ailred, *de Standardo*	Ailred of Rievaulx, *Relatio Venerabilis Aelredi Abbatis Rievallensis*, *de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc., ed R Howlett (London, 1884-9).
Ailred, *Saints of Hexham*	Ailred of Rievaulx, *Saint of Hexham*, in *The Priory of Hexham* (Surtees Society, 1863).
Anderson, *Diplomata*	*Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus*, ed J. Anderson (Edinburgh 1739).
Anderson, *Early Sources*	*Early Sources of Scottish History 500 - 1286*, ed A. O. Anderson (Edinburgh, 1982).
Anderson, *Scottish Annals*	*Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers 500 - 1286* ed A. O. Anderson (London, 1908).
APS	*The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, edd T. Thompson and C Innes (Edinburgh, 1814-75).
Archbishop Gray's Register	*The Register, or Rolls, of Walter Gray, Lord Archbishop of York*, ed J. Raine (Surtees Society, 1870).
Archbishop Greenfield's Register	*The Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York*, edd A. H. Thompson and W. Brown (Surtees Society, 1931-38).
Archbishop Romeyn's Register	*The Register of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York*, ed J. Raine (Surtees Society, 1870).
Bagimond's Roll	'Bagimond's Roll, Statement of the Tenths of the Kingdom of Scotland', ed A. I. Dunlop, *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vi (1939)
Benedict of Peterborough	*Benedict of Peterborough*, ed W. Stubbs (Londo , 1867).
CDI	*Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland*, ed H. Sweetman, (Dublin 1875-88).

CDS	Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, ed J. Bain, i-iv (Edinburgh, 1881-8); edd G. G. Simpson and J. D. Galbraith, v [supplementary] (Edinburgh, 1986).
CPL	Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britian and Ireland : Papal Letters, edd W. H. Bliss and others (London, 1893).
Chron. Extracta	Extracta e Variis Cronicis Scocie (Abbotsford Club 1842).
Chron. Fordun	Johanis de Fordun, Chronica Gentis Scotorum, ed W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1871-2).
Chron. Guisborough	Chronicles of Walter of Guisborough, ed H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957).
Chron. Holyrood	A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood, ed. M. O. Anderson (Scottish History Society, 1938).
Chron. Lanercost	Chronicon de Lanercost (Maitland Club, 1839).
Chron. Majora	Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1872-83).
Chron. Man	The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, edd P. A. Munch and Rev Dr Goss (Manx Society, Douglas, 1874); Cronica Regum Mannie et Insularum, trans G. Broderick (Belfast, 1979).
Chron. Melrose	The Chronicle of Melrose, (Facsimile Edition), edd, A. O. Anderson and others (London, 1936).
Chron. Pluscarden	Liber Pluscardensis, ed F. J. H. Skene (Edinburgh, 1877-80).
Chron. Wyntoun	Androw of Wyntoun, The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland, ed D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1872-79).

Dryburgh Liber	*Liber S Marie de Dryburgh* (Bannatyne Club, 1847).
Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*	*Sir William Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum*, v (London, 1846).
Glasgow Registrum	*Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis* (Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs, 1843).
Historians of York	*Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed J. Raine (London, 1880).
Holm Cultram Register	*Register and Records of Holm Cultram*, edd F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, 1929).
Holyrood Liber	*Liber Cartarum Sancte Crucis* (Bannatyne Club, 1840).
Inquis. Retorn. Abbrev.	*Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis Retornatarum, quae in publicis archivis Scotiae adhuc servantur*, *Abbreviatio*, ed T. Thomson (1811-16
Kelso Liber	*Liber S Marie de Calchou* (Bannatyne Club,1846).
Lawrie, *Charters*	*Early Scottish Charters prior to 1153*, ed A. C. Lawrie (Glasgow, 1905).
Lindores Chartulary	*Chartulary of the Abbey of Lindores* (SHS, 1903).
Melrose Liber	*Liber S Marie de Melros* (Bannatyne Club, 1837).
Midlothian Chrs	*Charters of the Hospital of Soltre, of Trinity College, Edinburgh and other Collegiate Churches in Midlothian* (Bannatyne Club, 1861).
Morton Registrum	*Registrum Honoris de Morton* (Bannatyne Club, 1853).
Paisley Registrum	*Registrum Monasterii de Passelet* (Maitland CLub, 1832

Palgrave, *Docs.Hist. Scot.*	*Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland*, ed F. Palgrave (London, 1837).
RCAHMS	*Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland*.
RMS	*Registrum Magni Sigilii Regum Scotorum*, edd J. M. Thomson and others (Edinburgh, 1882-1914).
RRS	*Regesta Regum Scottorum*, edd G. W. S. Barrow and others (Edinburgh, 1960-).
Reginald of Durham	*Reginald Monachi Dunelmensis Libellus de Admirandis Beati Cuthberti Virtutibus* (Surtees Society, 1835).
Richard of Hexham	Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Regis Stephani er de Bello Standardii*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc, ed R. Howlett (London, 1884-89).
Robert of Torigny	*The Chronicle of Robert of Torigny*, in *The Chronicles of Stephen* etc, ed R. Howlett (London, 1884-89).
Roger of Howden	*Chronica Rogeri de Hovedon, ed W. Stubbs* (London, 1869).
Rot. Lit. Claus.	*Rotuli Literarum Clausarum*, ed T. Duffus-Hardy i (London, 1833).
St. Bees Register	*The Register of the Priory of St Bees*, ed J. Wilson (Surtees Society, 1915).
Scots Peerage	*The Scots Peerage*, ed J. Balfour-Paul (Edinburgh, 1904-14).
Walter Daniel	Walter Daniel, *The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed and trans F. M. Powicke (London, 1950).

William of Newburgh	William of Newburgh, *Historiam Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc, ed R. Howlett (London, 1884-89).

Journals

AHR	*Agricultural History Review*
BIHR	*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*.
EHR	*English Historical Review.*
JMH	*Journal of Medieval History*.
MLN	*Modern Language Notes*
PMLA	*Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*.
PPRS	*Publications of the Pipe Roll Society*.
PSAS	*Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*
RCHS	*Records of the Church History Society*.
SHR	*Scottish Historical Review*.
TCWAAS	*Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological and Antiquarian Society*.
TDGAS	*Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society.*
TGSI	*Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness*.
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society.*
TRSE	*Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*.
TSES	*Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society*.

Dedication

To D.M.M. and M.M.A. whose recognition and encouragement of an early interest fostered an enduring commitment to the understanding of our past.

and

To the memory of John Campbell: a good friend sorely missed.

Chapter One.

Early Lords and the Origin of the Lordship.

When the lordship of Galloway appears in historical sources for the first time in the early 12th century, it is as a large political unit under the rule of one man, Fergus of Galloway. The circumstances of the development of this territory and the ancestry of its ruler are matters of obscurity which the limited contemporary written material allows to be penetrated only in part. As is the case with the documentary sources concerned with the early history of Scotland as a whole, materials which allow an insight into the social structure and administrative framework of Galloway in the period before c.1160 are fragmentary, ambiguous and generally of late date. From what does survive, it is apparent that the territorial unit which came to form the lordship by the later 12th century had been subject to the influences of diverse racial and cultural groups, and elements from all were adapted to produce a remarkably complex structure.

Knowledge of Galwegian society has come down to us through the works of later and solely non-Galwegian writers, whose understanding of what they were recording was at best vague. The formulaic nature of the most important of the surviving sources (the groups of charters recording grants of land and privileges within Galloway to monasteries and private individuals) makes it unwise for them to be treated as the definitive authorities on which to base any interpretation of the social and political structure of the region. The legal jargon of the surviving charters tends to obscure evidence for local traditions or systems of land-holding, as it tends to overstress the regional similarities, not any major diversity. It is clear, too, that the clerks of the later 12th and 13th centuries, who may have had no firm understanding of Celtic law, languages or society, struggled to find conventional terms in which to describe peculiarly Celtic features, and provided not always suitable equivalents from their Latin glossaries.

The brief notices which the written sources contain, scarce until the later 12th century, consist mainly of a very few saga or chronicle references. These enable only the most basic framework of historical events in the 11th century to be reconstructed. Evidence for a central authority in Galloway, with powers similar to the later lords, is extremely flimsy and relies on one ambiguous reference to a 'King of the Gall-Gaidhil' in an Irish source (1). The nature of any political relationship between Galloway and the neighbouring regions, particularly Strathclyde, is almost impossible to ascertain and the thorny questions of independence or overlordship in the period before c.1100 cannot be answered completely satisfactorily.

Extent of Galloway

One of the first problems to be addressed in any study of Galloway is the extent of the territory covered by that name. From medieval texts it is clear that the term could be used when dealing with the wider south-west, i.e. everything south and west of Clydesdale and Teviotdale. It was applied to a more precise unit which corresponded with the later lordship, or again with the still smaller bishopric.

The first form seems to have been of a general geographical character. It was applied with a certain degree of vagueness to an extensive region composed of a number of smaller political units, but initially with no real political identity in its own right. The second interpretation is applied to a defined territory, a political unit of recognised extent which had emerged by the later 12th century. Similarly, its application in cases involving the bishopric of Whithorn associated 'Galloway' with a clearly-defined unit of ecclesiastical government. This was co-terminous with the political unit, until the addition to the lordship territory in the time of Fergus's sons of the region east of the Urr. That district fell within the episcopal jurisdiction of Glasgow.

The application of the name 'Galloway' in its widest context is generally a 12th century phenomenon, but appears occasionally in the later 13th century. In the 1130s, David I issued charters in favour of the monks of Dunfermline from 'Strathyrewen in Galwegia', (2) apparently the Irvine valley in north Ayrshire. The lands of 'Keresban', which formed part of Thomas de Colville's barony of Dalmellington in Kyle were, in 1223, described as lying in Galloway,(3) whilst in the Brevis Descriptio Regni Scotie of c.1296, Annandale is said to be part of that region. (4) In the same work, however, Ayr is described as 'near Galloway', which implies that, by that date, the districts of Carrick, Kyle and Cunninghame may no longer have been regarded as lying within that region, except where the sphere of responsibility of the justiciar of Galloway was concerned.

In the context of the wider Galloway, there is also the question of certain territorial units named in grants made by David I and Malcolm IV to the Church of Glasgow and the monks of Selkirk/Kelso. The earliest of these was made in the foundation charter of Selkirk Abbey, issued by David shortly before 1120. This included the gift of the tithe of the royal cain of cheese and half of that of hides from 'Galloway' (5). This was amplified in c.1159 by Malcolm IV in his great charter of confirmation to Kelso Abbey, to which place the Selkirk community had been transplanted in 1128. The new grant bestowed the right to the tithe of the annual render to the Crown in cattle, pigs and cheese, 'from the four kadrez of that (part of) Galloway', which had been held by his grandfather, David, in the lifetime of King Alexander I. (6) No indication of where or what these kadrez may have been is given in the charter, but in a grant of David I to Glasgow, (7) four territorial units are named. These are Strathgryffe, Cunninghame, Kyle and Carrick, which emerge by the later 12th century as distinct political entities held of the Crown as lordships by such families as the Stewarts and Morvilles. There is, however, no conclusive internal proof that these are the four kadrez of the Kelso grant, or that they were the 'part' of Galloway controlled by David during the reign of his elder brother. In an early 13th century Glasgow document, however, reference is made to officers in Carrick known as kethres, who were apparently servants of the earl. (8) These men appear to have had some responsibility for the collection of cain. This perhaps reflects a transference of the name for the administrative unit used for collection of renders from the district to the officer responsible. On these grounds it is possible to propose that Carrick formed one of the four kadrez of David's Galloway (See below p.127).

Contemporary with these references to a wider Galloway are a number of incidental allusions to a more geographically distinct region, the later lordship. In the mid-1130s Fergus 'of Galloway' makes his first appearance in the witness lists to royal charters, (9) and by the later part of the century his family had come to be associated closely with the region encompassed by the later county of Wigtown and Stewartry of Kirkcudbright. It is possible that Carrick may have formed part of Fergus's original territories, but its inclusion within Glasgow diocese suggests the existence of an earlier tie with Strathclyde and a later transference of control to some member of the Galloway dynasty. By 1190 Carrick had been assigned as the lordship of Fergus's grandson, Duncan,and any connection with Galloway was severed. To the east, Nithsdale formed another independent unit under its own dynasty of native rulers. The lordship was thus confined to the country west of the Urr valley, until the acquisition of the district between the Urr and the Nith which had probably originally formed a portion of the lordship of Nithsdale. It is with this geographically circumscribed region that the present study is concerned.

Early Lords ? (c.1000 to c.1136).

Evidence for rulers holding sway over the region which came to form the lordship of Galloway, before the emergence of Fergus in the mid-1130s, is extremely insubstantial. Much rests on the interpretation of a brief reference in a 13th century Icelandic source to a Norse or Norse-Celtic jarl who held court in a place which may, or may not have been in Galloway. This concerns an Earl Malcolm or Melkolf, mentioned in Njal's Saga, as resident in the winter of 1014 at a place called Hvitsborg, which was located vaguely 'in Scotland'. (10) This 'White's Fort' cannot be identified with any certainty on the basis of this meagre evidence. Despite the etymological similarity between Hvitsborg, meaning the fort of someone called Hvitr (the White) and Whithorn, which is the Anglian form of the Latin *Candida Casa*, the White House (*Hwit Aerne*), there is no concrete proof to link the two names. Nevertheless, the belief that the Galwegian ecclesiastical centre was the seat of a Norse jarl has persisted in modern writings. (11) There is no support for this view in the sources, but this is not sufficient grounds on which to reject outright any belief in the existence of a Scandinavian presence at Whithorn. Indeed, recent excavations in that town point towards the presence of a substantial Scandinavian element in the population there from around the middle of the 10th century (see chapter 7).

The passage from *Njal's Saga* describes the movements of the Icelander, Kari Solmundarson, and his men after the battle of Clontarf. It tells how, having returned from delivering news of the battle to the people of Orkney, Kari had sailed south to 'Bretland' (Wales or Strathclyde) and thence they 'sailed up to Beruvik', laid up their vessel for the winter and travelled on inland to 'Hvitsborg in Scotland', (12) where they stayed with the earl until spring. Any identification of 'Beruvik' with the Berwicks of the east coast is rendered unlikely by Kari's northerly route from 'Bretland', which makes a location on the western sea-board of Scotland the strongest likelihood. M'Kerlie placed Beruvik in the Solway, (13) but provided no support for this identification. The laying up of Kari's ship in port, followed by a land journey to *Hvitsborg* made it attractive to identify Whithorn, with its inland position, as Malcolm's seat; but, although the apparent topography fits the saga, on linguistic grounds the two names in question do not tally. Huyshe, in his romanticised history of Galloway, identified the anchorage as lying at Port Yerrock, an inlet some 1.5 miles north of the Isle of Whithorn, and claimed that the jarl had his court at Cruggleton Castle, which was believed to be of Norse origin. (14) This view was taken up subsequently by most local historians, (15) but has been disproved by excavations at the castle, which showed its medieval occupation to commence in the 12th century.

A.B.Taylor proposed a location in Argyll for both Beruvik and Hvitsborg, (16) and identified the earl in question as one Malcolm mac Maelbrigte. He believed this earl to be mormaer of that district and an ally of the Norse rulers of Orkney. Taylor's hypothesis concerning the identity of Earl Malcolm has been wholly discredited, but a location in the Hebrides or southern Argyll is still the most probable site for a court at which Kari and his companions could have expected a friendly reception.

The removal of Earl Malcolm's supposed residence from Galloway to a Hebridean location leaves an obvious vacuum in the south-west. A laconic entry in the Annals of Ulster for 1034 goes only some way towards filling this. (17) It records the death of one 'Suibne mac Cinaedh, king of the Gall-Gaidhil'. Noted similarly in the Tigernach annals and the much later and derivative Annals of Loch Ce, but otherwise unknown in the sources, it is possible that this man, whose name implies hybrid Norse-Celtic ancestry, may have been the leader of the people who are supposed to have given their name to Galloway (See Chapter 7). There is, however, no indication of the location of the territory over which he ruled.

Later entries in the Annals of Ulster certainly use the title 'King of the Gall-Gaidhil' when reference is made to the 12th and 13th century rulers of the lordship of Galloway, (18) which implies that there was felt to be some relationship between the region, its rulers and that people. This makes it tempting to identify Galloway with Suibne's territory on that basis. Beyond this entry, however, there is no indication of the extent or origin of his powers, and no evidence for a dynastic link between Suibne and the family which came to rule over Galloway in the mid-12th century.

That Galloway was subject to a degree of settlement by Gaelic-speakers in the late 9th and early 10th centuries is generally accepted on the basis of place-name types (See below 324-5) It was in this period that the region is believed to have taken on the essentially Gaelic character which it was to retain down to the end of the Middle Ages. These incomers are supposed to have been the Gall-Gaidhil, hybrid Norse-Celtic by race, but in material culture apparently indistinguishable from the Gaels of the Hebrides and north-west Mainland, who had been open to considerable Norse influence.

Whilst the presence of the Gall-Gaidhil in Galloway has come recently into dispute, there is mounting evidence for a limited degree of Scandinavian settlement. This, however, is still insufficient to support the traditional view of major Viking colonisation. The source of the settlers who are recognised as having arrived in Galloway in the late 9th and 10th centuries is still open to debate, but material evidence from Whithorn suggests that the older colonies in the Hebrides and Ireland may have been their principal homelands. It was through the medium of contacts within those colonies that much of the cultural influences which supposedly gave rise to Gall-Gaidhil society were transmitted to the native Gaelic population of those regions. Such contacts are believed to be the catalyst which led to the formation of the hybrid Gall-Gaidhil society. Evidence for such influence in Galloway is rare. Place-names and archaeological material suggest that some Scandinavian settlement did occur in the Machars, particularly around Whithorn, and in the coastal district around the Dee estuary. Elsewhere in Galloway, proof of substantial Scandinavian immigration is negligible, and major Norse influences on Galwegian culture are not immediately visible. (see Chapter 7, 328-30)

The relationship of the Galwegians and the Norse in the 11th century does not always appear to have been one of peaceful integration. It is as a marauding Viking that a man who is said to have ruled over Galloway makes his appearance. Thorfinn Sigurdarson, earl of Orkney, was involved actively in piratical activities in the 1040s in the Irish Sea and Solway regions, preying on the people settled around the coasts of those sea areas. An error in one version of the text of the Orkneyinga Saga gave rise to the belief that the earl resided in Galloway one summer, and sent out raids from there into adjacent parts of England. This, in conjunction with the claim in the same saga that Thorfinn had won for himself nine earldoms in Scotland, (19) gave rise to the supposition that Galloway was one of those territories. Indeed, Huyshe went so far as to claim that Galloway became the earl's chief residence and that he died there in the 1060s. (20) Other versions of the text, however, make it plain that the earl was involved in raiding activity in the Solway and that Galloway was the target for his depredations, but, because the inhabitants had fled inland, taking their cattle and goods with them, he had been forced to turn his attentions to Cumbria. (21) It is highly unlikely that even a Viking as notorious as the earl of Orkney would have resorted to pillaging land over which he exercised any real political power.

The final appearance of Galloway in records of 11th century events is as a target for further Norwegian attack. This was a raid in 1098 by Magnus Olafsson, king of Norway, who earlier that year had restored Norwegian authority over Man and the Isles. The claimed result of the attack on Galloway was that the inhabitants submitted and provided Magnus with a tribute payment of timber, which he used for the construction of forts in Man. (22) What attracted Magnus to Galloway in the first place is unknown, but the prior existence of colonies in that region, perhaps settled by people from areas which acknowledged Norse overlordship, but who themselves had never accepted such a position, may have served as a lure. If Galloway had received colonists from Man and the Isles, it is possible that Magnus felt himself to be entitled to levy tribute from them as his legal subjects. The submission of the entire region must exaggerate the actual events, but could be taken simply to imply the submission of an important group of possibly Manx origin. Certainly, there are indications in the next century of strong mutual ties between the lords of Galloway and the kings of Man. (23)

Links with Man were maintained into the 13th century, (24) and were slackened only by the extinction of the male line in Galloway and the absorption of the lordship into the kingdom of the Scots. Whether the relationship between the two areas was due to some older tie, connected with possible mutual Norse-Celtic background, or was solely the result of independent dynastic policy in the 12th century, when both Man and Galloway exercised a considerable degree of independence from their theoretical overlords in Norway and Scotland, cannot be ascertained. The absence of any clear evidence for Manx influence before the end of the 11th century, e.g. in sculptural forms, might suggest political rather than cultural or economic ties. The obscurity of the origins of the Galloway dynasty and the absence of any knowledge of the authority by which they claimed to exercise rule, further clouds the issue and serves to render the question of Norse overlordship for Galloway a matter for conjecture.

Galloway and Cumbrian Overlordship.

Scandinavian material may shed little light on the political status of Galloway after 1000, but Cumbrian evidence, though somewhat problematical, may hold more conclusive answers. Following the collapse of Northumbrian power west of the Pennines in the later 9th century, areas of former Anglian overlordship passed into new hands. Much of the coastal area of modern Cumbria was subject to Scandinavian settlement, (25) but Annandale, Nithsdale and north-western England as far south as the rivers Derwent and Eamont passed into the possession of Brythonic Strathclyde. Place-name evidence from those latter districts suggests a revival of Brythonic speech outwith the region of Norse settlement, with a new stratum of Brythonic settlers being super-imposed over an earlier Anglian population, which itself had displaced an original Brythonic sub-stratum. (26)

In south-western Scotland, Kyle, conquered by Eadberht of Northumbria in 750, (27) and Carrick, which may have been occupied at an earlier date, appear also to have been absorbed into the expanding kingdom of Strathclyde. In Galloway proper, however, there is no evidence for a rise in Strathclyde's influence, such as can be detected in the areas to the north and east. This may be taken to imply that either Galloway was subject to the overlordship of some other agency, such as the Norse of Man and the Isles, or that the indigenous Anglian and Brythonic peoples had fused into a unit cohesive enough to prevent any attempt by Strathclyde to absorb them within its political orbit.

Direct evidence for the overlordship of Galloway by a mainland Scottish power is provided by later 12th century sources. This evidence takes the form of allusions in charters and other governmental records to renders due to the Scottish Crown for the easternmost part of the lordship. (28) Although late, this material probably records arrangements of 11th or early 12th century date. It must, however, be set in the context of the political developments in southern Scotland after the death of King Edgar in 1107, when his younger brother, David, was bequeathed control of the former territories of Strathclyde.

The long term presence of an active ruler south of the Forth-Clyde isthmus must have led to the strengthening of royal or princely power in Strathclyde, and probably to the extension of that power through opportunist actions into those districts bordering upon David's princely appanage. It cannot be doubted that in the period 1107-1124, David felt himself to be, and acted as, the heir to the rights of the Strathclyde kings, and strove to extend his powers into areas where such rights were lacking. Galloway west of the Urr may have been one such area, but certainly the segment east of that river, as part of Nithsdale, would have fallen beneath his jurisdiction.

The regaining of the territories in north-western England, which had been subject to Brythonic rule in the 11th century, was to become one of the principal features of David's policy after his accession to the throne in 1124. It was in the course of his reign that moves to consolidate Scottish control over those areas which had not been seized by William Rufus, bordering on Galloway, were first made. This resulted in the establishment of major territorial lordships in Annandale, Eskdale and Liddesdale for some of David's Anglo-Norman followers. David also felt himself to be sufficiently secure in his control over the districts which lay to the north of Galloway to be able to grant to his newly-founded abbey at Selkirk the tithe of elements of royal cain from all of that area. (29) Similarly, in c.1136, David granted the Church of Glasgow the tithe of his annual cain from cattle and cheese from Strathgryffe, Cunninghame, Kyle and Carrick, unless he went to those regions himself and consumed the food to support his retinue. (30) It is implicit from the latter that David regarded those districts as integral to his kingdom and that he could exercise effectively there his rights as lord to cain and the other privileges of his position.

A document in the Kelso register records an agreement reached in c.1200-1209 between the monks of Kelso and Alan of Galloway, great grandson of Fergus, whereby he gave them land in Lauderdale in exchange for their surrender of certain dues and renders from 'Galloway'. (31) What these dues and renders were is not specified, but that they were payable from some or all of Alan's paternal lands in the lordship and not his maternal inheritance in Cunninghame is implicit in the text, although the inclusion of his mother, Helen de Morville, amongst those to be quit from payment might indicate some north Ayrshire connection. There is no record of any grant of land or rights to the monks of Kelso by previous lords of Galloway, other than the minor gift of a saltworks in Lochkindeloch made by Alan's father between 1196 and 1199. (32) Kelso's rights, therefore, must have stemmed from David I's original grant of some of the elements of his cain from 'Galloway', made to the monks of Selkirk. The implications of this grant will be considered below.

The revival of the see of Glasgow and the administrative re-organisation which this entailed must have helped to define David's own position. The inquest into the lands and revenues of the old Cumbrian diocese, and into the rights pertaining to its bishops, must have touched also upon the lands, rights and privileges of David himself. The Glasgow diocese was, in its origins, the tribal church of the Britons of Strathclyde, and had shared in the vicissitudes of their kingdom. In essence, its effective boundaries were those of the kingdom at any given time. Thus, in the period of David's Inquest, it is probable that the revived diocese was envisaged as encompassing all of the regions over which Strathclyde had held sway at the height of the revival of the kingdom under the Scots in the 10th century.

Included within this extended territory was the region to the south of the Solway, centred on Carlisle. This, however, had been shorn politically from Scottish control in 1092, and in 1106 was given as a fief to Ranulf Meschin by Henry I of England. In 1133 the separation was to be finalised by the removal of the region from the episcopal jurisdiction of the bishop of Glasgow and the erection of Carlisle into a see suffragan of York.

The loss of Carlisle could have been accompanied by the loss of Teviotdale also, to which the bishop of Durham had a tenuous claim, based on his position as successor to St.Cuthbert and the bishopric of Lindisfarne. This region had been subject to Northumbrian rule from the 7th century, but it is probable that it had been relinquished long before the battle of Carham, which saw the boundary of Scotland and England being fixed at the Tweed. This sprawling territory, forming the Glasgow deaneries of Tweeddale and Teviotdale, appears to have formed the main seat of David's power, with the castle of Roxburgh as its administrative centre. To its north lay Lothian, which was retained as part of David's elder brother's kingdom. South of the Lammermuirs, the St.Andrews deanery of Merse formed part of David's appanage, the only part not under the sole spiritual authority of the bishop of Glasgow. Its inclusion within the sphere of David's control was probably based on simple geographical practicalities rather than any deeper political reasoning. The otherwise total exclusion of other bishops from David's territory as a whole must indicate an attempt to equate the see of Glasgow with the secular division, and aimed for unity of as much as possible beneath the spiritual authority of a single bishop.

Until the death of Alexander I in 1124, there was every possibility that Scotland and Cumbria could have gone their own separate ways, with David's successors ruling in the south and Alexander's over 'Scotia' proper. The emphasis on a single diocese can thus be seen as a move designed to eliminate external influences in Cumbria, preparing for ecclesiastical as well as political independence from Scotland. When viewed in this context, the inclusion within Glasgow diocese of a block of territory which formed the easternmost portion of the later lordship of Galloway takes on a new significance.

The extent to which the boundaries between the dioceses of Glasgow and Whithorn reflected the political reality of a border between the rulers of Galloway and David in Cumbria is difficult to gauge. Certainly the division took on more nationalistic overtones in the 12th and 13th centuries, stressed by the adherence of the bishops of Galloway to their oaths of obedience to the archbishops of York. The ecclesiastical division, however, was not co-terminous with its secular counterpart, as the substantial portion of the lordship lying between the Urr and the Nith was included in the diocese of Glasgow. It is generally regarded as the case that this district had been shorn from Whithorn's jurisdiction at some point. Some authorities have argued a late date for this dismemberment, and propose 1160, 1174 or the early 1180s as possibilities. (33) Glasgow itself based its claim on the tradition, of dubious authenticity, of the missionary work of St. Kentigern in this region (34). In addition to this, however, land at 'Edyngaheym', (possibly the Edingham lying east of Dalbeattie), is listed in David's Inquest (35) as pertaining to the Church of Glasgow by ancient right. This points towards a much earlier date for inclusion of this area in Glasgow diocese, probably by the 10th or 11th century.

There is no indication that Glasgow's spiritual jurisdiction over eastern Galloway was ever challenged seriously by the bishops of Whithorn, which implies that the division was probably established firmly by the early 12th century, when both dioceses were being reconstituted. It is not until 1174, however, that mention is made in papal documents concerning the jurisdiction which the bishops of

Glasgow claimed to have in Galloway. (36) Prior to this, Bishop Ingelram of Glasgow (1164-1174) was issuing charters to the canons of Holyrood in confirmation of their possesssion of the church of Urr, (37) which lay in the eastern portion of the Lordship. Then, in 1178, mention is made in papal records of a district in Glasgow diocese called Desnes. (38) These dates have been used to argue that the country between the Urr and Nith, called Desnes Ioan, was not attached to Glasgow until some time after 1160, perhaps in conjunction with some settlement forced upon the conquered lordship by Malcolm IV. There is no precedent for such an action, nor would it have served any worthwhile purpose in promoting peace within the region. If an early date, i.e. pre-1120, is accepted for the inclusion of this area in the diocese, and if the earlier possession of lands as far west as the Urr by the Cumbrian bishops is admitted, then the possibility must be considered that this unit between the Urr and the Nith formed part of David's territories, or was subject to his overlordship, before he became king in 1124. If this is the case, then there are serious implications for the question of the relationship of the lords of Galloway to David I and his heirs, and also for the the processes by which the lordship itself came into being.

In this context, the Kelso document mentioned above, (39) takes on new significance. In the early 13th century, the convent claimed the rights to certain dues and renders payable from the lordship, in arrears since the time of Uhtred. Payment of these had probably been halted in 1174 by the rebellion against William the Lion, and not renewed thereafter. The origin of these rights is not explained in the document, but it is implied that it pre-dated Uhtred's period of rule, possibly in the lifetime of Fergus or still earlier. There is no surviving record of such a grant being made by any of the early lords of Galloway, which suggests that the monks' rights in that region stemmed from a different authority with some form of control over at least part of the later lordship. David, either as prince in Cumbria, or as king, is the strongest candidate for the identity of such an alternative authority, but the lords of Nithsdale, who were notable patrons of Kelso, are possible alternatives. The right to a portion of David's cain from 'Galloway', granted to the Kelso community whilst originally at Selkirk, must be the source of this later claim. Whether this right was claimed over the entire lordship, or just its eastern portion, is not recorded. In view of the subjection of Desnes Ioan to the bishopric of Glasgow and, therefore, probably to David's principality in Cumbria, the latter is most likely the case.

Further indications of the distinct status held by Desnes Ioan are scarce. Its territorial integrity is revealed by a charter of Uhtred of Galloway, issued in favour of the canons of Holyrood. (40) The grant dates from c.1161 to c.1165 and involved various rights, which included the tithe of Uhtred's cain, the tithe of his pleas and the tithe of his hunting in the whole region 'from the water of Urr up to the water of Nith and the Cluden'. These rivers also formed the boundaries of the later Glasgow deanery within the lordship, which suggests that the secular and ecclesiastical units were co-terminous. Desnes Ioan appears from this grant to have been used as a collecting district for the renders due to its superior lord, a single element within a composite lordship. This fiscal role is one in which its secular or ecclesiastical counterparts west of the Urr never appear.

It is in a fiscal role that Desnes Ioan makes a second appearance in c.1170. About that year, Uhtred made a grant of the lands of Lochkindeloch, the modern New Abbey, to one Richard, the son of Troite, for the service of one knight. (41) The grant was burdened by the additional obligation of paying a money-rent to Uhtred for so long as he had to pay cain to the king for the districts of Cro and Desnes Ioan, the former apparently being a subdivision of the latter. (42) The implication within the wording of the charter is that Uhtred was negotiating with the king for relief from cain, a burden which was being lifted elsewhere from land on which knights were being infefted. (43) It is striking that Uhtred was to seek relief from cain for the whole district east of the Urr, an area from which most of the evidence for early settlement by men holding land by knight service comes; but more striking is the fact that no attempt appears to have been made to gain relief from similar burdens in the rest of his territories. This must indicate that the remainder of the lordship was not subject to the same burdens. Any special status for Desnes Ioan must surely imply that it came into the possession of the lords of Galloway by different means, presumably by royal grant.

Government and Administration

Evidence for the wider subjection of Galloway to overlordship by members of the Scottish ruling dynasty is very slim. It is, however, implicit in some sources that, by the 1130s, the whole of the south-west was possibly in some form of vassalic relationship with the Scottish Crown. From before the time of Fergus the lordship appears to have provided warriors for the royal army. This is illustrated by the major contingents from the south-west serving in the forces led into England by Malcolm III in the 1070s, David I in 1138 and William in 1174. (44) The terms under which these fighters were provided are unknown, but an extension into Galloway of forinsec service is a possibility. It should be noted, however, that Fergus was personally interested in the outcome of David's campaigns, and may have participated more as an ally than a vassal (see below 74-78). Any obligation to provide military service cannot have been the only burden placed upon the lords of Galloway. There is, however, no documentary evidence for renders in other forms from the region west of the Urr until late in the 12th century.

The most important of these later references, the record of a judgement by Roland, son of Uhtred, made in court at Lanark in c.1187, is an ambiguous source. The political implications of this matter are discussed below (see 118-20) but need brief notice here. The judgement dealt in particular with the collection of cain, and concerned the enforcement of royal rights to food renders from Galloway. (45) The judgement stated simply that the royal right to receive cain, presumably halted by the rebellion of Uhtred and his brother, Gilbert, was to be enforced within 'Galloway'. The scope of the territory covered by the judgement, however, cannot be determined, and there are cogent objections against its having applied to the bulk of the lordship lands. There is no way of knowing if the levying of cain in the region west of the Urr was a burden predating the subjugation of the lordship in 1160, or whether it was extended to that area as a visible symbol of the overlordship of the Scottish kings after that date. There are, moreover, no sound details of the structure of the system upon which the collection of renders was based within west and central Galloway. Officers responsible for its collection are mentioned, 'the mairs of Galloway' of Roland's 1187 judgement, but no indication is given of the divisions of the land which would form an administrative framework within which these men could operate.

In terms of the ecclesiastical administration, Galloway was made up of four deaneries, but these do not appear to have had any real meaning for the secular government of the region. The Cree, which later came to form the boundary between the sheriffdoms of Dumfries and Wigtown, was not the boundary between the deaneries of Desnes and Farines. This followed instead the eastern boundary of the parish of Minnigaff, the 'Awengalceway' of Bagimond's Roll. (46) The partition of western Galloway into Rhins and Farines also appears to have had no meaning in secular institutional terms. This entire region was administered as a whole in the later 13th century as a sheriffdom based on Wigtown. Similarly, there is no sign of any administrative purpose behind the division of eastern Galloway into Desnesmor and Glenken, although the suggestion has been made recently that the northern deanery did have its origins as an early secular unit, possibly being referred to as a cantref in some 15th century sources. (47) This term, however, could refer simply to the principal settlement of the district.

Of the Galwegian districts, Desnes Ioan alone does appear to have formed both an ecclesiastical subdivision of Glasgow diocese and a distinct component within the territories of the lords of Galloway, the borders of both being formed by the rivers Urr, Nith and Cluden. It was, moreover, the only one of the subdivisions of the lordship to appear in a secular role. In this it bears certain similarities to the other deaneries of Glasgow, such as Carrick, Cunninghame or the Lennox, where the secular lordships shared approximately the same limits as their ecclesiastical counterparts. Eastern Galloway, therefore, can be seen as forming an entity quite distinct from the country west of the Urr, a separateness which implies different origins and which can be taken to suggest that it was a later addition to a lordship confined originally to that western district. If it is accepted that the diocese of Glasgow was co-terminous with the borders of David's effective overlordship, then the inclusion within that see of the eastern portion of Galloway implies that it too was subject to him, or his successors, and that the lord of Galloway, at least for that area, was subject to the titular ruler of Cumbria.

This leaves unresolved the problems of the status of the remainder of the lordship in the period before c.1160. The complete absence from early documentary sources of references to that region serves to heighten the apparent differences, lending the centre and west of Galloway an aspect of blank uniformity. This makes it almost impossible to determine the processes by which the great agglomeration of territory over which Fergus and his successors ruled was accumulated (see Chapter Two). All that can be said with any certainty is that by c.1130, Galloway west of the Urr represented a unified whole, an identifiable political division which formed the territorial basis on which the see of Candida Casa was founded.

The refoundation of Whithorn could be seen as a direct emulation of David's actions concerning Glasgow, the creation of single diocese spanning the territories over which Fergus ruled, which gave them a certain ecclesiastical integrity and independence. If it is assumed that the lord of Galloway was in some way involved in the revival of the see, his interest could be seen to reflect his own image of his personal status, and would place him at least on a par with the younger brother of the Scottish king. The establishment of a diocese within Galloway removed the risk of its absorption into the sphere of the bishops of Glasgow and, no doubt, served to lessen any threat that the spiritual domination of the Cumbrian bishop could be converted into secular overlordship by the Cumbrian ruler. Such domination was to come, but it was achieved by the less subtle methods of invasion and conquest.

Notes to Chapter One.

1. *Annals of Ulster*, ed.W.M.Hennessy (London, 1887), i, 568.
2. *Early Scottish Charters Prior to AD 1153*, ed.A.C.Lawrie (Glasgow, 1905), Nos 84, 85.
3. *Liber Sancte Marie de Melros* (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1837), No 195.
4. 'Brevis Descriptio Regni Scotie', *Miscellany of the Maitland Club*, iv, pt.i (Glasgow, 1847), 21-34 at 34. See also *Regesta Regum Scotorum*, i, *The Acts of Malcolm IV*, ed.G.W.S.Barrow (Edinburgh, 1960), 38-39.
5. *ESC*, No 35.
6. *RRS*, i, No 131.
7. *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, (Edinburgh, 1843), No 9.
8. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 139.
9. Ibid, Nos 3, 9, 10.
10. *Njal's Saga*, trans. M.Magnusson and H.Palsson, (London, 1960), 353.
11. e.g. *Wigtownshire Charters*, ed. R.C.Reid (Scottish History Society, 1960), xi.
12. *Njal's Saga*, 353.
13. P.H.M'Kerlie, *The History of the Lands and Their Owners in Galloway*, second edition (Paisley, 1906), i, 79.
14. W. Huyshe, *Grey Galloway. Its Lords and Its Saints* (Edinburgh, 1914), 104.
15. e.g. J.F.Robertson, *The Story of Galloway* (Castle Douglas, 1964), 38.
16. A.B.Taylor, 'Karl Hundasson, King of Scots', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, lxxi (1937), 337, 340.
17. *Annals of Ulster*, i, 568.
18. Ibid, ii, 234, 290.
19. *Orkneyinga Saga*, trans. H.Palsson and P.Edwards (London, 1981), 75.
20. Huyshe, *Grey Galloway*, 105.
21. *Orkneyinga Saga*, 61.
22. *Cronica Regum Mannie et Insularum*, trans. G.Broderick (Belfast, 1979), f.34v., entry for year 1098.
23. *Cron. Man*, entries for years 1102 (recte 1112) and 1142 (recte 1152/3).
24. *Cron. Man.*, entries for years 1225 and 1228.
25. K.H.Jackson, 'Angles and Britons in Northumbria and Cumbria', in H.Lewis (ed.), *Angles and Britons* (Cardiff, 1963), 72.
26. Jackson, 'Angles and Britons', 72-77, 82-84.
27. *Baedae Continuatio* in *Baedae Opera Historica*, ed.C.Plummer (Oxford, 1896), i, 362.
28. *Liber Cartarum Sancte Crucis* (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1840), No 23; *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland*, edd. T.Thomson and C.Innes, i, (Edinburgh, 1844), 56; F.W.Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway Charters - Four Concerning Cardew and One the Westmorland Newbigging', *Transactions of the Dumfries and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, v (1916-18), 231-64 at 249-55.
29. *RRS*, i, 39.
30. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 9.
31. *Liber Sancte Marie de Calchou* (Edinburgh, Bannatyne Club, 1846), No 245.
32. Ibid, No 254.

33. R.C.Reid, 'The feudalisation of lower Nithsdale', *TDGAS*, xxxiv (1955-6), 102-10 at 108-9.

34. K.H.Jackson, 'The sources for the Life of St.Kentigern', in N.K.Chadwick, *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge, 1958), 273-357 at 321.

35. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 1.

36. Ibid, No 32.

37. *Holyrood Liber*, No 52.

38. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 57.

39. *Kelso Liber*, No 245.

40. *Holyrood Liber*, No 23.

41. Cumbria Record Office D/Lons/L5/1/S1.

42. G.W.S.Barrow, 'The pattern of lordship and feudal settlement in Cumbria', *Journal of Medieval History*, i, No 3 (1975), 117-38 at 126.

43. G.W.S.Barrow, *Kingship and Unity* (London, 1981), 57.

44. Ailred of Rievaulx, *Saints of Hexham* in *The Priory of Hexham: The History and Annals of the House* (Surtees Society, 1863), 178; Ailred of Rievaulx, *Relatio Venerabili Ailredi, Abbatis Rievallensis, de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II, Richard I*, ed. R.Howlett (London, 1884-9), iii, 187-90, 196-7; Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Regis Stephani et de Bello Standardii*, in *Chronicles of Stephen etc*, iii, 151-2; William of Newburgh, *Historiam Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of Stephen etc*, i, 186-7.

45. *APS*, i, 56.

46. *Bagimond's Roll*, 'Statement of the Tenths of the Kingdom of Scotland', ed.A.I.Dunlop, *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vi (1939), 74-155 at 74.

47. D.Brooke, 'The Glenkens 1275-1456: Snapshots of a Medieval Countryside', *TDGAS*, lix (1984), 41-56 at 43.

Chapter Two.

Fergus.

The history of Galloway from the early 12th century until 1234 is very much the history of five individuals, the lords of Galloway of the line of Fergus. The origins of this dynasty and the circumstances which brought it to power in the south-west are obscure in the extreme, a situation produced by the marked scarcity of contemporary written material and also of strong native oral traditions. This makes it impossible to state with any certainty the ancestry of Fergus, the known founder of the ruling house, or to reconstruct an ordered chronological sequence of the events of his period of rule. Documentary source material becomes more plentiful after c.1160, however, and allows a more detailed examination of the salient features of Galwegian history in the time of Fergus's successors. For these reasons, the history of the Galloway dynasty cannot take the form of an ordered chronological narrative, but must instead proceed thematically with an analysis of the lordship in the early 12th century, before embarking upon a more detailed study of Galloway under its later rulers, in the succeeding chapters.

The Ancestry of Fergus

Despite arguments advanced in favour of Earl Malcolm and Suibne mac Cinaedh, (1) there is no evidence for any independent power in the south-west before the emergence in the 1130s of Fergus of Galloway. The ancestry of the man and the source of his power over the lordship have, since the 19th century, been the subjects of much conjecture.

The obscurity of Fergus's origins, which stems wholly from the lack of any substantial body of documentation concerning him, has been clouded further by the work of largely antiquarian writers. Once the multiple layers of theorising have been stripped away, we are left with remarkably few pieces of concrete historical fact. What does exist, however, allows for some restrained conjecture.

In view of the evidence for military service being performed by Galwegians in the armies of Malcolm III in the later 11th century, (2) it was regarded as clear that the south-west had been subject to Scottish overlordship. This was seen as probably deriving from Scottish acquisition of the lands and rights of the former kings of Strathclyde. As a result, Fergus came to be viewed either as an upstart who had carved a position for himself in a region where royal power was weak, or as a protégé of the Scots, established in Galloway as a vassal of the Crown. Early writers, such as Mackenzie, (3) saw him as a replacement for the Galwegian leaders killed in 1138 at the battle of the Standard. (4) Mackenzie's theory was taken up enthusiastically by the xenophobic M'Kerlie, whose personal neuroses combined to add high colour to his account of Fergus's role in Galwegian politics.

To M'Kerlie Fergus was no more than a foreign governor, a non-Galwegian foisted by an unprincipled king upon a people left leaderless by the slaughter of its true rulers at Northallerton. (5) Fergus's lack of any patronymic fuelled M'Kerlie's view, and was seized upon as further proof that he was a mere adventurer who had ridden to power on David's shirt tails. The absence of a patronymic is indeed suggestive of there being some truth in the belief that he was a mere parvenu, the first of his line.

More elaborate traditions developed out of these initial observations. Fergus came to be depicted as a boyhood friend of the future David I, sharing with him an up-bringing at the court of Henry I of England. According to Huyshe, Fergus was a 'boon companion' of the boy David, and a 'favoured guest' at the English court. It was there, claimed Huyshe, that he met and fell in love with his future bride, Henry's illegitimate daughter Elizabeth. (6) As a close friend and confidant of David, and son-in-law of the English king, Fergus was destined for greatness. Huyshe concluded that through his close friendship with David, Fergus was to receive the lordship of Galloway when his boyhood friend became king. This supposed upbringing at the Anglo-Norman court and childhood spent with David is a mere echo of M'Kerlie's belief in Fergus's non-Galwegian origins.

This trend culminated in the work of J.F.Robertson, whose popular history of the region took up and amplified all these earlier theories. He narrates in striking clarity Fergus's training at the English court as a companion of Prince David, his meeting with the king's illegitimate daughter and their subsequent marriage. (7) Robertson's version of events is more detailed than those of his predecessors, but this owes more to a fertile imagination than greater scholarship. Much of his work is pure fiction.

The dominant theme of these views was that Fergus was not of native stock or, if he was, had been brought up as a Norman in the English court, owed his position to the favour of the Scottish king and was his appointed governor rather than natural heir to the lordship. While Fergus can be shown to have had close family ties with the English ruling house, there is nothing to support the theory of his education at their court. This appears to have been pure conjecture on Mackenzie's part, and is an attempt to explain how Fergus could possibly have met and married the daughter of the English king. Neither he, nor the writers who followed his thesis, gave any thought to the political implications of the marriage, or even considered that it might have been an act of diplomacy. All were caught up with a romantic interpretation of a lovematch of childhood sweethearts.

As to Fergus's background, there was a striking failure to show any strong evidence for his supposed Anglo-Norman roots. In view of M'Kerlie's contention that he was thoroughly Normanised in outlook and education, an examination of Fergus's career in Galloway could be expected to show signs of this, either in terms of changes in the style of government or the introduction of like-minded men to assist in bringing the lordship into line with contemporary developments in Scotland. The surviving evidence, examined in Chapter 5, does not support this. Indeed, Fergus's association with the conservative earls in the 1159-60 rebellion against Malcolm IV (see below 90-92) may indicate a marked antipathy towards the new social and cultural trends being introduced by the Canmore kings.

For Fergus to have been a 'boon companion' of David I there is little sign of any friendship other than in Galwegian involvement in the 1138 campaign in England. (see below 76-78) There is even less to support the view that Fergus was David's 'man' or that the Scottish king had established Fergus in 'feudal' dependency upon him. A vassalic relationship did become established under Fergus's heirs, but this almost certainly stemmed from the Scottish military conquest of Galloway in 1160. The 'feudal' relationship, however, did not become a significant factor in Scotto-Galwegian relations until after

Alexander II's successful intervention in Galwegian politics after 1234. Rather than strict dependence on the Scottish Crown, there are considerable signs of independence. For example, Fergus's marriage into Henry I's family occurred around the time that English control over Carlisle was being strengthened, and it is clear that the English king was further safeguarding his interests in the border area (see below 70-73). The marriage cannot have been entirely to King David's satisfaction.

To suggest, as M'Kerlie did, that David I was directly responsible for the 'creation' of Fergus, and for his appointment as 'governor' of Galloway, is to credit the Scots with greater authority in the south-west than any surviving documentation implies. David was responsible for the introduction of a new lord into Annandale, (8) which is paralleled in the north by the installation into Moray of Freskin the Fleming, (9) with these 'new men' acknowledging service dues to the Crown as the price for their positions. Whilst there is evidence for Scottish extraction of tribute and levies from Galloway (see above 19-20), there is nothing to suggest that Fergus owed or supplied any significant or regular service dues to David as would be implicit in any grant to him of power over Galloway. Both Bruce and Freskin were foreigners, and it is clear that David was pursuing a policy of installing men of his own creation , clearly indebted to him, in positions of power in strategic regions. Annandale was vital for any attempts to regain control over Carlisle and Moray was a region where the Crown had and was to face repeated challenges to its authority. (10) Galloway does not fit into this pattern. Fergus had no clear connection with David or his household, and was clearly not a dependent foreigner in the mould of Freskin. His name indicates

Gaelic ancestry, which alone would mark him down as an anomaly in a court which was notable for its general domination by men of non-Gaelic background. (11) The firm association with the lordship, which the 'Fergus of Galloway' of the Partick charter of 1136 illustrates, (12) must indicate some longer-standing connection with the region.

In opposition to this view which saw Fergus as an alien interloper, there developed an alternative thesis which saw him as the descendant of a line of Gall-Gaidhil chieftains, probably originating in Argyll or the Isles, but with the possibility of an ancient association with the south-west. Based primarily upon his family's later involvement in Hebridean politics, and on the unsupported belief that the lords of Galloway bore the surname MacDouall or MacDowall, possible a variant of the MacDougall patronymic of the rulers of Argyll and the southern Isles in the 13th century, this view saw Fergus as a man of Norse-Celtic stock, descended from a family which possessed ancient links with the Galloway region. A whole series of strands are interwoven in this thesis, in some cases forming a circular argument unsupported by outside evidence. The weakest element in the whole is the proposition which would equate the names MacDougall and MacDowall, and which would apply them to the family of Fergus (13).

Simple charter and chronicle evidence shows this to be a flawed view. From the time of Fergus down to the death of Alan in 1234, whenever contemporary documentary sources made mention of members of the Galwegian ruling dynasty, they were designated simply as '...of Galloway', or '...the son of Fergus, Uhtred, etc.'. The only surname associated with the ruling house occurs in the Irish annals, where

Roland and his sons are referred to as 'macUghtraigh'. (14) In Fergus's case, he is always designated simply as 'of Galloway' , with no patronymic or other form of name to distinguish him or indicate his ancestry. This suggests that by 1136, when he first appears in a charter source, Fergus was the head of the most important family in the south-west, requiring no other mark of distinction to differentiate him from the lesser nobility. A similar case can be seen with the family of Freskin the Fleming which rose to dominance in Moray in the later 12th century, being designated simply as 'de Moravia', implying a position of supremacy within that region.

While no family name can be attached to the lordly house, the surname MacDowall can be traced back to possible 12th century antecedents. The earliest surviving occurrence of a name linked by some writers to a possible ancestor for the MacDowalls in Galloway dates to the early 1160s, when a potential eponymous forebear, Mactheuel, witnessed Uhtred's grant of the church of Urr to the canons of Holyrood. (15) The descent from that man to the MacDowall family, cannot be proven conclusively, and it is doubtful whether the etymology of the names can be traced to a common root. The origin of later MacDowall influence appears to lie in their adherence to the anti-Bruce, pro-English faction rather than to any tradition of descent from the earlier lords. It must be acknowledged that Uhtred and Roland had other sons from whom this family could have been descended, such as Fergus, son of Uhtred (See Family Tree). The MacDowalls, however, advanced no claims to such an ancestry. This, however, did not prevent speculation concerning the origins of the MacDowalls on the parts of some 19th century writers.

Much weight in the arguments surrounding the ancestry of the MacDowalls, and their possible descent from a cadet line of the Galwegian ruling house, is based on heraldry. This stems from the question of coats of arms used by the lords and by the MacDowalls in the later 13th century. No arms can be assigned to Fergus's family earlier than the first quarter of the 13th century, with a representation on a seal of Alan, son of Roland. This is simply a lion rampant crowned, with no indication of the tinctures used. Since that date, the lion rampant has been adopted as the cognizance of Galloway. The earliest surviving example of the MacDowall arms comes again from a seal impression, that of Dougal MacDowall, appended in 1296 to the Ragman Rolls. (16) This takes the form of a shield, surrounded by three lizards, and bearing a lion rampant. Burke's Complete Armory gives the MacDowall arms as being azure, a lion rampant argent crowned or, (17) which by the 17th century were the arms assigned to the earlier lords. (18) This contention was accepted without question by later writers, such as the compiler of the Scots Peerage (19) and, by circular argument, has been used to show that the earlier lords bore the surname MacDowall. There is, however, no differencing of cadency which would be necessary to show that the MacDowalls were the descendents of a junior branch of the lordly line.

As a development from the above assumption, there arose a tradition which linked the MacDowalls, and by extension the lords of Galloway, with the family of Somerled of Argyll, and in particular with that of his son Dougal, progenitor of the later lords of Lorn, the MacDougalls. Certainly, the two surnames are of similar derivation, being anglicised versions of 'Mac Dubh Gall', with the 'g' in MacDowall probably having been first aspirated, then elided.

Comparison ends here, however, as there are serious difficulties of chronology, the founder of the MacDougall line being three generations younger than Fergus. M'Kerlie, while stressing his belief that the MacDowalls were not cadets of the Galwegian ruling house, favoured the view which saw the MacDougalls and the MacDowalls as kinsmen, (20) but could offer no evidence beyond the similarity of family name to support his theory. He argued, moreover, in favour of descent from the Mactheuel of Uhtred's Holyrood charter, (21) who certainly is not to be equated with Somerled's son. If the MacDowalls are to be accepted as descendants of an eponymous Mactheuel, who was active in the 1160s, and thus a contemporary of both Dougal of Lorn and his father, it cannot be argued that the were a branch of the Argyll dynasty. In the absence of more conclusive proof of a dynastic link, therefore, no weight can be placed on the similarity of the patronymics of the two families.

A theory related to the above is that which would draw a direct connection between the ruling houses of Galloway and Argyll. This sidesteps the issue of family names, drawing instead on the evidence for dynastic links forged between the two houses in the 12th and 13th centuries, and the roles played in Manx and Hebridean politics by Fergus's great-grandsons, Alan and Thomas. No direct connection in fact existed in the form sought by partisans of this theory, such as a possible marriage between Fergus and an unknown daughter or sister of Somerled. This is a garbled version of the marital alliance of Somerled with the Mac Heths. The closest marital link between the two families was established through the medium of Fergus's daughter, Affrica, wife to King Olaf Godredsson of Man, (22) a daughter of the latter being wife in turn to Somerled. The view which points to this latter marriage as evidence for a link between the dynasties of Galloway and Argyll generally fails to take into account that Somerled's wife was not a child of Olaf's marriage to Africa of Galloway, but was appparently one of his illegitimate offspring, born before his marriage in the 1120s to Fergus's daughter. Rather than descending from a common ancestor, or being linked by marriage, therefore, the founders of the two dynasties were no more closely related than by two stages removed of marriage, and even then by an illegitimate daughter of Fergus's son-in-law, not by any blood-relative.

Despite this evidence, some recent scholars have perpetuated the myth of common ancestry and devised increasingly elaborate lines of descent. Radford, in his historical background prefacing the first report on his excavations at Whithorn, describes Fergus as springing from the 'Norwegian Irish ruling class', and traced his pedigree back through the Argyll dynasty to the Norse earls of Orkney. (23) He identified Fergus as the historical personage on whom the fictional hero of the 13th century French romance, le Roman de Fergus, was based, and attempted to link the historical lord of Galloway through the fictional hero's father, one Soumilloit or Somerled, to the founder of the Argyll dynasty. Indeed, Radford went so far as to state that, 'there is no reason to suspect the writer (of the romance) of inventing this parentage for his hero and the name may be accepted'. (24) The crux of Radford's argument rested on the identification of the father of Fergus with an historical Somerled, from whom the lords of Argyll and the later MacDougalls of Lorn were also descended. He based his analysis on Munch's notes concerning the origins of the 12th century Somerled of Argyll, who was killed in battle at Renfrew in 1164, and proposed that the common ancestor in question was a late 11th century figure, one Somerled, king of the Isles, who died in 1083. (25) This man, it has been suggested, was a descendant of Earl 'Gilli' of the Hebrides, son-in-law of Sigurd the Stout, earl of Orkney. From this line, it was argued, both Fergus of Galloway and his near contemporary, Somerled of Argyll, were descended. (26) This latter contention is not borne out by any of the genealogies relating to the Argyll line, whose descent can possibly be traced back into the ranks of a junior branch of the ruling house of the Irish kingdom of Oriel. (27) At no point in these genealogies does an earlier Somerled appear, which calls into question the argument which would equate the historical Fergus with the hero of the romance on the basis of parentage alone.

The value of the Roman de Fergus as a trustworthy historical source is a matter for debate. There is no clear agreement on the circumstances of its composition, but it has long been suggested that it was a work intimately concerned with the Galwegian dynasty, perhaps having been commissioned by, or written in honour of, a member of that line. (28) The generally accepted view amongst proponents of this argument is that it was composed for Alan of Galloway, possibly on the occasion of his marriage in 1209 to Margaret, niece of King William. (29) Dominica Legge wove an elaborate theory around the personal and place-names contained within the text, and linked them in various ways to Alan's family in both maternal and paternal lines, to the families of his kinsmen and allies in Scotland and the Isles, and to the lands and offices which he held in the kingdom. (30) The argument is somewhat contrived, the allusions she makes in some cases being so cryptic as to be almost indecipherable. An alternative proposal would see the romance as a work of Balliol propaganda, produced by Devorgilla after 1234 to advance the claims of her sons to the throne, by virtue of her descent from David, earl of Huntingdon. (31)

In both cases, the bad light in which Somerled is portrayed, and the clear references to his inferior background, can have been of little credit to the supposed patrons of the work. The Devorgilla thesis, where the Roman is supposedly a work designed to cast lustre on her family and aid them in their aspirations to the Scottish throne, is particularly untenable. Firstly, she would have had to possess clairvoyant abilities to know that her youngest son was to be a contender for the throne in 1290-1. Secondly, advertising that your family was descended from peasant stock would surely have been suicidal in this context. With success dependent on the support of the aristocracy, it would have been a potentially fatal blunder to focus attention on the lowly origins of your dynasty, irrespective of its status by that date.

There are further objections which cast serious doubts upon the genealogical value of the Roman, and call into question the whole issue of its connection with the Galloway dynasty. Most notable amongst these is the question of the specific aim of the author of the work. If, as has been proposed by Owen, (32) the poet was composing a near parody of the conventional romance genre, as represented by the work of Chretien of Troyes, what value should be attached to names and locations given in his poem? Many obscure allusions, lost to us, may have been instantly recognisable to connoisseurs of the fashionable romances of the 13th century. It should be noted, moreover, that the poet, a Picard clerk named Guillaume, possessed only a very sketchy knowledge of the geography of western mainland Britain, and more particularly of Galloway and the Isles. This deficiency is difficult to reconcile with the belief held by some authorities that Guillaume is to be identified with Alan of Galloway's clerk, William, prior of St.Mary's Isle. (33) Similar objections can be raised as regards the composer's supposed attachment to Devorgilla's household.

Building on the defects obvious in the writer's knowledge of western Scotland, Joan Greenberg constructed an alternative hypothesis. (34) She pointed to the treatment of the character of the fictional Fergus, whom she describes as 'naif, gauche and rather dense', and the unfavourable treatment of Soumilloit, who is portrayed as a parvenu peasant owing his social advancement to a good marriage. She thus rejects the suggestion which would interpret the poem as a glorification of Alan's forebears. There is, moreover, a clear absence of any reference to the lord of Galloway as a patron, unlikely if the romance had been written specifically at his request in honour of his family. The unflattering treatment of the principal character and his father, if they are to be interpreted as Alan's ancestors, would have been unlikely to please any medieval nobleman, but particularly someone of the social status of the lord of Galloway. Her alternative proposal is that Guillaume le Clerc may have come to Britain in 1216 in the train of the Dauphin Louis, and had in some way become attached to the army of Alexander II when the Scots and French had met at Dover. He may have remained with this army, and had returned with it to Scotland, thus acquiring a detailed knowledge of the topography of the eastern part of that kingdom. The romance was then composed several years after this journey, which explains the mistakes in the geographical details. The poem had no ulterior political motive, such as forming a piece of Balliol propaganda, nor was it intended as a glorification of the Galloway dynasty. It was, rather, simply a romance written in the Arturian genre, with names for the settings and the principal characters drawn from sources other than the conventional pool of traditional Arthurian romantic literature. Guillaume chose to depart from tradition and named his characters after figures drawn from his personal experience. There are still areas of doubt in this hypothesis, but it is probably closer to reality than the elaborate interpretations constructed by some other writers.

In spite of the doubts thrown on her historical analysis, Dominica Legge persisted in her identification of the Fergus of the Roman with the historical personage, concentrating still further on the issue of his parentage. In a short note on The Father of Fergus of Galloway, (35) she accepted the historical impossibility of Fergus being the son of the Somerled killed in 1164, but placed considerable emphasis still on the marriage ties between their families. Legge abandoned the argument for any closer link with the Argyll dynasty by that route, or descent from the ruler of the Isles killed in 1083. Instead she introduced yet another Somerled, namely Sumarlidi Hauldr. He is another elusive character about whom little is known. He appears briefly in the fragments which make up the Orkneyinga Saga text as a west coast or Hebridean land-holder who was killed in 1156 by Swein Asleifson. (36) Considerable problems surround him, relating particularly to his ancestry, his relationship with the Argyll dynasty (he would have been a contemporary of Somerled the Great), and the location of the lands which he supposedly controlled. The principal problem, however, is confusion within the saga itself between Sumarlidi Hauldr and Somerled of Argyll, which in places makes it possible that they are one and the same character, or a conflation of two. The fate ascribed to Sumarlidi, however, is difficult to reconcile with the ultimate death in battle of the historical Somerled. Passing over these problems, Legge proposed that Fergus was a son of Sumarlidi _Hauldr_, whose ambitions led him to quit his father's household and journey to the court of King David at Carlisle, just as the fictional hero of the poem is described as quitting his father's home to travel to the court of King Arthur. There, he had won David's favour and been granted the lordship of Galloway while his father was still living.

Clinging to the romantic interpretation, Legge proposed that the Soumilloit of the poem, described as 'uns vilains de Pelande', represented a play on the name Sumarlidi Hauldr, or Somerled the Hold. The 'Hold' element of the name was interpreted as a social distinction, similar to the Westmorland 'statesman', signifying a free-born land-holder of middling class. The peasant Somerled of the _Roman_, therefore, with his castle and elevated social position, is seen almost as a charicature of Sumarlidi Hauldr. The fictional Somerled's fortunate marriage to a woman of noble lineage, moreover, is explained by Legge in terms of the probable marriage of Sumarlidi to a member of the old royal line of Argyll. This is used to explain Fergus's name, it having been common amongst male members of the Dalriadic line. According to this hypothesis, therefore, the lord of Galloway was the son of Somerled, but of neither of the men of that name proposed by earlier writers and, through his mother, was linked with the pre-Norse ruling-house of Argyll. This interpretation is based almost entirely upon supposition, rendering it unwise to place any weight on its historical value.

The weight of the evidence suggests that little store, if any, should be placed in le Roman de Fergus. In no particular can it be shown to relate to the Galloway dynasty, and beyond the coincidence of names there seems to be no grounds for accepting it as evidence for the parentage of Fergus. Similarly, the Soumilloit or Somerled of the poem can not be conclusively identified with any of the alternative candidates of that name provided by independent historical sources. The 11th century Somerled and the Sumarlidi Hauldr of the sagas are little more than names, about whom and around whom elaborate theories have been constructed. The evidence of the poem, such as it is, must therefore be set aside, leaving the question of Fergus's descent from a man named Somerled an open one. The most which can be said is probably best summarised by A.A.M.Duncan, who described Fergus as a man '...whose antecedents were probably Norse-Celtic and may have been West Highland'. (37) Beyond this, little more can be said on the basis of the purely literary evidence.

The Lordship of Fergus

While little can be said regarding the lineage of Fergus and the origins of his family, some way can be gone towards reconstructing the development of their power base within Galloway. From this basis, some general comments can be made regarding his ancestry. The emergence of Fergus by the 1130s as ruler of a substantial block of territory in south-western Scotland cannot be explained away in terms of a grant of lordship by David I, or his imposition of a court favourite as a governor over that region. Certain aspects of Fergus's actions as ruler of Galloway and the attitudes displayed towards both him and his successors by writers of chronicles, suggest some older association with the region perhaps based instead on inherited rights.

In the preceding chapter, the composite nature of the territorial structure of the later lordship and the relationship of its ruler to the Strathclyde kings were touched on briefly. The distinct character of the block of country lying between the rivers Urr and Nith, and its later acquisition by Uhtred was referred to, with the suggestion that it had originally come under Cumbrian overlordship, an arrangement fossilised in its inclusion within the diocese of Glasgow. The territory west of the Urr comprised the earlier lordship, to which the eastern district was later appended. The processes by which this original agglomeration of land was accumulated cannot be recovered, which lends the area an aspect of seemingly blank uniformity. Charter evidence relating to grants of land by Fergus and his heirs within that western region, however, hint at its gradual development out of an original core. The distribution of the places involved in these early grants display a marked regional concentration, perhaps betraying the location of the territory which formed Fergus's paternal inheritance.

No original document issued by Fergus survives, but confirmation of his grants in charters issued by his descendants show the concentration of endowments made by Fergus and Uhtred as being in east central Galloway. This restricted distribution within the district lying between the rivers Urr and Fleet, and to the lower Dee valley in particular, is all the more marked by the noticeably poorer survival of documents from the regions further west. The Dee valley, moreover, displayed a singular concentration in the distribution of grants made by Fergus's sons and grandsons also, which implies that the bulk of their personal estates lay within that area and that it may have formed the heartland of the later lordship, the core from which the major territorial block of the early 12th century had been built up.

Support for the above contention is provided by a number of factors, mostly related to the descent of the lordship estates through the successors of Fergus's great-grandson, Alan. On his death without direct legitimate male heirs in 1234, the Galloway inheritance was partitioned, according to 'feudal' principles, between the husbands of his three surviving daughters (See below 219). In accordance with these principles, Galloway was treated as a fief held of the Crown and subjected to dismemberment. As a fief, however, the caput and principal estates were not divided amongst the sisters, but passed intact into the possession of the eldest, Helen, and her husband, Roger de Quincy. On his death witout male heirs, the Quincy paternal lands were treated in a similar fashion, but Helen's personal estates were subdivided between the husbands of her three daughters by him. It is on an inquest post mortem, held in August 1296, to determine the extent of the estates of the youngest of these sisters, Helen de la Zouche, that any reconstruction of the Quincy lands in Galloway must be based. (38) The inquest records land scattered throughout the south-west, but with a marked concentration in the lower Dee valley. Apart from a small block of land at Troqueer held by Helen, the portion east of the Urr appears to have fallen largely to her aunt, Devorgilla, Alan's youngest daughter, which perhaps reflected a conscious division between the traditional inherited land west of the Urr and acquired land to its east.

The role of Kirkcudbright as the centre of the early lordship can be fairly well established. Traditionally, the earthwork site at Castle Fergus or Palace Isle, just to the east of the town, has been identified as the stronghold of Fergus and his elder son, Uhtred. With no excavation work on this site having been carried out, the date of its abandonment is unknown, but it was probably replaced by the mid-13th century at the latest by the stone-built castle of enceinte at Castledykes on the southern edge of Kirkcudbright. This has generally been regarded as a royal castle, appearing as such by the last quarter of the century, (39) but there is no reason to discount its having been built originally by Quincy. Certainly, Roger de Quincy held land at Kirkcudbright in 1237, (40) and by the 1290s the town was described as belonging to William de Ferrars, (41) who was descended from Roger's eldest daughter, Margaret, Countess of Derby. This would seem to represent a continuation of the policy which saw the caput as indivisible, with Kirkcudbright descending through the line of senior heiresses on both occasions. It would seem then, that at least in the eyes of the parties arranging the subdivisions of the Galloway inheritance, the district around Kirkcudbright represented the heart of the Galloway lands. By extension from this, it is possible that this territory, which corresponds roughly with the subdivision of medieval Galloway known as Desnes, formed the pre-12th century lordship of Fergus's predecessors, from which they extended their authority into neighbouring regions.

The exact extent of the domain of the lords of Galloway in the 12th century cannot be determined with precision, but in the time of Fergus's sons, the region under their overlordship was regarded as encompassing the whole country from the North Channel to the Nith, bounded to the north by the Rhinns of Kells and Glenken Hills and to the south by the Solway. Carrick may have fallen into their sphere, but any link was severed shortly after 1186 when William the Lion erected it into a lordship for the junior branch of the lordly line, descended from Gilbert, son of Fergus. The assumption that Fergus also exercised rule over this same extended region in the early 12th century drew some support from belief in his traditional involvement in the revival of the episcopal see of Whithorn. (42) Fergus's involvement in the revival at Whithorn, however, is open to question, and the geographical extent of the bishopric can no longer be regarded with certainty as a reflection of the political sphere of the lord of Galloway (See below 269-73).

That Fergus's control extended into western Galloway from early in the 12th century is supported by a number of factors. Firstly, there is the association of his descendants with the castle of Cruggleton near Whithorn and a number of important estates in the vicinity. This castle also pertained to the Quincy inheritance, passing through the second daughter, Elizabeth, into the possession of the Comyn family (See below 225). On record by the early 1140s, when it was visited by St. Malachy of Armagh on his return to Ireland from Clairvaux, (43) Cruggleton represented the chief fortress of the later lords in western Galloway. Although described in the Life of St. Malachy as being the stronghold of David I, where the saint cured the king's ailing son Henry, it appears that the author, Bernard of Clairvaux, had compressed locations and events, confusing a visit to the royal castle at Carlisle with one to the lord of Galloway's residence at Cruggleton.

Carlisle was one of David's chief residences at this time, and a visit there would have been an obvious stage on a journey back through Galloway for the sea-crossing to Ulster. Malachy, as an active ecclesiatical reformer, would have had much in common with the king. Residence at Cruggleton, a remote stronghold on the Galloway coast, is extremely unlikely for David, and we have no evidence that he ever set foot west of the Nith. The castle, however, has long been linked in tradition and historical record with the lords of Galloway. Malachy's visit to Cruggleton may have been more than a courtesy visit to the lord of the region through which he was passing, and may have involved ecclesiastical business. It has been suggested that this was the occasion on which the first steps towards the foundation of Soulseat Abbey were taken. (44) There is a clear implication in the Life that Cruggleton was the seat of power in this region. We have no firm grounds on which to identify this power with Fergus, but the possession of this castle by his heirs provides strong circumstantial evidence that it was Fergus whom Malachy would have met. On this basis, therefore, it can be argued that Fergus's territories centred on Wigtown Bay and the Dee estuary.

A second factor strongly indicative of a major landed concern in western Galloway is the close association of Fergus with two Wigtownshire monasteries; Soulseat Abbey and the priory of canons regular serving the cathedral at Whithorn. (45) The foundation of the former is ascribed to him in two sources, the Obituary of Prémontré and the Necrology of Newhouse, whilst Whithorn is assigned to him only in the Obituary. (46) The establishment of religious foundations on this scale required substantial landed resources from which to endow new monasteries. The foundation of two such establishments within the same general region by the same man, suggests that Fergus had access to such resources. It is clear, then, that by the time of his resignation of control over the lordship in 1160, Fergus enjoyed overlordship of the country stretching from the Urr to the North Channel, and was in possession of a substantial landed domain within that region, which placed him on a level above any of the other regional nobility.

The Style of the Rulers of Galloway

The nature of Fergus's control over Galloway in the 12th century and his relationship to David I is perhaps best revealed by the style and titles used by, or accorded to, both him and his descendants. The use of certain titles for Fergus and his successors has been taken as indicative of the exalted status which they felt themselves to possess, or were regarded by others as possessing. These titles demonstrate their undisputable supremacy over the region and its people. The particular style of the titles in use in the early 12th century has been interpreted as generally claiming some degree of royalty. This could indicate that Fergus felt his power to derive from no higher authority, a quite telling point against any proposal for his being subordinate to David, or appointed by him. What was being claimed by Fergus was that his position was acquired through inheritance and not from the hands of some overlord. Less exalted titles are accorded to both Fergus and his heirs in Scottish sources, which suggests that the Scots challenged any claims to royalty and the independence which royal status implied. This is consistent with the efforts of David and his heirs to ensure that there was only one king in Scotland. It is probable that the change in style which occurred in the later 12th and 13th centuries represented a gradual acknowledgement of a closer relationship to, and overlordship by, the Scottish Crown.

In most modern works, Fergus is usually accorded the title 'lord of Galloway', an anachronistic style which was never used by him in his own lifetime. In some works, he is referred to as 'self-styled "king"' of Galloway, a phraseology which seems to seek to deny any legitimate claim to royal status on his part. (47) In general, however, contemporary sources awarded him no distinguishing title, most usually designating him simply as 'of Galloway'. (48) There are five main early exceptions to this general rule, where titles of royal or apparently princely nature are used, occurring in the records of the Hospitallers, the writings of Walter Daniel, Irish Annals, the Chronicle of Holyrood, and the works of Roger of Howden.

The first of these, appearing in Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, is a record of a grant made by Fergus to the Knights of the Order of St. John. (49) The text of the grant is lost, but the subject heading has been preserved amongst a list of landed endowments bestowed on the Order by various benefactors. In its existing form, it states simply that 'Fergus, King of the Galwits, gave land in Galloway'. The title, 'king of the Galwits', was probably lifted directly from the heading of the original charter and is unlikely to have been invented by the clerk compiling the list of endowments. It indicates that Fergus, or the recipients of the land at least, had an elevated view of his social status. The date of the grant is unknown.

The use of apparently royal titles in association with members of the Galloway dynasty is not restricted to this isolated instance. Walter Daniel, in his Life of Ailred of Rievaulx, (50) refers to the ruler of Galloway as 'regulus', a title translated as 'petty king' by the editor of the text. Although no name is given, the context is such that there is no doubt that it is Fergus to whom reference is being made. The noun regulus, a diminutive of rex, can be translated as kinglet, petty king or even prince. It can, however, be simply taken as 'ruler', which removes the obvious royal connotations in the use of the noun. In 12th century Scottish and Manx sources, the title 'regulus' is used to style Somerled of Argyll, (51) the intention being perhaps to indicate a subordination to a higher authority, in this case either the king of Scots or king of the Isles. The title is not used in any source to describe the descendants of either man, a possible indication of a drop in status brought about by the division of power in the territories of both between their sons.

Irish sources make reference to the royal status of the rulers of Galloway. Fergus himself does not appear in any Irish text, but his grandson, Roland, and great-grandson, Alan, appear on occasions. Where they occur, both Roland and Alan are accorded the style 'Rí Gall-Gaidhil', (52) a designation which raises many problems of its own (see chapter 7 for a discussion of Gall-Gaidhil and Galloway). The title rí is a designation used in Irish sources to denote anyone with some degree of royal pretensions, ranging from minor tribal chieftains to major territorial rulers. It does, however, imply that the person to whom the title was applied had some right to a degree of kingship. In Irish eyes, therefore, there would have been no problem in fixing Fergus's status in the social hierarchy of the time. To them he, or rather his descendants, were kings, rulers over the Galwegians, probably holding a status equivalent to that of the multitude of petty rulers who governed the various tribal kingdoms in Ireland. Similar titles were used to describe the rulers of Argyll and the Isles in the later Middle Ages, and the usage continued to be applied in Ireland to family chieftains into the 16th and 17th centuries. In an Irish context, the lesser kings were grouped into federations under more powerful rulers, and it is possible that this is the sort of relationship which the Irish chroniclers may have viewed the lord of Galloway as having with the king of Scots.

A less independent but still exalted status has been taken to be implied by the title applied to Fergus and his sons in the two remaining sources to be considered. The compiler of the Holyrood chronicle, in which monastery Fergus ended his days as an Augustinian canon, styles him as 'princeps Galwaie', usually translated as 'prince of Galloway'. (53) Similarly, Roger of Howden, who was personally familiar with Fergus's son, Gilbert, having been sent to Galloway as an envoy by Henry II, when giving titles to Fergus's sons, refers to them as 'principes Galwalensium'. (54) Doubt has been cast on the value of the Holyrood chronicle, with suggestions that it was not a disinterested source, giving exaggerated titles to a man who had been a considerable benefactor of the abbey. Fergus appears twice in the chronicle, in the annals for 1160 and 1161. In the former, the conquest of Galloway by Malcolm IV is recorded, with Fergus's subsequent retiral into Holyrood and gift of land to the canons completing the annal. The second entry records his obit in May 1161. There is nothing in either to suggest that the chronicler was seeking to overstate the importance of his abbey's former patron, indeed, the brevity of the texts in question argues against this being the case.

The use of the title by Roger of Howden seems to add more weight to its value. To him, Uhtred and Gilbert were 'principes', or on one occasion 'duces', of the Galwegians. The titles, however, do not appear in the alternative version of his chronicle, the so-called _Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough_, (55) which in many ways provides more details of the events in Galloway from 1174 to 1186. In it, no style is granted to the rulers of the lordship, they are simply designated as 'the sons of Fergus'. This raises questions of precisely what Roger was implying by his use of certain titles when applied to men of uncertain status.

The translation of the Latin noun _princeps_ as prince, in its accepted modern sense, is anachronistic. In no early medieval British source is it applied in an unambiguous manner to men of quasi-regal status. In the case of the native rulers of Wales, who nowadays are referred to as princes, implying a lower status or grade of kingship than their English counterparts, medieval sources generally describe them as _rex_ or _regulus_. Only in the case of David I, who before his accession to the Scottish throne in 1124 is on occasion described as 'prince of Cumbria', does _princeps_ appear to carry its later medieval and modern meaning. A strict interpretation of the noun would translate it as leader, chief or first man, with prince only emerging as a royal title in the late Middle Ages. Roger's use of 'duces' on one occasion, an alternative noun signifying simply a position of leadership, supports an interpretation of 'princeps' as meaning only a leader or chieftain, with no quasi-regal connotations in this case. When viewed from this standpoint, the use of the style 'princeps Galwaie', or any of its variants, to describe Fergus or his sons, cannot be taken as proof of any royal status in the manner which the titles 'rex Galwicensium' or 'ri Gall-Gaidhil' can. Of these two last titles, the first appears to have been used by Fergus to describe himself, and the second by Irish writers to describe a man whose status in their eyes cannot have been dissimilar to that of many of their own tribal chieftains. It is perhaps more significant that no Scottish or English source (with the sole exception of those which use the ambiguous term 'princeps') accords any title which can be taken to imply regality. Indeed, the writers seem almost at pains to avoid using any designation which would acknowledge such a status.

It has been suggested that 'the royalty of Galloway was suppressed in 1160-1 by Malcolm IV', (56) involving the forced retirement of Fergus into a monastery and the partition of his former domain between his sons. Certainly, the style used by his successors as rulers over the region never again assume royal pretensions and Scottish sources similarly strenuously avoid use of any title which could imply royal status. There does, however, appear to have been a general uncertainty about what status rulers subsequent to Fergus possessed, the terminology employed by chancery clerks and chroniclers displaying a remarkable vagueness. In the later 12th and 13th centuries, the style which gradually gains currency is 'dominus Galweiae', or variants upon that theme, (57) translated as 'lord of Galloway', a title now applied in modern works to all members of the line from Fergus to Alan.

In its more general application, when accorded as an honorific to a member of the landed nobility, the style dominus need not imply any specialised function or specified status such as the title comes carried. Its most common usage was to signify a man of high status, not neccessarily indicating any specific position within the social hierarchy, but denoting that the man was worthy of respect. There was, however, a small group of the Scottish nobility where the style appears to have a specialised meaning. This can be seen where it is applied in conjunction with possession of a major territorial subdivision, such as Badenoch or Galloway. The formula used in these cases is 'X lord of Y', as opposed to the more common 'lord X of Y'. The group of men to which the former title formula was applied formed an extremely restricted subset within the top-most stratum of the territorial nobility, equated with or narrowly surpassed by the earls alone. Such broad-based territorial titles occur generally in areas outwith the traditional heartland of the kingdom, such as the western or south-western periphery, and were applied to rulers of substantial territorial agglomerations, in some cases exceeding the earldoms in scale. How this distribution is to be interpreted is open to question.

The emergence of these great territorial lordships is difficult to trace, but the development of the earldoms may provide some useful pointers. The title 'earl' was in Scotland an importation of early 12th century date. Applied to men who had previously held the office of mormaer, holding the major provincial subdivisions of the kingdom, such as Fife, Mar, Buchan, Strathearn or Atholl, it is found initially with a restricted geographical distribution, confined to the heartland of the old kingdom north of the Forth. In Lothian, the earls of Dunbar represented an old Anglian line, whilst such northern earldoms as Ross or Caithness were new creations, or former Norwegian dignities subsumed by the Scottish Crown. Such instances represent exceptions to the main distribution. The creation of earldoms outwith the ancient heartland was a gradual process, generally marking the firm establishment of royal power over a region which had formerly lain on the periphery of the Crown's effective sphere of control, or representing an attempt to bolster royal influence by identifying the local ruler firmly with the Crown as an officer in the locality. Its main use seems to have been restricted largely to the former provincial nobility of mormaer rank, who enjoyed great independence within their own territories. It marked them out as the principal agents of royal power in the localities and and linked them closely with the Crown, thus placing curbs on any separatist tendencies. These men came to represent the top-most level in the social strata, a position clearly demonstrated by their placing within the pecking order of precedence in the witness lists of royal charters. (58) As regards position within the social hierarchy, it is clear that the title of earl represented in many ways only an honorific, with real power coming to be vested in the royal officers such as chancellor, chamberlain, constable, and later, justiciar. It remained, however, a mark of social primacy, which placed them at the head of a graded scale of status within the nobility as first in secular affairs after the king and his immediate family. Within their own ranks, however, there was an apparent pecking order, with Fife claiming, not always with success, a position of primacy and poor earldoms, such as the under-endowed Angus, lying towards the bottom of the scale. Indeed, it can be seen that the earlier earldoms, based on the power and resources of the the great provinces, generally exceeded the importance of the later creations, such as Carrick, whose positions were founded on narrow territorial bases. The true status of the earls is often more clearly demonstrated in terms of regional politics. This reveals a hierarchy based less on gradation of titles, such as clerks of the royal chapel produced in the witness lists of charters, and more on a reality centred on actual wealth, power and territorial control.

This is illustrated quite neatly by the position of Duncan, earl of Carrick, in relationship to Alan, lord of Galloway, as revealed in the witness lists of a series of charters issued to the monks of the abbeys of Vauday and Melrose by members of the Colville family. (59) In the early 13th century Thomas de Colville granted land in his barony of Dalmellington in Kyle to the Cistercian abbey of Vauday in Lincolnshire, which transferred its rights in 1223 to the monks of Melrose. (60) Dalmellington lay in southern Kyle, on the frontiers of Carrick, Galloway and Nithsdale, the main political divisions of the region, and was held directly of the Crown by the Colvilles. As witnesses to his grant, Thomas was able to call on the most influential members of the south-western nobility, representing the ruling families of the three above-named regions. If the structure of the witness list is to be regarded as representative of what was felt to be the hierarchy of the regional nobility, the lowly position of the one earl within it suggests that the acquisition of that title by Duncan of Carrick did little to enhance his power or status within the south-west. In the initial grant, Alan of Galloway was the principal secular witness, preceded only by the abbot of Melrose. Following in succession to Alan is his uncle Fergus, son of Uhtred, then Edgar, son of Duvenald, one of the lords of Nithsdale, Duncan, earl of Carrick and finally a succession of minor Gaelic leaders, such as the head of the Kennedy family. The relegation of the one earl to fourth position amongst the secular witnesses, behind two _domini_ and a man whose sole claim to status was as the uncle of one of those two, must surely reflect a hierarchy based on landed power, a commodity with which an extent of Carrick in the 1260s suggests that the earls were not overly provided. (61)

The position of the earl of Carrick in the south-western power structure was somewhat anomalous, for he was the only earl created south of the Forth from the inclusion of Dunbar within the Scottish nobility in the early 12th century until the creation of the Fleming earldom of Wigtown in 1341. Southern Scotland, or more specifically Strathclyde, was a land of domini, men whose landed base put them on a par with most of the northern earls, but whose titles marked them down in some way as being inferior to those bearing the style of earl. The antiquity of their lordships is beyond dispute. Each unit appears to originate as a subdivision of the former kingdom of Strathclyde, ruled before the establishment of the Anglo-Norman lords by what was clearly a Celtic nobility exercising power directly below the Crown. In this, they seem to have been little different from the nobles who emerged as earls by the end of the 12th century. The significant difference seems to have been that they did not hold a territory which could be identified with one of the sub-provinces of old Scotia, regions which still possessed some archaic, quasi-regal features in the 12th century, but were provincial rulers within a country which had been acquired by the Scots in the 11th century. This seems to be the crux of the argument. The domini of Strathclyde could not trace their institutional history back to the hereditary sub-royalty of the former Pictish territories, in most cases owing their office instead to the kings of the Canmore dynasty. Certainly, they were lords over their region, acknowledging no superior but the king of Scots, but they were clearly lords by royal appointment. Only in such cases as Galloway and Nithsdale where there is uncertainty with regard to the origins of the ruling dynasties is the source of lordly power not directly attributable to royal grant. Even in these cases, however, royal involvement cannot be entirely ruled out. Admittedly the earls also received their titles from the Crown, and recognised in return that they held their lands and positions as fiefs; but their elevated style and social primacy represented a continued recognition of their predecessors' exercise of quasi-regal powers.

While the above argument may in part explain the social precedence of the earls over the lords, it only goes some way towards an understanding of the position of the lord of Galloway. It does not explain the extraordinary value and importance attached to this style. Certainly there appear to have been some difficulties on the part of the royal clerks in finding a title which would adequately explain the status of the rulers of Galloway, but without according any style which would admit any degree of royalty. The lords of Galloway were the equals in power and prestige of the earls, a social group who derived their positions from a tradition which claimed, with some justification, royal or princely status for their holders. The powers and landed base of the Galloway dynasty were, at times, greater than those of the other men accorded lordly status, such as the Comyns in Badenoch, or the Bruces in Annandale.

In terms of wealth and influence, the lords of Galloway were at least the equals of the Scottish earls. This position was enhanced after 1196 by process of dynastic inheritance, whereby the extensive possessions of the Morville family fell to Roland as husband of Helen, principal heiress to that family's lands. He had, moreover, acquired the coveted title of Constable of Scotland, one of the chief titular offices of the realm. Despite this remarkable standing amongst the Scottish nobility, there was never any suggestion by the kings of Scots that Fergus's heirs should be granted the title of earl. This was, perhaps, a move designed to curb the regal pretensions of the Galloway line, such as Fergus had expressed, denying them the link with a quasi-regal past which most earls possessed through their ability to trace descent from a holder of the office of mormaer. The creation of the earldom of Carrick for Gilbert's son, by which a minor lordship of limited power and resources was elevated into social superiority over the lordship of Galloway, was a calculated move by the Crown. It was clearly an attempt by the king to counter-balance the power of Galloway by introducing a new secular power enjoying the rank and privileges of the top echelon of the nobility into the south-western power structure, but in this it was singularly unsuccessful. Duncan of Carrick possessed neither the landed wealth nor political dominance which his relatives enjoyed within Galloway. His title made him their social superior, but until the extinction of the male line in the lordship, he was a second rate power in the region in comparison to them.

This, then, is the dilemma facing commentators on the position or acts of the ruler of Galloway. In land, military strength and political power he was more than equal to the earls. In addition to his lordship powers, he enjoyed a high position in the royal administration from the 1190s and held a title which placed him in the top rank of office-holders. Duncan and Brown, indeed, go so far as to describe the lords of Galloway as being 'in fact though not in name "mormaers", governors of sea-board provinces'. (62) Despite this, however, Roland and Alan were denied the dignity of an earldom, although their cousin had received that honour for his lordship in Carrick. It is clear that this ambiguity of position caused problems to foreigners, who may not have been able to differentiate between the fine points of semantics which denied these men entry into the top rank of the social hierarchy. Clearly, to some of them, there was great difficulty in isolating any distinction between the lord of Galloway and that of any of his supposed social superiors. Thus, for Richard of Hexham, Fergus was an earl, (63) just as for the composer of *Haakon's Saga* over a century later, Alan was '...an earl in Scotland...a son of Rollant earl of Galloway'. (64) Yet, in Scottish sources, Fergus's successors were never given any greater style than *dominus*.

The denial of the grant of the title of 'earl of Galloway' to any of Fergus's descendants must be seen as a deliberate attempt by the Crown to limit the position of the Galloway dynasty within the kingdom. Apart from the rejection of any claim to former semi-royal status, such as may have been implied by the grant of the title of earl to holders of former mormaerdoms, it may also have been a reaction against the ambivalent ideas nature of the lords themselves about their social ranking. Operating on two levels, both within and without the sphere of the king of Scots, they seemed on the one hand to accept the overlordship of the Crown, paying cain, providing military service and fulfilling the obligations with which other nobles were burdened; but on the other they felt capable of transferring their allegiances elsewhere, conducting aggressive foreign policy and indulging in wars of territorial aggrandisement abroad. Other than the lord of the Isles in the later Middle Ages, no other Scottish *dominus*, let alone earl, felt capable of pursuing this mode of social behaviour.

This returns the question once again to what was implied by the title of dominus and how it relates to what is known of the power of the lords of Galloway and their relationship to the Crown. It would seem that it was applied in most cases to the rulers of substantial territorial blocks, such as Annandale, Nithsdale, Cunninghame, Lorn or the Garioch, districts which could trace an existence as components of larger political groupings from at least the late 11th century. Their rulers exercised considerable local powers, but were regarded as subject to the Crown, receiving their positions from the hands of the king, as is demonstrated most clearly by the grant of Annandale to the Bruces. (65) They were not regarded as possessing some residual aspect of former royal or quasi-regal status in the way that the original earls were, although in terms of the exercise of justice, military leadership and local control they enjoyed a position, like that of the earls, which in some ways could be described as regalian.

The emergence of the title of lord of Galloway after the Scottish conquest of 1160 reinforces the above interpretation, and must reflect the beginnings of effective royal control over Galloway in the later 12th century. The use of the style dominus emphasised the subordination of the ruler of Galloway to a superior power in just the same way as the lords of Nithsdale, Annandale, Cunninghame or Lauderdale were subject to royal restraints on their powers. It is a clear indication of the beginnings of the vassalic relationship which was to emerge in the course of the 12th and 13th centuries. It may, however, have been a somewhat optimistic move on the part of the Scottish administration, for the image which the style dominus conveys with regard to these other lords falls far short of the reality of the lord of Galloway's powers. In essence, therefore, it was a compromise title, used where no other suitable alternative existed which could express the status of the rulers of Galloway without admitting any greater degree of independence or acknowledging claims to regality.

Galloway and Scotland c.1100-1160.

The development of the lordship in the early 12th century, both in terms of territorial extent and the political influence of its ruler, occurred at a time when the power of the Scottish monarchy was undergoing similar expansion. During the period from 1097 to 1153, the throne was held by a series of dynamic kings, sons of Malcolm III and Margaret, who sought to extend their influence into areas on the periphery of the kingdom, or to reassert control in regions such as Argyll or the south-west, where the royal interest appears to have been allowed to decline in the preceding century. In both these districts, the absence of firm government from the centre cannot but have fuelled the development of separatist tendencies and encouraged the growth of ruling dynasties which did not look to the Canmore kings for the source of their powers. The result in Galloway appears to have been the emergence of a family which acquired control over a substantial portion of the region, and whose relationship with the Scottish Crown was far from precise. Indeed, by the early part of the 12th century, the head of that family appears to have been arrogating some degree of royal rank to himself, which suggests an independence of mind which had little regard for the overlordship of the Scottish Crown.

The creation of a princely appanage for the younger brother of Alexander I in the former territories of the Strathclyde kings started a process which saw the irrevocable shift southwards of the main centres of royal government in the course of the 12th century. The development of Roxburgh and more especially Carlisle under David I, the former whilst he was ruler of Cumbria before 1124 and the latter as king of Scots, saw the political centre of the kingdom move south of the old heartland north of the Forth into Lothian and Strathclyde. As a result of this shift, there is an evident increase in royal interest in its residual rights and privileges in this southern region, both with a view towards establishing the fiscal position of the Crown and the extent of its powers, but also with a view to regulating the standing of the provincial Church. This last point is manifest in such acts as David's inquest into the lands of the see of Glasgow, or his grants of tithes of royal revenues from cain or cash income to both the Church of Glasgow and the new monasteries founded throughout his territories, (66) The importance of the Inquest in determining the territorial extent of the Cumbrian see, and by implication the degree of his own rights within that diocese, have been discussed in the preceding chapter. The implications of this survey, however, for the relationship of the ruler of Galloway with the new power in Strathclyde, particularly in the light of the inclusion of what came to be the easternmost part of the lordship within Glasgow diocese, requires expansion.

It has been implied by A.A.M.Duncan that the rise of Fergus of Galloway may have been a phenomenon post-dating the elevation of David I to the Scottish throne in 1124, perhaps attributable to royal favour or indulgence. (67) It is indeed possible that David, with his increased commitments north of the Forth, recognised the necessity for strong local government in the south-west and was prepared to allow a considerable degree of independence to the man whom he saw as capable of offering that strong government. Whilst Carlisle remained in Scottish hands, serving as a seat of government from which David could pursue his policies in northern England, then Galloway could also be kept under a degree of supervision. It is perhaps significant that it is only after David's seizure of the city in 1136 that Fergus appears as a witness to royal charters. The loss of Carlisle in 1157 removed the only significant royal bastion in the region, and with it the ability to curb Fergus's powers. (68) It may indeed be important in this context that the disturbances within Galloway and the reaction against Scottish rule post-date that event. There is, however, much in Fergus's actions which points towards an even greater degree of independence.

The establishment of the see of Glasgow on a firm basis by David gave institutional unity to the politically fragmented territory which came into his hands in 1107. As discussed in Chapter 1, the reorganisation of the diocese in the 12th century can be seen as a move designed to establish a single bishopric for the region under David's control, in effect rendering the political and ecclesiastical boundaries almost co-terminous. Based solely upon the inquest, the rights of the see would have been restricted to Clydesdale, Teviotdale, upper Tweeddale and Annandale, the districts in which its lands and mensal churches were found to lie, the sole exception being Edingham in the Urr valley. Its wider compass, which included Kyle, Cunninghame, Carrick, Renfrew and Lennox, where early records of mensal lands are negligible, reflects the political sphere controlled by David on the basis of inheritance of the powers of the former kings of Strathclyde. The establishment of a Glaswegian claim to the district falling between the Urr and the Nith, based on the findings of the inquest, would have had great weight in emphasising the political power of David in that area as secular counterpart to the bishop. For the bishop of Glasgow to have had any hope of actual recovery of any former rights in eastern Galloway, the secular power must have felt itself entitled to intervene in a district where there is little sign today of any earlier influence by a king of Strathclyde. The situation arising from this must surely have led to some conflict of interests between any expanding power in Galloway and another, with ill-defined rights of lordship, seeking to bring Nithsdale and Desnes Ioan into an ecclesiastical relationship which would have meant, by extension, a recognition of the subservience of those areas to David's political will.

There is no record of any confrontation, military or otherwise, arising from this possible conflict of interests, which suggests that some form of accommodation was reached. A possible interpretation is that some agreement involving a recognition of Dunegal of Strathnith in his lordship was devised in return for an acknowledgment of the overlordship of these areas by David on the parts of the local rulers. This would certainly explain the payments of cain due from eastern Galloway in the later part of Uhtred's tenure of the lordship, when he had received control of the lands between the Urr and the Nith. Apart from the plantation of the Bruces in Annandale, the Avenels in Eskdale and Ewesdale and the Soulis family in Liddesdale, David and his grandson Malcolm IV seem to have had little early success in establishing royal authority west of the Annan. The great advances in that direction appear to have stemmed from direct military intervention and the creation of a supervisory system of royal bailiffs within the lordship of Galloway and a takeover in Nithsdale in the last years of Malcolm IV's reign.

If, however, we are to believe the suggestion that Fergus was a royal protege imposed on Galloway after 1138, or even that he owed his position to the removal of the immediate royal or princely presence from the south-west after 1124, it would be necessary to assume that the Crown possessed sufficient resources within the region from which to create a suitable lordship for its candidate, or to enforce its decision to instal such a person. This, however, cannot be proven to be the case; rather the Crown throughout the 12th century appears to have been critically short of any landed base both within Galloway and Nithsdale. The royal position in lower Nithsdale improved somewhat in the later 12th century through the acquisition of the former lands of Radulf, son of Dunegal, probably through escheat on his death without heirs. This apart, however, there is little indication of a strengthening of the royal landed position; even after elimination of the male line of lords in 1234 the Crown was to be singularly unsuccessful in securing any significant territorial interest in the region.

Footnotes to Chapter 2 pt 1

1. see, for example, Reid, *Wigtownshire Charters*, xi.
2. Ailred, *Saints of Hexham*, 177-80.
3. W.Mackenzie, *The History of Galloway From The Earliest Period To The Present Time* (Kirkcudbright, 1841), i, 167-8.
4. Ailred, *De Standardo*, 197.
5. M'Kerlie, *Lands and Their Owners*, i, 109-11.
6. Huyshe, *Grey Galloway*, 107-8.
7. Robertson, *Story of Galloway*, 41.
8. *APS*, i, 82.
9. *RRS*, i, 19; Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 138, 189.
10. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 165-7, 193-4, 196-7.
11. For a discussion of the composition of the inner circle of David I's court see, G.W.S.Barrow, *David I of Scotland (1124 to 1153), The Balance of New and Old* (Reading, 1985).
12. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 3.
13. A.Agnew, *A History of the Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1864), 613; J.Kevan MacDowall, *Carrick Gallovidian* (Ayr, 1947), 34; J.M.McGill, 'A genealogical survey of the ancient lords of Galloway', *Scottish Genealogist*, ii (1955), 3-6.
14. *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 234, 252, 256, 290; *Annals of Loch Cé*, i, 206, 246, 248, 250, 264.
15. *Holyrood Liber*, No 23.
16. *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ed.J.Bain (Edinburgh, 1881-8), ii, app.iii, No 293.
17. B.Burke, *The General Armory of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales* (London, 1878), 639.
18. Timothy Pont, *Galloway Topographised* (National Library of Scotland).
19. J.Balfour-Paul, *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh, 1904-14), iv, 144.
20. M'Kerlie, *Lands and Their Owners*, i, 280-99 passim.
21. ibid, 282.
22. *Chron.Man*, annal for 1102; A.A.M.Duncan and A.L.Brown, 'Argyll and the Isles in the Later Middle Ages', *PSAS*, xc (1956-7), 196.
23. C.A.Ralegh Radford, 'Excavations at Whithorn, First Season, 1949', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 99-100.
24. ibid, 99.
25. *The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys*, edd.P.A.Munch and Rev.Dr.Goss (Manx Society, Douglas, 1874), 167-8.
26. Ralegh Radford, 'Excavations at Whithorn', 99-100.
27. W.D.H.Sellar, 'The origins and ancestry of Somerled', *SHR*, xlv (1966), 123-42.
28. *Fergus*, ed.E.Martin (Halle, 1872).
29. K.Webster, 'Galloway and the Romances', *Modern Language Notes*, lv (1940), 363-6.
30. M.D.Legge, 'Some notes on the Roman de Fergus', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 164.
31. B.Schmolke-Hasselmann, 'Der arthurische Versroman, et 'Le Roman de Fergus': technique narrative et intention politique', in *An Arthurian Tapestry: Essays in Memory of Lewis Thorpe*, ed.K.Varty (Glasgow, 1981), 342-53.

32. D.D.R.Owen, 'The craft of Guillaume le Clerc's Fergus', in *The Craft of Fiction: Essays in Medieval Poetics*, ed.L.Arrathoon (Rochester, Michigan, 1984), 47-81 at 48 and 77.
33. Legge, 'Notes on the Roman de Fergus', 165.
34. J.Greenberg, 'Guillaume le Clerc and Alan of Galloway', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, lxvi (1951), 524-33.
35. M.D.Legge, 'The father of Fergus of Galloway', *SHR*, xliii (1964), 86-7.
36. *Orkneyinga Saga*, 208-9.
37. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 163.
38. *CDS*, ii, No 824.
39. *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, ed.J.Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1870), i, No 208.
40. *CDS*, i, No 1372; *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland, 1171-1307*, ed.H.Sweetman (1875-86), i, No 2380.
41. Brevis Descriptio Regni Scotie, 34, 'In Caleway est... Kirkcudbrythe · Willelmi de ferres...'
42. I.B.Cowan and D.E.Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses of Scotland*, 2nd edition (London, 1976), 212.
43. St.Bernard of Clairvaux, *Life of St.Malachy of Armagh*, ed.H.J.Lawlor (London, 1920), 76.
44. Reid, *Wigtownshire Charters*, 84-86.
45. Cowan and Easson, *Religious Houses*, 102-3.
46. N.Backmund, 'The Praemonstratensian Order in Scotland', *Innes Review*, iv (1952-53), 25-41.
47. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 48.
48. *Glasgow Registrum*, Nos 3, 9, 10.
49. *Sir William Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum*, vi (London, 1846), pt.ii, 838.
50. Walter Daniel, *Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. F.M.Powicke (London, 1950), 45.
51. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 60; *The Chronicle of Melrose* (Facsimile Edition), edd.A.O.Anderson et al. (London, 1936), 36-7.
52. *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 234, 291.
53. *A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood*, ed.M.O.Anderson (SHS, 1938), 137, 139.
54. *Chronica Rogeri de Hovedon*, ed.W.Stubbs (London, 1869), ii, 57.
55. *Benedict of Peterborough*, ed.W.Stubbs (London, 1867), i, 67-8, 79-80 etc, cf *Roger of Howden*, ii, 63, 69, 105.
56. Barrow, 'Lordship and feudal settlement', 128.
57. *Chronicon de Lanercost* (Maitland Club, 1839), 40, 42, 59; *Chron.Melrose*, 83; *Melrose Liber*, ii, No 5 (appendix).
58. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 164-8.
59. *Melrose Liber*, Nos 192-4.
60. ibid, No 95.
61. I.A.Milne, 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *SHR*, xxxiv (1955), 46-9.
62. Duncan and Brown, 'Argyll and the Isles', 195-6.
63. Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Regis Stephani et de Bello Standardii*, in *Chronicles of Stephen etc*, iii, 178
64. The Saga of Hacon, in *Icelandic Sagas*, trans. G.Dasent, iv (London, 1894), 150.
65. *ESC*, No 54.
66. *Glasgow Registrum*, Nos 9, 10; *ESC*, No 50.
67. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 163.

68. ibid, 164.

Chapter 2. Part Two.

Fortune's Wheel: The Career of Fergus c.1130-61

Although little detailed information concerned with the career of Fergus survives, certain salient features stand out in isolation. These provide neat illustrations of aspects of his government and policy. Much is based on inference from later events or developments, particularly in the field of ecclesiastical reform. This indicates a strong debt to contemporary Scottish precedent, particularly to David I's work at Glasgow. Other matters, such as his interest in the kingdom of Man and the Isles, display a strongly independent stance, not strictly in accordance with Scottish interests. At variance with this latter point, however, is evidence for a willingness to comply with David I's policy towards Stephen of England and the campaign in support of the Empress Matilda. The involvement in the latter may have been dictated by interests quite separate from any obligation to the Scottish Crown, and perhaps stemmed from marital ties with the family of Henry I. The final element in Fergus's career, the support for the rebel earls in 1159 and subsequent enforced retirement into a monastery, completes the cycle. This appears to show him operating within the framework of Scottish noble politics, or using the tensions which existed between certain of the higher nobility and the Crown in an attempt to ease the pressures of Scottish overlordship on himself. It is difficult to make sense of this tangle of contradictions, but a thread of consistency can be traced running through the whole, namely a desire to secure links with regions outwith the political sphere of the king of Scots. Thus did he make clear the ambivalent attitude of the early lords towards their role within Scotland.

Foreign Relations: England, Man and the Isles.

One of the main strands of evidence which point towards a considerable degree of freedom from external controls lies in the sphere of foreign relations. A recurrent theme in Galwegian politics of the 12th and early 13th centuries was the emphasis on close links with England and the kingdom of the Isles. On occasion, these ties could be seen as running contrary to Scottish interests, particularly in relation to the tortuous affairs of Man and the connections with the descendants of Godred Crovan or Somerled of Argyll. Interests did, however, sometimes coincide, as in the period 1136-8, when Fergus co-operated with David I's northern English designs. In general, however, the Galwegians went their own separate way, with little regard for the affairs of the Scottish Crown.

Most difficulties revolve around analysis of Fergus's relations with England. As was discussed in earlier, a body of material was developed in late 19th century writings which associated Fergus closely with the court of Henry I of England, proposing an up-bringing and education there. The basis for such beliefs is bound up in the tradition of a marriage to an unknown illegitimate daughter of the English king, and to a supposed long term friendship with David I which arose from time spent together at the Anglo-Norman court. The latter of these traditions can not be entirely proven in the light of the ambiguous material surrounding it, but there is a certain amount of inconclusive evidence which would support the tie of kinship with the Anglo-Norman dynasty. That such a marriage alliance occurred is now generally accepted, (1) but it is unlikely to have been the love-match proposed by Huyshe. Instead, it was probably a politically-motivated union, an act of English foreign policy designed to draw a powerful regional lord into the orbit of the English Crown. This marriage had serious political repercussions in the later 12th century.

The explicit statement that Fergus was married to a certain 'Elizabeth, youngest natural daughter of Henry I', can be traced no earlier than a reference by Mackenzie in his history of Galloway, taken up and developed by Chalmers in a note in his Caledonia. (2) The sources cited by Chalmers, however, make no reference to an Elizabeth, and refer rather to Sibylla, illegitimate daughter of the English king and wife of Alexander I of Scotland. The editor of the Scots Peerage could find no evidence for such a marriage, but did point out that the epithet 'cousin' was used to describe the relationship between Henry II of England and Uhtred of Galloway. (3) Similarly, the Complete Peerage, which deals at length with the illegitimate offspring of Henry I, makes no mention of a daughter named Elizabeth. (4) Despite this negative evidence, however, there is a considerable body of material which points towards the existence of some tie with the English ruling house.

It is in documentary sources relating to Fergus's sons that the bulk of evidence for kinship with the family of Henry I is to be found. Roger of Howden, whose chronicles form the main source for details relating to the rebellion of 1174 and its aftermath, refers to Uhtred, son of Fergus as 'consanguineus' of Henry II, related through the king's mother, the Empress Matilda. (5) A point which is examined in a later section, is that Uhtred's brother, Gilbert, is never honoured with this title, which has been used to suggest different parentage. An incidental reference in the chronicle of Robert of Torigny, concerning the relationship of the king of Man to Henry II, described him as 'consanguineus regis Anglorum ex parte Matildis impratricis matris suae', (6) cousin or blood-relation of Henry on his mother's side. Godred of Man, about whom Robert was writing, was the son of Olaf, who had taken as wife, Affrica, daughter of Fergus of Galloway. (7) This is the only marriage through which Godred could trace kinship with Henry II. The conclusion is inescapable that Fergus was married to an otherwise unrecorded illegitimate daughter of the English king.

Henry is known to have had at least eleven illegitimate daughters by his five known mistresses, with at least one further daughter concerning whom there is some uncertainty. Of the eleven, all are named and their marriages and careers recorded, but the twelfth is known only from an undated letter of Archbishop Anselm to King Henry, advising against a marriage to William de Warenne as it would have been within prohibited degrees. (8) The daughter in question is un-named and could simply be one of the other eleven, who was married off with more success at a later date. As the dates of marriage of most of Henry's daughters are unknown, this is a distinct possibility. The proposed marriage to William de Warenne must have been under discussion between 1103, when he was restored to royal favour, and 1109, when Anselm died, but on the basis of the existing evidence cannot be dated with any greater precision. The possibility remains, however, that she was a twelfth daughter, who was married to Fergus after an abortive attempt to arrange a marriage with the earl of Surrey.

The disposal in marriage of Henry's daughters formed an important element in English royal policy. Any taint of illegitimacy was more than compensated for by the royal blood of Henry's brood of bastards, both male and female, which made them valuable items in the battery of royal patronage. The sons could form valuable agents and supporters of the Crown, the most notable being Robert, whom Henry created earl of Gloucester, and Reginald, created earl of Cornwall by his half-sister, Matilda. The daughters' main value was in linking members of the Norman or French nobility with the royal house.

A clear policy concerning the marriage of Henry's daughters can be seen, with family links being forged with the ducal house of Brittany, the counts of Perche and the lords of Breteuil, Montmirail, Beaumont and Montmorenci, men of great importance in the border areas to the south and west of the duchy of Normandy. A similar connection can be seen in the marriage of Sibylla to Alexander I of Scotland, which underscored the close relationship with the Scottish ruling house. (9) The marriage of a daughter to the lord of Galloway would represent a continuation of this policy, as it forged a link with a man whose territories occupied a key position on the north-western flank of the kingdom.

In this latter context, the date of such a marriage becomes important. When Fergus first appears as a charter witness in 1136, he is accompanied by his elder son, Uhtred. (10) It is generally accepted that in the Middle Ages fifteen years was regarded as the minimum age for witnesses to important documents. On this basis, Uhtred was born at latest in 1121, which suggests a marriage date for his parents in 1120 or before. It is perhaps significant that it was around that time that Ranulf Meschin, Henry's protege as lord of

Carlisle, was to surrender his lands in Cumberland to become earl of Chester. David, at this point, was strengthening his position in south-western districts, where he was to create lordships for the Bruces, Soulis and Avenels. It is possible, therefore, that Henry arranged a marriage with Fergus to compensate for the loss of Ranulf in the north-west and to redress the imbalance in David's favour by establishing links with the dominant power on the latter's south-western frontier, thus winning an ally for himself and his family.

The alliance with the Galwegian ruling house bore fruit after Henry's death in 1135, as it was the basis on which Matilda secured support from that quarter in her bid to wrest the throne from Stephen. In this matter, the attitudes and aspirations of Matilda's uncle, David I, were of cardinal importance. His recently-acquired control over the Solway region, stemming from his seizure of Carlisle, may have provided the additional influence over Fergus necessary to draw him into a military venture in support of his wife's half-sister. There is no concrete evidence to support this contention, but there is sufficient inferential material to show a long term commitment on the part of the Galwegians after 1136 to support the aspirations of the Empress Matilda.

At the beginning of 1136, soon after Stephen's coronation, David and his army crossed into northern England, and in a whirlwind campaign seized both Newcastle and Carlisle, plus the bulk of the northern castles of consequence, so gaining control of Northumberland and Cumberland. In the February of that year, Stephen met David at Durham, which the Scots were besieging, and entered into protracted negotiations to secure a Scottish withdrawal from the north of

England. After two weeks it was agreed that David's son, Earl Henry, should be vested with the earldom of Huntingdon, formerly held by David, as well as Carlisle and Doncaster. The Scots in return would withdraw from Durham, restore Newcastle and put the question of Northumberland to arbitration. (11) The uncertainty over the future of the north-eastern earldom left David with what he felt to be a legitimate excuse for the renewal of hostilities at a later date, but for the meantime Earl Henry stayed at Stephen's court and a brittle facade of stability was maintained in the north.

David's movements after February 1136 are difficult to trace, but it is certain that in July he was at Glasgow for the consecration of the newly-completed cathedral church. (12) This occasion brought together a substantial body of the Scottish nobility, and may have been used as an opportunity to plan future moves against Stephen. The witness list to a royal charter, probably issued by David at the time of the cathedral's consecration, displays the importance of the group assembled, and shows that a particularly strong element of south-western nobles were present. (13) In addition to the chancellor, chamberlain and marshall, there were David's nephew William, Malise, earl of Strathearn, and Duncan, earl of Fife, who formed a collection of the most important officers and nobles of the kingdom. The only significant absentee was the Constable, Hugh de Morville. From the south-west were drawn Fergus of Galloway and his son Uhtred, Radulf, son of Dunegal of Nithsdale, and his brother, Duvenald, who represented the principal secular powers in that region. An assemblage of this nature may be expected at the consecration of one of the major cathedrals of the realm, but the presence of the rulers of Galloway and Nithsdale, whose territories were peripheral to or outwith the bounds of the diocese, suggests an ulterior motive, and it may be significant that a number of these men played leading roles in the campaigns of 1137-8. William fitz Duncan and Earl Malise in particular featured significantly in the conduct of the the campaign which culminated in the battle of the Standard.

It must be considered that the attendance of the heads of the south-western nobility at Glasgow in 1136 stemmed from the great increase in royal power in that region resultant from the Scots' acquisition of Carlisle. David could simply have been testing out newly augmented powers of overlordship, but this seems too simplistic a reasoning when the political developments of the months leading up to the assembly at Glasgow are borne in mind. In view of the rapid deterioration of relations with Stephen in the later part of 1136, (14) it is possible that David used the meeting for the consecration as an opportunity to bring together the military leaders necessary for the renewal of hostilities. Considering the importance of Galwegian warriors in the campaign prior to the battle of the Standard, it seems not altogether improbable that David was sounding out the views of Fergus, who, if his wife was indeed a half-sister of Matilda, would not have been a disinterested party.

The uneasy peace with Stephen collapsed early in 1137, and, abandoning the treaty made at Durham, David collected an army by Easter for the re-invasion of Northumberland. The northern barons maintained their loyalty to Stephen and mustered a large force at Newcastle. This, along with a personal appeal made at Roxburgh by Archbishop Thurstan of York, served to deter David for the moment, and a truce was settled. (15) The Scots made a final demand for the cession of Northumberland to Earl Henry, but on Stephen's refusal to countenance this David renewed hostilities. Campaign and counter-campaign in the early months of 1138 saw Galwegian contingents in the forefront of action, being singled out in some sources as the perpetrators of the worst excesses. (16) Success in Northumberland and victory over the English at Clitheroe in Lancashire was followed by a drive southwards across the Tees towards York, a march halted by a hastily-assembled English force near Northallerton. In the ensuing defeat in the battle of the Standard, the Galwegians featured prominently and may, by their rash assault on the heavily armoured English, be held largely to blame for the repulse of the Scottish offensive.

No source records the presence of Fergus at Northallerton, nor mentions his involvement in any part of the campaign of 1138, but this negative evidence need not necessarily be taken as definite proof of his absence. Where the Galwegians appear, as in the campaign into Craven, which culminated in the victory over the local English levies at Clitheroe, they were serving as part of a composite force consisting of elements drawn from the main Scottish army, placed under the overall command of David's nephew, William, son of Duncan. (17) Commanders subordinate to William are not named, but it can be assumed that the individual elements of the army placed under his command served under their own leaders. This was certainly the case at the battle of the Standard, with two such chieftains being recorded amongst those killed. It was these men, named by Ailred as Ulgric and Duvenald, (18) that M'Kerlie interpreted as the native rulers of Galloway, by whose deaths David was left free to impose Fergus on the leaderless Galwegians. There is nothing in Ailred's work to suggest that these men were anything other than war-leaders, chieftains serving under a higher authority.

Not until the peace settlement which concluded this phase of hostilities with Stephen was ratified in April 1139 is some slight indication of Fergus's possible involvement given. Even then, the identification cannot be established beyond doubt. By the terms of the second treaty of Durham, amongst the hostages taken as security for the peace was an un-named son of 'Earl Fergus'. (19) There was no Scottish earl of that name at the time of the treaty and, unless the chronicler of the agreement, Richard of Hexham, was entirely in error, the reference could only be to Fergus, there being no other major nobleman of that name involved in the campaign against Stephen. Beyond this, however, there is nothing more concrete to link Fergus with the Matildine cause thereafter and the subsequent Scottish involvement in English affairs. The brief flirtation with David's policies had resulted in a bloody nose.

Running parallel with the alliance based on family interests which drew Galloway into the civil war in England was a developing involvement in Manx affairs. This was conducted apparently without reference to any higher authority. As with the English marriage, the policy in mind seems to have been directed towards securing a dynastic connection with a family outwith the orbit of the Scottish Crown, a policy which can be seen also in the marital alliance between Galloway and the lords of Allerdale, forged by the marriage of Uhtred to Gunnilda, daughter of the lord of that territory (see below p97). Some form of relationship appears to have existed between Galloway and Man at least from the 11th century, when, in 1098, Magnus Barelegs is said to have raised tribute from the Galwegians. (20) Certainly, with Galloway and Man being intervisible, some form of political connection was at least a distinct possibility. Such a link was firmly established in the reign of Olaf Godredsson of Man (1102-53), who married Affrica, daughter of Fergus. (21) It was their son, Godred II, who was described as kinsman of Henry II of England by Robert of Torigny. (22) The date of this marriage cannot be fixed with certainty, but is probably to be placed in the 1130s. (23) This would fit the evidence for the adult status of their son in 1152 when he travelled to Norway to pay homage to his father's overlord. (24)

The marriage to Affrica appears to have represented a change in policy on the part of the Manx, who had looked previously to the rulers of Orkney and the Isles for allies and brides. It seems that Olaf himself may earlier have been married to a sister of Earl Haakon of Orkney, preserving this traditional link. (25) An alliance with a rising mainland power may have represented a move towards distancing Man from the politics of Norway and her northern island dependencies, in keeping with the rapprochement which Olaf is claimed to have established with the Scots and the Irish. (26) By the mid-12th century, the rulers of the Isles gave little more than lip service and irregular monetary tribute to Norway, except where a closer relationship was to their immediate political advantage. This usually occurred when the Manx needed military assistance in securing their hold over their kingdom. Certainly, the Galwegian marriage would have brought Olaf into the political orbit of Henry I, a more immediate and potent power than the distant king of Norway, and thus linking his family by blood with one of the most powerful rulers in western Europe.

For Fergus the alliance between the two families brought immediate political advantages, even if the main beneficiaries in the end were his great-grandsons, Alan and Thomas. They derived considerable advantage from the association through their involvement in the dispute between their second cousins, Reginald and Olaf, sons of Godred II, which split the Manx in the early 13th century. Of more immediate value was the attraction of an alliance with what was still the dominant naval power in western maritime Britain, for it secured peace from a quarter from which Galloway had come under attack as recently as 1098. It provided, moreover, another ally outwith the sphere of the king of Scots, although this consideration was probably not paramount in Fergus's mind at the time, in view of his increasing rapport with David.

How extensive Galwegian influences within Man were at the time of the forging of the marriage alliance is difficult to gauge. Foreign involvement is most notable in ecclesiastical affairs, with the diocese of Man and the Isles being regularised, and mainland monasteries, particularly the abbey of Furness, gaining a considerable landed interest on the island and control over its ecclesiastical government. Ecclesiastical connections between Man and the lordship were established and maintained down to the Reformation in terms of land-holding, with Whithorn Priory acquiring land on the island. (27) Galloway, moreover, was to provide a number of important personnel for the see of the Isles, with a series of Galwegians holding the episcopate up to the middle of the 14th century. (28) The settled conditions engendered by the marriage alliance lasted for at least two decades, until in 1153 Olaf was murdered by his nephews, sons of his brother, Harald, who had been brought up in Dublin. Their cousin, Godred, had been absent from the kingdom at the time, having travelled to Norway to pay homage to his father's titular overlord. With the legitimate heir to the throne absent, the three brothers partitioned the island, (29) and prepared to secure their position by attacking the only possible source of immediate opposition, Galloway. To this end, they mustered their forces to invade Fergus's territory, but met with stiff opposition and were driven off with heavy losses. On returning to Man following this reverse, they massacred or expelled all the Galwegians whom they could find resident there.

It is unfortunate that no Galwegian account of the events of 1153 survives, for the general acquiescence of Fergus over the disinheritance of his grandson is difficult to explain. The move against him by Harald's sons so soon after their coup has the flavour of a pre-emptive strike, designed to prevent him from intervention in Godred's favour. Certainly, the attacks on Galwegians in Man must be seen as a move intended to eliminate any pro-Godred element in the island, perhaps a faction adhering to his mother, which may have been seen as favouring closer associations with Galloway. The raid on south-western Scotland may have been more successful than the Manx chronicler, who was distinctly hostile to Harald's sons, would allow. Fergus appears to have been incapable of lending immediate assistance to Godred or his supporters, it being with Norwegian help that the usurpers were overcome. (30) This passivity on Fergus's part, however, may have been brought about by circumstances elsewhere in Scotland, which diverted his attention from Man at the critical moment.

Fergus and Scotland 1153-60

The general disturbance of the Isles and western mainland districts of Scotland was to become a recurrent feature of the middle decades of the 12th century. Rival contenders for the Manx throne and domination of the Isles, and rebellion on the part of the rulers of Argyll added to this general air of unsettlement. Into this troubled climate Fergus may have found himself being increasingly drawn, by virtue of his links with the Manx dynasty and position as a pivotal power dominating communications between Man and the Hebrides. A certain degree of stability had been maintained by David I, who had managed to exert some form of control over Somerled of Argyll, and by Olaf I, who had held the chieftains of the Isles in check. The simultaneous removal of both strong supervisory powers destroyed these curbs, leaving Somerled in particular free to attempt to win greater control over the southern Hebrides and adjacent mainland. It was with him, his relatives and heirs that the successors of both David I and Olaf I were to contend for control of the Isles and Argyll, a struggle which met with differing degrees of success on the parts of the Scots and Manx.

In late May 1153, David I had died at Carlisle, having outlived his son and heir, Earl Henry, by just under twelve months. The new king was David's twelve year old grandson, Malcolm IV. David had spent the last months of his life in winning acceptance for the boy amongst the major noblemen of the kingdom, so as to avoid the internal dissension of a disputed succession. The succession of a minor, however, was seized upon by the more disaffected or opportunist elements within the kingdom to loosen the curbs imposed upon them by King David, and to reassert the independence which some had enjoyed before the last reign. The most obvious manifestation of this was the revolt of Somerled and his sons in 1154 in support of his brother-in-law's family, the MacHeth pretenders to the throne, a conflict on the fringes of which Fergus may have been caught.

Malcolm MacHeth, the head of the family, had married a sister of Somerled sometime before 1130, perhaps hoping to use that connection as a lever by which to gain military support for his regal pretensions. There is, however, no indication that Somerled broke faith with David I; he maintained good relations with the old king down to the latter's death in 1153. Indeed, Somerled appears to have shown little concern for the welfare of his brother-in-law following his capture by David in 1134, and did not raise any protest against Malcolm's twenty-three year imprisonment at Roxburgh. The succession of a minor in 1153, however, changed the situation completely, and when this was coupled with the opportunity for territorial gain in the Isles provided by the assassination of King Olaf, Somerled discovered his avuncular duties and rose in rebellion to support Malcolm's sons in their bid for power. That Somerled's actions were largely, if not entirely, influenced by self-interest is beyond question. This was demonstrated quite clearly when he abandoned his nephews to pursue his own course in the Hebrides, where there seemed to be opportunities for easier gains.

Fergus's role in the events after David's death cannot be established, but there are strong indications of a change in his relationship with the Scottish Crown. These were perhaps dictated by factors at home. That he avoided embroilment in the MacHeth rebellion is clear, but it would appear that efforts were made to draw him into the rebel camp.

The Holyrood Chronicle records in 1156 the capture of Donald MacHeth at Whithorn, Fordun ascribing this action to 'certain men loyal to King Malcolm', and the imprisonment of the captive with his father at Roxburgh. (31) What Somerled's nephew was doing in Galloway at this time is completely unknown, but it is probable that he was seeking new allies for his rebellion. Fergus, with his traditionally independent stance, would have been an obvious target for the MacHeths as a potential source of military assistance, but if he was one of those loyal followers of the king, clearly the rebels had misjudged their man.

In view of his relationship with Godred II of Man, Somerled's great rival for the hegemony of the Isles, Fergus may have looked askance at overtures from the nephews of his grandson's enemies, who were also seeking to subvert him from his loyalty to David's heir. It is possible that Donald, realising that his uncle's increasing preoccupation with Hebridean politics would lead eventually to his abandonment of the MacHeth cause, was seeking to find new allies before the rebellion petered out through want of support. Whatever the reason, his capture at Whithorn brought an effective end to the revolt. But the rising may not have been entirely in vain; in 1157, Malcolm MacHeth was released from imprisonment and appointed, by 1162 at the latest, as earl of Ross, his family thereafter causing no more problems for the Crown.

Despite the good service provided by his probable support in 1156, there is little indication that Fergus was otherwise significantly active on behalf of the Crown following King David's death. On the basis of the frequency of his appearance as a witness to royal charters, Fergus had never been a regular attender of the royal court, his chief appearances being in the 1130s. Under Malcolm IV, he vanishes completely from the royal court, never occurring as a witness to any Crown document. In view of his non-attendance in the previous reign, this in itself is not unusual, but in the light of the obvious value of Galloway to the Scots as a source of military assistance, his lack of prominence in the campaigns against the MacHeths before 1156 argues for a distancing from Scottish politics. This may have been a legacy of his commitments to Man and the damage inflicted on Galloway in 1153 by Olaf's nephews, but there appear also to have been problems nearer to home. By the mid-1150s, Fergus's grip on Galloway may have been slipping.

The Fall of Fergus

In Walter Daniel's Life of Ailred of Rievaulx, which draws a considerable amount of its anecdotal material from Ailred's own personal experiences, the author claims that during a visit by the abbot to his monastery's daughter house of Dundrennan, made in 1159, Ailred found the land torn by civil strife.

> '...He found the petty king of that land incensed against his sons, and the sons raging against their father and each other...The king of Scotland could not subdue, nor the bishop pacify their mutual hatreds, rancour and tyranny. Sons were against father, father against sons, brother against brother, daily polluting the unhappy little land with bloodshed'. (32)

Walter goes on to claim that through Ailred's efforts peace was restored, with the father (who is clearly Fergus) being prevailed upon to renounce his lordship and retire into a monastery, leaving the sons ruling jointly in amity. Whilst this version of events contains many elements of fact, it understates the complexity of the situation and simplifies the outcome, which was brought about through military means rather than any amicable settlement.

On the basis of the Life of Ailred, which, in view of the abbot's personal knowledge of Galloway, must be treated as an authoritative source, it is clear that by the later 1150s, Fergus was facing major problems at home. The main difficulties appear to have revolved around his relationship with his sons, Uhtred and Gilbert, who may have been seeking a greater say in the running of the lordship. It is possible that they felt anxiety over their father's disposal of demesne estates as gifts to the Church, which may have been whittling away at their patrimony. Unfortunately we have no record of what grants, if any, Fergus had made to Whithorn and Soulseat before his loss of power in 1160 (see Chapter 6, 297-8). Internal dissension between Fergus and his family probably accounted in large part for the failure to respond to the coup in Man in 1153 and also for his disappearance from Scottish politics at this time. With divisions at home, Fergus would have been unable to commit himself to any major foreign venture without having had to make concessions to his sons. From the allusions to open strife, it is clear that he was not prepared to relinquish any authority without a struggle.

Fergus's sons, by the 1150s, would have been mature adults. The elder, Uhtred, was almost certainly married and with a family of his own. In 1136, when he witnessed the charter of King David granting Partick to the Church of Glasgow, Uhtred is likely to have been at least fifteen years old, (33) and accompanied his father to a great assembly of the Scottish nobility as acknowledged heir. By the 1150s, therefore, he was approaching forty and as yet had no clear prospect of coming into his inheritance, although his marriage to Gunnilda may have provided him with some manors of his own to administer in his father-in-law's lordship (see below 97). The date of Uhtred's marriage is unknown, but in the light of comments concerning the age of his son, Roland, in 1174, it was probably contracted no later than the early 1150s. Gilbert is more problematical as regards age, there being a degree of uncertainty regarding his parentage. In view of his having an adult bastard son in 1174, it is likely that he, too, was a mature adult by the time of the events outlined in the Life of Ailred. The relationship between the two brothers was, in the light of later events, certainly turbulent, the animosity between them leading eventually to fratricide. Fergus appears to have been able to hold their ambitions in check throughout the 1150s; but by 1159 he seems to have committed himself to a course of action which was to lead to his own downfall and the division of his lands between his sons.

Malcolm IV, despite many popular myths concerning his weakness or effeminacy, showed in the course of his short reign that he was a fairly conscientious governor, an able warrior and strong proponent of the merits of military feudalism in bolstering Crown authority. His reign, however, opened with a backlash against the new centralist tendencies in royal government, and the close relationship with the

English Crown. Reaction against both features may be seen in the composition of the participants in the rebellion of 1154, such as Ness of Calatria, a prominent nobleman of the Falkirk area. He, it has been suggested, was representative of the resentment amongst the native landholders in the heart of the kingdom against the steady influx of Anglo-Norman settlers. (34) Such men probably sought to exploit the advantage presented by the Somerled-MacHeth rebellion to attempt to curb this trend and perhaps aimed to place restraints on the king's actions. The failure of the rebellion in the political heartland of the kingdom, however, was guaranteed on this occasion by the loyalty of the earls to the king. On the next occasion the issue was not so clear cut.

The settlement with Malcolm MacHeth in 1157, as well as Somerled's increased preoccupation with Hebridean affairs, lifted pressure from the king and left him free to deal with other pressing matters. Of prime importance were his relations with England, particularly as regards the tenurial position governing his control of Cumbria, which required clearer definition. There was, moreover, the outstanding question of the earldom of Huntingdon, which had probably been seized by Stephen in 1141 and never subsequently restored. In the summer of 1157, Malcolm travelled south for a series of meetings with Henry II, which culminated in an assembly at Chester, where Henry was preparing for a campaign into north Wales. There Malcolm yielded up the northern counties acquired by his grandfather, including the patrimony of his younger brother, William, in Northumberland. Malcolm received instead the earldom of Huntingdon. (35)

The loss of Carlisle substantially altered the balance of power in northern England, as it removed the only significant royal bastion in the west south of Lanark and Cadzow, returning Eskdale and Annandale to the position of frontier lordships. With Carlisle also went the supervisory position over the Solway region established by Malcolm's grandfather. This may not have had any immediate deleterious effect upon the relationship between Galloway and the Scots, but the long-term effects were to be damaging to the Crown.

The restitution at Chester can be seen as nothing other than a surrender on the part of Malcolm IV, abandoning the advantageous position won by David I between 1136 and 1141. Despite the regaining of Huntingdon, it could not be disguised that a region which had been under Scottish rule for twenty years had been surrendered without any significant struggle and for little compensation. The homage performed at that time by Malcolm to Henry was couched in vague terms, and it is unclear whether it applied solely to Huntingdon or had wider applications as regards the relationship between Scotland and England. (36) Concern about the increasing evidence for subjection to English overlordship was certainly mounting at home, and was brought to a head in 1159-60 when a major rebellion against the king broke out. The stated reason for this was said to be that the rebels were '...enraged against the king because he had gone to Toulouse', (37) to participate in Henry II's campaign against Raymond de St.Gilles. This evidence for a willingness to comply with the English king's military designs was the catalyst which converted the mounting hostility of much of the Celtic nobility into open rebellion.

On his return from Toulouse, Malcolm found himself facing a major revolt amongst the native aristocracy. Precise details of the rebellion and its participants are sketchy, but the prime mover appears to have been Ferteth, earl of Strathearn. The first attack was probably led by Ferteth from his earldom, as an assault on Perth was launched with the avowed aim of capturing the king. What they intended to do with him is unknown, but it has been suggested that their plans were aimed at preventing further actions which hinted at vassalage and to remove the 'evil influence of his Anglo-Norman counsellors'. (38) A far more important factor may have been resentment at Malcolm's preparedness to abandon his kingdom to pursue his chivalric ideals in foreign military ventures which had no direct bearing upon the security or welfare of his people. (39) In either case, the intention appears to have been less to overthrow Malcolm than to place restraints upon him and restore him to the proper counsels of his native lords. The attack, however, was a failure and the king was able to muster his superior military strength against the rebels.

As stated above, the identities of the ringleaders are largely conjectural, Ferteth of Strathearn being the only earl named in any of the passages in chronicles relating to the affair. The earls of Fife and Dunbar were staunchly pro-royal, being associated closely with the governments of David I and Malcolm IV, but the political inclinations of the other men of comital class are unknown. Barrow put forward a list of individual candidates which included the earls of Atholl and Mar, (40) but the only other named nobleman who can be identified with the rebellion is Fergus of Galloway. (41)

How Fergus came to be involved in the rebellion of 1160 is by no means clear. Having perhaps been of service to the Crown in the MacHeth rising as recently as 1156, his disenchantment seems to have been a sudden phenomenon. The removal of Carlisle as a centre of royal government in the Solway basin may have lifted controls over the region which David had exercised, destroying the balance of power, and leaving Fergus free to manoeuvre. There is little indication that Galloway was particularly heavily burdened with the weight of Scottish overlordship, and suggestions that Fergus may have been trying to break free from restraints imposed on his government have little to commend them. As his few recorded actions do show, he enjoyed a major degree of independence as it was, far in excess of most of the other Scottish territorial magnates. There is, moreover, no evidence beyond the late and fantastic account of the foundation of the priory of St.Mary Traill (42) to suggest that Fergus was ever on anything other than cordial terms with King David, which makes his involvement in the rebellion even more difficult to comprehend. It is, of course, possible that simple disenchantment with a king who quietly handed over land that had been won at great cost, much of it in Galwegian blood, was the deciding factor. Certainly, his commitment to the rising was total and it was in his territories that the issue was settled.

Following their failure to capture Malcolm at Perth, the rebels appear to have fled south to Galloway. The reasoning behind the location of their retreat, and indeed the circumstances which prompted the earls' seemingly precipitate flight, are difficult to perceive. The poverty of the surviving sources for this crucial event obscure most of the circumstances, and leaves only the barest bones of a narrative framework. Details of any military action immediately following the abortive assault on Perth are lost, but some development must have occurred to prompt flight to the apparent safety of Galloway. Defeat in the field is the most likely explanation, for a complete withdrawal from the political heartland must indicate that the rebel position had become untenable and that victory was irretrievable without the assistance of a third party. The failure of the earls to withdraw to their own territories implies that Malcolm had successfully isolated them from their recruiting grounds. The choice of Galloway then becomes more understandable. Throughout the Middle Ages, the lordship was regarded as an important source of quality manpower, to be exploited by the kings of both Scotland and England. It was this resource, coupled with the apparent inaccessibility of Galloway to Scottish armies, which drew the earls southwards.

It is by no means certain that Fergus was involved in the rebellion from its inception, rather his hand may have been forced by the appearance of the earls in his territories. Whether they persuaded him to lend support, or he had refused a royal demand to surrender the rebels is unknown, but it was on his territories that the final stage of the rising was fought. The fact that no Scottish king is known to have campaigned in Galloway prior to Malcolm's reign may have served as a further attraction to the rebels, but it was no deterrent to the king. His invasion of Galloway in 1160 represented the first firm step towards establishing undisputed Scottish overlordship of that territory. In three successive invasions of the lordship, about which we have no details, the earls were brought to battle and defeated, with no significant loss to the royal army. (43)

Some of the justice of their complaint may have been recognised in advance or subsequently acknowledged, as great magnanimity is said to have been displayed towards the broken rebels, with no evidence for forfeitures or executions. Fordun, however, claims that the Galwegians were 'pressed so sore' that their ruler gave up his armed struggle and retired into a monastery, giving his son, Uhtred, as a hostage to the king. (44) Fergus did surrender and retreat into the seclusion of Holyrood, where he may have taken monastic vows, the occasion of his entry being marked by an endowment of land at Dunrod in the lordship. (45) His retirement was of short duration, for on the 12th May 1161, he died.

Fergus appears to have been the only significant casualty amongst the leadership of the rebellion. His abandonment of the lordship and flight into a monastery has echoes of the legendary ruse recorded in the foundation myth of St.Mary's Priory. The historically recorded 'retirement' is probably the model on which the later legend was constructed. The legend, probably written no earlier than the 15th century, describes Fergus's involvement in a rebellion against the king (in this case David I) and his disguise in a canon's robe to trick the king into giving him the kiss of peace. The story is too obviously an embroidery on the events of 1160 for it to be regarded as a valuable historical source.

From the choice of monastery it is probable that the decision to 'retire' was not made entirely of Fergus's own free will, the royal abbey at Holyrood being ideally situated adjacent to the castle at Edinburgh for the incarceration of an important prisoner. Such an incarceration in a monastery is unusual at this period, but was to become more common practice in the later Middle Ages (e.g. the ninth earl of Douglas's immurement in Lindores). It is not clear that Fergus gave up control of the lordship at this time, for the chronicles state only that he laid down his weapons and ceased to oppose the king. The surrender of Uhtred as a hostage certainly looks like an attempt to arrange a peace settlement, with Fergus retaining control of the lordship, at least in name. There is no indication that the division in power between Uhtred and Gilbert took place before their father's death in 1161, which suggests that he may not have regarded the retreat in to Holyrood as a permanent arrangement.

Death robbed Fergus of any opportunity of re-establishing his position in Galloway and of making satisfactory arrangements for the governance of the lordship after his decease. In the years which followed, the south-west came to be subjected to a rigorous enforcement of Crown right, and was bound to Scotland more firmly than on any previous occasion. Malcolm IV's conquest of Galloway and the retirement and sudden death of its ruler, led to the establishment of a new government over the people of the lordship. There was no change in the ruling dynasty, or imposition of a foreign governor to keep the defeated province in check, Fergus's timely demise offering the solution to Malcolm's problems. The partition of the lordship between Uhtred and Gilbert, whether along the lines of a pre-arranged inheritance settlement, or stemming from royal policy, provided an opportunity to increase royal influence in the region. In view of the animosity recorded between the brothers in the 1150s, such an arrangement must have considerably weakened local resistance to Scottish control, but the division of power was to prove ultimately a failure, the result of personal hatreds rather than any inherent flaw in the plan itself.

Footnotes to Chapter 2 pt.ii

1. see e.g.C.Given-Wilson and A.Curteis, *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London, 1984), 71.
2. Mackenzie, *History of Galloway*, i, 70; Chalmers, *Caledonia*, i, 366 and note.
3. *Scots Peerage*, iv, 136.
4. *The Complete Peerage*, edd G.E.Cockayne and others xi (London, 1949), Appendix D, 105-21.
5. *Roger of Howden*, ii, 105; *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 80.
6. *The Chronicle of Robert of Torigny*, in *Chronicles of Stephen etc*, ed.R.Howlett (London, 1889), iv, 229.
7. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 60.
8. Epistolae S.Anselmi, *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J-P.Migne, ii (Paris, 1854), No lxxxiv.
9. *Complete Peerage*, xi, 118.
10. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 3.
11. *Chron.Melrose*, 33; Richard of Hexham, 146.
12. *ESC*, 348-9.
13. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 3.
14. Richard of Hexham, 146.
15. *Chron.Melrose*, 33; Richard of Hexham, 150-1.
16. Ailred, *De Standardo*, 187-8; Richard of Hexham, 152-3, 155-6, 156-9.
17. Richard of Hexham, 156.
18. Ailred, *De Standardo*, 197.
19. Richard of Hexham, 178.
20. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 56.
21. ibid, 60.
22. *Robert of Torigny*, 229.
23. Anderson, *Early Sources*, ii, 226 note 2.
24. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 62.
25. *Orkneyinga Saga*, 53.
26. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 60.
27. B.R.S.Megaw, 'The Barony of St.Trinians in the Isle of Man', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 173-82.
28. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 116, 118.
29. ibid, 62.
30. ibid, 64-6.
31. *Chron.Holyrood*, 128; Johannis de Fordun, *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, ed.W.F.Skene (Edinburgh, 1871), i, 255.
32. Walter Daniel, *Life of Ailred*, 45-6.
33. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 3.
34. *RRS*, i 8-9.
35. *Chron.Melrose*, 35; *Chron.Holyrood*, 131, William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of Stephen etc*, i, 105-6.
36. *RRS*, i, 9-10.
37. *Chron.Melrose*, 36.
38. *RRS*, i, 12.
39. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 225-6.
40. *RRS*, i, 12.
41. *Chron.Holyrood*, 136-7.
42. 'Fundatio Prioratus Insule de Traille', *Bannatyne Miscellany*, ii (Bannatyne Club, 1836), 19-20.

43. Chron.Holyrood, 136-7 'Rex Malcolmus duxit exercitum in Galwaiam ter, et inde, dev[ict]is inimicis suis fed[er]atis, cum pace et sine dampnum remeavit'.
44. Chron.Fordun, i, 256.
45. Chron.Holyrood, 136-7.

Chapter 3

Division and Recovery.

The Lordship Divided: Uhtred and Gilbert 1161-74.

In his lifetime, Fergus overshadowed his sons to a great degree. Evidence for their activity in public life before 1160, other than as possible hostages for their father's good behaviour, is extremely scarce: Uhtred witnesses only one charter with his father and appears three times on his own. (1) His independent presence at Scone in what appears to be a major royal assembly, where he witnessed a charter of Bishop Robert of St.Andrews datable to 1147-52, is difficult to explain. His occurrence along with Radulf and Duvenald of Nithsdale points to some official capacity; perhaps he was acting as his father's deputy on this occasion, as he undoubtedly was when he witnessed a charter at Roxburgh in 1159. By the late 1140s Uhtred was a married man and a landholder in his own right in Cumbria, (2) where he held estates at Torpenhow in north Allerdale from his father-in-law. These possessions must have given him a certain degree of freedom from his father. Gilbert, however, appears in no surviving document from his father's lifetime. This apparent exclusion from a public role may have been a contributory factor in the animosity between the brothers, and would explain Gilbert's supposed hostility to his father in the 1150s.

On the strength of later events it would seem that the dispute between Uhtred and Gilbert centred upon the inheritance issue, and in particular the question of precedence. Most medieval authorities imply that Uhtred was the elder son, but some more recent historians give Gilbert the seniority. (3) It has been suggested, moreover, that the brothers were sons of different mothers, with only Uhtred being born of Fergus's marriage to Henry I's daughter. (4) This argument makes Gilbert the son of a second and later marriage to an unknown woman. In the chronicle of William of Newburgh, however, Gilbert is described as 'first born', in contradiction to the statements of all other contemporary writers. (5) On the strength of this one text, some modern writers have granted Gilbert seniority (6) despite the better authority of sources like Howden's chronicle. Roger of Howden consistently places Uhtred before his brother in all joint references to them, a style which implies clearly that he regarded Uhtred as the elder.

A possible explanation which must be considered is that Gilbert was the elder son, but that he was conceived as the result of an irregular liaison, such as were common in the Norse and Celtic regions of Scotland. There was no impediment in the way of children of such 'marriages' succeeding to their father's lands, unless a subsequent child by a regular marriage existed. (7) On the marriage of Fergus to Henry's daughter all previous irregular arrangements would probably have been repudiated and any children relegated to a subordinate position in regards to inheritance. The names of the two brothers might support this argument for different parentage and background. Uhtred is a common Anglo-Scandinavian name, such as could be expected to be given to the son of a mother of English background. Gilbert, however, is not the Norman-French name which it is usually translated as, but is a Gaelic Christian name. This is illustrated by the form of the name used in charters, where it is Latinised as Gilebertus. (8) The Gile first element appears to be the common Gaelic prefix Gille- (as in Gillecatfar or Gillemore), which occurs in several Galwegian names in the 12th century. It is possible, therefore, that

Gilbert's mother was of native Celtic background. If this is accepted, it would explain Gilbert's hostility towards Uhtred, and his supposed grievance that he had been robbed of his full inheritance when the lordship was partitioned. (9)

The style used by Howden when reference is made to the brothers may add support to the argument that they were children of different marriages. When talking of Uhtred he describes him as 'consanguineus' of King Henry II, (10) in recognition of his descent from a bastard of Henry I. This dignity is never accorded to Gilbert, but this may be diplomacy on Howden's part in an attempt to obscure the king's relationship to a fratricide. In this respect, the description of Gilbert's son Duncan as cousin to King John may be revealing, (11) although his childhood as a hostage at the English court and his future good service to John could mean that this is but a courtesy title. The ambiguities in the sources, however, preclude definitive answers.

In either case it is difficult to explain why Gilbert should have felt entitled to succeed to the undivided lordship. Later examples from the Celtic west show that illegitimacy was not necessarily a social stigma in Celtic society, nor did it debar someone from a possible share in his paternal inheritance. The emphasis, however, is that he would share the inheritance with his legitimate siblings, not inherit it alone. Seniority was still outweighed by legitimacy. It must be admitted as possible, therefore, that Gilbert was an illegitimate son who, under Celtic custom, could have inherited his father's territories along with a legitimate brother.

The rules governing inheritance were still in a state of flux, with differing systems being applied to meet differing circumstances. In terms of 'feudal law', primogeniture, debarring younger or illegitimate children, was becoming the most commonly followed method. Succession of the eldest son in strict line of descent was, however, only coming to the fore in Scotland in the 12th century, with the kings from David I through to Alexander II having to struggle to establish the principle even in regards to royal inheritance. Similarly, the Church at this time was placing greater emphasis on the sanctity of marriage and was clamping down increasingly on concubinage. These factors strengthened the shift towards a more clearly regulated series of laws governing inheritance.

Until the late 12th century there was no strict rule or principle governing succession to land, so that we find resort to a variety of systems. Even in areas where 'feudal law' was gaining currency, strict primogeniture was not always followed, with partible inheritance being adopted instead. Some distiction within the framework of primogeniture could be made between inherited and acquired land, with the elder son generally retaining the original patrimony, and younger brothers sharing what had been added in their father's lifetime, although the elder could chose the opposite. This can be seen with the Bruce and Morville lands, with the eldest sons choosing to retain the smaller English estates rather than their fathers' major new lordships in Scotland.

In a Celtic society, partible inheritance continued to be the custom. The most significant example contemporary with the division of Galloway was the fragmentation of Somerled's lordship between his sons. (12) The situation which developed in Galloway appears as a complex amalgam of Celtic custom and 'feudal' principles, which brought about a division which does not appear to have been satisfactory to either of the parties involved.

The nature of the partition which was made on Fergus's death appears to have been along the lines of a straight territorial split, rather than a division of lands and rights on an equal basis and the creation of a dual lordship throughout Galloway. Documentary evidence for the disposition of their respective estates is slight in Uhtred's case and non-existent for Gilbert, but the former is believed to have acquired the land to the east of the Cree, the latter everything to its west.

The lands granted out by Uhtred, either to monasteries or incoming Anglo-Norman settlers, display a marked concentration in the lower Dee valley, particularly the region around Kirkcudbright. (13) This, it has already been argued, formed the core of his father's lordship and was to be regarded as the caput in all subsequent inheritance settlements (see below 224-6). For Uhtred to gain the recognised inherited heartland is strongly suggestive that he was regarded as the senior heir.

Details of the government of the lordship in the thirteen-year period of division down to Uhtred's death in 1174 are fragmentary in the extreme. In the light of events in that year, it would appear that Malcolm IV and, after 1165, his brother, William, had taken the opportunity to introduce royal officials in a supervisory role over the region. A key element in this system would appear to have been lower Nithsdale, whose native lord, Radulf, disappears from the sources around this time. He last appears in a royal charter datable to between late March and early December 1165, (14) issued at Jedburgh; he is not found as a witness subsequently to any documents of the new king. There is no indication that he had any direct successor, and the Crown may have seized the opportunity to establish a new royal centre to replace Carlisle by taking lower Nithsdale as an escheat through default of heirs. This would have brought Dumfries, with its vital bridging-point of the Nith, into royal hands, and guaranteed the Crown a stronghold on the fringes of Galloway.

The date of the establishment of such a royal castle at Dumfries is a matter of debate, it being assumed generally that the fortress was created at the time of the probable granting of the burgh charter in 1186. This is to reject the possibility of the prior existence of a castle and dependent settlement there, belonging to Radulf, which the Crown merely took over as an already established regional focal point and seat of government.

There is a certain amount of evidence to suggest that Dumfries may soon after 1165 have become the seat of an officer who exercised powers in the manner of a sheriff over an administrative zone covering lower Nithsdale and, possibly, Desnes Ioan. His base may have been the 'old castle' on record by c.1179, (15) which had possibly been attacked in the disturbances after 1174 and was to be replaced by a new structure in the 1180s. Material from the early 14th century relating to the defence of Dumfries under Edward III's administration shows the garrison of the castle being provided by castle-guard service levied on the tenants of neighbouring baronies, such as Staplegordon or Tinwald. (16) The list, however, is incomplete, and since Annandale to the east was exempt from such service dues, it has been suggested that the missing men were provided originally from the territories between the Nith and Urr. (17)

The date at which Desnes Ioan passed into the possession of the lords of Galloway cannot be fixed precisely, but the transfer must have taken place between 1165 when Radulf of Lower Nithsdale last features in the records and c.1170 when Uhtred granted Lochkindeloch to Richard, son of Troite (see below 199-200). This region, politically and ecclesiastically part of Strathclyde-Cumbria, remained distinct from the remainder of the lordship in that the Crown maintained its rights to the traditional renders from the lands east of the Urr, and the old boundary of the diocese of Whithorn remained fixed at that river: Uhtred's new territories remained firmly under the episcopal authority of Glasgow. The circumstances in which the grant was made are lost to us, but in view of the tensions with Henry II at the start of William the Lion's reign (18) the award to Uhtred may have been an expedient forced on the Scots, although Uhtred had been associated with the royal court immediately before Fergus's downfall in 1159-60 and may have received this land as a mark of favour. His role in the downfall of his father in 1160 is far from certain. In 1165, if William was actively preparing to resist the English king, the settlement of the western border and Dumfries area was of vital importance. Uhtred, as the greatest local landowner, would have been expected to play his part in the new arrangements and, through his family links with Cumbria, may have been viewed as having access to a ready supply of colonists.

Certainly, Uhtred was establishing knights on his lands by c.1170, with Richard, the son of Troite, being infefted with Lochkindeloch, and Walter de Berkeley with Urr. Castle-guard at Dumfries, however, is not mentioned expressly in Richard's charter, and there is no subsequent indication that the lord of Galloway was obliged to provide a garrison service at Dumfries. Such an obligation, however, would not have been unlikely in view of the military nature of the settlement of Galloway after 1160, with men holding land by military tenures in the region from that date.

The establishment of a supervisory system to keep watch over the lords of Galloway was just one symbol of the tighter controls established over the region by Malcolm IV and William I. That Malcolm regarded his conquest as the final act of integration, bringing about by force the merger of Galloway with the kingdom of the Scots, is demonstrated by the few pieces of royal legislation which touch on the region. The clearest evidence for this can be seen in the extension of the king's peace to the south-west, which is illustrated by a brieve directed to Uhtred and Gilbert in Galloway and Radulf and Duvenald in Nithsdale. This stated that the men of the canons of Holyrood going to and from their land at Dunrod had been taken under firm royal protection. (19) It is implicit within this brieve that Malcolm felt his government over Galloway to be firm, and that through his conquest of the region and imposition of royal officers he could force implementation of his policies and safeguard the interests of his dependents. The king's peace could be maintained effectively within the areas where royal government was an established fact, where the royal will was obeyed, but outwith that zone it had little force, as in Caithness, where the bishop's murderers were beyond the reach of the king unless he mounted a military expedition. (20) That Malcolm felt himself capable of enforcing this decision in Galloway is testimony to the secure grip which he felt himself to have over the region.

The relationship of the new lords of Galloway with the Crown in the period after 1161 is difficult to uncover. According to Fordun, Uhtred had been taken as hostage following his father's surrender, (21) but this is borne out by no earlier source. Malcolm, rather, may have attempted to draw both brothers into the royal orbit and involve them more closely in the affairs of state. Thus, between c.1161 and 1172, the brothers appear as witnesses to a number of important royal charters, issued at major gatherings of the higher nobility in the royal court. Uhtred was present at Edinburgh and Jedburgh, (22) Gilbert at Edinburgh, (23) and both brothers jointly at Lochmaben to witness the confirmation of Bruce tenure of Annandale by King William. (24) Only in the last case can any of these occasions be tied to a matter touching directly upon south-western affairs, the others pertaining to ecclesiastical subjects which were of little importance to the rulers of Galloway, whose presence in the witness lists must be attributable only to their coincidental attendance at court.

Uhtred's more regular presence at court dates back to his father's lifetime, and may have made him more receptive to the new influences pervading the kingdom in the mid-12th century. Certainly, he displayed a willingness to establish and endow monasteries and to encourage the settlement of men holding land for knight service. Charter evidence highlights the apparent differences in these matters between Uhtred and Gilbert, with the former being a generous benefactor of the Church, founding a nunnery at Lincluden and bestowing land on the abbeys of Holyrood and Holmcultram, (25) whilst there is not one single document attributable to the latter. The loss of the cartularies of the Wigtownshire monasteries of Soulseat and Whithorn may provide a partial explanation for this striking fact, but his total absence as a benefactor of non-Galwegian houses, in stark contrast to Uhtred, is more difficult to explain.

Uhtred's link with Holmcultram stemmed from his marital ties with the lordly house of Allerdale, in whose territories the abbey lay, this being an exclusively personal connection of no concern to Gilbert. The grants to Holyrood, however, are probably related to Fergus's retirement and death there, and perhaps represent guilt payments by Uhtred to salve his conscience for any part in his father's downfall. The notable absence of any grants to this house by Gilbert cannot be explained away in terms of non-attendance at court, but hint instead at some deeper anti-clericalism, related perhaps to an unwillingness to alienate any part of his patrimony.

Attempts have been made to develop the apparent differences between the policies of Uhtred and Gilbert towards the Church into a wider divergence of opinion on a whole gamut of matters relating to feudalism and Scottish overlordship. This has hardened into a view which sees Uhtred as strongly pro-feudal and Gilbert as a violent reactionary and Celtic nationalist, (26) whose opposition to the overlordship of Galloway by the Scots and the introduction of new-fangled tenures led to fratricide and rebellion against the Crown. Such an interpretation would seem to be supported by the apparent failure of Gilbert to infeft any knights on his land and by the violent reaction against such men in eastern Galloway in the aftermath of his rebellion in 1174. Admittedly, there is little concrete evidence, such as exists for Uhtred's infeftments in the east, to indicate that Gilbert showed any obvious enthusiasm for the introduction of military tenure. There is only a single charter of Roger of Skalebrooke, a knight from Yorkshire holding land in north

Carrick from Gilbert' son Duncan, which describes Gilbert as 'my lord', which suggests some kind of vassalic relationship. (27) This evidence cannot be taken as conclusive, but does appear to show that the supposedly 'anti-feudal' Gilbert was in fact introducing foreign settlers into his territory in response to royal demands for more knights for service in the royal army.

Reaction and Rebellion, Galloway Under Gilbert 1174-85.

In 1173, William the Lion involved himself in the quarrel between Henry II and his sons, hoping thereby to regain for himself the lands in northern England which had been stripped from Scottish control in 1157. Galloway was called upon to fulfil its military obligations and a force under the joint leadership of Uhtred and Gilbert marched in the spring to join William in his offensive in Northumberland. Early in July 1174, the king is reported to have divided his army to ravage the lands of Odinel d'Umfraville, the major landholder and supporter of King Henry in the region, sending the main body of the Scots eastwards into the coastal plain, the Galwegians westwards and his own retinue to William de Vescy's stronghold at Alnwick. (28) On the 14th of that month, King William, attended by only a small force, was surprised outside the castle and taken prisoner. (29) This one event provided the Galwegians with the opportunity they required to break the Scottish stranglehold and, immediately on receiving news of the king's capture, the brothers hastened back to their territories. (30)

From this point, chronicle entries relating to the central events of the rebellion against Scottish rule which the brothers embarked upon become more detailed. The chief sources for the rebellion of 1174 and Gilbert's subsequent actions are the chronicles of Roger of

Howden, who served as an emissary of Henry II's in Galloway, sent to explore the possibilities of taking the lordship under direct English overlordship, and the chronicle known as 'Benedict of Peterborough', an expanded version of Howden, almost certainly by the same author. The intense English interest in Galwegian affairs, which stemmed from an appeal for protection made by the brothers to King Henry, has served to make this short episode one of the best-documented phases in the history of the lordship.

On their return to Galloway, the brothers seem at once to have risen in rebellion, turning against all visible symbols of Scottish domination introduced since 1160. One late source alone states that Uhtred remained loyal to William and that the driving force behind the revolt was Gilbert, (31) but contemporary annalists such as Roger of Howden regarded the rebellion in its initial stages as a joint venture. The first moves were directed against the royal officers imposed by the Scots, who were expelled from the lordship; then the attacks turned to the Anglo-Norman settlers who could be presumed to have remained loyal to the Crown.

According to the annals, all foreigners were either massacred or expelled and the castles of the incomers and of the king, the latter probably at Dumfries, stormed and destroyed. Having thus freed their territory from Scottish controls, the brothers sent a joint deputation to the king of England, asking him to take the overlordship of Galloway for himself. (32) The probable motive behind this move was that Henry was a distant figure, preoccupied with his territories in France and southern England, unlikely to involve himself too heavily in the affairs of a region on the northern periphery of the kingdom. He was, moreover, blood-kin through his mother, Matilda, with Uhtred.

If it was the brothers' assumption that Henry would be too preoccupied with business in the south to intervene directly, they were to be proven sadly wrong. A consummate diplomat and legalist, Henry was not going to become embroiled in a situation which could rebound to his discredit; but the lure of adding further territory to his empire and of gaining a vassal province which could be used to keep the Scots off balance was too appealing to be ignored. Before making any decision, therefore, he dispatched Roger of Howden, a royal clerk, and Robert de Vaux, a prominent north-western landholder and sheriff of Cumberland, as emissaries to investigate the possibilities. In the meanwhile, however, the old quarrels between Uhtred and Gilbert had re-emerged and were shortly to be brought to a savage conclusion.

The fullest account of the quarrel appears in the Benedict of Peterborough version of Howden's chronicle. (33) According to it, the dispute revolved once more around the question of precedence and had resulted in much acrimony, with both parties plotting to ambush and kill the other. Eventually, Gilbert's men, led by an illegitimate son, Malcolm, surprised Uhtred in his residence and had him blinded, castrated and otherwise mutilated, leaving him to die of his injuries a short time afterwards. The English envoys learned of Uhtred's death only on their arrival in Galloway in late November and, on their discovery of Gilbert's implication in the murder, refused to make any settlement despite the offer of two thousand marks of silver and an annual tribute of five hundred cattle and five hundred pigs. On learning of the murder of his kinsman, and fearing the consequences of continued negotiations with a fratricide, Henry refused to have any further dealings with Gilbert and took steps for him to be brought to justice.

Following his release from captivity in February 1175, William returned to Scotland and took immediate action against Gilbert. He, however, probably realising how exposed his position was, with the kings of both Scotland and England roused against him, submitted to William rather than risk battle. According to Fordun, peace was made as the result of the intervention of 'some Scottish bishops and earls', the settlement involving a money payment and the giving of hostages, (34) but there is the possibility that he was confusing this event with the later peace settlement with the English. In late August, William and his nobles went to York to pay homage to Henry, but Gilbert appears to have held aloof and, following the ratification of the Treaty of Falaise, King William was dispatched north with licence to raise an army to crush Gilbert finally. The stated reasons for the move were that Gilbert had foully slain his brother and had broken faith with Henry II. (35) Although Gilbert may have made his peace with William, Henry was to use the full weight of feudal law against him, the failure to perform homage giving just one legitimate excuse to move against Galloway.

No record survives of the campaign which brought Gilbert to heel, but in the autumn of 1176 William escorted him to England, and in October at Feckenham the lord of Galloway made his peace with Henry, paying homage and swearing fealty to him against all men. In return for admission to the king's peace, Gilbert promised payment of a thousand marks of silver and, as security for the peace, gave his son and heir, Duncan as a hostage, (36) extremely light terms considering the enormity of his crimes. Gilbert certainly came off the better from the settlement, for part of the agreement appears to have been that no foreigner who held land in Galloway through the efforts of the king of Scots was to have his possessions restored, (37) which kept Scottish overlordship at a distance. The financial settlement was largely ignored, with over three-quarters of the sum being outstanding in the Exchequer at the time of Gilbert's death ten years later. (38)

Gilbert' submission to Henry II achieved one of the principal objectives of the 1174 revolt: Galloway was removed from the subservient position to the Scottish Crown in which it had lain since its conquest by Malcolm IV. Gilbert had given his homage and fealty directly to Henry, side-stepping the intermediate lordship of King William. Like Scotland, therefore, Galloway was placed under the direct overlordship of the English Crown, but it is not clear whether it was treated as a fief or as a vassal territory similar to the Welsh principalities. In many ways Henry's overlordship cannot have been that vigorous, as the failure on Gilbert's part to maintain payments of his fine to the Exchequer displays, but in other spheres, particularly ecclesiastical affairs, the English Crown was consistently more active. One of the terms of the Treaty of Falaise appears to have been that '...the king of England shall present the honours - bishoprics, abbacies and other honours - in Scotland; or to say less, he shall be consulted in their presentation'. (39) There is every reason to believe that the English established a controlling interest in the presentation to the see of Whithorn at this time (see below 278-81).

The extent of Gilbert's dominion within Galloway after the settlement of 1176 is far from certain. Uhtred's eldest son, Roland, was a grown man by the time of his father's murder and was unlikely to have sat by tamely and allow himself to be disinherited. He had been associated with his father in the government of Galloway for a number of years, being referred to in documents from the mid 1160s, witnessing charters and attending the royal court. (40) Most chroniclers fail to mention Roland in their accounts of the events of 1174-6, but William of Newburgh states that with the help of his father's friends he resisted his uncle's hostile moves. (41) It is generally assumed that Gilbert gained control of the entire lordship after the settlement of 1176, but the above statement and certain aspects of the terms of a settlement between Roland and Henry II, reached in 1186, argue against this. Indeed, as Duncan proposes, it would appear that Roland succeeded to his father's land through inheritance, possibly gaining admission to his patrimony as part of the 1176 compact. (42) Certainly, the dating of Roland's re-grant of land in Kirkgunzeon to the monks of Holmcultram can be placed as early as 1184 on the basis of its mention in a papal bull of May 1185, (43) which implies that he was in possession of at least part of eastern Galloway by the early 1180s (see also below 116).

The possible sucession of Roland to his father's estates, occurring most likely in the wake of Gilbert's submission to William and Henry, makes the renewal of rebellion by his uncle in the last years of his life more understandable. In 1184, William hastily disbanded an army which he had raised to crush Gilbert, who was once again raiding his territories and slaughtering his men. (44) William had raised his force without the approval of Henry, and his sudden dismissal of it on receiving news of the latter's return from Normandy suggests that Gilbert may have enjoyed some degree of support from the English king. Certainly, he was a vassal of Henry's by virtue of his submission to him in 1176, and any attack on him by William could be construed as an injury to the interests of the English Crown. No settlement was reached on this occasion and on Gilbert's death on 1st January 1185 he was still in rebellion, being described as the 'enemy of his lord, the king of Scots'. (45)

The Lordship Reunited, Roland 1185-1200.

The death of Gilbert, with his heir Duncan a hostage in England, left Roland's opponents momentarily leaderless. Seizing advantage of the situation, he at once collected together an army and invaded his uncle's lands, killing all those who dared to oppose him. (46) His first move was to wipe out the native leadership who could be expected to support Duncan, and to seize their lands and wealth for his own uses. This was followed by the construction of a series of strongpoints and the establishment of garrisons with which to suppress dissent. Late sources, expanding upon a brief entry in the Chronicle of Melrose, (47) give more details of the events of 1185. According to Fordun, Roland had the connivance of William the Lion in his attempt to gain mastery of the lordship, a state of affairs which would not only explain the king's subsequent failure to comply with Henry's orders to subdue Galloway, but also the speed with which Roland was able to act. (48) The annals go on to name the leading supporters of Gilbert as having been one Gillepatrick, Henry Kennedy and a certain Samuel, all of whom Roland brought to battle and killed in July 1185. Gillepatrick has been identified as a son of Dunegal of Nithsdale, on no solid grounds. (49) Kennedy was almost certainly head of the Carrick family of that name, his presence lending strength to the contention that that region had formed a portion of Gilbert's domain, and helping to explain its later allocation to Duncan. Nothing is known of 'Samuel'. In the autumn of that same year, Roland gave battle to a free-booter named Gillicolin, who had been ravaging Lothian and, seeking to exploit the unsettled condition of western Galloway, had turned his attention towards that region. Again victory fell to Roland, but an un-named younger brother fighting on his side was slain. (50) His possession of the lordship secure, Roland now felt prepared to face the wrath of King Henry.

The English king was not prepared to accept a fait accompli and by May 1186 was free to move against Roland. King William and his leading men were summoned to Henry's court, supposedly to discuss the king's marriage, and whilst the Scottish king waited in England for the arrival of his bride-to-be, hostages were taken from the nobles and they themselves were sent north to bring Roland to heel. Henry may have suspected William's complicity in the affair, and by keeping him out of the campaign against Roland was intending to bring about a speedy end to the business, so as to prevent further duplicity. Henry's grievance, as stated in Benedict of Peterborough, (51) was that Roland had acted against the explicit orders of both his justiciars and himself, had entered into the land of Gilbert and his chieftains and forcibly brought it into his possession. Henry's interest in the affair may not have been entirely founded on selfish priciples. Certainly Roland by his subsequent actions could be seen as closer to William than to Henry. With him removing the useful check to Scottish ambitions in the western border region which Gilbert had provided, there would have been much to fear from a reunited Galloway in the hands of a pro-Scottish ruler. By his actions, moreover, Roland had disinherited his cousin, the son of a sworn vassal of King Henry, so providing the English king with a legitimate reason for intervention. An assault on one of his vassals could be taken to tantamount to an assault on the interests of the Crown.

In response to this threat Roland amassed an army of his own and took steps to obstruct the progress of a hostile army entering Galloway. Provoked thus further, Henry mustered a major force and advanced as far as Carlisle. With this great army looming on Galloway's borders, Henry sent William and his younger brother, David, earl of Huntingdon, to bring the recalcitrant Roland to him. After protracted negotiations, Roland secured a safe-conduct and satisfactory securities from Henry and came to him at Carlisle. The terms of the peace arranged on this occasion were strikingly favourable to the former. Perhaps this signalled a recognition of the strength of Roland's grip on Galloway and an acknowledgement of his long-standing and still unsettled grievance against his late uncle and his family for the murder of Uhtred. In addition to retaining the lands of his father, his claims on Gilbert's lands, claimed also by Duncan, were to be put to the arbitration of the English court. This having been settled, Roland took an oath to observe the terms, gave his sons as hostages, and swore fealty to King Henry on King William's instructions. (52)

The result of Roland's submission at Carlisle was the effective reaffirmation of Henry II's authority over Galloway and the removal of any ambiguity in Roland's relationship with the English Crown. His oaths of homage and fealty were no less binding than those sworn by Gilbert at Feckenham, and placed him under the immediate overlordship of Henry. King William may have secured the victory of a less hostile, more pro-Scottish candidate to the Galloway lordship, but had to accede immediately to his submission to the English Crown. Galloway thus remained under the direct lordship of the king of England, and was to remain in this position until 1189, when by the Quitclaim of Canterbury Richard I sold his rights of overlordship over Scotland. The lordship is not specifically mentioned in this settlement, but there is no reason to doubt that the superiority of Galloway was not sold back to William with his other rights. Indeed, after c.1190 it is clear that the Galwegians were once more operating in a Scottish context.

The English chronicles nowhere record the result of the dispute between Roland and Duncan concerning Gilbert's lands, but later Scottish sources ascribe the settlement to the good offices of King William. Fordun claims that the king, on account of Roland's faith and good service to him, adjudicated in his favour, awarding him most of a reunited lordship. (53) Henry may, indeed, have left William to arrange a settlement as matters elsewhere in his empire demanded immediate attention. Certainly after the end of 1186 Henry was in no position to involve himself further in the issue, with war breaking out with Philip II of France and the chain of events leading to the final revolt of his sons being set in motion. Without strong support from England, Duncan would have been in no position to press his claims.

The precise dating of the final settlement remains open to question. In view of the continued overlordship of Galloway by Henry II after Roland's submission at Carlisle, it is possible that it was not until 1189-90, when William the Lion was freed from English restraints, that the issue was put to arbitration. According to Fordun, Roland received not only the land which was his by hereditary right, a phraseology which lends support to the contention that he had gained possession of his father's lands before 1185, but also those of his uncle's former territories which he had seized. Duncan swore to accept this decision as binding and abjured any future claims to Galloway on his or his descendants' part. In return for this renunciation and in compensation for his more general disinheritance, William granted him the lordship of Carrick, which may have formed a portion of Gilbert's former domain.

Roland was to hold the reunited lordship uncontested from the time of the settlement of 1186 until his death in December 1200. His tenure of Galloway saw a marked change in the character of the region, with further settlement by Anglo-Norman landholding families leading to the development of stronger ties with the nobility of southern Scotland and Cumbria. More striking, however, was the growth of stronger ties with the Scottish Crown, which may have offset the risks which William had taken in allowing the lordship to fall largely to one man and in creating a secondary lordship for Duncan.

The king, however, was not prepared to let his gamble fail and was strengthening his own position in the south-west, augmenting his hold in neighbouring districts. Nithsdale, if not already drawn into the royal orbit by the mid 1160s, became a new royal bastion. By grant of a charter establishing the royal burgh of Dumfries in 1186, William was asserting his control of the Nith crossings and possession of a key fortress on Roland's eastern march. Similarly, the foundation of a new castle at the mouth of the Water of Ayr in Kyle in 1197, both lying on Duncan's northern border and providing access down the Doon valley into Galloway, strengthened royal power in an area where it appears previously to have been weak. The purpose of these new royal centres is at once apparent: the south-west was, henceforth, to be kept under the close supervision of royal officers based on strategically sited fortifications.

The close relationship with the Scottish Crown had developed most probably in the years between 1174 and 1185 when Roland may have required royal support to resist Gilbert. Any royal commitment to him in this period was to be more than amply repaid by the service which the lord of Galloway provided after 1186, in both military and administrative fields. In 1187 he was again active in the field on the part of the king in the campaign into Moray and Ross against Donald MacWilliam, leading the force which defeated and slew the pretender in battle at the unidentified 'Mam Garvia', somewhere in the vicinity of Inverness. (54) His services to the Crown, however, were not only of a military nature for, from about 1190, he appears to have held the office of justiciar, being so styled in three royal charters. (55) From this it would appear that a third Scottish justiciar, in addition to those of Lothian and Scotia, was created by William to administer the regions which the settlement of the Galloway problem and the royal advances into Kyle and Nithsdale had brought into his sphere of control. Documentation relating to this office is sparse, but where it does occur it is in contexts relating to matters outwith the lordship proper, in the sheriffdoms of Ayr, Lanark and Dumfries. It is possible, therefore, that the new justiciar's remit was the zone of royal territory enclosing the lordship to the north and east, but excluding his own domain, within which a differing legal system was in force. (56) The advancement of Roland to such a high office is clear testimony both to his power within the region and to the high regard for him which the king possessed.

Following the settlement of 1186, the legal relationship of the south-west with the rest of the kingdom appears to have been a matter for concern, with various steps being taken to tighten up irregularities and clarify subjects which may have fallen into abeyance during the rebellion. Roland's involvement in this process was indispensible and as early as May 1187 he was actively enforcing royal rights in the region, sitting in judgement at Lanark to determine Crown entitlement to cain from 'Galloway', the means for its collection and punishments for defaulters. (57) The re-establishment of fiscal rights in that part of the lordship granted to Uhtred, probably in arrears since 1174, would have been high on William's list of priorities. It is in a similar context that the royal judgement made at Dumfries concerning punishment for breaking of the king's peace has been interpreted. (58) No date is assigned to this ruling, but Duncan suggests that the scale of the punishments, clearly aimed at substantial landholders rather than peasants, indicates some connection with the settlement of 1186; perhaps the native nobility were brought to book for their involvement in Gilbert's rebellions and their resources directed towards Crown use. (59)

Further royal legislation affecting Galloway is alluded to but does not survive. Much apparently dealt with the pursuit of criminals into that region from neighbouring territories. (60) From this, it would appear that the south-west could still provide a haven for outlaws, lying as it did beyond the reach of most royal officials. Hence royal concern to draw Roland into the judicial process and the need for a second justiciar south of the Forth. With the offices of sheriff of Ayr, Dumfries and Lanark still in the process of formation, a high royal judicial official was necessary to establish firm government in what was still very much a 'free zone' outwith the reach of the king's peace. It is perhaps significant that following Roland's death in 1200 there is no clear evidence for the appointment of a successor as justiciar, this having perhaps been rendered unnecessary by the firm establishment of the regional sheriffs. When a south-western justiciar does reappear in c.1258 in the person of John Comyn of Badenoch, he is explicitly designated as 'of Galloway'. (61) The reappearance of this office cannot be dated with precision, but may belong to the period post-dating the conquest of Galloway in 1235, when a new administrative structure was being imposed and a high supervisory officer was required to oversee the pacification of the province, playing a similar role to that of Roland in the preceding century.

In addition to his more obvious judicial role, Roland appears to have been a regular member of the royal court, figuring prominently as a witness to important charters and brieves issued in the years between 1187 and 1198. (62) He occurs generally in documents concerning the southern part of the kingdom, being present most often at Edinburgh and Lanark, but also travelling to assemblies at Stirling, Selkirk, Roxburgh and Haddington. His name appears most frequently towards the top of the witness lists, usually within the first three of the secular dignitaries alongside the justiciars of Lothian and Scotia, and it was probably by virtue of his office that he so regularly figured in this way. Roland's position amongst the top-most members of the Scottish nobility was assured by other means as well, principally by his marriage. Dynastic links forged with such families as the powerful Morville lords of Lauderdale and Cunninghame, probably made before 1185, provided him with an entrée into the exclusive circle of the upper nobility, guaranteeing a prominent position within the kingdom.

The Morville marriage is perhaps the clearest evidence for Roland's arrival on the political stage and his expectations of status within the kingdom. His wife, Helen, daughter of Richard de Morville, Constable of Scotland and lord of Cunninghame and Lauderdale, whilst only one child amongst many and with little prospect of inheriting any substantial portion of the family land, was nevertheless a valuable match in that she provided a link with one of the greatest Anglo-Scottish baronial families. The date of the marriage, probably being contracted in the 1170s (as Roland had three sons to give as hostages by 1186), argues more in favour of it having been a simple dynastic link between neighbouring landholding families rather than a grand political marriage or mark of royal favour. The association between the two families stemmed most likely from their interests in north-western England. Roland, through his mother, was heir to some manors in his grandfather's lordship of Allerdale, whilst the Morvilles held the neighbouring barony of Burgh-by-Sands.

The marriage may have served Roland well in the years after 1174, guaranteeing him support from an important member of the baronage who was influential in royal circles, but there is little sign of any significant degree of dependence on Morville power. Certainly, he attended his father-in-law's court in the period before 1185, witnessing charters and occupying a prominent place amongst the attesters as befitted a man of his station, and featuring in legal disputes touching on Morville affairs, (63) but he appears by no means to have been an exile dependent upon the Constable. The infrequency of his occurrence in Morville documents argues against any long-term presence in the Constable's household, such as could be expected had he been driven into exile from Galloway following Uhtred's murder in 1174. The lack of evidence for this lends support to the theory that Roland succeeded in maintaining control over part of eastern Galloway.

The value of the marriage took on new importance in the 1190s as Helen moved closer to the family's inheritance through the death of her nearer male relatives, becoming the sole heir to her brother, William, who had succeeded as Constable in 1189. On his death without direct heirs in 1196 the Morville lands and titles devolved upon her. A heavy relief appears to have been demanded, according to Fordun being as much as 700 marks. (64) On its payment the Galloway and Morville lands were linked and Roland gained the office and privileges of Constable. The union of these two blocks served to place the lords of Galloway in a league apart from the bulk of the Scottish nobility, outstripping the landed resources and influence of most other members of the aristocracy. The inheritance also opened new horizons on the international scene, with Helen's estates in the English midlands elevating Roland to the rank of tenant-in-chief of the English Crown, augmenting the manors which he had acquired through his maternal ties with Allerdale. From the acquisition of the Morvilles' English lands in 1196-7 the lords of Galloway begin to figure in English administrative documents as important and influential members of the southern aristocracy, featuring most prominently in the reign of King John.

There is little evidence that Roland altered his routine following his acquisition of the Morville lands and the Constableship. Surviving documentation does not show any increase in his attendance at the royal court or any greater emphasis on affairs relating to

Lauderdale and Cunninghame. Helen maintainied the controlling interest in her patrimony, while Roland concentrated on Galloway. Such gifts as a grant of a saltery in Lochkindeloch to the monks of Kelso, (65) a monastery with which his family had no previous connection, may stem from his newly-acquired interest in the Lauderdale and Roxburgh district, but this appears to be an isolated instance. In a Scottish context, indeed, the four years from 1196 until 1200 suggests Roland's withdrawal from the political scene, a surprising phenomenon in view of his earlier prominence in royal service; and whilst the Morville Constables had been assiduous in their attendance on the king the new holder of that office rarely graced the court with his presence. Age and ill-health may have contributed to the state of affairs, Roland being at least well into his fifties by 1196, but litigation involving his wife's English lands may have formed the main diversion in the years up to his death.

It is in connection with a lawsuit concerning certain of these southern lands that Roland is last recorded. In November 1200 he accompanied King William south to Lincoln, where the king swore fealty to King John for his English lands. Roland was probably in attendance in his capacity as Constable and a chief baron of Scotland to make supporting oaths to guarantee William's observance of this submission. Other business, however, may have brought him southwards as, following the ceremony at Lincoln, he travelled on to Northampton, where he initiated a lawsuit concerning part of his wife's estates at Bozeat in Northamptonshire. (66) He gave five hundred marks to have the recognizance of twelve free men of the vill to answer questions concerning the seisin of Richard de Morville in that manor and to determine the reasons for his disseisin. On the 19th December, however, Roland died at Northampton and was buried in the abbey of St.Andrew in the same town, (67) the suit still unsettled. For twelve years afterwards the Pipe Roll accounts for the sheriffdom of Northampton continued to show Roland as owing five hundred marks for a recognizance until the settlement of the case by his widow and son in 1212.

Through his marriage to Helen, Roland had four recorded children: three sons and a daughter. (68) Of these, one of the sons appears to have died young, for only two are mentioned subsequently: Thomas, who became earl of Atholl in right of his wife, Isabella, and Alan, the elder, who succeeded to the lordship. Roland's daughter, Ada, was married in 1233 to Walter Bisset, lord of Aboyne, a prominent north-eastern nobleman. Together, Alan and Thomas represented a formidable duo and it was during their lifetime that Galloway was to be brought to the height of its political and military power. Through his entry into the Scottish aristocracy, Roland had opened up new areas for enterprise, winning a central role in national politics. His sons, however, were far to exceed his successes, operating on an international stage and establishing Galloway, albeit temporarily, in a pivotal role in the politics of western maritime Britain.

The Apogee of Power: Alan 1200-34.

Alan of Galloway makes his first appearance in the historical records during his father's lifetime in the accounts of the sheriff of Oxford for 1194-5 as owing fifteen marks for having the king's benevolence in some unspecified issue. (69) The following year, he appears as owing twenty marks for having seisin of Teinford in Northamptonshire, apparently holding the land independently of his father, and in 1196-7 he is further noted in the rolls as owing money relating to the same business. (70) Following these brief and uninformative notices, Alan vanishes from English sources for almost ten years, devoting his time to his Scottish interests. It is not until the reopening of the Bozeat case that he appears to have had much personal involvement with his affairs in the south. His brother Thomas, however, was more active in England at this time, and may have acted there on Alan's behalf. (71)

Within Scotland, from before his father's death, Alan seems to have been active at court, perhaps serving in as a deputy for Roland. He was at Forfar for Christmas 1199, witnessing his first important royal charter, (72) but it is in the years immediately after his father's death that he appears to have been most often in attendance on the king. In the period from December 1200 to 1209, he witnessed at least eight major royal charters issued at locations as widely spaced as Aberdeen, Kincardine, Linlithgow, Stirling, Roxburgh, Selkirk and Stow, (73) being placed high amongst the list of dignitaries present. In most cases he was named within the top four rankings, usually as the first secular individual of non-comital rank. Alan's high standing within the kingdom at this time is perhaps best indicated by his marriage in 1209 to Margaret, eldest daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon and niece of the king; (74) but this event appears to have marked the high-water mark of his influence at court, for he had tenurial obligations to answer in England and after c.1210 evidence for activity in Scottish affairs falls away sharply. From this point his career in English affairs began to develop and it was in the context of English royal politics that he was most commonly recorded down to 1215.

In the years after 1200 it is inconceivable that Alan could simply have abandoned his interests in England until such time as his Scottish commitments allowed him time to deal with them. Although there is no clear evidence, it is possible that Thomas acted as his brother's deputy and attended to such outstanding matters as demanded immediate attention. Certainly, Thomas appears consistently to have been more active in the service of King John in England than his brother ever was, and was accordingly to reap the rewards of such service in the form of grants of land and gifts of money. (75) In March 1205 Thomas sent galleys to aid John in his preparations against the French, the vessels undoubtedly being drawn from Galloway. (76) This may have represented Alan's response to requests for fulfilment of his military obligations to the Crown as a tenant-in-chief, and was to be the first in a long series of such instances of involvement in the military designs of the English king.

Relations between John and Roland's sons revolved around their value to him in his military ventures in Wales and Ireland. In 1210 John invaded the latter in pursuit of his vendetta against the Briouze family, who had fled there for safety with their Lacy allies, Walter and Hugh. The invasion provided John with the opportunity to curb the independence of the Anglo-Norman baronage, with the Lacy lordships of Meath and Ulster as the prime targets. For his support of the Briouze family Hugh was deprived of the earldom of Ulster and his lands were occupied by the royal army. He himself, however, managed to elude capture and escaped into exile first in Scotland, then in France. Matilda de Briouze and some of her children, eluding the besiegers of Carrickfergus Castle, likewise attempted to escape to Scotland, but were captured by Duncan of Carrick and handed over to John to die in custody at Windsor. (77) As a reward for this assistance John began a new trend in the distribution of his patronage, making use of his Irish windfall, and granted Duncan land in Antrim out of the Ulster territories. It is generally assumed that the disappearance of Alan from Scottish affairs at this time was as a result of his participation in the Irish campaign of 1210, and that the substantial block of territory granted to him in Antrim by King John was a reward for this service, (78) along the lines of the grant made to his cousin. Whilst there is no positive evidence that Alan was involved in the actions of 1210, the dating of the confirmation of the award in early summer 1212 rules out the possibility that it was made in connection with any subsequent event such as John's abortive campaign in north Wales.

The scale of the grant made to Alan, comprising the whole of the north Antrim coast from Glenarm to Coleraine, saving only twenty knights' fees which were to provide the castle-guard service for the newly-acquired royal stronghold at Kilsantan, was immense, being assessed at one hundred and forty knights' fees. (79) This suggests that it was a largely speculative award, with there being little prospect that Alan would be able to find sufficient men to enfeoff as subtenants. It seems unlikely, moreover, that Alan could expect unopposed entry into most of this territory, which lay towards the fringes of the zone of former Lacy power in districts where the influence of the native Irish chieftains was still strong, particularly beyond the River Bann in the land of the Cinel Eoghain. There does, however, appear to be a certain amount of reasoning behind John's grant, with the awards being made to individuals who were felt to be capable of conquering and retaining possession of these territories. Both branches of the Galloway family, with their own principal estates only a few miles away across the North Channel in Scotland, and already enjoying a close relationship with the English Crown, were natural choices for such roles.

There are signs that by 1212 the Galwegians were active in Ulster, perhaps in connection with an attempt to gain possession of the lands assigned to Alan. The Annals of Ulster, in 1212, record a raid by Thomas, son of Roland, in conjunction with Ruadhri and Donald, grandsons of Somerled, lords respectively of Kintyre and Islay, against Derry and the Innishowen peninsula, lying at the western extremity of his brother's supposed lands. (80)

In the following summer, John granted Thomas 'the cantred of Talachot', probably Tullyhoe in the territory of Cinel Eoghain, to be held for the service of three knights, (81) a purely speculative award considering that this represented the heartland of native power in the region. This was supplemented a few weeks later by a grant of six more fees, apparently part of the twenty retained in royal hands to provide castle-guard service for Kilsantan. (82) Thomas continued his operations in Ulster in 1214, plundering Derry with Ruadhri for a second time and raiding into Twescart, the latter being part of Alan's assigned territories. The raids, however, do not appear to have been simple piratical exercise, but were probably aimed at softening the opposition from the Cinel Eoghain preparatory to an attempt to occupy Tullyhoe. Thomas's principal act of that year, the construction of a castle at Coleraine on the Bann, was almost certainly part of this policy, for it provided him with a fortified base on the edge of the territories assigned to him in 1213. (83) The establishment of Coleraine, confirmed by a royal charter which assigned to it all twenty of the fees formerly attatched to Kilsantan, represented only the start of a long involvement in English royal service in Ireland on Thomas's part. There is little indication of such activity on Alan's part until considerably later.

It is not until the summer of 1212 that there is any clear evidence for Alan's activity in John's service and beyond the reopening of the Bozeat case by his mother, (84) there is no sign of his presence in the south until then. The king, however, was soon to demand a practical return for his generosity. A letter from King John to 'his faithful cousin' Alan, dated 20th July 1212, reminded him of the 'great business' which they had discussed on an earlier occasion, probably whilst the king had been in the north for negotiations with the king of Scots earlier in that year, when the lord of Galloway acted as surety on the Scottish side for an agreement between the kings. John asked for 'one thousand of his best and most active Galwegians' to be sent to Chester by mid August, ready for military service. (85) It was preferred that Alan should meet the cost of their service, but arrangements could be made if he were unable to do so, and it was requested that he place over them a commander who could hold them in check. This latter is clearly an allusion to the unpredictability and notorious unruliness of the Galwegians in previous campaigns. The Galwegians were intended for use in an invasion of Gwynedd, the 'great business' mentioned in the letter, but rumours of a conspiracy against the Crown by certain barons of suspect loyalty led John to abandon his venture. Alan, however, had already travelled south with his men and in mid August was at Nottingham, where he received payment for his troubles. (86)

The favour shown to Alan and Thomas by King John in the years immediately following 1210, and their increased involvement in English affairs at this time, was to lead to difficulties by 1215 as the political situation within England disintegrated and relationships with the new Scottish king, Alexander II, deteriorated. Both brothers, Alan through inheritance and Thomas through royal favour, (87) were substantial landholders in England as well as tenants-in-chief of the Scottish Crown for Lauderdale, Cunninghame and Atholl. The dual allegiances which had developed prior to 1215 were workable so long as a stable relationship was maintained between Scots and English, but as Alexander's clear identification with the cause of the rebel barons in England became increasingly obvious, landholders such as Alan and Thomas were placed in an invidious position, with any move bound to displease one or other of their overlords. Alan continued to steer a middle course for as long as possible and in December 1214 attended Alexander II's Christmas court at Forfar. (88) Following this, early in January 1215, he was confirmed in his possession of the Constableship, but he does not appear to have allowed this homage to the new king in any way to restrict his freedom of action, or bind him as a result to the baronial cause. By the summer of that year, indeed, both brothers had thrown in their lot with John, and Alan was one of his supporters at Runnymede in June, where he was the fifth lay dignitary named in the preamble to Magna Carta as one of the men on whose advice the charter was issued. (89) As a reward for their loyalties, the brothers received a general confirmation of their Irish estates, which were further augmented by additional speculative grants of Cinel Eoghain territory, Thomas also gaining custody of the royal castle of Antrim. (90) The short term peace which followed the issuing of the charter may have provided the brothers with a means of extracting themselves from further embroilment in John's affairs for, with the renewal of the conflict in the early autumn, there is no evidence for their further active commitment to his cause.

The inactivity of Alexander II in the early part of the conflict may have been the factor which had enabled Alan and Thomas to support John openly, but his entry into the strife in October 1215 would have necessitated their withdrawal rather than face the consequences of bearing arms against the King from whom they held their major estates. Thomas may simply have withdrawn from the conflict, without compromising his relationship with either king, but Alan had much more at stake and was forced to join Alexander's camp. As Constable of Scotland, an office in which he had only recently been confirmed, and husband of a cousin of the Scottish king, it was unthinkable that he should take up arms against him. His mother, moreover, was nearing the end of her life and self-interest dictated that Alan adhere to King Alexander to secure easy entry into the Morville lands. There is little surviving evidence that Alan suffered any major loss as a result of his abandonment of John's party at this stage, such as widespread forfeiture of his English or Irish estates, although there is record of one of his vills at 'Eston' in Oxfordshire being transferred to John Marshal, nephew of William, earl of Pembroke, a loyal adherent of the king. (91) It is for failure to perform homage and fealty to Henry III following John's death in 1216 that his estates were taken into royal hands. (92)

Alan was certainly involved in the Scottish campaigns of 1215-16 in northern England, Galwegians according to tradition being assigned the blame for the sack of Holmcultram Abbey in the course of these events. There is little, however, to indicate the degree of his involvement in Alexander's military venture and it is unknown whether he was at Dover in 1216 for the meeting with the Dauphin Louis. Following that event and the death of the English king at Newark in mid October, Alexander withdrew northwards, ceasing his major military operations and concerning himself primarily with securing his grip on Northumberland. The collapse of the rebel position in England after the coronation of Henry III left the way free for peace negotiations, but the Scots were unwilling to relinquish their few gains in the north, particularly Carlisle, and Alexander launched a pre-emptive raid in July and was planning another in September when news of peace negotiations reached him. By mid September 1217 the rebels had been defeated in the field and Louis had made his peace and withdrawn, leaving Alexander as the last of the main foreign leaders in the field. Diplomacy rather than military action was resorted to, with letters calling for wiser counsels and requesting the return of Carlisle, the main stumbling block to peace, being sent by the English government to both the king and Alan. (93) Peace soon followed, with Alexander ordering the surrender of Carlisle to Robert de Vipont, the appointed warden of the city and castle for Henry III, and before the end of the year he journeyed to Northampton to pay homage for the earldom of Huntingdon.

Peace with Henry III did not see Alan's immediate return to English business and it is clear that he did not enjoy the same relationship with the new regime as he had done with the King John. Family interests within Scotland probably prevented his speedy return to his southern concerns. On 11th June 1217, his mother, Helen, had at last died and the entire Morville inheritance, held apart from the Galloway lands during her lifetime, fell into his possession. (94) Deep involvement in the transference of the Lauderdale-Cunninghame lordship to his own administration and settlement of this business with the king probably kept him in Scotland, and by March 1219 some outstanding matters pertaining to his English lands, such as his homage and fealty to the new king, remained unsettled. The English administration showed great patience, granting safe conduct until Pentecost for Alan to come to Henry to perform his acts of homage, and placing certain of his lands, which had initially been in the custody of his father-in-law, Earl David, under local administrators. (95)

In an undated letter, probably written before May 1219, Alan reminded Henry of the blood-relationship between their two families, and professed his willingness to serve him in all things. He thanked the young king for the favour shown to his brother and himself by King John, but complained of their inability to derive any benefit from their Irish lands. The letter was carried by two of Alan's clerks, William, prior of St.Mary's Isle, and Thomas of Kent, who had further matters concerning their master's interests to discuss. (96) It was probably as a result of their communications with the king that Alan was excused from his obligation to be at court by Pentecost, distance and expense being the profferred excuses, and none of the threatened moves towards distraint were taken. (97) Thomas, however, travelled to Henry's court by mid June and gave homage and fealty, being confirmed in possession of his Irish lands as a result. (98) A further mission by one of Alan's clerks, a certain Hamo of Galloway, sought restoration of his lands in Ireland and assured the king of his readiness to perform homage, but apparently only once the Irish lands had been confirmed to him. (99) Henry ordered Alan or his representatives to be given seisin of the Irish estates, but required him to come to the discussions with King Alexander to be held in the summer at York to pay homage and fealty. Only when that had been done would his English lands be retored in full seisin. (100) In the assembly at York on 15th June 1220, Alan at long last renewed his fealty to the English Crown and received confirmation of possession of his lands in England and Ulster. (101) The fulfillment of his obligations, however, did not herald the beginnings of a new phase of service to the English king and Alan appears to have returned promptly to Scotland.

Once again, the surviving documentation sheds little light on Alan's activities. There is evidence for a series of military campaigns in the northern and western provinces of the country in the early 1220s and it is probable that, as Constable, he was involved in these. (102) In June 1221, Alexander may have launched an abortive attack on Argyll and the Isles, for which levies were later supposed to have been drawn from Galloway. (103) The assault was renewed in the summer of 1222, resulting in the submission of a number of Hebridean chieftains to the Crown. As a result of this new emphasis on the western sea-board, Alan may have turned his attention to Man and the Isles, and it is in connection with this region that he is mostly recorded in the last decade of his life. Thomas, in the interim, had been active in the English administration in Ulster, but in July 1222 was ordered to surrender custody of Antrim Castle to Henry's justiciar. (104) The mandate does not appear to have been obeyed, or custody was restored to him soon after, for in the following summer a similar order was issued from Gloucester, instructing him to return to Ulster to secure the stronghold against Hugh de Lacy, who had returned to his former earldom and was raiding royal lands, or to surrender it to the Archbishop of Dublin if he could not. (105)

The return of Hugh de Lacy to Ulster in 1223 represented a grave threat to the interests of both Alan and Thomas, who had profited considerably from the earl's downfall in 1210, and they threw their weight behind the royal effort to drive him from the earldom. Alan, who appears to have been active in some other military expedition in the southern Isles, was prepared to abandon this venture and cross to Ulster, where Thomas was already active in the field. The latter's castle at Coleraine, controlling the crossings of the Bann, was attacked by Hugh in alliance with Aedh O'Neill, whose territories had been subject to Thomas's raids, and the Galloway lands in north Antrim came under attack. In the summer of 1224, however, Lacy made his peace with the king and, anxious lest Henry restore him to all his former lands, both brothers wrote to the English administration seeking confirmation of their rights. (106) To allay their fears, in the charter restoring the earldom to Hugh, the lands assigned by King John to Alan and Thomas were specifically excluded from his territories. (107)

Such royal assurances appear to have been of little value, and there is no indication that the brothers were ever restored to their rights. It is argued by T.E.McNeill that Earl Hugh regarded the Galloway brothers and their cousin Duncan of Carrick as potential rivals for his control of Ulster and that he was not prepared to tolerate their restoration. (108) Certainly, so long as he maintained his alliance with O'Neill, there was little prospect of Thomas being able to reassert control in the Coleraine district, and when the castle was rebuilt in 1228 it was almost definitely the work of the earl. Alan, who never appears to have been able in the past to secure full possession of his Irish lands, may have been more amenable to a settlement, and in 1229 had married Hugh's daughter. (109) This marriage neutralised the Galwegian threat to the earl's position and provided the lord of Galloway with a face-saving means of withdrawal from a thorny situation, leaving him free to pursue his interests in Manx affairs.

Despite his promises to lend military support to Henry in Ulster in 1223-4, a declaration motivated primarily by self-interest, Alan appears to have been following a largely independent course, acting outwith the control of either of his titular overlords. The political instability of the Kingdom of Man and the Isles, at that time under the rule of the brothers Reginald and Olaf, grandsons of Olaf Godredsson and Affrica, offered the possibility of expanding his territorial influence. Olaf, the younger of the brothers, appears to have held the northern portion of the kingdom, at first under his brother's overlordship, but subsequently as an independent principality. Reginald, seeking to regain full possession, planned to move against his brother and sought the support of Alan of Galloway, renewing a tie which had lain dormant for about seventy years.

It is probable that the naval expedition in which Alan was involved in 1224 was connected with this joint campaign with Reginald against Olaf; the cruising from island to island with his army in his galleys, which is mentioned in the letter to King Henry, fits a description of operations in Hebridean waters. The campaign in question was probably the initial attack on Olaf, assigned to 1225 in the Chronicle of Man, which describes the venture as being abortive. (110) Following this failure, Reginald returned to Man, but towards the end of 1225 travelled to Alan's court and, to cement their alliance, gave his daughter in marriage to Alan's bastard son, Thomas. The Manx, whom Reginald had not consulted and who felt deceived by his actions, declared him deposed and summoned Olaf from the Isles to take the throne. (111) In 1228, whilst the latter was absent in the Hebrides, Alan and his brother, along with Reginald, invaded Man and succeeded for a while in establishing their own officials in control of the island, an action which has more of the flavour of an outright conquest rather than of an attempt to restore an ally to the throne.

This event marked the nadir of Olaf's fortunes, as he had been deprived of his base in Man itself and was being harried in his territories in the Hebrides. To this phase can be attributed a letter, which survives only in fragments, from Olaf to Henry III. In it Olaf sought English support against Reginald and alluded to the open aggression towards him on the part of Alan of Galloway. In an effort to relieve some of the pressure from himself, he begged King Henry to use his influence with the Scots to secure Alan's withdrawal from the conflict. (112) The Galwegian success, however, was shortlived, for Olaf returned to the island at the year's end and the foreign bailiffs were expelled. (113) In the course of the winter, Reginald sought to repeat the success of the summer and launched a surprise attack, but after some initial success was killed by his brother's men. (114) The removal of his ally, however, did not lead to Alan's abandonment of his interest in Manx affairs, for his illegitimate son, as husband of Reginald's daughter, was a potential candidate for the kingship and in 1229 and 1230, Galwegian activity in the Isles intensified.

The already tortuous politics of the Kingdom of the Isles were further complicated by the machinations of the descendants of Somerled, who advanced claims to kingship over various portions of formerly Manx territory. Thomas of Galloway, as early as 1212, had cooperated with the brothers Ruadhri and Donald, sons of Ranald, who held Islay and Kintyre. Two of their cousins, Duncan and Dugald Screech, sons of Dugald of Lorn, who had succeeded to power in Lorn and the southern island districts, cutting off Olaf's access to his northern territories in Skye and Lewis, formed natural allies for Alan in the later 1220s in his operations against the King of Man. Under their combined assaults, Olaf gave ground and early in 1230 was forced to go to his titular overlord, the King of Norway, to seek assistance. (115)

News of the disturbances in the Isles had reached the Norwegian court in the summer of 1229 and Alan of Galloway, described as 'the greatest warrior in that time', was named as the chief perpetrator of the hostilities in that region. (116) King Haakon, determined to reassert his overlordship in the west, was already intriguing with members of Somerled's kin and had appointed one 'Uspak' (Gillespic ?) to be king over the Isles by the time that Olaf arrived in Norway.

He brought further news of Alan's activity, reporting that the Galwegian invasion of Man was imminent and repeating a supposed boast of Alan's that '...the sea was no more difficult to cross to Norway, than from Norway to Scotland, and it was no worse off for havens there to him who wished to harry'. (117) This statement, no doubt an invention of Olaf's designed to rouse Norwegian ire against Alan, had its desired effect, with support from Haakon being guaranteed; and in the summer of 1230 the fleet sailed.

Initial operations in the northern Hebrides met with considerable success, Dugald and Duncan's army being defeated and the former being captured. With the lords of Lorn defeated, the fleet sailed southwards round Kintyre into the Firth of Clyde to attack Bute, which theoretically formed part of the kingdom of the Isles, but which had been taken by the Scots. Rothesay Castle was assaulted and captured, but Uspak was wounded in the attack and from this point the fortunes of the campaign waned. News was brought that Alan had assembled a great fleet, presumably for his attack on Man, but had diverted his force northwards to intercept and crush the Norwegians. Rather than risk defeat, Uspak and Olaf sailed back round Kintyre and into the Isles, where the former was shortly to die as a result of his injuries received at Rothesay. Olaf now assumed command of the remains of the fleet and turned it to his own purposes, sailing southwards to Man. Forces raised against him there refused to fight him and he was able to resume the kingship unopposed. There may, however, have been conditions attached to the provision of Norwegian assistance, for present in the army was Olaf's nephew, Godred Don, son of King Reginald, for whom Olaf may have been required to make a position within the kingdom. A settlement between the two lines of the family would have strengthened resistance to both Alan and the descendants of Somerled, robbing the former of any potential benefit from the marriage of his illegitimate son to Godred's sister. Indeed, as there is no further indication of any major military operations against Olaf on Alan's part, it is possible that he recognised the unprofitability of his stance and came to terms with this arrangement. Certainly on the departure of the Norwegians northwards in the spring of 1231, accompanied by Godred, who was later killed in battle on Lewis, there was no renewal of hostilities. (118)

The Manx and Hebridean campaigns of 1230 were to be Alan's last mejor military venture, with the final years of his life being devoted to domestic affairs. Further expeditions may have been planned, but in 1231 Thomas, his close associate in this business, was killed, apparently by a knight of the earl of Dunbar, with whose family both Alan and Thomas appear to have had close ties. (119) Despite this incident, relations with that earl remained strong, and in the disturbances which racked Galloway in 1234-5, he was to play an important mediatory role. Moreover, there is reason to believe that it was with the Dunbars that Thomas's heir, Patrick, was to receive most of his education, rather than at his uncle's court in Galloway, his mother the countess of Atholl having links with both that family and the Comyns. Alan, for his part, was completing his network of marriage alliances, forging links with two further prominent families. By his three known marriages he was already related to both branches of the Lacy family and to the Scottish royal family, (120) his illegitimate son was married into the Manx royal house and two of his daughters to Roger de Quincy and William de Forz, prominent members of the English nobility. In 1233, in pursuance of this last policy of marriage into important English families, Alan arranged for the match of his youngest daughter, Devorgilla, with John Balliol, lord of Barnard Castle in Teesdale. (121) The marriage in the same year of his sister, Ada, to Walter Bisset, lord of Aboyne on Deeside, represented a departure from this trend, but established a link with a family that was rising fast in royal service, a good match considering the lady must have been at least in her mid thirties by that date. These examples of dynastic alliance were to be Alan's last recorded actions for, early in 1234, he died, bringing to an end the direct senior male line of the lords of Galloway. (122)

The death without a legitimate male heir and an apparently poor provision for succession precipitated a grave crisis for the Galwegians. Half a century of uninterupted stable government under Roland and Alan had been brought to a sudden end, and the prospect of partition amongst the foreign husbands of the three heiresses loomed large. It is perhaps an indication of the changes wrought in the period from Gilbert's death, which had brought a closer relationship with the Scots, that the people of the region did not at once rise in rebellion. It is not that they were leaderless; there were male representatives of the dynasty, both legitimate and illegitimate, upon whom the title of lord could have been bestowed. But fifty years of firm government and the development of new links with the Scots may have accustomed them to an acceptance of and belief in the value of royal justice. Only once their appeal to King Alexander had been passed over was there resort to violence, and even then there is reason to believe that outside agencies may have been at work in stirring up unrest.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. Glasgow Registrum, No 3; RRS, i, Nos 131, 159.
2. Scots Peerage, iv, 137; Holyrood Liber, No 24.
3. Scots Peerage, iv, 136-7 and note 1.
4. ibid, 136 and note 4.
5. William of Newburgh, 128.
6. Barrow, 'Lordship and feudal settlement in Cumbria', 128.
7. W.D.H.Sellar, 'Marriage, concubinage and divorce in Gaelic Scotland', Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness, li (1978-80), 464-93.
8. see e.g.RRS, ii, No 80.
9. William of Newburgh, 186-7.
10. Roger of Howden, ii, 105.
11. see e.g.CDS, i, No 480.
12. Duncan and Brown, 'Argyll and the Isles', 197.
13. Holyrood Liber, Nos 23, 24, 49, 73.
14. RRS, i, No 265.
15. RRS, ii, No 216.
16. R.C.Reid, 'The feudalisation of Lower Nithsdale', TDGAS, xxxiv (1955-56), 103.
17. Scott, 'An early sheriff', 90-91.
18. Anderson, Early Sources, ii, 264 and note 4.
19. RRS, i, No 230.
20. Crawford, 'Earldom of Caithness', 103-7.
21. Chron.Fordun, i, 256.
22. RRS, i, Nos 159, 265.
23. ibid, No 254.
24. RRS, ii, No 80.
25. Holyrood Liber, Nos 23-5, 27, 49; SRO GD141/NoA (The Logan Charter); Register and Records of Holm Cultram, edd F.Grainger and W.G.Collingwood, (Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, 1929), No 120.
26. Wigtownshire Charters, xviii-xix.
27. Melrose Liber, No 31.
28. Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle, ed R.C.Johnston (Oxford, 1981), 126.
29. Roger of Howden, ii, 60.
30. Benedict of Peterborough, 67-68.
31. Chron.Fordun, i, 266.
32. Roger of Howden, ii, 105; Benedict of Peterborough, i, 126.
33. Benedict of Peterborough, i, 79-80.
34. Chron.Fordun, i, 266.
35. Benedict of Peterborough, i, 99.
36. Roger of Howden, ii, 105; Benedict of Peterborough, i, 126.
37. Benedict of Peterborough, i, 126.
38. CDS, i, No 183.
39. Robert of Torigny, iv, 267-8.
40. Holyrood Liber, No 24; RRS, ii, No 80; CDS, ii, No 1606(4); Holm Cultram Register, No 120.
41. William of Newburgh, 186-7.
42. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 183.
43. Holm Cultram Register, No 50a.

44. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 313.
45. ibid, 336.
46. ibid, 339.
47. *Chron.Melrose*, 45.
48. *Chron.Fordun*, i, 269.
49. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 183.
50. *Chron.Melrose*, 45.
51. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 348.
52. *Roger of Howden*, ii, 309; *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 348-9.
53. *Chron.Fordun*, i, 269-70.
54. *Benedict of Peterborough*, ii, 7-9.
55. *RRS*, ii, Nos 309, 400, 406.
56. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 203-4.
57. *APS*, i, 378, c.xxiii.
58. *APS*, i, 378, c.xii.
59. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 185-6.
60. *RRS*, ii, No 406.
61. *CDS*, i, No 2155.
62. *RRS*, ii, Nos 260, 299, 308-10, 367-8, 371, 400, 405-6.
63. e.g.*Melrose Liber*, Nos 94, 108, 111.
64. *Chron.Fordun*, i, 278.
65. *Kelso Liber*, No 254.
66. *CDS*, i, No 294.
67. *Roger of Howden*, iv, 145; K.J.Stringer, 'The early lords of Lauderdale, Dryburgh Abbey and St.Andrews Priory at Northampton', in K.J.Stringer (ed), *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1985), 45-46, 52.
68. *Scots Peerage*, iv, 139; C.T.Clay, 'Two Devorgillas', *EHR*, lxv (1950), 89-91.
69. *CDS*, i, No 208.
70. ibid, Nos 236, 243.
71. ibid, Nos 357-60, 362, 370, 382, 397, 402, 404, 405, 409, 426 etc.
72. *RRS*, ii, No 421.
73. ibid, Nos 428-30, 432, 438, 337, 460, 497,
74. *Chron.Melrose*, 54.
75. e.g.*CDS*, i, Nos 357, 359, 370.
76. ibid, Nos 360, 389.
77. *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland*, ed H.S.Sweetman, i (London, 1875), No 427.
78. *CDI*, i, No 573.
79. R.Greeves, 'The Galloway lands in Ulster', *TDGAS*, xxxvi (1957-58), 115-21.
80. *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 252.
81. *CDI*, i, No 468.
82. *CDI*, i, No 474.
83. *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 256.
84. *CDS*, i, No 511.
85. ibid, No 529.
86. ibid, No 533.
87. *Rotuli Literarum Clausarum*, ed T.Duffus-Hardy, i (London, 1833), 17, 22, 25, 56, 94.
88. Lloyd, *King John*, 295.
89. Matthew Paris, *Cron.Majora*, ed H.R.Luard (London,

1872-83), ii, 589-90.

90. *CDI*, i, No 565, 567.
91. *Rot.Litt.Claus.*, i, 288.
92. *CDS*, i, No 718.
93. ibid, No 673.
94. *Chron.Melrose*, 68.
95. *CDS*, i, No 717, 718.
96. ibid, No 754.
97. ibid, No 721.
98. *CDI*, No 879.
99. *CDS*, i, No 754; *CDI*, i, 937.
100. *CDS*, i, No 755.
101. *CDI*, i, No 942; *CDS*, i, Nos 763, 764.
102. see e.g.*APS*, i, 398, c.ii.
103. *Chron.Fordun*, i, 288.
104. *CDI*, i, No 1044.
105. ibid, Nos 1126, 1127.
106. *CDS*, i, No 890; *CDI*, Nos 1218, 1219.
107. *CDI*, i, No 1371, 1372.
108. T.E.McNeill, *Anglo-Norman Ulster. The History and Archaeology of an Irish Barony. 1177-1400* (Edinburgh, 1980), 21-22.
109. *Chron.Lanercost*, 40.
110. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 88.
111. ibid, 90.
112. *CDS*, v, No 9.
113. *Chron.Man* (Munch and Goss), 90.
114. ibid, 90-92.
115. ibid, 92-94.
116. *Hacon's Saga*, 150.
117. ibid, 150 c.163, 152 c.166.
118. ibid, c.166-7.
119. *Chron.Me;rose*, 81; *CDS*, i No 1894.
120. K.J.Stringer, 'A new wife for Alan of Galloway', *TDGAS*, xlix (1972), 49-55.
121. *Chron.Melrose*, 82.
122. ibid, 83.

Chapter 4

The Heirs of Alan

The two generations after the death of Alan are among the most poorly documented in the region's history. The period saw not only major changes in the ruling dynasty, but also the gradual expansion of royal power into the lordship and the introduction of mechanisms for more effective royal government. How these changes were effected is largely unknown as there is little in the way of surviving Scottish governmental records from the middle of the 13th century which has any relevance for Galwegian history. Source material from chronicles is also rare, largely because Galloway became a relative backwater, thrust into obscurity by the loss of its line of dynamic lords who had enjoyed an international reputation. Annal entries concerning regional affairs after 1235 all but cease, and it becomes clear from the few references to Alan's successors that their main interests lay elsewhere, both in Scotland and on the wider international scene. As with the 12th century in the region, however, it remains a truism to say that the history of the lordship is the history of its rulers, and despite their preoccupation with non-Galwegian affairs, it is on them that any examination of the region into the mid 13th century must centre.

Rebellion and Suppression

The months immediately after Alan's death in 1234 appear to have been ones of uneasy calm as the issue of the succession began to unfold. Amongst the Galwegians, there was a desire to retain the integrity of the lordship, to avoid the partition which female succession would entail. It was hoped that Alan's daughters would be passed over in favour of one of the surviving male representatives of the lordly house. The Galwegians proposed to the king that the succession should fall to Alan's bastard son, Thomas, or, if inheritance of the lordship by an illegitimate line was unacceptable, to Patrick, Alan's nephew. Failing that, one of the more distant male relatives, perhaps from the family of Alan's uncle, Fergus, was offered as an alternative. (1) As a last resort, the Galwegians appealed to King Alexander, and asked him to take possession of the lordship for himself, thus keeping the region united under one lord. The appeal, however, was rejected and the division of the inheritance between Alan's daughters was ordered. (2)

Alexander's motives in 1234 were not dictated entirely by an altruistic concern for the interests of the women whom he was being asked to dispossess. Certainly, the decision which he took was the only one which 'feudal' law allowed and was considered to be the most just settlement of the issue. The offer of personal control of the lordship may have been a temptation, but such interference in the laws of succession would have set a dangerous precedent and could not but have alarmed the higher nobility, raising spectres of arbitrary royal government interfering in the lawful descent of landed wealth. The advantages to be gained from acceptance of direct control of the lordship had to be weighed against the prospect of the break-up of what amounted to one of the largest blocks of land in magnate hands within the kingdom. There were, moreover, family interests at stake. Christina and Devorgilla were cousins of the king through their mother Margaret of Huntingdon, and the husband of Helen, Roger de Quincy, was a prominent figure in Alexander's service. Division of the lordship, then, offered more in the way of benefits to the Crown, with succession falling to a group that was probably more amenable to the royal will than any of the male candidates. Alexander's insistence on partition, however, drove the Galwegians into open rebellion in defence of their interests, and they put forward Thomas as their candidate for the lordship.

The Galwegian rebellion of 1235 is portrayed generally as a spontaneous rising on the part of the people against an unpopular, though legally just, decision by the king of Scots. The three main contemporary sources give which details of the rising, however, contain within their narratives hints of deeper motives and outside influences at work. The briefest description, that of the Chronicle of Lanercost, mentions attacks on royal land on the frontiers of Galloway, presumably in Kyle and Nithsdale, and names the chief supporter of Thomas as being a certain 'Gilleroth', about whose origins nothing is known. (3) The Chronica Majora of Matthew Paris and the Chronicle of Melrose give more detailed accounts of the action. The former speaks of an alliance of Galwegian, Manx and Irish interests, brought together by the efforts of Hugh de Lacy, who had been Alan's father-in-law, with the avowed intent of winning the inheritance for Thomas or one of his male relatives, preferably Patrick of Atholl. The earl of Ulster is not mentioned subsequently, or in any other chronicle, but all are agreed that Ireland was the major source of support for Thomas's cause, providing men and a refuge when required. What Hugh de Lacy's motives were is difficult to uncover, but it is possible that some lingering question relating to the Galloway lands in Ulster lay at the foot of the earl's involvement.

Most details of the actual military operation involved in the suppression of the revolt are to be found in the Chronicle of Melrose. According to it, the king invaded the lordship in mid July, determined to bring the rebels to battle. A swift conclusion was brought about when the Galwegians fell on the royal army which was in difficulties in marshy ground, but Farquhar MacTaggart, earl of Ross, brought his men round in the rear of the rebels and routed them. The following day the Galwegians submitted to the king, but Thomas and Gilleroth escaped to Ireland. Believing the question to be settled, Alexander withdrew, and was at Berwick by 1st August for the marriage of his youngest sister to Gilbert, earl marshal of England, leaving Walter Comyn, earl of Menteith, to complete the pacification. Comyn's men, however, proved to be ill-disciplined and began to indulge in indiscriminate looting, the abbeys of Tongland and Glenluce apparently being sacked. At this point Thomas and Gilleroth returned from Ireland with reinforcements, bringing about panic in the Scottish force, which fled rather than fight, falling apart in disorder. Gilleroth, however, soon deserted Thomas, having come to some arrangement for his own safety with the earl of Dunbar, who advanced on the rebels with a new army. Abandoned by his chief commander, Thomas was forced to throw himself on the king's mercy and was imprisoned in Edinburgh Castle. (4) The Chronicle of Melrose claims that his detention was of short duration, but he was handed over to Devorgilla and, in the words of the Chronicle of Lanercost, 'shut up until decrepit old age in the confines of Barnard Castle'. (5)

Thomas played no further part in the history of Galloway and remained in obscurity until 18th March 1286, when the question of his release was amongst subjects discussed at Alexander III's last council-meeting in Edinburgh. (6) The implication of this reference is that Thomas was still in Balliol custody. The king's death that night appears to have ended moves towards the release of the unfortunate Thomas, for ten years later he was brought out of imprisonment by Edward I. On 6th March 1296 the king had him released from Barnard Castle and, in an astute but rather optimistic move, armed him with a charter of liberties and dsepatched him towards Galloway. Edward's purpose was clear: Thomas was to be used as an alternative focus for Galwegian loyalty in an attempt to undermine John Balliol's influence in that region. How effective he would have been is open to question and it is unlikely that he would have received much support after a sixty years' absence. The strength of Galwegian loyalty to the son of Alan was never put to the test, however, for Thomas was escorted only as far as Carlisle, where he was put once more into custody in time to witness the outbreak of hostilities between his nephew John Balliol and the English king. His fate thereafter is unknown. (7)

The collapse of the Galwegian opposition in 1235 and the subsequent imprisonment of Thomas marked the end of any serious challenge to Scottish rule in the region until the end of that century, when Edward I was to exploit Galwegian hatred of the Bruce family to good effect. The victory was absolute and left Alexander free to make the settlement as he wished. Apart from the bastard, Thomas, the only viable male claimant was Patrick of Atholl, but in 1235 he was only about twelve years old and presented no serious problem to the king. His murder in 1242 before he even formally became of age removed any potential future threat. Determined to break the power of provincial particularism, King Alexander reaffirmed his original intention to divide the lordship between the heiresses, the only logical course open to him.

The Partition of 1235

At the time of Alan's death in 1234 his daughters had been married into prominent families of Anglo-Norman or Picard origin: Quincy, Forz and Balliol. It is a positive reflection of his outward-looking policies that of the families to which he allied himself through his daughters' marriages only the Quincys had any previous substantial landed interest in Scotland. Helen, the eldest of Alan's daughters and the only surviving child of his first marriage to an unknown Lacy, (8) had been married to Roger, son and heir of Saier de Quincy, earl of Winchester, a possible associate of Alan's in the Magna Carta wars. Christina and Devorgilla, daughters by Alan's second marriage to Margaret, daughter of David, earl of Huntingdon, were married respectively to William de Forz, son and heir of the earl of Albemarle, and John Balliol of Barnard Castle. There is no clear indication of a previous link with either of these families, although the Forz's possession of land in Cumbria may have provided the connection. The failure of Christina's line on her death without issue in 1246 left Galloway in the hands of her surviving sisters.

The exact nature of the partition of 1235 is no longer recoverable. Few documents of the 13th century involving the demesne estates of any of the successor families survive, those which do permit the reconstruction of only a fragmentary picture. The traditional interpretation is of a straight split into territorial blocks, Helen receiving the west as far as the Cree, Christina a middle portion and Devorgilla the lands from the Dee to the Nith. In reality, the partition appears to have been a much more complex affair, with the entire lordship being broken up into a number of isolated portions, with each of the sisters receiving sections in all parts of Galloway, though with clear concentrations of interests in specific areas. The clearest indication of the pattern of estates established between 1235 and 1246 can be recovered from the inquest into the possessions of the second daughter of Helen de Quincy, Helen de la Zouche, who died in 1296, heiress to a third of her mother's land, and from English documentation concerning the estates of Edward Balliol in the 1330s and 1340s (see below, 223-8).

According to Matthew Paris, Helen de Quincy, as the senior heiress, succeeded to the majority of Christina's lands in the lordship, (9) but this does not appear to be borne out by the later evidence for the land-holding patterns of the Quincy successors and their Balliol relatives. Devorgilla was a major beneficiary from her sister's death, as she received Christina's share of their uncle's Chester estates, which had fallen to them in 1237. Helen, who was the child of Alan's first marriage, did not share in this inheritance, as it descended to Christina and Devorgilla through their mother Margaret of Huntingdon. Within Galloway also, moreover, it would appear that Devorgilla was successful in acquiring a larger proportion of Christina's estates than was her due, for shortly before 1296 her son John was to reach an agreement with John Comyn of Buchan '...in recompense of the earl's rights in the Galloway lands of the said [John Balliol], of which he has more than his purparty, and also of the earl's rights in the lands which belonged to Thomas son of Alayn de Galloway...'. (10)

This is the only evidence to suggest that Thomas may have been provided for by his father, which could be taken as indicative that Alan did not plan to have Thomas succeed him. He was probably allotted some lands before 1234, but he was never at liberty long to enjoy them. The Balliols, who had his custody, appear always to have exploited his lands for their own benefit to the exclusion of Helen and her family, a matter of dispute remedied towards the end of the century when John Balliol compensated the other interested parties. (11) Thomas was not the only disappointed aspirant to a share in the inheritance, for the families of Alan's younger brother and of their sister, Ada, wife of Walter Bisset, may have expected to benefit in some way. The question of the fate of Thomas of Atholl's lands in Ulster and Galloway is a complete unknown, (12) but the matter may in some way have led to one of the most sordid episodes in the history of the family, the murder in 1242 at Haddington of his son, Patrick of Atholl.

Patrick, Alan's nephew, was the heir to the earldom of Atholl, which had been held by his mother, the Countess Isabel. In 1242, he had not yet attained his majority, but was soon to come into his inheritance. Before this could come about, however, his lodgings at Haddington were burned down and the bodies of Patrick and his companions were discovered in the ruins. Rumours of murder were rife and the finger of suspicion was swiftly pointed to certain of his relatives who stood to gain from his elimination. The Chronicle of Lanercost goes so far as to claim that he was murdered, 'because he was expected to become a great lord of a certain heritage', and that he had been warned of his danger by a letter from the wife of his murderer. (13) Lanercost names neither the believed murderer nor the inheritance in question, but suspicion in Scotland, expressed clearly in the Chronicle of Melrose, laid the blame firmly at the feet of the Bissets, particularly of Patrick's uncle, Walter Bisset of Aboyne, and cousin, John Bisset. (14) If these men were responsible for the crime, (and it cannot be proven conclusively), then the warning sent to Patrick would have come from his aunt, Ada, wife of Walter. (15) The Bissets can have had no claim on Patrick's inheritance in Atholl, as their relationship to him was through his paternal, Galwegian line, and so the root of the matter, if the oblique statements of the Chronicle of Lanercost are to be accepted, must relate to his father's south-western and Irish estates. Why the Bissets should have felt entitled to some share in these lands has never been explained satisfactorily and the whole question of their guilt never proven beyond doubt. Indeed, even at the time of the murder, King Alexander was sufficiently doubtful of the value of the evidence that he failed to move against the Bissets until Patrick's Comyn relatives forced his hand. (16)

The final aspect of the partition to be considered is the gains made by the Crown as a result of the fragmentation of the lordship. Apart from the obvious political advantage to be had from its division, the king made considerable capital from his handling of the succession dispute and defence of the legal heirs. On a more tangible level, however, he failed to acquire any appreciable landed interest in the region, although a royal presence at Wigtown may have been established prior to the creation of the sheriffdom. Alexander's most significant gain was in influence over the provincial Church after his intervention in the episcopal election at Whithorn in 1235. For the Crown, the death of the old bishop, Alan's former chamberlain, Walter, was a fortunate occurrence, as it removed a man who could have become a focus for resistance to royal domination. Despite the opposition of the canons of Whithorn, who claimed the right of election and advanced a rival candidate, Alexander secured the election of the Cistercian monk, Gilbert, who unlike his opponent, Odo, was not of Galwegian background (see below 297-9).

In the field of secular politics the collapse of the independent lordship saw an intensification in royal activity and the promotion of men identified closely with the interests of the Crown into positions of regional importance. The processes whereby the sheriffdom of Dumfries was enlarged to include all the lands east of the Cree, and the dates at which this development took place, are unknown, but the extension had probably occurred by the time of the appearance of the neighbouring sheriffdom of Wigtown in the 1260s.

The family which benefited most from the intrusion of royal power into the region were the Comyns, prominent already at court and major landholders in northern Scotland. As the dominant family in Scottish noble politics of the 13th century, the Comyns played a major role in Alexander II's conquest of Galloway, and benefited accordingly. (17) There is no evidence for their having an interest in the lordship before 1235, but in that year, Walter Comyn, earl of Menteith, head of the family, was left in control of the territory after the first phase of Thomas's revolt, with instructions to complete the pacification of the province. This task he failed singularly to do, but despite initial failure, he succeeded in establishing an association with the region which the family was to maintain down to the extinction of the male lines and the forfeiture of the female lines after Bannockburn. What role Earl Walter played in the province after the final defeat of the rebels in 1235 is quite unknown, but there is reason to believe that he may have enjoyed some local influence. In 1237 both he and Earl Patrick of Dunbar, his close political ally and associate in the defeat of Thomas, were regarded by Henry III of England as being responsible for piratical raids on Ireland, and in 1244 Walter is named as being involved in the fortification of two castles in southern Scotland felt to be a threat to England. (18) It is the view of Duncan that both men may have held some official position in the lordship and were able to use it as a springboard for their activities in the Irish Sea zone. (19) Such raids may have been directed against Hugh de Lacy in Ulster, or his Irish allies, in retliation for his possible involvement in the 1235 rebellion, but the chronicle reference does not make this explicit.

It is possible that the earl of Menteith had been appointed to some such office as Justiciar of Galloway in 1235, charged with the settlement of a newly-subdued region in much the same manner as Roland had been in the preceding century. There is, however, no positive proof for the existence of such an office until 1258, when John Comyn of Badenoch, who had acquired the lordship of Dalswinton in Nithsdale, appears to have gained the position, being so designated in an alliance with the Welsh ruler of Gwynedd made in that year. (20) Certainly, as Justiciar Menteith would have had the authority to put down revolt and restore law and order, and also to authorise the building and repair of fortresses. Such powers could be abused and Comyn may have exploited his position in Galloway as an opportunity to indulge in some lucrative raiding across the North Channel.

Galloway Under The Heirs Of Alan

After 1234 the history of the region remains very much the history of its ruling families, but Galloway ceased to be their prime concern, as it formed just another part of their substantial territorial inheritances, which in some cases spanned three countries. The heirs of Alan continued to occupy the centre stage of Anglo-Scottish politics, particularly in the periods 1249-59 and from 1286 until 1314, but Galloway itself was relegated to a secondary position in the political ambitions of the Balliols and Comyns, forming a source of wealth and a reservoir of man-power, but playing little part in the shaping of family policy. Certainly, the differing branches of the dynasty jockeyed for the position of dominance within the region, but such family bickering had little influence on the delicate framework of political alignments which had been established within the kingdom in the early decades of the 13th century.

The elaborate structure of the new lordships created after the suppression of the Galloway rising was a transient arrangement, as a consequence of the failure of the Forz line in 1246 and the swift reallocation of Christina's estates. Throughout this period of upheaval and readjustment the Galwegians were remarkably passive, perhaps exhausted or crushed by the defeat of their earlier rebellion. This facade of passivity was to be shattered in 1247 when there was a localised rising. The sole 13th century authority for this event is the Chronica Majora of Matthew Paris, (21) in which it is treated specifically as a rising against the government of Roger de Quincy.

Earl Roger appears to have been one of the few members of the family to make any serious attempt to establish a presence within Galloway, being the only one of Alan's sons-in-law to have had a significant landed interest in Scotland prior to the succession of his wife in 1234. Already in possession of extensive estates in Fife and Lothian, and enjoying a prominent position at court, Quincy was sufficiently committed to his Scottish interests to make an attempt at securing a firm grip on his wife's Galwegian inheritance a worthwhile proposition. His efforts, however, may have been over-zealous and prompted a violent reaction on the part of the populace.

The chronicle entry is a short paragraph, lacking in detail, and gives only vague reasons for the rebellion. According to Paris, Quincy was attacked in his castle by his rebellious subjects. In view of the concentration of his wife's lands in the lower Dee valley, this was most probably the 13th century stone castle at Kirkcudbright, but Cruggleton is an alternative. The reason given for the attack is that 'he oppressed by tyranny the nobles of that land more than was customary and otherwise than he ought'. An interpretation of this would seem to be that Roger was introducing new practices into his wife's domains, perhaps riding roughshod over native customs and tradition, and seeking to impose the mechanisms of an alien administration on what was still largely a Celtic society. One of the issues most probably at stake may have been an effort to redefine the nature of the lordship exercised by the heirs, seeking to interpret it along more strictly Anglo-Norman lines. Any aims on the rebels' part, other than the elimination of the innovative foreigner, are unknown, and there is no indication of a general rising throughout Galloway at this time. Paris concludes simply, stating that the Scottish king punished the rebels and restored the earl peaceably, but gives no indication of how this pacification was achieved. Simple reinstatement by the king is an unlikely option, for the opportunity was probably taken to wring further concessions from the local ruler and to augment royal power in the region. Amongst such concessions may have been the limiting of Quincy's regalian rights, and it is possibly at this time that the shrieval framework of the south-west crystallised, with the basis for the sheriffdom of Wigtown being established. Roger, however, was restored to his lands and remained in control of them after Helen's death in 1250, whereupon her lands were divided between their three daughters. The partition of the Quincy lands in Galloway may not have occurred until after Roger's death fourteen years later.

The three Quincy heiresses had, like their mother and aunts before them, been married into eminent noble families, two of them with no pre-existing Scottish interests. The eldest daughter, Margaret, was married to William de Ferrars, earl of Derby, father of her own father's second wife, thus putting her in the interesting position of being her step-mother's step-mother and mother-in-law of her natural father! The youngest sister, Helen, was married to the prominent Leicestershire nobleman, Alan de la Zouche. (22) The families of Margaret and Helen played little subsequent part in the history of Galloway and Scotland, although both lines retained their northern lands until their forfeiture as adherents to the English Crown in the early 14th century. It was the marriage of the second sister, Elizabeth or Isabel, that had the greatest importance.

Elizabeth was married to Alexander Comyn, earl of Buchan, half-brother to the earl of Menteith and one of the most powerful men in the kingdom. Alexander was to use the prominence which his wife's lands in western Galloway gave him to secure the new office of sheriff of Wigtown. A further indication of his influence was his success in acquiring the Constableship, which by right belonged to the Ferrars line. There is a possibility that the title lapsed on the death of Earl Roger in 1264, for Margaret's husband was never so designated, probably never having come to Scotland to be invested with the office. Margaret's son made some attempt to have the title settled on him, but in 1274 his mother appears to have been induced to renounce her claim and surrendered her right to the office to the Crown. A fragment of a letter recording the surrender survives and in it she is represented as having indicated that her brother-in-law, Alexander, should have the office, which appears in his possession by 1275 at the latest. (23)

The Comyns were undeniably the most influential family to gain an interest in Galloway in the 13th century, but their very prominence in national politics served to dominate their time and it is generally in a Scottish rather than Galwegian context that they are recorded. Elizabeth de Quincy's husband, Alexander, earl of Buchan, was the third son of William Comyn, Justiciar of Scotia and earl of Buchan, the eldest child of his father's second marriage to Marjory, daughter of the last Celtic earl of Buchan. (24)

During the factional struggles which characterised the decade 1249-59, it became apparent that the Comyns had established themselves in a strong position in the southern part of the kingdom, in contrast with the opposition which they faced in their traditional heartlands in the north-east. This was at a time before the family secured its chief landed interest in the Quincy heritage and depended more on political affiliations rather than territorial domination. Indeed, some of their closest political associates of the minority of Alexander III were prominent southern noblemen, such as John de Soulis of Liddesdale and Thomas Randolph of Nithsdale, whilst John Balliol is generally linked with their faction, largely on account of the schemings of his colleague as representatives of Henry III in Scotland, Robert de Ros of Wark-on-Tweed. (25) Balliol's association with the Comyn party did not represent a total commitment, as he is generally depicted as serving the English interest in Scotland, suffering disgrace only as a repercussion of Ros's failed political machinations. (26) There are also indications that his personal interests at times clashed with the policy of the Comyns, as over the 1253 episcopal election where he sought to oppose the official court nominee, who at this time was probably a Comyn candidate.

The balance of power in the kingdom during the decade of Alexander III's minority swung between the contending factions of the Comyns, Durward and Dunbar. This state of affairs prevailed until the spring of 1259, when the young king declared an end to his minority and began to play an active part in the government of the realm. By 1260 the factional alignments within the kingdom appear largely to have lost significance; Menteith, leader of the Comyns, died in 1258 and Alan Durward, his chief political opponent, lost hold of his central role in national politics. Despite the humiliations and tribulations of the first decade of his reign, the king was strikingly magnanimous. He exacted no retribution for past events, and confirmed in office or bestowed new honours on several members of the Comyn family, control over the justiciarships being the most significant of these.(27)

In addition to the justiciarship the Comyns and their allies gained possession of the two regional sheriffdoms, Dumfries being held by the Randolphs and Wigtown falling to Alexander, earl of Buchan. The acquisition of the latter post is an important indication of the rapid rise to dominance in the region which the family enjoyed. Buchan's association with the lordship stems principally from his marriage to Elizabeth de Quincy, which widened the Comyns' network of alliances in the south-west and provided a connection with a powerful Anglo-Scottish family with access to the ear of Henry III of England, an important consideration in view of that king's successive intervention in Scottish domestic affairs during the minority. Although it is probable that Roger held on to his Helen's lands until his own death in 1264, it is possible that her moiety of the Galloway estates was divided between her daughters soon after her death in 1250, which would account for the steady rise in Comyn dominance in the region throughout the minority years. This would certainly explain Alexander's possession of the sheriffdom by 1263, (28) as Elizabeth's portion of the inheritance appears to have consisted primarily of the western estates, including Cruggleton Castle, and this probably made him the major landholder in that region. The deciding factor in his favour in this context, however, was the inactivity in Scottish politics of his brothers-in-law, William de Ferrars and Alan de la Zouche, and their permanent residence in England.

Whilst the Quincy moiety of the Galloway lordship endured successive subdivisions and suffered further outbreaks of unrest after 1235, the remaining territory had continued under the dominance of one family, that of Devorgilla. She was one of the foremost and most enduring personalities in Anglo-Scottish affairs throughout the 13th century. The youngest of the sisters she was also the longest-lived, dying only in January 1290 at an advanced age. (29) It was probably in recognition of her relative unimportance as third daughter of Alan that her marriage, contracted in 1233, was to a nobleman who although a major landholder was otherwise of no great distinction. At the time of her marriage her father himself had recently remarried, and there was every possibility that he could yet have a male heir to succeed to the lordship. Alan's death the following year transformed her status from that of a minor heiress, important only as the daughter of the lord of Galloway, into a portioner of one of the greatest inheritances in the kingdom.

Along with the lands to which she fell heir seems to have descended the title of 'Lady of Galloway' an honorific never accorded to any members of the family of Helen, the senior heiress. Her husband, John Balliol, was referred to as lord of Galloway, and following his death in 1269 she continued to use the title in her own right. (30) Her succession to this title raises questions concerning the partition of 1234-5. Titles, unlike lands, were impartible and could only devolve upon a single person, hence the succession of Helen's husband, Roger de Quincy, to the Constableship. As the senior heiress, Helen had gained what was recognised as the caput of the lordship and it would normally be expected that the title and the land descended together. On the contrary, however, it would seem that the titles were treated as separate heritable items and that the most prestigious, that of Constable of Scotland, fell to the eldest daughter, whilst the lordship fell to a junior heiress. Certainly, had the title fallen to Helen it would swiftly have become of little consequence or even local relevance, as the Quincy inheritance underwent subsequent divisions, markedly reducing the standing of the individual heirs in terms of landed possessions. A Ferrars 'lord of Galloway' would have been strikingly inferior in that area in comparison to his Balliol relatives.

In spite of their pre-eminent position within Galloway, the Balliols have left little indication in the sources of any great activity within the region, other than the pious works of Devorgilla. Devorgilla's husband, John Balliol, appears to have been a somewhat lacklustre character, largely overshadowed by the dominating personality of his wife. His emergence in Scottish politics in the 1250s, serving as an envoy of Henry III, came about as a result of his cross-border landholding rather than personal ambition. His colleague, Robert de Ros, was responsible for embroiling him in the factional intrigues of the Scottish court, an activity which led to their political disgrace. Balliol comes across, however, as occupying very much a secondary role to Ros, perhaps being more important to the Comyns on account of his wife's landed strength rather than for any skill in court intrigue. As the relationship between the Comyns and Henry III deteriorated in 1257 both envoys were recalled to England, their official status as the king's representatives being terminated, apparently ending Balliol's brief sojourn in Scottish politics. (31)

Beyond a few court cases in England in pursuit of Devorgilla's inheritance, John Balliol's active involvement in the affairs of the lordship appears to have been slight. After 1257 it is in an English context that he most commonly occurs, attempting to regain the royal favour which he had lost as a result of his activities in Scotland in the 1250s. The strength of his former relationship with Henry is indicated by the marriages of two of his sons, Hugh and Alexander, to two of Queen Eleanor's numerous group of impecunious relatives, for whom a marriage into the Balliol family represented a considerable advance. Both men, however, died without issue. (32) On his return to England, John swiftly became caught up in the Barons' War, becoming an active adherent of the king's party, serving on the royal side in 1264 at the battle of Northampton. (33) For losses incurred in the royal cause he was compensated in the general settlement after Evesham, (34) but he played no part in royal government after that date, never fully regaining the position which he had enjoyed in the early 1250s.

Balliol's death in 1269 was followed in quick succession by those of his three eldest sons, all of whom in turn had held the lordship of Barnard Castle, (35) which brought the lands by 1278 into the hands of the youngest son, John. Devorgilla herself, whilst retaining some dower lands from her husband's estates, retained personal control of her own inheritance and was to spend much of her remaining life at Buittle in Galloway or on her English manors of Fotheringhay and Kempston. Of her daughters, Cecilia had married but died without issue before 1273; (36) Ada had been married in 1266 to William de Lindsay of Lamberton; Eleanor c.1279 to John Comyn of Badenoch, father of John Comyn 'the Red', murdered at Dumfries in 1306. (37) The connection with William de Lindsay, lord of Lamberton in Berwickshire and Kendal in Westmorland, head of a family associated with the Justiciarship of Lothian and member of the top group of baronial families, widened the network of Balliol alliances within the Anglo-Scottish nobility. Eleanor's marriage, however, no doubt arranged by Devorgilla, had considerably greater political importance, as it reaffirmed the Balliol-Comyn connection, strengthening a link with an important landholder in Nithsdale and bringing the justiciarship of Galloway within the inner family circle.

No clear marital policy can be detected on the part of the Balliols, especially in the cases of the marriages of the sons, but there are some indications that Devorgilla was working actively to strengthen her family's position within the network of Anglo-Scottish baronial alliances. The marriages of her sons, two into the family of Henry III's wife and that of John, the youngest, to Isabel de Warrenne, daughter of the earl of Surrey, had little bearing upon the Balliols' political position within Scotland, but those of Ada and Eleanor cannot but have served to strengthen their standing. To what extent any deep political motives were at work, involving aspirations to the Crown, is a matter of surmise but one which cannot be discounted. Certainly, in the crises following Alexander III's death in 1286 it rapidly became clear that the Balliols had established a firm hold within the political community that was sufficiently strong to enable them to take the initiative in the question of the royal succession.

Notes to Chapter Four

1. Matthew Paris, *Chron.Majora*, iii, 364-5.
2. *Chron.Melrose*, 83.
3. *Chron.Lanercost*, 42.
4. *Chron.Melrose*, 84-85.
5. *Chron.Lanercost*, 42.
6. ibid, 116.
7. *CDS*, ii, Nos 728, 729; *Rot.Scot.*, i, 22.
8. Stringer, 'A new wife', 52.
9. Matthew Paris, *Chron.Majora*, iv, 563.
10. *CDS*, ii, No 1541.
11. ibid.
12. Duncan. *Making of the Kingdom*, 544.
13. *Chron.Melrose*, 90; *Chron.Lanercost*, 49-50.
14. *Chron.Melrose*, 90.
15. Compare the above with Matthew Paris, *Chron.Majora*, iv, 200-2.
16. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 544-5.
17. D.E.R.Watt, 'The minority of Alexander III of Scotland', *TRHS*, xxi (1971), 1-23.
18. Matthew Paris, *Chron.Majora*, iv, 379-80.
19. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 542.
20. *CDS*, i, No 2155.
21. Matthew Paris, *Chron.Majora*, iv, 563.
22. Andrew of Wyntoun, *The Orygynale Cronykil of Scotland*, ed D.Laing, ii (Edinburgh, 1872), 314-6.
23. *APS*, i, 9; *CDS*, ii, No 92.
24. *Scots Peerage*, ii, 252-3; For the political career of the Comyn brothers see Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, Chapters 20 and 21; Watt, 'Minority'; A.Young, 'The political role of Walter Comyn, Earl of Menteith, during the minority of Alexander III of Scotland', *SHR*, lvii (1978), 121-42; A.A.M.Duncan, 'The earldom of Atholl in the thirteenth century', *The Scottish Genealogist*, vii (1960), 2-10.
25. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 566.
26. ibid, 575.
27. For a full examination of the Justiciars see G.W.S.Barrow, *The Kingdom of the Scots* (London, 1973), Chapter 3.
28. *The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, edd J.Stuart et al., i, 22.
29. *CDS*, ii, No 405; *Chron.Lanercost*, 133-4.
30. William Rishanger, *Chronica et Annales*, ed H.T.Riley (London, 1865), 21; *Chronicles of Walter of Guisborough*, ed. H.Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957), 189, 233; *The Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, ed H.E.Salter (Oxford Historical Society, 1913), No 564.
31. *CDS*, i, No 2091.
32. *Scots Peerage*, i, 142-3.
33. *Chron.Guisborough*, 188-9.
34. *CDS*, i, No 2399.
35. *RRS*, vi, No 235; *CDS*, i, No 2600; *CDS*, ii, No 139.
36. *RRS*, vi, No 235.
37. *Scots Peerage*, i, 507-8.

Chapter Five

Colonisation and Conquest:The Anglo-Scottish Settlement of Galloway.

It is a current area of argument in Scottish historical research as to whether the 12th century saw the 'feudalisation' of the kingdom by the Anglophile kings of the Canmore dynasty, or that the apparent changes in the tenurial system already extant represented only a redefinition or a more rigorous interpretation of earlier arrangements. (1) The finer points of the argument are too detailed for reproduction here, but the debate revolves around the significance of the emergence by the mid 12th century of a substantial body of men holding land in return for personal military service in the royal army, serving as knights.

One school sees this development as the end result of the importation of a wholly new system of land tenure, superimposed upon the old native pattern. This saw estates being granted to individuals in return for clearly-defined obligations of service to a superior lord. Such service was usually seen as military in nature and was characterised by the knight and the knight's fee, known from the mid 17th century by the name 'feudalism'.

Opposed to this interpretation is the view which sees the appearance of these knights as simply an effort by the Crown to up-date the royal army. Their infeftment was seen as a means of producing a force of the new heavily-armoured cavalrymen who were emerging as the most significant development in warfare at that time. Examination of the conditions of tenure enjoyed by these men suggests that their rights of lordship were little different from earlier, 'pre-feudal' forms, which implies that what was changed were only some aspects of the obligations of land tenure. These were primarily in the pre-existing royal rights to military service from the land-holding nobility, such as the forinsec service which continued to be the basis for the raising of the Scottish host throughout the Middle Ages.

Where both views agree is that the knights were a new element in society. Indeed, they had a striking impact on the character of that society and culture which marked Scotland down as a Celtic region, as they introduced alien ideas and innovations in government and administration from their homelands. The knights did not represent a changed system, they themselves were the mechanisms for change which brought about subtle alterations to the character of lordship and tenure.

Background: Emergence of a New 'Class'.

The appearance of men holding land in return for knight-service was more marked at first in those areas where Crown influence was strongest. Into districts with a concentration of royal demesne the kings could introduce colonists from the south, already trained in the techniques of mounted warfare. By the second generation after Hastings there was a ready supply of younger sons and brothers prepared to seek their fortunes in the north alongside the men who had already secured a stake there through their friendship with members of the Scottish ruling house. The northward flow of settlers gained pace in the lifetime of David I. The importance of his midlands English earldom as a source of men, schooled in the new forms of fighting, has long been recognised, but it was not the sole reservoir of potential colonists. Barrow's examination of the origins of some of the non-native families which rose to prominence in Scotland in the course of the 12th century has demonstrated that a number were drawn directly from the Continent. (2) The majority, however, such as the Bruces, Stewarts, Morvilles or Avenels, were from families established in England by 1100, of varying degrees of importance in land-holding terms, and were generally to preserve the cross-border link.

David made full use of the resources of the royal demesne and adapted the local administrative units, or 'shires', as the basis for his new system. He granted out land formerly administered by royal officials to his new men, thus inserting them into positions of local power without disrupting the existing pattern of estates to any significant degree. The administration of these units had previously lain with members of a class of ministerialis type, generally referred to as thanes, who, though possibly of aristocratic birth, were dependent upon a superior lord for their lands and offices. There is no evidence for the displacement of this class by the incomers, vacant offices presumably being filled by Anglo-Norman colonists on the death of the incumbent rather than being bestowed on another man of thanely rank. The eventual disappearance of the thanes as a class is probably more due to their gradual assimilation with the new men of knightly status rather than their being pushed into an inferior position which led ultimately to submergence in the mass of the peasantry.

The South-Eastern Model.

The shires which formed the basis of the thane system were comparatively large units, but consisted normally of little more than a central focus with a hinterland made up from the territories of outlying villages. They were only a fraction of the size of the English shires, but in terms of economic potential were important units which formed the collection areas for the fiscal rights which pertained to the Crown or the provincial nobility. As such, they formed the basis for the administrative system of much of south-eastern Scotland. Their restricted distribution (the bulk of the known examples lying in Lothian and Berwickshire) suggests an Anglian origin, but the acquisition of Lothian by the Scots in the 10th century halted any further development along Anglo-Saxon lines. Rather than undergoing processes of amalgamation and enlargement, they remained generally as discrete lordships in royal hands, thus forming suitable units for the settlement of Anglo-Norman colonists.

The economic potential and administrative importance of the shires meant that comparatively few were granted in their entirety to individuals. Corporate bodies such as monasteries did well in this respect, the grant by David I to Holyrood Abbey of large parts of the shire dependent on Edinburgh being one of the better-documented examples of an estate largely made up from a single unit. (3) A few members of David's closest circle of Anglo-Norman dependents were equally successful. The most notable was Hugh de Morville, who gained the whole of the unusually large shire of Lauderdale. In such a case the Crown expected additional service, i.e. more knights, which entailed the subdivision of the large block into smaller components on which the principal tenant established further knights. These were dependent on him and fulfilled in turn his obligation of extra knight service. As a result there emerged a pattern of holdings in the south-east which took on the appearance of a patch-work of individual knights' fees, with comparatively few large or compact estates.

The West and South-West.

In contrast to the south-eastern model, the settlement of the territories of the former kingdom of Strathclyde was marked by the establishment of major territorial lordships. Here the Crown was introducing its new men into positions of power based on units of much greater extent than the shires. These were apparently the chief components of the Cumbric kingdom. Although significantly larger than the eastern units, the nature of the land may have limited their economic potential, but the rights attendant on lordship may have been proportionately greater. The western units appear to have been defined largely in terms of geographical rather than political or social determinants, with the convenient division of the country into major river-valley systems being used as the natural basis for the pattern which had emerged by the 12th century. The whole country from the Clyde to the Ribble divides into neat units which developed by the 12th century as the major lordships common to the whole of Cumbria from Kentdale to the Lennox.

The administrative function of these regions is extremely shadowy, but appears to have been much the same as the shires of the east, namely the collection at focal points of food renders and dues owed to the Crown .(4) This role is demonstrated quite clearly in the charter of David I to the Church of Glasgow, which granted a tithe of the king's cain from the districts of Carrick, Kyle, Cunninghame and

Strathgryffe, (5) the major subdivisions of the country between Galloway and the Clyde estuary. Kelso Abbey's great charter of confirmation from Malcolm IV, issued in c.1159, mentions four districts referred to as *kadrez* from which the monks were entitled to draw the tithe of the king's cain in certain foodstuffs. (6) The identification of these units is uncertain, but they are probably to be equated with those named in David's Glasgow charter. (7) The etymological relationship of *kadrez* with the Welsh *cantref*, as well as the apparently fiscal role displayed by both, makes it plausible to suggest that such units formed the principal administrative elements of Brythonic Strathclyde.

Little is known of the native personnel on whom the Crown relied for the exercise of its rights throughout the Cumbric territories prior to the colonisation of the region by Anglo-Norman settlers. In general there is a void in our understanding of the hierarchy of power in the west, filled only in the 12th century by the emergence of the new royal tenants. Even in these cases, however, little is known of the terms by which the land was held, or the rights which the new tenants acquired. Indeed, not much more is known other than the identities of the men involved. There is no evidence surviving for earlier native dynasties in Annandale, Cunninghame, Kyle or Strathgryffe, regions into which David I and Malcolm IV introduced the families of Bruce, Morville and Stewart. In Nithsdale a Celtic family held the lordship into the 13th century, eventually declining in status through the general subdivision of their land by dynastic processes.

In the early 12th century the Nith valley was the lordship of a certain Dunegal, known from the charter of David I which granted the adjacent lordship of Annandale to Robert Bruce. (8) The origins of Dunegal and the source of his authority for lordship over the valley are unknown, but his name suggests a Gaelic rather than Brythonic ancestry. This implies a date in the 11th century for the emergence of his family as part of what appears to have been the settlement of Strathclyde by Goidelic colonists as the old Brythonic kingdom underwent assimilation into Scotland. His lordship formed an effective barrier to the westwards penetration of Anglo-Norman colonists from Annandale and Clydesdale, and it was not until the apparent division of his lands between his sons and the eventual extinction of the line holding lower Nithsdale that the Crown succeeded in establishing a direct presence in the valley.

The heirs of Dunegal appear from the mid 1130s as active adherents of the Crown. Both Radulf and his brother, Duvenald, feature prominently in official documentation. (9) Despite this seemingly close relationship, there is little indication that the Scottish king was able to open up Nithsdale to colonisation by Anglo-Norman families. Certainly, there is no evidence for any attempt to redefine the relationship of the Nithsdale family with the Crown, such as part conversion of forinsec service to knight service, until late in the 12th century when King William acquired control of a substantial part of the valley. Scottish overlordship, however, appears to have been accepted from an early date. This no doubt stemmed from the residual privileges of the old rulers of Strathclyde acquired on the death of Owen the Bald in c.1018. Foremost amongst these were rights to cain and the fiscal benefits stemming from judicial controls, (10) neither of which were likely to be innovations of the later 12th century, but derived presumably from the Canmore dynasty's inheritance of the perquisites of the Strathclyde kings. It was by virtue of this acknowledged position as overlord that William was able to take possession of lower Nithsdale and Dumfries on Radulf's death and start the process of colonisation which ensured firm royal control (see above 100-2).

In Annandale, it would appear from the vague terms in which the initial grant to Robert Bruce in c.1124 was made, that there had been a complete break in any tenure of the valley by a major territorial lord. This appears to have resulted in uncertainty of knowledge concerning the precise nature of the powers of the lords and also of the rights pertaining to the Crown as their overlords. This would explain the recourse to the terms by which Ranulf le Meschin held Carlisle from Henry I, the details of which are unfortunately no longer extant. Barrow has suggested that in common with the other major Anglo-Norman tenants in north-western England Ranulf rendered military service and castleguard, presumably cornage also, but what rights in the exercise of justice were enjoyed is a complete unknown. (11)

A clearer insight into the tenurial situation in Annandale emerges by c.1165 when King William confirmed Robert's son in possession of the lordship, (12) but extended the initial privileges bestowed by David I. Full judicial rights were conceded by the king, with the exception of the six pleas of the Crown. Even here concessions were made, with Robert II of Annandale being permitted to appoint one of his own men to direct the proceedings and having the benefit of the hearings being held at one set court. Taken together, such judicial rights represented a considerable degree of independence from Crown interference and, furthermore, formed a substantial financial advantage to the Bruce family, with the cash benefits from control of the proceedings falling to them. The service demanded by the Crown in return was quite light, probably in recognition of the low initial value of the lands in Annandale which were probably largely unexploited and regarded very much as frontier territory. Castleguard had been included in the initial awards, but William discharged this obligation in his confirmation, leaving only the burden of knight service, set at ten knights, provided by Bruce sub-tenants.

The Lesser Administrative Officers in the West.

Dunegal's family in Strathnith and the Bruces in Annandale were representative of the top-most stratum in the hierarchy of royal vassals in the west. They controlled territories substantially larger than any nobleman in the south-east of the kingdom, with the possible exceptions of the earl of Dunbar and Hugh de Morville. The local power structure on which their control of these territories rested is, like details relating to the relationship of lords and Crown, an area of limited knowledge. There is a certain amount of information concerning lesser administrative officers with responsibilities involving fiscal levies and judicial matters, but the material is fragmentary and gives little indication of the organisation of the structures of government and the status of the officers involved.

The most prominent of the minor officials were the *mairs*, men who can be equated roughly with the sargeant class in Wales and who were to be replaced by serjeants of the peace in the course of the 13th century. Their first appearance in a south-western context was in connection with a judgement made by Roland as justiciar for the region, promulgated at Lanark in the 1180s. (13) This provided for the collection of cain by the mairs of Galloway and empowered them to take action against debtors, having considerable powers of sequestration as a means of distraint. How extensive their other judicial powers were is unknown, but it would seem that their scope was more restricted than those exercised by the later serjeants, who had independent rights of attachment and indictment, (14) which allowed considerable misuse of the office. Restrictions were placed on the serjeants in Lothian in the mid 1240s, but Galloway was specifically excluded from this act (15) until the end of Alexander III's reign. An appeal made to Edward I in c.1300 complained about the strange and 'ycorteneuse' law called 'surdit de sergaunt', which had been stopped before 1286 but was now being re-enforced. (16) This law essentially gave the serjeants summary powers which were apparently greatly abused.

In other respects the serjeants and the mairs can be equated. Both enjoyed certain privileges which concerned free shelter and food for the night when absent from their homes in pursuit of their duties, a perquisite which could be easily abused. These latter rights appear to represent residual benefits of lordship stemming from the Celtic past, such as 'sorran and frithalos', which formed the traditional entitlements to maintenance in food, clothing and shelter from one's vassals, (17) common to all parts of Britain. In Nithsdale, such rights were still operating in David II's reign. (18)

Officers related to both the mairs and the serjeants appears to have been the kethres, described in two Glasgow charters as 'servientes', which can be interpreted as sargeants or simply as servants. (19) These men are mentioned only in connection with Carrick and the Lennox, where they appear as officers of their respective earls, in charters freeing the lands of the Church of Glasgow and its men from their impositions. The point at issue appears to have been the privilege of free billeting and maintenance from tenants on their masters' lands, described in the documents in question as 'corredium', probably to be equated with the customary rights of sorran and frithalos. Little else is known about the status or function of these men, but the similarity between 'kadrez' and 'kethres' may imply that they originally had a regional role, perhaps connected with the collection of cain in much the same way as the mairs of Galloway.

Between men like Dunegal of Nithsdale and the mairs, kethres and serjeants of the west and south-west there is a considerable void in our knowledge of the hierarchical structure. These represent two extremes on the scale of lordship, but detail relating to the intervening strata is lacking entirely. It can be assumed that most incoming colonists of the 12th and 13th century occupied this central position, but the personnel whom they were replacing or absorbing are very much grey figures. There can be no doubt that there was a substantial body of lesser native noblemen. Families such as the Kennedys, MacDowalls, McCullochs and MacCans, emerged from amongst their ranks in the 13th century, but their earlier relationship with the greater lords in Galloway, Nithsdale and the other regional lordships is irrecoverable.

By the second half of the 12th century a more clearly defined group of men holding land in these regions from either the Crown or, more usually, from the territorial magnates had begun to take shape. They are identifiable with the men of knightly status in the east. Such men, however, represented a markedly restricted group, relatively few in number, who were to come to achieve political dominance in the localities by the end of the 13th century. Not entirely composed of colonists, but still largely so, it is in this sense alone that they can be described as a new class or as the representatives of a new system.

The gradual emergence of this group in the south-west was dictated largely by the prevailing political situation. In Annandale, with its apparent absence of an earlier administrative structure, the Bruces were able to introduce a considerable number of tenants from their Yorkshire estates to meet their service obligations to the Crown. In neighbouring Nithsdale it was not until the 1170s that the knightly class appears to emerge. There the Crown may have been the agent for change, using its recent acquisition of Radulf's land to introduce an element of dependable support into the ranks of the native nobility. These were established on manors taken out of the former lordly demesne. The appearance in the mid 1170s at Morton in Nithsdale of a certain Hugh Sansmanche, (20) a man of apparently Anglo-Norman background, may indicate that the process was underway within a decade of Radulf's demise. Barrow, however, has suggested that the tenancy stemmed from some marital tie with the lordly house rather than from a Crown grant. (21) Hugh's possession was apparently of short duration, there being no subsequent mention of him at Morton and the land appears to have fallen by 1214 at the latest to Radulf's nephew, Edgar. (22)

Royal exploitation of Radulf's former land was the means by which the Kirkpatricks were probably introduced to Nithsdale from Annandale (23) as part of the Crown's measures to contain the threat from Galloway after 1174. Such instances, however, were isolated and there is no indication that the region was swamped by an in-rush of land-hungry colonists. Rather a few men were established in key positions throughout the south-west and under their influence the character of the land-holding nobility was gradually to be changed.

Galloway: Initial Settlement, 1160-74.

Later 12th century Galloway has long been seen as the last bastion of Celtic conservatism and violent 'anti-feudal' sentiment in Scotland south of the Mounth. It has been represented as a region where the spread of 'feudal' settlement had to 'creep tentatively along the shores' of the Solway (24) under the constant threat of attack from the independently-minded Galwegians. This reputation has arisen largely as a result of the comparative lateness of the development of what the pro-feudalists see as the classic 'feudal' institutions, the knight and his fee, and the savage anti-foreign reaction which occurred in the region in the period 1174 to 1185. This latter event, though patently directed at foreigners and the visible symbols of foreign rule, is generally represented as an 'anti-feudal' movement, despite the fact that the Galwegian leader almost immediately entered into a relationship with the English king that was more overtly 'feudal' than any aspect of the overlordship of the Scottish Crown. Certainly, the violent reaction against the spread of Anglo-Norman settlers and their influences into the south-west was unique in southern Scotland. It finds parallels only in Moray and the far north. (25) It was a backlash against royal encroachment, not against the institutions of knight service, but it did disrupt the process of settlement and destroyed the embryonic pattern of colonisation established by 1174.

Two views concerned with the introduction of foreign settlers into the lordship can be detected in Scottish historical writings which touch on the subject. One, a cataclysmic interpretation, saw their imposition on the country by an external agency, i.e. the deliberate establishment of men loyal to the Crown in the south-west as an act of policy by Malcolm IV in the aftermath of his victory over Fergus in 1160. (26) This view saw the Anglo-Norman settlers being used by the Crown as agents to secure the future good behaviour of the men of the lordship, to help prevent future rebellion and to break down the barriers of provincial particularism which served to prevent the region's assimilation fully into the kingdom.

In opposition to this is the view which saw the growth of 'feudalism' as a gradual process, fostered and encouraged by the Crown, but not imposed as a harsh act of arbitrary policy. (27) Indeed, without the co-operation of the rulers of regions like Galloway the Crown could never have succeeded in introducing reliable supporters into key positions in the local power structure. The alternative was the expenditure of vast amounts of energy and resources to secure control by outright conquest. Under Roland's regime, foreign settlers may have been introduced by his arbitrary decision in support of his seizure of his uncle's land after 1185, but the numbers involved were few and the native aristocracy, although apparently excluded from his household, probably remained in control of the bulk of the lordship. They re-emerged as the power of the ruling houses declined at the end of the 13th century.

The earliest evidence for settlement by Anglo-Norman colonists occurs in connection with the pacification of the province in the aftermath of the downfall of Fergus. Colonisation occurred probably as a consequence of Malcolm IV's victory. Arguments in the past which proposed earlier settlement of foreign knights under Fergus's regime stem largely from misapprehension of his relationship with David I and misinterpretation of the documentary evidence. The views espoused by M'Kerlie, to the effect that Fergus was a non-Galwegian governor of 'feudal' sympathies imposed on the lordship following the convenient elimination of the native rulers at Northallerton in 1138, naturally gave rise to the premise that he introduced 'Norman' knights to help him keep the country in subjection. (28) While the belief that Fergus was of Anglo-Norman stock cannot be credited, the view which proposed that he initiated the process of 'feudalisation' and colonisation has proven more resilient.

If the military aspects of tenure alone are taken as representative of the nature of the land-holding system under Fergus, there is no indication that knight service played any part in his obligations to the Crown. Galloway, both in 1138 and 1174, was to provide major contingents of foot soldiers to the Scottish army and as late as 1212 Alan was still producing substantial bodies of such men for service in 'feudal' armies. (29) The alternative is simple forinsec service, whereby all landowners, irrespective of rank, were eligible for the performance of military duties, an obligation to the Crown which dated back to the very formation of the Scottish kingdom.

Only in a few isolated instances can forinsec service be seen to be reinterpreted in terms of knight service. This development was intended to provide the lord of Galloway with a body of knights for his own army and to meet any changed service demands from the Crown.

The first indication of a significant change is provided by a charter of one Hugh de Morville, which bestowed the church of Borgue in Galloway on the canons of Dryburgh. (30) This survives only as a transcript in a 15th century cartulary, where it has been placed by the monastic scribe out of sequence in a group of 13th century grants made to the abbey by subsequent holders of the lordship of Borgue. The compiler of the cartulary gave the transcript the heading 'Prima Donatio Super Ecclesiam de Worgis'. This, and the assumption that the Hugh de Morville in question was the elder of that name, who became Constable of Scotland, and who had indeed founded Dryburgh, led Fraser in his edition of the cartulary for the Bannatyne Club to propose a date of c.1150 for the issuing of the charter. Rather than interpret 'prima donatio' as referring simply to the first grant concerning Borgue, it was taken to mean the first grant to Dryburgh after its foundation in 1150. (31) This would require Hugh to have had sasine from at least that date, over a decade earlier than the next surviving record of a major Anglo-Norman nobleman holding land in Galloway. In an endeavour to link this with what is known of events surrounding the first period of colonisation after 1160, it was proposed that Fergus had been obliged to permit the introduction of an important Crown vassal in a supervisorial role into his territories as a punishment for some unrecorded misdemeanour. (32) This argument rests on too many imponderables and insufficient hard facts for it to be readily acceptable.

The alternative to the above view is that the charter has been dated at least a decade too early and that the identification of the grantor with Hugh the Constable is an error. In view of the connections of the Galloway family with Cumbria, particularly with the lordly house of Allerdale, it is more probable that the man in question was the Constable's son, also Hugh, who held extensive estates in Cumbria from Henry II, but who acquired little landed interest in the family's Scottish possessions.

With the exception of the dubious Morville tenure of Borgue, it is not until after 1160 that the progressive colonisation of the region got under way. The victory of that year provided the Crown with an unparalleled opportunity to break down the barriers of provincialism in the south-west and at the same time to establish on a clearly defined footing the exact relationship of the lords of Galloway with the Crown. While it is implicit in the chronicle sources that Malcolm IV made efforts to administer the region more effectively through royal officers and to supervise it by military means, (33) he also appears to have attempted to draw the local rulers into a closer relationship with the Crown and to secure their active participation in the government of the realm. Uhtred and Gilbert, however, never appear as regular attenders at the royal court, (34) but their few appearances suggest that they themselves felt that there was at least some advantage to be gained from what may have amounted to little more than lip-service. It is probable that the active involvement of the Galwegian rulers in royal government would have facilitated the enforcement of royal rights in Galloway. For example, the levying of cain may have been expedited, but it is with military rather than fiscal developments that Malcolm IV may have been most concerned.

The introduction of men performing knight service may have been left largely up to the native rulers, but it is possible that their settlement was necessitated to meet new obligations which King Malcolm and his brother, King William, imposed on the lordship. It has been argued by Scott that soon after 1165 the Crown established its presence at Dumfries and may have installed a proto-sheriff in the person of Roger de Minto, a minor knight from Lothian , with a sphere of government extending westwards as far as the Urr. (35) The defence of this new royal castle was based on castleguard service, provided by tenants on lands which had formerly belonged to Radulf. Reid, referring to the garrisoning of Dumfries in the 14th century, showed that less than half of the service could be accounted for by the holdings lying in an arc around Dumfries to the north and east. (36) Scott, developing this argument, suggested that the remaining service was provided by tenants settled by Uhtred on the lands between the Urr and the Nith. Certainly, it was in this area that the majority of the early colonists were settled. Most notable amongst these were Walter de Berkeley at Urr and Richard, son of Troite, at Lochkindeloch. (37) A third individual may have been Cospatric, son of Orm, Uhtred's first cousin by marriage, who possibly held Colvend. While it cannot be proven conclusively that the settlement of these men was linked to new demands by the Crown, their establishment on land within what appears to be the original jurisdictional sphere of the sheriffs of Dumfries carved from property formerly held by the lords of Nithsdale is at least strongly suggestive that royal demands played a significant role in determining the location of their estates.

Outwith Desnes Ioan there is little evidence for any large scale movement towards the introduction of Anglo-Norman families, something which again points towards service demands concerned with Dumfries only. Where such evidence does exist it is weighted heavily towards Uhtred's land, giving rise to the belief which has painted him as 'pro-feudal', whilst the lack of material relating to Gilbert has led to his being labelled 'anti-feudal'. (38) This interpretation is based solely upon the distribution of surviving charter evidence, which locates all known Anglo-Norman settlement in Galloway before 1185 to the east of the Cree, traditionally Uhtred's inheritance. On this basis, Uhtred has been interpreted as a strongly outward-looking man who was not averse to the benefits of introducing foreign settlers, whilst Gilbert was the conservative die-hard, stubbornly resisting the efforts of the Crown to impose colonists on the territories under his control. The negative evidence speaks strongly against Gilbert, but the traditional image may be far removed from the reality.

Within his territories in eastern Galloway, outwith Desnes Ioan, Uhtred can be shown to have introduced only two Anglo-Norman settlers, David, son of Terrus and Hugh de Morville. No similar evidence for settlement survives from Gilbert's portion of Galloway west of the Cree, but there is evidence from Carrick which suggests that he introduced at least one man on to lands there. This is Roger de Skalebrook, a Yorkshire knight, who between 1186 and 1196 granted land from his estates at Greenan in the lower Doon valley in northern Carrick to the monks of Melrose. (39) In his grant he describes Gilbert, son of Fergus, as 'my lord', which implies a vassalic relationship which survived the disruptions of 1174 to 1186 to be reaffirmed under Gilbert's son, Duncan, who is similarly described as 'my lord'. Roger was succeeded by his two daughters, the elder of whom appears to have married into the local Celtic nobility, (40) hence the quick disappearance of his family name. Although this is not overwhelming evidence in Gilbert's favour, this one instance serves to illustrate the dangers in accepting the surviving Galwegian material at face value.

More can be said regarding the men whom Uhtred introduced on to his lands. Of the known five who may have been established by 1174, four share the common factor of having been drawn from primary holdings in Cumbria. These are Cospatric of Workington, David, son of Terrus, Richard, son of Troite, and Hugh de Morville, only one of whom was of distinctly Anglo-Norman background. The fifth man, Walter de Berkeley, Chamberlain to William the Lion, may have owed his presence to his prominence at court. The Cumbrian connection stems from Uhtred's marriage before 1160 to Gunnilda, daughter of Waltheof of Allerdale, a prominent member of the north-western English aristocracy. By that marriage, Uhtred had acquired manors at Torpenhow in Cumberland (41) and also forged marital ties with major tenants of the lords of Allerdale and Westmorland, most notably the lords of Workington, who were descended from Gunnilda's paternal uncle, Cospatric of Dunbar. Under Roland, the family of Cospatric of Workington was to rise to prominence in his household, to emerge as one of the most eminent noble families of eastern Galloway in the early 13th century.

David, son of Terrus, is one of the more problematical members of the group. He appears to have been lord of part of Over Denton in Gilsland (42) in eastern Cumberland, quite removed from Uhtred's area of knowledge in Allerdale. He received the lordship of Anwoth in the hilly district to the west of the river Fleet, the parish church of which he bestowed on his overlord's favoured monastery of Holyrood. (43) Evidence for his activities in Galloway are otherwise slim; he appears on only one other occasion in surviving documents, as a witness to Uhtred's grant of Lochkindeloch to Richard, son of Troite. (44) David's son, Nicholas, was a witness to the same charter and it is probably his son, also Nicholas, who as lord of Cardoness, the caput of Anwoth, makes his appearance in possesion of the estate in the early 13th century. (45) Another descendant may have been a certain William de Anwoth who was holding land near Sorbie in Wigtownshire in c.1220. (46)

Even more difficulty, as mentioned above, surrounds the identity of Hugh de Morville, lord of Borgue. It was for long believed that this man was Constable to David I and Malcolm IV and that his possession of land in Galloway dated from the time of Fergus. (47) Serious problems of chronology surround this view. Hugh the Constable died in 1162, a short time after his retirement into his abbey at Dryburgh as a Premonstratensian canon. Unless he had been granted Borgue by Fergus, this allows less than two years for his gaining possession of the manor, for him to have made his grant of the church to the abbey and to have retired into that monastery. A more likely candidate is his son, also Hugh, infamous in history as one of the murderers of Becket.

In 1157, following Malcolm IV's surrender of the three northern English counties to Henry II, the elder Hugh's tenure of the major barony of North Westmorland, bestowed on him by David I, was ended. The younger Hugh, however, took up service with Henry II and became his tenant for that holding until his death sixteen years later. (48) As lord of Westmorland and Burgh-by-Sands, Hugh de Morville was a neighbour of Waltheof of Allerdale and it was probably through this factor that any relationship with Uhtred had its source. Morville's death shortly before the outbreak of the Galloway rebellion in 1174, may have ended his family's interest in Borgue, there being no indication of any association with it in Roland's time. Certainly, Hugh had died without direct heirs and his English lands had fallen to his sisters. His brother, Richard, had inherited their father's lands in Scotland and may have acquired Borgue on Hugh's death, although it is equally possible that it had reverted to Roland as an escheat. The non-appearance of any new tenant until after c.1200 suggests that the former may have been the case, and that it only returned to the possession of the lords when Roland's wife, Helen, inherited the full Morville heritage in 1196.

It is an unfortunate consequence of the paucity of the charter sources that there is no evidence for the nature and extent of the lordships of such men as David at Anwoth and Morville at Borgue, or of the conditions of the tenure by which the estates were held. Thus, when one such document concerning a grant made by Uhtred to a private individual does survive, there are inherent dangers in assuming that it was representative of the grants made to other tenants of the lords.

The document in question is a charter of Uhtred bestowing the land of Lochkindeloch on Richard, son of Troite, brother of Robert, the sheriff of Carlisle. (49) The grant, made with Roland's assent, gave to Richard 'the whole land of Lochenelo to be held by fee and heritage for the service of one knight'. In addition, Richard received the full array of the rights and privileges of lordship, which ranged from possession of the mill and the control of pannage, matters of immediate economic importance to the inhabitants of the estate, through to deer-hunting rights and the sole entitlement to hawks and the eggs of birds of prey. In this sense the charter is little different from other contemporary grants to private individuals, but further conditions were attached, which served to make the initial generous allotment of land and privileges considerably less attractive.

Over and above the burden of knight service, Uhtred required an annual rent of eight pounds in silver for as long as he had to make the traditional payment of cain to the Crown from Desnes Ioan, the district in which Richard's new estate lay. It was agreed that this sum would free him from all other dues payable to the Crown, which Uhtred would perform in his stead. The charter ends with the optimistic promise, which suggests that Uhtred was negotiating with the Crown for relief from certain servile dues, that when he was 'free and quit of payment of cain, he [Richard] shall hold freely the aforesaid land by the service of one knight'. This extra payment of cash from the tenant and the desire to be free from cain from a wider geographical area rather than the single estate in question lends support to the belief that the Crown was demanding new service from this region in general. It is in this area (Desnes Ioan) that Uhtred was attempting to settle most of his Anglo-Norman incomers, and it is likely that cain in addition to knight service and probably castleguard was rendering the attraction of would-be colonists to the district more difficult. It would appear that the Crown was waiving its entitlement to traditional renders elsewhere in the kingdom, so facilitating the recruitment of land-hungry men from the south. This would justify Uhtred's attempt to free his territories from that burden. The outcome of his negotiations with the king is unknown.

In tandem with the obligations to the Crown, Richard's lordship was probably burdened with dues owed to Uhtred as overlord. The nature of these dues is not stated in the charter, probably being covered also by the cash payment. In the later 13th century, however, after the estate of Lochkindeloch had reverted to the lords of Galloway, it was granted by Devorgilla to Sweetheart Abbey on its foundation as the basis for the monastic demesne. In her foundation charter, issued in 1273, (50) the land is shown to be burdened with traditional Celtic renders, such as sorran, as well as the 'feudal' obligations of customs, aids, assizes, gelds etc. Cain, however, had disappeared from the formula of Crown perquisites, although certain of the 'feudal' rights, such as prizes, may have included elements of these old customary benefits of overlordship. The survival of these aspects serves to illustrate quite neatly the continuity of practice rather than the replacement of the old system by a completely alien regime. Old rights may have been redefined to meet new circumstances, but there is every indication that little other than terminology relating to the general aspects of lordship was actually changed.

Native Reaction 1174-85.

In view of the apparently limited nature of the settlement which occurred in Galloway after 1160, and the slightness of the apparent changes which required the introduction of new elements or were caused by their arrival, it is difficult to accept the interpretation which regards the rebellion of 1174 as a conservative backlash against the 'feudalising' tendencies of the Crown. (51) The hostility which erupted following King William's capture at Alnwick was directed towards the Crown itself and the visible symbols of its controls over Galloway, of which alien settlers were only one aspect. Anti-foreign sentiments need not imply 'anti-feudal' feelings, as there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Fergus's sons were not averse to the benefits to their own power which could be derived from changes in the basic structure of lordship.

The anti-foreign aspect of the rising is at once evident from the chronicle sources which record the event. They describe the particular hostility towards men seen as Crown agents. Howden describes the expulsion of royal officers, attacks on Anglo-Normans and the storming of strongholds held by royal servants, (52) while the Benedict of Peterborough version of his work specifically mentions 'bailiffs and wardens' imposed on the region by the Scots. (53) The direction of the attacks is uncertain, but Walter de Berkeley's motte at Urr has produced some evidence for destruction and an ensuing period of abandonment or dereliction for an uncertain length of time. (54) As the caput of a man associated closely with the king's household it is probable that it was regarded as a royal outpost rather than as a stronghold of one of Uhtred's vassals. It is likely that Dumfries was attacked at this time and the 'old castle' (55) there destroyed. This would have removed the most obvious centre of royal administration in the region. The castle at Dumfries was probably speedily replaced once William was released from his captivity in Normandy and may have been one of the factors which provoked Gilbert's renewed rebellion in the 1180s

Gilbert's death in January 1185 brought this Indian Summer of Galwegian nationalism to an abrupt and bitter end. With his heir Duncan a hostage at Henry II's court, his nephew Roland was able to occupy Gilbert's lands while his opponents were leaderless and proceeded to establish his government over them. (56) The chronicles are clearly of the impression that Roland governed both by right of inheritance and right of conquest, having defeated his uncle's vassals, confiscated their lands and established fortresses on them to hold down the occupied districts. It is generally assumed that the men on whom Roland relied for his support were Anglo-Norman knights, introduced largely from Cumberland and Westmorland. The speed with which he was capable of raising an army and invading Gilbert's lands, however, points less towards the cumbersome processes of recruitment outwith his home territory and more towards the exploitation of the resources available to him in Galloway. This would seem likely in view of arguments in favour of Roland as having succeeded in gaining possession of at least part of his paternal lands before 1185. The foreign element in Roland's army may have been quite small, therefore, and indeed the men to whom he was going to grant land subsequent to his conquest form a very restricted group. It is possible that the bulk of his support was drawn from his father's former vassals, the largely native population of eastern Galloway, the men whom William of Newburgh describes as assisting in Roland's resistance to Gilbert in

1174. (57)

The New Regime: 1185-1234.

The emergence of most of the families of Anglo-Norman origin in Galloway is ascribed to Roland's generosity in recognition of their services in 1185-6. (58) Certainly, men ejected from their lands in 1174, such as Walter de Berkeley, were restored to their possessions, but in this latter case restitution may have occurred soon after the initial phase of the rebellion in the mid 1170s had been brought to a close. Berkeley appears to have been in control of Urr before 1185, being mentioned as holding part of the adjacent manor of Kirkgunzeon in a letter of Bishop Christian, (59) who died in October 1186, although he may not have reoccupied the motte at Urr until after the establishment of more settled conditions. Actual evidence for a policy of widespread infeftments is wholly lacking and what does appear to have occurred is a restoration of the situation as existed between 1160 and 1174, with the bulk of the settlement occurring in the lands east of the Urr.

Walter de Berkeley's lordship of Urr appears to have been the major component in the pattern of estates formed in this region. It lay at the western end of the old roadway along the ridge which divides Kirkgunzeon from the open country of Lochrutton and Kirkpatrick-Durham. The motte itself occupied very much a frontier position, and controlled the crossings of the Urr. The extent of the barony is unknown, but the modern parish of Urr, with Blaiket to the north, a portion of Kirkgunzeon to the south and some part of Lochrutton to the east appear to have been encompassed by its limits. The southern portion was to form a source of dispute with the monks of

Holmcultram, as it had been granted originally to them by Uhtred as part of their grange of Kirkgunzeon. This dispute was only settled by Walter's regrant to the abbey of the land in question. (60) The eastern portions, centred on the lands of Corswadda, were granted in c.1189 by Walter to a certain William, the son of Richard, to be held for the service of half a knight, (61) probably to ease the discharge of service obligations on the extensive lordship based on Urr. This grant represents the earliest surviving example of the process of subinfeftment in Galloway. On Walter's death in 1190 control of Urr passed to his son-in-law, Ingelram Balliol of Cavers in Roxburghshire, (62) in whose family it was to remain down to the Wars of Independence.

To the south of Urr lay the lordship of Colvend, the estate of Roland's relatives the lords of Workington. Their possession of this lordship stems probably from their kinship with the Galwegian ruling house. Tenure of Colvend possibly dated from Uhtred's lifetime when the land may have been settled on Cospatric son of Orm, but there is no conclusive proof for this. His sons, however, acquired a considerable landed interest in this region and were to emerge as close associates of Roland and Alan, a relationship which arose from the ties of kinship. The elder brother, Thomas, who inherited the paternal estates at Workington, received the moiety of Colvend,(63) his family eventually acquiring the territorial designation 'of Colvend' as a surname. Gilbert, the younger brother, acquired Southwick, lying to the east of Thomas's lordship, (64) and appears to have gained prominence as an active member of the household of the lord of Galloway. He occurs most normally as a Galwegian nobleman, whilst his brother's succession to the Cumbrian estates preserved a closer identification on his part with England. Both branches of the family were to maintain their links with Galloway down to the end of the 13th century, but after 1314 the cross-Solway connection was to be severed and the Colvends and Southwicks reverted to being solely Cumbrian families.

In the cases of both Walter de Berkeley and the sons of Cospatric of Workington, the association with the lords of Galloway stems from relationships formed long before 1185, and, although they may have assisted Roland in that year, they did not receive their estates as a reward for this service. There is no indication, moreover, that they gained any increase in their lands by grants of portions of Gilbert's former demesne or the estates of his allies in western Galloway. All three men remained solely eastern Galwegian in their landed interests.

Despite the statement of Howden that Roland seized the lands of both Gilbert and the native lords in the west who had supported his uncle, (65) there is little indication in written sources that he used these to establish a body of men in that region on whom he could rely for support in future. In fact, only one case where it would appear that Roland was introducing a wholly new family into western Galloway is recorded. This hardly suggests the subjection of the region by Anglo-Norman 'feudal' settlers based on fortified strongpoints. The striking absence of evidence for the settlement of the region by foreigners must imply that their role in the affair was grossly exaggerated and that the numbers of men involved were considerably less than has been believed previously. It is possible that Roland may have found it difficult to attract colonists to the less fertile districts beyond the Cree, where most good land was held by the Church or was the demesne of the lords themselves. Native support, drawn from eastern Galloway, probably accounted for the bulk of his warriors, raised through the exercise of his traditional rights of lordship involving military service by his subjects. Drawing on such rights, Roland had no obligation to give payment in land or otherwise for these services, leaving him with a free hand to dispose of his conquests as he wished.

The only surviving evidence for Roland settling one of his foreign supporters on land seized from Gilbert or one of his supporters concerns the Vipont family. In common with most of the Anglo-Norman knights whom Uhtred and Roland introduced into Galloway, they were prominent members of the Cumbrian aristocracy and, moreover, related by marriage to Roland's wife, Helen. The family had gained possession of Hugh de Morville's barony of North Westmorland through a combination of royal patronage and marriage policy, William de Vipont received permission from the English king to marry Helen's aunt, Hugh's sister, Matilda. (66) Ivo, youngest son of William and Matilda, who had inherited only a minor interest in the family's English lands, received the manor of Sorbie in the Machars from Roland, husband of his cousin. The manor consisted of land in two parishes, Sorbie Major and Sorbie Minor, the churches of which were subsequently granted to Dryburgh Abbey, emphasising the Morville link. (67) On Ivo's death the manor was split between his sons, Robert and Alan, the former receiving Sorbie Major, the latter Sorbie Minor. By the middle of the 13th century Sorbie Major was in the hands of John le Fraunceys, a member of the household of Henry III and a noted property speculator. He had been put in possession by Robert de Vipont, who granted his homage and service to John Balliol, by then overlord of the manor in right of his wife, Devorgilla. (68) Alan de

Vipont preserved his interest in Sorbie, his land there passing to his son Robert, the last known member of the family associated with Galloway. The ultimate fate of both Roberts in Scotland is unknown, but it would appear that their lands had reverted to the Balliols before 1286.

In the light of this somewhat limited evidence, it must be admitted that Roland's maternal links with Cumbria provided him with a source of aspiring colonists, although few in number. It cannot be argued, however, that Galloway was subdued solely through the efforts of a body of Cumbrian knights, and that Roland settled these men throughout the region, relying on them to hold down a restive native populace. Where settlement can be attributed to Roland, the deciding factor appears to have been ties of kinship rather than any other element, the Viponts, Colvends and Southwicks all being related to him by varying degrees. Those families which were not directly related to him, such as the Berkeleys, or the lords of Lochkindeloch or Anwoth, could trace their presence in Galloway to Uhtred, or, like the one knight who may have formed a part of Helen de Morville's household, Roger Maule, have secured their position by a transfer of allegiance from the Morvilles to Galloway on the occasion of the marriage alliance between the families. Maule is the only probable Morville vassal who can be seen to make this transfer, securing a landed interest remote from his family's principal holdings in Lauderdale. Presumably a junior member of the Maule family, with little hope of securing any part of their Lauderdale possessions, Roger had received the moiety of the manor of Colvend, (69) but may not have maintained his interest in this area, as he appears only once in connection with that place. It has been suggested recently that this south-western connection may have been used by the Maules to strengthen their interests in north-eastern Ireland, (70) but whether Colvend was used as a stepping-stone to lands in Ulster cannot be determined. Their connection with the manor of Colvend cannot have lasted much into the 13th century, as the family of Thomas, son of Cospatric, appears to have secured sole possession by the time of Alan.

The Household of Roland and Alan c.1196-1234

Where Anglo-Norman incomers do appear to have made the greatest impact is in the household of the lord of Galloway himself. This is demonstrated most strikingly by the personnel who witnessed the charters of the lords. In these a clear dichotomy emerges between Uhtred and Roland, or more especially, Alan, in terms of the background of the men involved. Uhtred was generally eclectic in his choice of witnesses, and drew on men of Celtic, Anglian and Scandinavian background, although the Celtic element predominated. (71) Men such as Gillemore Albanach, Gillecrist MacGillwinin and Uhtred's foster-brother, Gillecatfar, feature as regular witnesses to his grants. Where men of Anglo-Norman background are present, it is in connection with grants of land in Cumbria which pertained to the Allerdale properties, or grants made to one of their own number, such as Richard, son of Troite. In this last instance, a large assembly of the Anglo-Norman aristocracy of north-western England was present, and included members of the Stokes and Cantilupe families. The character of the witness lists generally reflects the make-up of the men present or available at the time of the drawing up of the charter in question, and comprised largely of the men most commonly in attendance on the lord. Uhtred's Galloway charters display unmistakably the predominantly Celtic nature of his following, his household and the men available to swell the ranks of the witnesses to important grants. Under Roland and, more particularly, Alan, the surviving documentation shows a change in the character of this inner group of supporters, with the Celtic members being replaced largely by men of Anglo-Norman background.

The rare survival of charters issued by Roland concerned solely with his Galloway lands makes it impossible to state with any certainty that this represents a conscious replacement of the native retainers with foreign dependents. Charters issued by Alan which survive in their original form are equally scarce, but from those which do remain a clear pattern of development emerges. While the evidence is too slim to make any categoric statements, it is possible to detect distinct groups within the lists of witnesses. A small number form a group of relatives, headed by Gilbert, son of Cospatric. (72) They, however, are outstripped by what appears to be household knights and dependent clerks. The former was dominated by a group of Lauderdale men, the principal tenants of the Morvilles in that region, who came to form the curia of Roland and Alan. The imbalance in favour of former Morville men is attributable solely to the bias of the existing documentation. They were generally not active outwith Lauderdale and normally figure only in sources pertaining to Alan's maternal inheritance.

Families such as the Haigs and Thirlestanes, prominent as tenants of the Morvilles in Lauderdale before 1196, retained their local preeminence after the lordship passed to the Galloways. Whilst they continued to dominate records of the administration of Lauderdale under Roland and Alan, they remained purely of local significance, and appear rarely to have provided members of either man's mobile retinue. As a result, they cannot be shown to have benefitted greatly from service to their new overlords. A few individuals, however, appear to have used the opportunity for advancement which the fusion of the Morville and Galloway estates afforded.

One such individual was Vivian de Mulinans or Mulineys, who, although his career can hardly be described as meteoric, appears to have made his name through service to his new overlords. He appears first in a Morville context, in the time of William de Morville, as a relatively minor witness to his superior's charters. (73) After William's death in 1196 Vivian clearly transferred his hopes to to the new lords of Lauderdale, but is found as witness to only one charter of the lords of Galloway, again in a Lauderdale context. (74) His service, however, appears to have been valuable enough for Alan to have granted Vivian Collielaw near Lauder. (75) Certainly, Vivian appears to have regarded Roland and Alan as his chief patrons for, when towards the end of his life he granted the whole of his lands of Saltoun in Midlothian to the Hospital of Soutra, it is stated in his charter that the bequest was for the souls of both men; his former Morville masters receive no mention. (76) In comparison with other members of the lordly household, however,Vivian was a very minor character.

Two men stand out amongst the vassals of Alan, Gilbert de Southwick and Radulf de Campania, the former his second cousin, the latter originally a household retainer. Gilbert was the younger brother of Thomas, son of Cospatric, the lord of Colvend, and appears to have opted to make a career in the service of his cousin in

Galloway. As a younger brother, he had probably gained no significant part of the paternal estates at Workington, and was dependent upon the generosity of Roland and Alan for his social advancement. Through this connection he received the lordship of Southwick, from which his descendants adopted their surname, and it is solely as a knight of the lord of Galloway that he appears in association with Alan.

Gilbert's career in Galloway commenced in the time of Roland when he featured as a witness to charters of Roger Maule and Roland himself which bestowed property on the Solway coast at Preston and Colvend on the priory of St.Bees in Cumbria. (77) The lands in question flanked Gilbert's own lordship of Southwick, and it is presumably as an important local landholder that he is present as a witness. Under Alan, however, Gilbert was involved in more general business, most commonly outwith Galloway. His presence in the witness lists of documents concerned with business which touched on Alan's Cumbrian, Lauderdale and Yorkshire estates suggests that he was in regular attendance on his cousin, and was presumably a member of his mobile household. Thus Gilbert is found as a witness to Alan's quitclaim of interest in the advowson of the church of Kippax, an arrangement bound up in the negotiations connected with Alan's marriage to a Pontefract Lacy. (78) He figures also in Alan's charter to the abbey of St.Andrew at Northampton, which confirmed the grants of land made to that monastery by Helen de Morville following the burial of her husband there in 1200. This was a purely Lauderdale matter. (79) Finally, he witnessed Alan's grant of a portion of his Cumbrian estates in Torpenhow to John de Newbigging. (80) His prominence as a lay witness to his cousin's charters is exceeded by only one man, Radulf, lord of Borgue.

Radulf de Campania's rise to prominence is particularly noteworthy as an example of a man 'created' through his association with a major nobleman. His family appears to have reached Galloway in the early 13th century through their connection with the earls of Huntingdon, apparently being their vassals for land at Stokes in Leicestershire. (81) The Campanias probably arrived in the train of Alan's second wife, Margaret, daughter of Earl David, and had received the lordship of Borgue, (82) which appears to have been divided between two branches of the family. Robert de Campania, apparently an elder brother of Radulf, had received the Castleton of Borgue, it being in the possession of his grandson, also Robert, in 1259. Radulf had presumably received a moiety of the manor, as some time after 1234 he was in a position to grant the patronage of the church to Dryburgh Abbey. (83) The circumstances by which he came into Alan's service, beyond the possibility of his arrival with Margaret of Huntingdon, are unknown, but a description of him in 1213 as 'butler' may suggest that he had entered the lord of Galloway's service in this capacity. (84)

Radulf rose fast in Alan's favour as one of his knights and principal servants, and he figures in Alan's charters in a capacity similar to that of Gilbert of Southwick. The death of Alan in 1234 and the partition of his estates may have come as a blow to Radulf's aspirations, but as a setback it was temporary. Within a few years of his master's demise Campania had taken up service with the Crown and ended his days as Constable of Roxburgh, one of the most important offices in the eastern March ,(85) but appears also to have preserved his old Galloway connections. After 1234, Radulf figures on a number of occasions in association with Roger de Quincy. (86)

The ecclesiastical dependents of Alan's household form a much more visible group than its lay members. This body include a wide range of men described as 'our chaplain' or 'our clerk', many of whom appear on only one occasion. Others, however, enjoyed much greater prominence, most notably the clerks Radulf de Clifton, Thomas de Kent Adam de Thornton and Walter. Despite their prominence, Clifton and Thornton are enigmatic figures, whose origin and later careers are largely unknown. Thornton occurs generally in connection with Morville business and may have Lauderdale connections. Certainly, he appears to have acquired the parsonage of Lauder as a reward for his service to Alan. (87) Clifton may similarly have had Morville connections, as a family of that name may have held land at Morebattle in Roxburghshire, on the fringes of the Lauderdale lordship. Thomas de Kent was probably Alan's most active clerk, witnessing at least five charters, possibly eight, and acting as one of the lord of Galloway's envoys to Henry III in 1220. (88)

The benefits of service to Alan for clerics were great. Thomas may have ended up as parson of the church of Troqueer, quite a small reward for a long and faithful service, but others were considerably more successful. Walter, the former chamberlain of Alan of Galloway was, in 1209, elected to the bishopric of Whithorn, (89) his elevation probably being the result of Alan's influence. Another household cleric, William, described in 1220 as 'beloved and familiar' clerk to Alan, held the position of prior of Holyrood's dependent cell of St.Mary Traill. (90) The store of patronage on which Alan could draw was immense, spread through two countries and including the rights of presentation to five major abbacies plus lesser monasteries and parish churches. It cannot be doubted that the promise of future advancement was the lure which drew ambitious young clerks to his service.

The image which the documentary evidence serves largely to present of the lords of Galloway by 1234 is that of the powerful Anglo-Norman baron, scarcely distinguishable from the bulk of the nobility of Anglicised Scotland. This depiction, based largely upon the evidence of charters and writs, portrays Alan as the 'feudal ' lord, overlord of lesser knights and the head of a complex household containing chamberlain, butler and a train of clerks, serving both as chaplains and secretaries. But it must be remembered that this material is singularly biased, and presents only one side of the image. Beneath the facade of Anglo-Norman urbanity runs an undercurrent of a completely different type. From the surviving evidence there can be formed a quite contrasting image, that of the great Norse-Celtic chief, who commanded a fleet of galleys filled with native warriors, and who raided round the Hebrides and in Ireland. It is easy to overlook the background of Alan and Roland, to see them solely as the product of late 12th century Anglo-Norman culture, and to forget their deep roots in the Norse and Celtic traditions of their lands. Beneath this thin veneer of 'feudal' trappings, the predominantly Celtic character of the region was unchanged, a factor to be revealed by the rising of 1235.

Footnotes to Chapter 5 pt 1

1. Barrow, Kingship and Unity, chapters 2 and 3; Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, chapter 15.
2. G.W.S.Barrow, The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History (Oxford, 1980).
3. Holyrood Liber, No 1.
4. Barrow, 'Lordship and feudal settlement', 130-2.
5. Glasgow Registrum, No 9.
6. RRS, i, No 131.
7. ibid, 38-9.
8. APS, i, 82.
9. Glasgow Registrum, Nos 3, 9, 10, 11, 15; RRS, i, Nos 138, 195, 245; Paisley Registrum, 249.
10. Glasgow Registrum, Nos 10, 11; RRS, ii, No 367.
11. Barrow, 'Lordship and feudal settlement', 122-3.
12. RRS, ii, No 80.
13. APS, i, 378, c.xxiii.
14. W.C.Dickinson, 'Surdit de sergaunt', SHR, xxxix (1960), 170-5.
15. APS, i, 403.
16. CDS, ii, No 1874.
17. Dickinson, 'Surdit de sergaunt', 173-4.
18. RMS, i, No 192.
19. Glasgow Registrum, Nos 139, 141.
20. Kelso Liber, No 404.
21. RRS, ii, No 183 and note.
22. Kelso Liber, No 347.
23. R.C.Reid, 'The early Kirkpatricks', TDGAS, xxx (1951-2), 61-110; Holm Cultram Register, No 133a; Kelso Liber, No 343.
24. Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 47-9.
25. see e.g.B.E.Crawford, 'The earldom of Caithness and the kingdom of Scotland 1150-1266', Northern Scotland, ii (1974-77), 97-117.
26. Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, chapter 10.
27. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 181.
28. M'Kerlie, Lands and Their Owners, i, 109-15.
29. CDS, i, No 529.
30. Liber S.Marie de Dryburgh (Bannatyne Club, 1847), No 68.
31. Wigtownshire Charters, xvi-xvii.
32. ibid, xvii; Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 164.
33. Benedict of Peterborough, i, 67.
34. Paisley Registrum, 249; RRS, i, Nos 131, 159, 265; RRS, ii, No 80.
35. Scott, 'An early sheriff', 90-91.
36. Reid, 'Feudalisation of lower Nithsdale', 104-5.
37. Holm Cultram Register, No 120a; D/Lons/L5/1/S1.
38. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 182-3; Wigtownshire Charters, xix.
39. Melrose Liber, Nos 31, 34.
40. ibid, Nos 33, 36.
41. Holyrood Liber, No 24.
42. Wigtownshire Charters, xxii.
43. Holyrood Liber, No 49.
44. D/Lons/L5/1/S1. Cumbria Record Office.
45. Monumenta Historia Hibernorum et Scotorum, ed.A.Theiner (Rome, 1864), No 105.

46. *Dryburgh Liber*, No 73.
47. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xvi-xvii.
48. K.J.Stringer, 'The early lords of Lauderdale, Dryburgh Abbey and St.Andrews Priory at Northampton', in Stringer (ed), *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh,1985), 44-71.
49. D/Lons/L5/1/S1; Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway Charters', 231-64.
50. *RRS*, vi, No 235.
51. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xxi.
52. *Roger of Howden*, ii, 57.
53. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 67-68.
54. B.Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr. Interim report 1951 season', *TDGAS*, xxix (1950-1), 167-72.
55. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 50.
56. *Roger of Howden*, ii, 299; *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 339.
57. *William of Newburgh*, 186-7.
58. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xxi-xxix.
59. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 120a.
60. ibid, Nos 120a, 122, 123, 126.
61. *Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus*, ed.J.Anderson (Edinburgh, 1739), No 77.
62. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 124.
63. *The Register of the Priory of St.Bees*, ed.J.Wilson (Surtees Society, 1915), No 92.
64. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 131.
65. *Benedict of Peterborough*, ii, 339, 349.
66. R.C.Reid, 'De Veteripont', *TDGAS*, xxxiii (1954-5), 91-106.
67. *Dryburgh Liber*, Nos 71-74.
68. *CDS*, i, No 1808.
69. *St.Bees Register*, No 60.
70. Stringer, 'Early lords of Lauderdale', 51 and note.
71. see witness lists of *Holyrood Liber*, Nos 23, 24; D/Lons/L5/1/S1.
72. *St.Bees Register*, No 42; *CDS*, i, No 553; Stringer, 'Early lords of Lauderdale', No 7; Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway Charters', No 5.
73. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 46; *Furness Coucher Book*, ii, pt.ii, No 3.
74. *Kelso Liber*, No 246.
75. *Midlothian Charters*, No 32.
76. ibid.
77. *St.Bees Register*, Nos 60, 62.
78. *CDS*, i, No 553; Stringer, 'A new wife', 50.
79. Stringer, 'Early lords of Lauderdale', 67, No 7.
80. Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters', 258, No 5.
81. *Publications of the Pipe Roll Society*, lxxv (1961), 103; *Chartulary of Lindores Abbey 1195-1479*, ed. J.Dowden (Scottish History Society, 1903), No 87.
82. *Dryburgh Liber*, No 64; *Lindores Chartulary*, Nos 87, 88, 113.
83. *Dryburgh Liber*, No 64.
84. *PPRS*, lxxv, 103.
85. *Melrose Liber*, No 282.

86. e.g.*Holyrood Liber*, No 63.
87. *Kelso Liber*, No 245; Watt, *Dictionary*, 531.
88. *CDS*, i, No 754; *CDS*, ii, No 1606(7); *Melrose Liber*, Nos 79, 227.
89. *Chron.Melrose*, 54; Watt, *Fasti*, 128.
90. *CDS*, i, No 754.

The Division of Power, 1235

Regardless of current arguments concerned with the question of whether 'feudalism' existed in 13th century Scotland, or the semantic problem of giving a precise definition of the system described by that term, there are instances apparent where recourse was made to certain of the 'feudal' legal forms in common use in the Europe of the day. The reality of the system may have been far from the images conveyed by the legal jargon, with the emphasis being more on rents and renders and the traditional dues as the burden imposed by the overlord, rather than the rare incidences of knight service. It is perhaps too extreme a view in opposition to Geoffrey Barrow's image of a 'feudal' kingdom of Scotland to argue, as Simpson does, for a situation where the language in which the primary sources are couched, overtly feudal in derivation, conceals a reality where continuity from the Celtic past was the prime influencing factor on tenurial forms.

Continuity must be seen as an important factor in determining the character of Scottish medieval landholding systems, but the existence of 'feudal' forms and influences cannot be wholly dismissed as the device of the lawyers and clerks who recorded the land transactions. They alone could not have imposed the language of a foreign system upon a strong native tradition; there must have been some strong element in society for whom the imported terminology had a meaning. There can be detected in certain instances an unmistakable shift, in practice as well as theory, away from traditional methods towards the imported ideas. Such instances include procedures concerned with the inheritance of land, particularly where a major estate was involved and, more importantly, where the estate spanned the borders between regions where different legal systems were operative. An important example of this is provided by the records relating to the settlement of the Galloway inheritance issue, where the laws of inheritance applied were those which had developed in Frankish Europe rather than the Celtic forms which were to prevail in parts of Western Scotland and the Isles into the 16th century.

It is debatable whether the application of Anglo-Norman legal procedures to resolve the Galwegian problem represented an ingenuous action on the part of Alexander II, intended to bring about a peaceful settlement between the co-heirs, or whether it was a political expedient, the workings of an opportunist monarch who sought to exploit to the full the potential provided by the situation for an extension of royal authority into Galloway. (see above 145-50) His decision to bring about the tripartite division of the Galloway inheritance between Alan's daughters, whilst legally correct in cases relating to major fiefs in accordance with the practices of Anglo-French law, by treating the lordship as a fief held of the Scottish Crown failed to take into account the peculiar status of the lords of Galloway and their relationship with the king of Scots. Whilst the move was of dubious legality, it had the merit of defining a previously imprecise relationship. Native law and tradition was passed over, as was tending to occur elsewhere in the kingdom, with what appears to be a flagrant disregard and the final decision ignored the wishes of the Galwegians themselves. In these ways, a settlement along the lines of Anglo-Norman law was wholly unsatisfactory as an answer to the complex problem created by Alan's death, and appears only as a solution to the threat posed to the Crown by the existence within the realm of a major semi-independent lordship. The answer settled upon by King Alexander seems very much to have been influenced by the theory of 'divide and rule', although the reasons were complicated further by a number of other major issues (see above 145-9). In a society largely untouched by the influences of Norman-French military culture, the imposition of a seemingly arbitrary decision in accordance with an alien law-code was bound to provoke a hostile reaction.

The death of Alan in February 1234, leaving no legitimate male heir to succeed to his extensive territories, precipitated a crisis in the lordship and gave rise to a power vacuum in the south-west which various parties sought to exploit (see Chapter 3). Alexander was in an invidious position, caught between the opposing claims and the interests of the Crown. He wanted to regain control over an area which had eluded the grasp of his father for forty years after the rout at Alnwick, and so guarantee the security of the realm from that quarter. He aimed to curb the independence of whichever party gained control of Galloway, but was faced with the responsibility of being seen to do right by Alan's daughters and so demonstrate the impartiality of royal justice.

A number of options were open to him, but none could have satisfied the aspirations of any of the interested parties in full. The inheritance could have been treated as two distinct parts; the lordship per se and the estates acquired through Alan's Morville mother. The former could have been permitted to retain its territorial integrity under one of Alan's male relatives, whilst the latter was partitioned between the daughters. This would have preserved the distinction between Galloway, which prior to 1234 seems never to have been treated as a fief, and those estates acquired subsequent to the time of Fergus, which lay generally in parts of the kingdom most influenced by Anglo-Norman tenurial procedures. Such a situation, however, would have left unresolved the ambiguities which surrounded the relationship between the lords and the Crown. It would neither have afforded the Crown the opportunity to extend its power into a region where it itself was weak, nor would it have removed the spectre of an autonomous principality within the kingdom. Could Galloway be treated as a fief and so legally be partitioned between the heiresses, or did the quasi-regal powers claimed for some of its former rulers imply a status bordering on kingship and therefore impartible? It is ironic that half a century later the same questions were to be asked of Scotland itself. Alexander opted to end the ambiguities of the relationship and imposed a settlement which he was prepared to back with military force when challenged. The settlement implied that the lordship was a fief held of the Crown by bringing about a partition between Alan's three daughters, and rejected the appeals of the Galwegians. This move marked the opening of a new phase in the tenurial arrangements within the lordship and saw a definition of its status with regard to the Crown.

It is unlikely that Barrow's somewhat simplistic interpretation of Alexander's actions as being those of a king 'determined to uphold feudal law' (1) explains the reasoning behind this momentous decision. Admittedly, the settlement imposed on the Galwegians after the suppression of their revolt and the surrender of the bastard, Thomas, in 1235 was made strictly in accordance with 'feudal' legal practice, and there is no indication of the Crown profiting through the acquisition of territory. Son of the 'Lion of Justice' or not, however, Alexander was acting very much out of self-interest rather than any real desire to uphold a legal form whose application in this case was open to question. The king could not have allowed the Galloway inheritance to pass intact to Alan's nephew Patrick, heir to the earldom of Atholl and his father's own estates in Lothian, and a protege of the rising Comyn family, for not only would it have vastly augmented that family's network of alliances, but would also have created an even greater agglomeration of estates within the kingdom than Alan had ever possessed. Patrick, moreover, was a minor in ward, and the political instability of Galloway needed firm hands in control. It was also impolitic to allow Duncan of Carrick to inherit his kinsman's lands, as this would have reunited the portions of the lordship severed in the 1180s and have shifted the balance of power in the south-west decisively away from the Crown. Duncan was barred from the succession in any case by his oath which renounced for himself and his heirs any claim upon the territories which his father had ruled, but which his cousin, Roland, had seized. (2) By regarding Galloway as a fief Alexander was asserting his position as 'feudal' overlord, thus finally removing any ambiguities concerning its status. His decision secured the break-up of the territory, and thus ensured that no single man could acquire such power as Alan and his predecessors had enjoyed. Recourse to 'feudal' forms, therefore, may have been little more than a device to secure royal control in one of the last peripheral areas of the kingdom where the power of the Crown had been weak.

Formation of the Quincy and Balliol Lordships

The precise terms by which the division of the Galloway lands was achieved cannot be reconstructed from the few surviving fragments, but from what does remain some way can be gone towards that goal. Amongst the meagre group of 13th century documents concerned with the lordship after 1234, the most important in this context is the post mortem inquest into the lands and privileges of Eleanor or Helen de la Zouche, (3) youngest daughter of Roger de Quincy and Helen of Galloway, which was held at Berwick shortly after her death in 1296. The inquest provides details of her portion of the combined estates of her parents throughout southern Scotland, which pertained to the Galloway lands acquired on her mother's death in 1250 and the Quincy lands which fell to her on Roger's death in 1264. This gives precise information regarding the fragmented holdings and associated privileges which she had inherited in the south-west as a portioner of her mother's Galloway lands.

What the inquest reveals is a scattering of estates representative of approximately one third of the Quincy lands in the lordship, itself roughly half of the overall Galloway inheritance. These had their major concentration around the former caput of Alan's lordship at Kirkcudbright, which had fallen to Helen de Quincy in 1234 as the senior heiress. In addition to this focus, the Quincys had a network of estates in the Machars, plus outlying holdings in Desnes Ioan at Troqueer.

The Balliol lordship displays a similarly dispersed aspect. It was not the compact block of estates in eastern Galloway which tradition describes it as, but formed a composite lordship with concentrations of territory in the lower Urr and upper Dee valleys, the southern tip of the Machars and the northern part of the Rhins. The geographical distribution of the estates of the third heiress, Christina, is unknown. Despite the claims of the Scots Peerage (4) that Devorgilla fell heir to these, they were in fact divided between both surviving sisters, only the lands pertaining to her uncle's Chester inheritance descending to Devorgilla alone.

It cannot be assumed that the la Zouche lands represented an equal portion of a three-way split of her mother's inheritance, as there are indications that certain major sections passed undivided into the hands of the husbands of her two sisters. Margaret de Ferrars, the eldest sister, wife of the earl of Derby, appears to have gained the old caput at Kirkcudbright in sole possession, as it is described as belonging to the Ferrars family in the Brevis Descriptio. (5) How effective her family's control over their Galloway estates was cannot be determined, but there seems to be good reason to believe that Alexander Comyn, husband of the middle sister, had secured their possession for himself by the mid 1270s. Other major components of the Quincy estates also fell to him intact. Nevertheless, working from the basis of an equal partition, it is possible to reconstruct the general layout of one of the main divisions of the lordship as it stood in the late 1240s following the death of Christina and the reallocation of her estates.

Certain anomalies require to be noted at this point. In the later 13th century Comyn emerged as the dominant political force west of the Cree, although the Balliols may have held a superior landed base there. By 1264 he appears in possession of the office of sheriff of Wigtown, (6) presumably in recognition of his local preeminence.

Furthermore, in c.1274 he gained control of the office of hereditary Constable of Scotland, which by right of primogeniture ought to have passed to Margaret de Ferrars and her family. Reference survives to her renunciation by letter of her claim to that office and to any land which pertained to its dignity, and to her apparent designation of Alexander Comyn as the man most suited to receive them instead. (7) This letter, however, may have been no more than a recognition of the situation prevailing in Galloway by that date, for as early as 1266 Earl Alexander was being described in the Exchequer Rolls as 'keeper of two parts of the lands of the late Roger de Quincy in Galloway'. (8) The most notable of the estates which Comyn secured was the land and castle of Cruggleton, the chief seat of the lordship in the Machars. This was still in Comyn possession at the end of the 13th century when Alexander's son, John, was granted leave by Edward I to mine lead in the Calf of Man to carry out repairs to the roof of the castle. (9) Together, these acquisitions gave him a larger personal share in the Quincy inheritance, which must be borne in mind when calculating the size and burden of service imposed on those estates which pertained to that heritage, as revealed by the Zouche inquest.

The inquest deals with the Zouche lands on a regional basis, dividing the estates and the revenues received therefrom between the sheriffdoms within which they were located. The Galloway portions thus fall between the sheriffdoms of Wigtown and Dumfries. In Wigtownshire the Zouche lands amounted to little more than one third of a vill, which brought an annual income of eighteen pounds sterling. This estate, held in chief for the service of half a knight, lay at 'Manhincon' [misread as Mauhinton in Bain], the principal manor of the later barony of Craichlaw. (10) It was in eastern Galloway that the bulk of Eleanor's inheritance lay. There she held one third of Girthon and one third of Senwick, one sixth of Troqueer and 'Drumflet' and a single merkland at Kelton, with the render of one pound of wax in all issues. For these lands, in both shires, which gave her an annual income of 561.13s.4d., Eleanor owed 'one and a half knights' service and the third of half a knight', (11) which represented the obligation of approximately one third of the Quincy half of Galloway.

If it is assumed that the remaining two thirds of Manhincon, Senwick and Girthon, one third of Troqueer and two further merklands in Kelton were in the hands of the other two parceners, the Ferrars and Comyn heiresses, then an annual render of approximately one hundred and seventy pounds from those lands is obtained, and a service due of about five knights is gained. This, of course, does not represent the full half of the inheritance divided on Alan's death as it does not include the Comyn-held barony of Cruggleton, nor the Ferrars lands at Kirkcudbright. Both represented substantial estates, the latter in particular due to its important harbour, but no material relating to revenue from the port survives from the 13th century.

Evidence concerned with Cruggleton is almost equally scarce, but details of its value after 1300 are preserved in a number of sources. In the later Middle Ages the barony appears to have consisted of three portions of ten merklands' value apiece, which gives a total land-valuation of twenty pounds. (12) It is impossible to determine how much the value of the land had changed from c.1250, but the general trend had been downwards as a result of the wars which had ravaged Galloway on a regular basis since 1286. No indication survives of any service due to the Crown, the estate having been granted in free alms to the priory of Whithorn. (13) It is probable, however, that before its grant to the canons the estate had been burdened with knight service which, in view of its later valuation, was probably set at one knight.

A detailed breakdown of the Balliol portion of the Galloway inheritance cannot be reconstructed with such ease, as there is unfortunately no such useful contemporary document for them as the Zouche inquest. A starting point can be made with the Chamberlain of Galloway's accounts of the Douglas lands seized by James II in 1455, (14) but several factors combine to make this a not altogether dependable source. The late date of this account is one of the main stumbling blocks in its use which, when coupled with the substantial amounts of land alienated or acquired since the Balliol forfeiture of 1296, does not allow for uncritical acceptance. It is clear that the Douglas estates did not represent only Balliol lands, but also territory acquired from other families between the 1320s and 1450s. Recourse must also therefore be made to a number of disparate sources, generally of late 13th or early 14th century date, which survive in fragmentary form or are preserved within later documents.

As stated above, the bulk of Devorgilla's inheritance lay in three substantial blocks. The chief concentration, however, appears to have been in the lower Urr valley and Desnes Ioan, centred upon the lordship and castle of Buittle. (15) This later became the caput of the original Douglas lordship in Galloway, (16) before its replacement by Threave in the 1380s. In addition to that major barony she held the whole of Lochkindeloch, which had reverted to the lords at an unknown date, and part of Kirkpatrick-Durham. These two estates were used by Devorgilla in 1273 as the initial endowments of her abbey of Sweetheart. (17) From sources which refer to lands forfeited by her son, John Balliol, and to those restored to Edward Balliol as pertaining to his heritage, it would appear that Preston in Kirkbean parish, (18) along with the baronies of Kenmure or Kells, Balmaghie and Crossmichael pertained to the original Balliol lordship in eastern Galloway. (19)

In Wigtownshire the Balliols possessed a substantial landed base which took the form of a block of land in the southern part of the Machars and some estates in the Rhins. Devorgilla's husband, John Balliol the Elder, is recorded in 1251 as overlord of the moiety of the Vipont lordship of Sorbie held by John le Frauncеys, (20) an estate otherwise surrounded by Comyn-dominated lands. Amongst the estates forfeited by Devorgilla's son in 1296 was Glasserton, (21) to the south of Whithorn, with its caput at Kidsdale. This latter place was restored to Edward Balliol and subsequently granted in 1352 to William de Aldeburgh. (22) Devorgilla also appears as the former owner of the lands of 'Malmene in Farines', which was granted before 1318 by Edward Bruce to Whithorn priory. (23) The identification of this place is doubtful, but a strong candidate is Milmain in the parish of Stoneykirk in the Rhins. This identification is strengthened by the possession of Stoneykirk by the Marshal family, (24), two of whom were prominent amongst the witnesses to Devorgilla's foundation charter to the monks of Sweetheart. (25) Unfortunately, none of these sources give any details of the values of these estates, nor of the income derived from them annually. Similarly, no indication is given of the services rendered to the Crown for their tenure and when details do emerge in the mid 14th century, military services or money payments had often been replaced in charter formulae by renders in blench-ferme.

In several respects the policy adopted by Alexander II in 1235 proved extremely effective. With the exception of a brief and apparently localised rising against Roger de Quincy in 1247, (26) the division of Galloway appears to have broken any active resistance to the increase in Scottish overlordship which the death of Alan had brought about. Significantly, in the records of both the 1235 and 1247 rebellions, there is little indication that the opposition could muster any effective support amongst the lesser nobility, the tenants of the old lords, and it is clear that the influx of new blood into their ranks after 1185 and the open 'internationalism' of both Roland and Alan had served to break down the barriers of particularism in this important group.

One of the chief consequences of the loss of most Galwegian records from before 1300 has been a gap in our understanding of how this second rank of nobility developed in the years after 1235, and of the basis of its relationship with the heirs of Alan. Undoubtedly, the tenants continued to look to one or other of the husbands as their 'feudal' superior, and paid whatever dues were required of them, but the removal of an effective central authority cannot but have weakened the relationship. Within Galloway the division of the lordship estates effectively meant a reduction in the powers of the ruling dynasty. Until Alan's death, the House of Fergus had maintained its position as the dominant family through control of the bulk of the landed property in the lordship. The fragmentation of what had once been held by one man between three heiresses, and the subsequent further partition of one of those portions between a further three daughters, destroyed the monopoly of land-based power that the early lords had maintained. Although the Balliols succeeded in preserving their portion as a significant block of property, and the Comyns managed to create an effective counterbalance in Wigtownshire, the scale of their holdings was on a significantly lower level than that enjoyed by the lords before 1234. The gap between the lordly house and its principal tenants was narrowing, and by the end of the 13th century certain families such as the MacDowalls and the McCullochs had emerged as the effective powers within the region.

An important factor in the decline in lordly influence was undoubtedly the alienation of the people of Galloway from their rulers in the sense that Alan's heirs were rarely resident within Galloway. Roger de Quincy held substantial estates in Fife and Lothian and was an active member of the royal council, all of which served to ensure his rare appearance in his wife's Galloway lands. He was certainly resident there on occasion, but duties at court and the demands of his other estates in Scotland and England undoubtedly led to long absences. Similarly, John Balliol and Devorgilla had extensive properties in England to manage, and it is as an English landholder that the lady of Galloway most commonly occurs. To some extent Galloway may have been seen more as an asset to be exploited. In her widowhood Devorgilla may have spent more time in Galloway, involved in the establishment of Sweetheart Abbey and the friary at Wigtown, but it was at Barnard Castle that she eventually died. (27) Her son, John, appears to have had little contact with his mother's personal estates before 1290, but following her death he appears to have used them as his Scottish base. Indeed, after he became king, Buittle was to be used as an occasional residence, (28) but his new duties as monarch must have ensured that he became a stranger to his people. Despite this gradual separation of the people of Galloway from the family of Alan the lordship maintained its loyalty to its ruling house and was to remain one of the chief centres of Balliol support against the Bruces after 1307.

The success of the Balliols lay in the longevity of Devorgilla and her production of a son to succeed her. At the time of John's succession to his mother's Galloway lands only one generation lay between him and Alan, which was surely a significant factor in securing the support of many of the regional nobility. The Quincy line, however, had fragmented again, and despite the success of the Comyns in building up an effective power-base in Wigtownshire they were less clearly associated with the old lordship than were the Balliols. Both the Zouches and the Ferrars were overwhelmingly English in their interests, and there is nothing to suggest that representatives of either branch showed much interest in the Galloway portions of their inheritance until their involvement in Edward I's campaigns at the end of the century.

Footnotes to Chapter 5 pt ii

1. Barrow, Kingship and Unity, 114.
2. Benedict of Peterborough, i, 348-9; Chron. Fordun, ii, 269-70.
3. CDS, ii, No 824.
4. Scots Peerage, iv, 142.
5. Brevis Descriptio Regis Scotiae, 34.
6. ER, i, 22.
7. APS, i, 9.
8. ER, i, 22-23.
9. Stevenson, Documents, i, No 266.
10. D.Brooke, 'Kirk-compound place-names in Galloway and Carrick', TDGAS, lviii (1983), 63.
11. CDS, ii, No 824.
12. R.C.Reid, 'Cruggleton Castle, TDGAS, xvi (1929-30), 152-60.
13. RMS, i, app.i, No 20.
14. ER, vi, 191-210.
15. CDS, ii, No 1630.
16. Morton Registrum, No 32.
17. RRS, vi, No 235.
18. CDS, ii, No 1338.
19. CDS, iii, No 1578.
20. CDS, i, No 1808.
21. CDS, ii, No 1338.
22. RH.1/1/2 1 December 1352.
23. RMS, i, app.i, No 20.
24. CDS, iii, No 258; RMS, i, app.ii, No 322.
25. RRS, vi, No 235.
26. Matthew Paris, Chron.Maj., iv, 653.
27. Chron.Lanercost, 134.
28. e.g.CDS, ii, No 708.

Part III

The Physical Remains of Lordship.

While charter evidence relating to the colonisation or conquest of Galloway by Anglo-Norman or Scottish noble settlers fails consistently to give any real conception of the scale of the movements in question, the archaeological evidence for the same has been claimed as demonstrable proof of a major influx of men and the forcible subjugation of the lordship, or establishment of an alien aristocracy in defensive positions in hostile territory. Within Scotland Galloway possesses the single greatest concentration of earthwork remains assignable to 12th or 13th century military developments, exceeded only in a British context by the density of remains in the Welsh Marches. This fact alone has been taken as proof of the scale and nature of the colonisation: military conquest and subsequent control based on fortified strongpoints. This contention, epitomised in the work of R.C.Reid, (1) is based on little other than the numbers and distribution of the type of monument represented, a dangerous generalisation in view of the limited amount of work carried out on any medieval secular site in Galloway. All that can be stated with any certainty at present is that the earth and timber castles of motte type were an innovation introduced into Galloway in the course of the 12th century.

The development of early lordship centres in Galloway and the form which they took is largely unknown. Sites associated with Fergus are few in number and are generally encumbered by later buildings, but more is known of the seats of power under his descendants. The principal centre of Fergus's lordship is usually identified with Castle Fergus, or Palace Isle, a large earthwork site in the high ground immediately east of Kirkcudbright. (2) This takes the form of two oval mounds, heavily eroded by agricultural action, but still of considerable extent, crowned by the denuded remains of an earthen rampart. Both rise from what was once the bed of a shallow lochan, drained in the 18th century. The traces of a large building visible within the enclosed area of the larger of the two mounds represent the foundations of a house belonging to the MacLellans of Bombie, destroyed in the course of a feud in the later 15th century. From the surviving remains, it would appear that the original stronghold was an insular site, approached by a causeway from the north-east and depending for defence upon the surrounding waters and marsh rather than the light earth and timber rampart which enclosed the residence. No indication survives of the internal arrangements of the site other than the 15th century house. There is no other monument quite like Castle Fergus in Galloway, although a number of medieval island sites are known, and it is difficult to find comparisons outwith the region. A possible comparative site may be the old MacDonald stronghold at Finlaggan in Islay, with its island castle approached by a causeway. Of the other early sites, both Buittle and Cruggleton are obscured by later stone structures, although excavations at the latter have shown a major phase of development in the 12th century, with the formation of a motte and bailey on the headland utilising the natural features of the site. (3) Whereas Castle Fergus is supposedly representative of the native fortified tradition in Galloway, the mottes and associated forms are interpreted generally as the product of foreign influences. With this there is little dispute. Classic forms, i.e. the inverted 'pudding-basin' or truncated cone with surrounding ditch, possibly with attendant basal court, are attributed to the incoming settlers, conversant with the techniques of fortification then prevalent in north-western Europe. Variants, however, or general peculiarities in form, are commonly attributed to native attempts to emulate Anglo-Norman fashions. (4) This hypothesis fails to take into account such major determinants as the nature of the topography of the sites in question or the adaptation of the motte and bailey style to meet specific requirements.

As a specific class of fortification mottes are far from being a homogeneous group, those within Galloway being divisible into three general categories, with further subsets within them. The first are the 'classic' motte and bailey types, as described above, which form the smallest of the three groups. Second are those instances where a motte stands in apparent isolation, perhaps with only a ditch around the base of the mound and lacking any evidence for a bailey enclosure. Finally come the anomalies, those which do not fit neatly into either of the first two categories. A fourth variant, whose presence in Galloway is only just being recognised are 'ring-works' (5) sites again attributed to Anglo-Norman colonists but of a less defensive and more residential character than the mottes.

The first group, the 'classic' motte and bailey mode, is apparently represented at only four sites in the Stewartry District covered in the survey carried out by Tabraham: Boreland of Borgue, Southwick, Kirkcarsewell and Mote of Urr. At the first three the bailey has been reduced either to vestigial humps or survives only as cropmarks, making it a distinct possibility that similar enclosures at sites where only the motte now survives have been obliterated through agricultural action. The fourth example, Mote of Urr, remains the most impressive monument of its class in the country, the ditch and rampart of the bailey, enclosing the motte, surviving intact. Two other sites, Kirkclaugh and Boreland of Anwoth, possess baileys, but depart from the 'classic' mode. Both sites utilise natural features, at Boreland a long alluvial ridge which has been scarped and cut in two to form a 'motte' and a 'bailey', but there has been no attempt to raise the former above the level of the base court. Kirkclaugh is even more unusual, its clifftop motte being surrounded on two landward sides by an L-shaped bailey. According to the criterion which would have such anomalies labelled as native products, these two sites should belong to that category. The motte at Anwoth, however, would appear to have been the caput of the manor bestowed by Uhtred on David, son of Terrus. Outwith the district under Tabraham's survey surviving baileys are less common, only two definite examples, those at Cruggleton and High Drummore, (6) being known.

Mottes standing in isolation form the most substantial group within the class, eleven out of the eighteen ascribed to the 12th and 13th century by Tabraham falling into this category, and at least a further thirteen outwith the area covered by his survey taking this form. Certainly, it is possible that as at Southwick the baileys have been obliterated by agricultural activity, or were simple palisaded enclosures without prominent ditch and rampart defences, which would leave little surface indication of their former existence. A considerable but indeterminate number, however, would appear never to have possessed a permanent outer enclosure, such as Kirkland Motte at Parton, or that at Balmaclellan, where the only visible defence is a shallow ditch encircling the upcast mound.

The final group, the 'native anomalies', defy attempts to categorize them more specifically. These include such abnormalities as Lochrinnie and Trostrie, where the motte takes the form of a massive elongated mound of substantial summit area. The former also possesses a small 'bailey' at a slightly lower elevation. As at the Boreland of Anwoth the natural configurations of the sites appear to have been the main features determining layout. Lochrinnie is formed from the end of an alluvial ridge on the north side of the Cairn Valley, which has been separated from the main mass by a natural dip in the spine of the ridge. This dip has been artificially cut through by the motte's builders. At Trostrie a rock outcrop forms the basis of the mound. The closest parallels for such sites, but on a more massive scale, would appear to be such earthworks as the Doune of Invernochty or Peel Ring of Lumphanan, where all the necessary buildings were located on the summit of the substantial mounds. At these two Aberdeenshire sites, however, the defences were of stone, which places them in the 'shell-keep' category, whereas those at Lochrinnie and Trostrie appear simply to have been of wood. Another form, epitomised by Roberton in Borgue parish, appears as an adaptation of the bailey-less motte, but has been formed by digging away a deep ditch around a small site on the edge of a steep natural drop, rather than constructing a mound from the upcast soil. There is nothing in the utilisation of such natural features of the sites in question to require them to be stigmatised as feeble native attempts to copy Anglo-Norman models.

The chronology of the majority of motte sites in Galloway, in common with the rest of Scotland, is a major problem. In specific cases a builder can be identified, allowing a rough date for construction to be postulated. At Ingleston in New Abbey parish, Richard, son of Troite, appears to have been the agent responsible, giving a date of c.1170 for its construction. At Anwoth David, son of Terrus was established before 1174 and at Borgue Hugh de Morville was in possession before that date. The motte at Urr can be assigned to Walter de Berkeley, but it is possible that the great size of the bailey here is less a sign of his superior status as royal chamberlain (7) than a result of his utilisation of an earlier fortification. (8) This motte alone of the Galloway sites has undergone partial excavation in recent years, (9) confirming the 12th century date for the construction of the mound, but work was restricted to that feature with no exploration of the bailey or outer fortifications taking place.

Nothing in the typology of motte sites can be taken as forming conclusive chronological indicators. It was for long assumed that mottes with baileys predated the free-standing form. (10) Whilst the latter type appears to have continued to be constructed much later than the former, they seem to have been formed contemporaneously and the differences probably owe more to the status of the builder, configuration of the sites or requirements of the occupants. Certainly, Ingleston in New Abbey parish is contemporary with the motte and baileys at Cruggleton, Borgue, Anwoth and Urr, but lacks any sign of having formerly possessed an outer enclosure. (11) Admittedly, however, except where an earlier motte and bailey was re-utilised, none datable to the time of Roland or later is known to possess a base court.

The Galloway mottes are generally interpreted as belonging to two main phases. The earlier group, dating to the period between 1160 and 1174, has been seen as the product of 'enforced infeudation' (12) by Malcolm IV and William. To this period can be assigned the mottes at Anwoth, Borgue, Urr, Ingleston and possibly Colvend and Southwick. The violent upheavals of the years after 1174 are supposed to have witnessed the destruction of these strongholds by the native Galwegians. (13) Hope-Taylor's uncompleted excavations at Urr produced only inconclusive evidence for destruction and abandonment, the evidence for the silting-up and recutting of the ditches not necessarily forming proof for the dereliction of the site in the later 12th century. (14) but perhaps indicating simply the periodic scouring of the ditch. At Balgreggan in the Rhins peninsula, fragments of burnt wood and daub exposed by the weathering of the summit of the mound (15) suggests destruction by fire at this site. In a building of timber construction, however, fire must have been an ever present risk and there is no need to attribute the burning of Balgreggan solely to hostile natives. It remains for a structured programme of excavation at documented sites to establish firm proof for their systematic destruction in the course of the 1174 rebellion.

It is to the second period, the years after 1185, that the majority of mottes in the south-west are normally attributed. (16) They are supposed to mark the influx into Galloway of new Anglo-Norman families. To Stewart Cruden the mottes '...mark the spread of the feudal system', (17) and form the visible symbol of the subjugation of the province by superior military force. Reid, too, saw the earth and timber castle as the epitomé of feudalism, imported by foreigners. For him their distribution was doubly significant, for '...the majority are situated on the sea-coast or the navigational limits of rivers. The obvious inference from these structures is that they were erected by intruders who arrived by sea and were at first prepared to face the hostility of the local inhabitants and to preserve a line of retreat in the event of a serious rising...they are clear evidence of a new order in the state, which was much more firmly established in the Stewartry than in Wigtownshire'. (18)

The distribution of the motte sites in Galloway is considerably less complicated than Reid's theory of sea-borne invaders would allow. Certainly, most have a marked coastal or riverine spread, but this is a pattern dictated by the south-western topography, with its sharp divisions into compact river systems between areas of high land. The good, cultivable ground, attractive alike to native or colonist, was limited to the coastal districts and the main river valleys, particularly those of the Dee, Ken, Urr and Nith. Other more fertile areas, like the Machars, contain a number of mottes and early castle sites. Similarly, the eastern side of the southern Rhins, sheltered by the low hills to the west, contains a series of mottes running down its length. It is only in the upland districts of the Stewartry and the moors of northern Wigtownshire, or in areas of major ecclesiastical demesne that this form of site is absent.

As Tabraham's work showed, most parishes contain only one motte site, (19) a finding which can be applied to those areas outwith the scope of his survey. This suggests a close relationship between lay and ecclesiastical units, with the motte forming the caput of the manor with its boundaries roughly matching those of the religious subdivision. At certain locations like Parton, Dalry, Kirkcormack, Minnigaff and Druchtag-Mochrum (20) this relationship is stressed by the proximity of the church and motte sites. At Minnigaff the church stands in what may have been the bailey. In those parishes where more than one motte occurs, such as Kelton, (21) this phenomenon can be explained as resulting from the post-medieval merger of several individual units, or, as in Borgue, (22) result from the complicated pattern of tenure within the barony/parish. In addition to those parishes where the chief landowner was an ecclesiastical corporation, several other Galloway parishes possess no known motte sites. At Senwick and Balmaghie this may stem from their having been the demesne estates of the lord of Galloway, lying close to others of his main administrative centres and requiring no caput of their own. Elsewhere, such as Lochrutton, it would appear that the lordship centre took a form quite different to that of the motte. (23)

The crannog at Lochrutton, excavated in part in the first years of this century, (24) produced evidence for its occupation in the Middle Ages. A re-examination of ceramic material from the site suggests that Barbour's 13th century date is too early, (25) but it is probable that only the top layers of the occupation deposits were touched in his excavations. With a mainland peninsula defended by a ditch apparently forming part of a quite complex structure, analogies have been drawn between the Lochrutton site and motte and bailey fortifications. (26) i.e. crannog = motte, peninsula = bailey, but the arrangement would appear to be purely coincidental and shore-side appendages are known from elsewhere in Galloway. (27) The building tradition represented by the crannog is purely native and extends back into remote prehistory. Within Wigtownshire some thirty-four monuments of this type are known, plus an equally considerable number where natural island sites or outcrops in bogs have been similarly utilised. The majority date to the Iron Age, but a number are clearly of medieval date. These may have formed the residences of members of the native aristocracy. The use of crannogs need not be taken to imply inferiority or backwardness and it is clear that they formed an important element in the pattern of lordly settlement in the later Middle Ages. Burned Island in Loch Ken, the 'insula Arsa' of Edward Balliol's charter to William de Aldeburgh, and mentioned also in Wyntoun's chronicle, (28) is almost certainly a crannog site associated with the lords of Galloway themselves. From this island the lands of Kells and Crossmichael were administered before the development of Kenmure. Its alternative name, Erisbutil, (29) a name of Anglian origin which contains the generic botl, implying a hall of high status, suggests an importance of considerable antiquity.

From the middle of the 13th century major changes are evident in the nature of the main fortresses of the lordship. At the key group, formed by Cruggleton, Wigtown, Kirkcudbright and Buittle, there is a shift to building in stone, which resulted in a series of fine 13th century castles of enceinte, comparable with current developments elsewhere in Scotland. Of these strongholds, Wigtown alone was definitely a royal castle by 1260, whilst Kirkcudbright was probably Roger de Quincy's stronghold until its appropriation by the Crown towards the end of the century. Cruggleton's main development can be attributed to the later years of the lifetime of Alan or the period of its ownership by the Comyns, whilst the main work at Buittle may belong to the later part of its possession by the Balliols.

Of this group of four castles, only Cruggleton has undergone excavation in recent years. The findings of this work point to a radical alteration in the layout of the fortress, with the timber buildings of the motte and bailey being replaced by a substantial stone-built curtain wall with gate-house and towers, which enclosed a massive keep-like tower on the summit of the old motte. Dating evidence from occupation levels associated with this phase of reconstruction points towards the first half of the 13th century for the execution of the major part of the work. (30) This suggests that it was probably carried out in the later years of Alan's lordship, or under Roger de Quincy rather than his Comyn successors. Analogies have been drawn between the curtain wall defences at Cruggleton and the 13th century castles of enceinte on the western sea-board, such as Mingarry, Tioram or Dunstaffnage (31) and there is certainly more in the way of kinship in terms of siting and plan with those strongholds than with contemporary castles in eastern or central Scotland, such as Dirleton, Kildrummy and Bothwell. Although distinctly 'native' in character, with angular layout and crude constructional techniques contrasting with the scientifically-planned fortresses like Caerlaverock, certain refined features, such as the elaborate gate-house, indicate its builders' familiarity with current developments in ideas concerning defence. The excavator draws parallels with similar buildings in Ulster, such as Dundrum Castle. These factors serve to stress the probability that this work was carried out by Alan rather than Roger de Quincy or the Comyns, his double character of Anglo-Norman baron and Celtic chieftain fitting with the hybrid nature of the castle.

A striking contrast is provided by the remains of the great stone fortress at Castledykes in Kirkcudbright, excavated in stages from 1911 to 1913. (32) Here were uncovered the foundations of a large 13th century stone castle of enceinte set in the centre of a complex of possibly earlier outer earthwork defences. There are no close parallels to this plan, but certain of its features have similarities with elements at Bothwell, Kildrummy and particularly Dirleton, especially in its massive gate-house and the donjon towers. Although not documented until 1288 (33) and occurring with greater regularity in the period 1290-2, (34) there is nothing to suggest that it was not built considerably earlier, executed by Roger de Quincy or perhaps built under Crown supervision after his death. An examination of the pottery recovered in the course of Robison's excavations, which were restricted to pursuing wall lines and left the interior untouched, showed the presence of an important assemblage of late 13th and early 14th century imported wares, as well as a substantial body of largely undatable vessels of probably local manufacture. (35) This provides no conclusive evidence for the date of the castle's construction.

Of the castles of Wigtown and Buittle considerably less is known, no work having been carried out at the latter and only an unpublished examination undertaken in the early 19th century having occurred at the former. (36) Wigtown appears by origin to have been a royal castle, established in conjunction with the formation of the sheriffdom in the mid 13th century. Its first appearance in official records occurs in 1265, when expenses for the employment of a certain Peter the Mason to carry out repairs on 'houses' within the castle are mentioned in the sheriff's accounts for that year. (37) In 1286 it was seized by the earl of Carrick in the course of his raid into the region, (38) and in 1290 was one of the south-western castles placed under Edward I's control during the hearing of the Great Cause. (39) The early 14th century saw its use as one of the key strongholds in the English defence of the region, probably resulting in its capture and slighting by Edward Bruce in his campaigns between 1308 and 1312. It appears never to have subsequently been rebuilt.

Buittle Castle has undergone no serious examination beyond its survey by the Royal Commission in 1911 (40) and its resurvey in early 1987 following the clearance of trees from the site (not yet published). The remains of the castle, represented by fragments of a twin-towered gate-house and irregular curtain wall occupying the summit of a level platform above a crossing point of the Urr, point to a later 13th century date for its construction. The visible remains on the site possibly represent its development as an English garrison after 1296. Despite the probability of an earlier structure on the site, possibly dating back to an original Anglian botl, the surviving remnants are all of much later date. The earthworks alone may belong to the fortress of the Balliols. This is certainly a site which would reward excavation.

Major stone castles, as represented by the four given above, were expensive to build and maintain, a point indicated by the rarity of their occurrence. Within Galloway they appear to have been the work solely of the lords of Galloway or their successors, the financial outlay involved in such buildings being beyond the capabilities of the lesser nobility. Until the development of the tower-house in the later 14th century, as represented by the Douglas stronghold of Threave, these were the only significant stone-built fortifications in Galloway. The absence of any such structures built by the lesser lords suggests that the tradition of construction in earth and timber may have continued through the 13th and into the 14th century, with the mottes remaining as the most common form. Certainly, at Urr Hope-Taylor found evidence for the continued use of part of the site throughout the 13th century, although the tower on the motte summit may have been allowed to fall into decay. (41) Outwith Galloway, at Roberton in Clydesdale, there is pottery evidence for the continued use of the small motte there into the 14th century. (42) but this slight evidence is not sufficient to build up any argument about the longevity of the motte-building tradition.

It is possible that the more settled conditions of the later 13th century saw a switch towards less heavily-defended sites of a more clearly residential form, but the evidence for such a development in Galloway is slim. Charles Thomas's excavations on Ardwall Island uncovered the foundations of what was interpreted as the footing, undercroft or built cellarage of a major timber hall dating from c.1250 to 1350. (43) The building, forming one side of a small courtyard, has no obvious defensive characteristics beyond its siting on a tidal islet. Two other island sites preserve remains of similar buildings. On Hestan Island in the Rough Firth are the unexcavated remains of what has been interpreted as Edward Balliol's manor-house. (44) This survives as a rectangular stone foundation set in an irregular enclosure. This structure appears to represent the cellarage occupying the basement beneath a large hall at first floor level. The third example comprises part of a complex of buildings, largely of later medieval date, which occupy an island in Castle Loch at Mochrum. (45) The earliest part of the building here has been interpreted as a 13th century chapel on an early monastic site, enlarged and converted in the 14th century into a major hall with appartments at either end. No excavation has been carried out on the site, but the clearance of rubble in the last century produced thirteen coins which range in date from 1272 to 1346. This fits the chronological range suggested by Thomas at Ardwall.

These buildings appear to fit into Cruden's 'hall-house' category, (46) which he describes as analogous with the English fortified manor-house. Certain aspects of his identification of hall-houses and the dating of some of his examples have been challenged, but his argument still holds good in its generalities. Such structures as represented by Craigie in Ayrshire and Rait in Nairnshire appear to have belonged to men of middling status, for whom the chauvinistic declaration of power and wealth implicit in the greater castles of enceinte was an aspiration beyond their resources. Wealthier families or individuals, such as the Randolphs or Douglases at Morton or the Bishop of Orkney at Kirkwall, did occasionally adopt the form, but the majority appear to have been built by men of lesser means. (47) The paucity of their survival need not be taken to indicate an original rarity of the form, the few examples extant probably representing only the manifestation in stone of what was probably mainly a tradition in timber building. Certainly, the Ardwall example appears largely to have been of wooden construction with at most a stone basement. Their disappearance as a form of lordly residence by the later 14th century is probably the result of the general instability of the country after 1296, with lightly fortified halls no longer being sufficient defence against raiding parties. As a class of building they are a seriously neglected aspect of 13th and 14th century noble settlement, with the fine surviving examples attracting all the detailed examination and debate. Little attempt has been made to determine the numbers or distribution of these sites throughout Scotland, or to determine the social position of their owners. They are a group most worthy of more detailed examination.

The two kinds of evidence examined in this chapter, the documentary and the archaeological, reveal a striking dichotomy in the study of the colonisation of Galloway from c.1150 to 1250 and the development of the lesser lordships of the vassals of the lords of Galloway. Documentary source material indicates only a relatively minor but protracted influx of foreigners, who arrived less as conquerors and more as invited colonists. The majority appear to have been brought in by the lords themselves, being kinsmen related through marriage, although the settlement need not have been carried out entirely with the willing support of the native populace.

By way of contrast, the archaeological material, based almost entirely on non-excavational fieldwork, suggest a more thorough-going take-over of the lordship by foreigners. Evidence for Anglo-Norman settlement rests almost entirely on the plotting of the distribution of mottes, which can only in a few cases be married with the documentary material. This more radical colonisation seems to gain support from the writings of the 12th century chroniclers, who, depending upon the interpretation placed on their work, seem to imply that Roland's success in 1185-6 was resultant from military conquest and the wholesale importation of foreign knights. The occurrence of mottes in almost every medieval parish does at first sight appear to imply the establishment of Anglo-Norman nobles in all the major manors, but this is too simplistic an interpretation of the physical evidence. In view of the continued importance in 13th and 14th century of families of native Celtic origin, it would seem unlikely that the 12th century had witnessed their social degradation beneath an incoming tide of land-hungry foreigners. Many of the mottes, more than just a few 'native anomalies', are almost certainly the products of the Galwegians themselves, the new fashion being adapted swiftly to meet local needs. The lord of Galloway himself, at Cruggleton, adopted the motte and bailey form for his castle. Without the more firm evidence from a programme of selective excavations at a number of motte sites, arguments for a major Anglo-Norman colonisation of Galloway in the later 12th century cannot be safely advanced.

Footnotes to Chapter 5 pt iii

1. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xxii-xxiii.
2. *The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland*. Fifth Report and Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in Galloway, ii, County of the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright (Edinburgh, 1914), No 263.
3. G.Ewart, *Cruggleton Castle. Report of Excavations 1978-81* (Dumfries, 1985), 18-22.
4. C.J.Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway. Recent fieldwork in the Stewartry', in D.Breeze (ed), *Studies in Scottish Antiquity Presented to Stewart Cruden* (Edinburgh, 1984), 121.
5. ibid, 118.
6. Ewart, *Cruggleton Castle*, 18-22; *RCAHMS*, Galloway, i, No 149.
7. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 436.
8. G.Stell, *Exploring Scotland's Heritage. Dumfries and Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1986), 115.
9. Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr', 167-72.
10. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xxiii.
11. *RCAHMS*, Galloway, ii, No 385.
12. Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 122.
13. *Roger of Howden*, ii, 63.
14. Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr', 171.
15. *The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Scotland*, xxiv, West Rhins (Edinburgh, 1985), 185.
16. G.G.Simpson and B.Webster, 'Charter evidence and the distribution of mottes in Scotland', in Stringer (ed), *Essays on the Nobility*, 10; Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 122.
17. S.H.Cruden, *The Scottish Castle*, 3rd edition (Edinburgh, 1981), 10.
18. *Wigtownshire Charters*, xxii-xxiii.
19. Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 120-1.
20. ibid, 102, 106, 111; *RCAHMS*, Galloway, i, No 200; *RCAHMS*, Galloway, ii, No 337.
21. Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 105-7.
22. ibid, 96-98.
23. *RCAHMS*, Galloway, ii, No 331; Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 109-10.
24. J.Barbour, 'An account of excavations at Lochrutton lake-dwelling', *TDGAS*, xvii (1902-03), 246-54.
25. Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 110.
26. J.Williams, 'A crannog at Loch Arthur, New Abbey', *TDGAS*, xlviii (1971), 121-4.
27. *RCAHMS*, Galloway, i, No 98.
28. SRO RH/1/2 1 December 1352; *Chron.Wyntoun*, 477.
29. Brooke, 'The Glenkens', 43.
30. Ewart, *Cruggleton Castle*, 22-36.
31. ibid, 34-5.
32. J.Robison, *Kirkcudbright (St.Cuthbert's Town): Its Mote, Castle, Monastery and Parish Churches* (Dumfries, 1926), 54-86; *RCAHMS*, Galloway, ii, No 262.
33. *ER*, i, 39.
34. *CDS*, ii, Nos 520, 547, 550, 572, 580, 582, 589.

35. G.C.Dunning et al, 'Kirkcudbright Castle, its pottery and ironwork', PSAS, xci (1957-8), 117-38.
36. M'Kerlie, Lands and Their Owners, ii, 151.
37. ER, i, 30-31.
38. Palgrave, Docs Hist Scot, i, 42-43.
39. CDS, ii, No 520.
40. RCAHMS, Galloway, ii, No 74; Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', 99.
41. Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr', 170-1.
42. C.J.Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Upper Clydesdale: Recent archaeological fieldwork', TDGAS, liii (1977-8), 117.
43. C.Thomas, 'Ardwall Island. The excavation of an early church site of Irish type', TDGAS, xliii (1966), 88.
44. C.A.Ralegh Radford, 'Balliol's manor house on Hestan Island', TDGAS, xxxv (1956-7), 33-7.
45. C.A.Ralegh Radford, 'Castle Loch, Mochrum', TDGAS, xxviii (1949-50), 41-63.
46. Cruden, The Scottish Castle, 91-99.
47. Duncan, The Making of the Kingdom, 441-2.

Chapter 6

A Spiritual Counterpart: The Galwegian Church c1000-1250

In any study of the role of the Church in the history of Galloway the researcher is hindered by the dearth of native documentation concerned with the origins and structure of the local arrangements. Some material does survive, mostly in charter form, recording grants of land and privileges to monasteries. The bulk of these gifts, however, were made to establishments outwith Galloway, which acted as little other than distant landlords. The cartularies of all the Galwegian monasteries have been lost, apart from a few stray documents in royal registers or late records of feuing preserved at the Reformation by the new owners of the former monastic estates. (1) Likewise, the episcopal registers have been destroyed. In compensation for this, however, the registers of successive archbishops of York (2) contain a wealth of material concerned with elections at Whithorn, internal politics of the Galwegian see, its administration during vacancies and the role of its bishops as suffragans of York. This, however, sheds little light on other matters, such as the thorny question of the revival of the see, the state of the Galwegian Church before the 12th century and the evolution of the parish system in the diocese. For these topics information scattered through a variety of sources must be pieced together to give at least a limited overview of the structure.

Background c.450-c.1000

Despite its traditional position as the location of Scotland's first recorded church, much of the ecclesiastical history of Galloway down to the 12th century is totally obscure. Knowledge of the earliest phases of Christian activity is limited to epigraphical and hagiographical sources, with recent archaeological and onomastic work beginning to make a significant contribution to the pool of information. It is generally accepted that Christian communities were present in the region by the mid 5th century and formed the basis upon which the 'Ninianic Mission' was founded. Hagiographical tradition portrays Ninian or Nynia as a priest trained in the Roman tradition and drawn from native Brythonic stock. (3) Knowledge of the origins of his mission and its development subsequent to his death is scanty, and relies on fragmentary historical and archaeological sources. Debate still rages about the location of Nynia's Candida Casa, the date of its establisment and the very existence of a single 'St.Ninian' at the core of the hagiography rather than a composite figure built out of traditions concerning several men. (4)

Archaeological evidence, whilst neither confirming nor denying the existence of Nynia, points strongly towards Whithorn as being the chief centre of early missionary work in western Galloway. This position of hegemony was retained throughout the Middle Ages by the church there. (5) The programme of excavations at Whithorn which commenced in 1984 has largely confirmed the findings of earlier archaeologists, producing evidence indicative of the site's high status and local dominance in the 5th to 7th centuries. (6) The nature of the earliest phase of the Christian settlement is still indeterminate, but it is probable that the remains are those of a large religious community with attendant secular settlement. Whithorn, however, was not alone in Galloway, for a second site at Kirkmadrine probably performed a similar missionary role in the Rhins. (7) Evidence for similar establishments of early date in eastern Galloway is so far unknown from the archaeological record, with the late 7th century chapel at Ardwall being the earliest ecclesiastical site excavated in that region. (8) Place-names and hagiographical traditions, however, suggest late 6th century missionary work in the region between the Urr and the Nith, perhaps based on Kentigern's supposed monastery at Hoddam. (9) Dedications to St.Brioc at Dunrod and Machutus (Malo) at Wigtown, both missionary priests and better known from Welsh, Cornish and Breton contexts, point to continuing links with the Romano-British and Gallic worlds. The coastal distribution of these sites suggests that the western seaways may have formed as important a medium for missionary contacts as links with centres in Strathclyde-Cumbria. (10)

The development of the Galwegian Church after the 'Ninianic' period is largely a matter of surmise. Evidence for the influx of Irish settlers into western Galloway and some material in Irish hagiographical sources, the latter open to alternative interpretations, has led to the suggestion that Whithorn may have developed into a monastic and educational centre in the Irish manner. (11) The excavations at Whithorn, however, have so far failed to produce any evidence for such a development, although Charles Thomas would assign Irish characteristics to the early enclosure surrounding the 13th century chapel at the Isle of Whithorn. (12) Findings to date at Whithorn itself suggest the continuity of the British community down to the late 7th or early 8th century. After 700, Whithorn underwent major changes in conjunction with the Anglian takeover in Galloway. It would appear that the links formed with York at that time were strong enough to ensure that when the see of Whithorn was reorganised in the 12th century the Archbishop of York was able to establish his metropolitan supremacy over the diocese.

Anglian control of Galloway appears to have stimulated a new burst of ecclesiastical activity, with Whithorn again serving as the spiritual focus. Evidence for this comes mainly from the distinctive sculptural forms which developed under the Northumbrian aegis. These are concentrated most heavily in the Machars, but with outlying groups around the head of Luce Bay and the Dee and Fleet estuaries. These apparently pin-point the chief centres of the Anglian Church and the distribution of estates possessed by the chief monasteries. (13) Structural remains assignable to an Anglian phase have been uncovered at Whithorn, which point to a revitalisation of the site in the 8th and 9th centuries. (14) This matches neatly with the written evidence which records the establishment of a Northumbrian bishopric at Whithorn shortly before 731, with a succession of bishops continuing down to the early 9th century. (15) This period coincides with the apogee of Northumbrian power in the region, which reached its peak in 750 with Eadberht's annexation of Kyle. (16) Anglian influence is generally believed to have gone into decline thereafter, hence the apparent break in the episcopal succession after Badulf, the last known incumbent. Such an abandonment would parallel the similar disappearance of the short-lived see of Abercorn following the loss of Northumbrian control over southern Pictland in 685. (17) Archaeological evidence from Whithorn, however, suggests that although the line of bishops possibly ended soon after 800, the monastery continued to function and maintained contacts with the Anglo-Saxon world throughout the 9th century. (18) with little evidence for any decline.

Whithorn, Kirkmadrine and two other possible sites in eastern Galloway formed the chief centres of the Church in Galloway before 1000. Evidence for less important sites is surprisingly meagre and rests largely on the study of sculptural material, but some excavation work has been undertaken. Thomas's excavations at Ardwall Island suggested a 'floruit' in the 8th century and abandonment in the course of the 10th century. (19) Examination of the skeletal remains from the cemetery associated with the late chapel showed the presence of adults and children of both sexes, which indicates its use by the local population. Ardwall probably should not be seen as an embryonic parish, the presence of fragments of a corner-post shrine suggests rather a primary role as a cult centre. Its pastoral function was probably a secondary and later development. There is nothing to suggest that it was a proprietory chapel on a nobleman's property and its eventual decay may have been symptomatic of the development of a more convenient centre on the mainland.

Not all early cult sites passed into oblivion and some may have risen to attain parochial status. This may have been the case with St.Brioc's church at Dunrod, and was certainly so at such sites as Kirkmaiden-in-Farines. (20) The remote position of the latter, at the foot of steep slopes dropping into Monreith Bay, was probably the diseart of some hermit, which developed later as a centre for popular devotion despite its relative inaccessibility. While it is clearly unwise to read too much importance into the numerous sites with names heavy with religious significance which dot the map of Galloway, their widespread distribution points to a vigorous Christian tradition permeating all levels of society in the populous districts of the region.

Saint dedications are a field of inquiry full of pitfalls for even the most scholarly examination and are frequently of little help in the construction of chronologies when unsupported by archaeological and documentary materials. The dedication of certain sites to obscure Celtic saints, as at Dunrod and Wigtown, may be indicative of early origins, and preserve a memory of missions in the region, (21) but the revival of interest in the cults of otherwise obscure saints in the later Middle Ages makes this dangerous ground. Much weight has been attached to the kirk- and kil- prefixes associated with many of the ecclesiastical sites connected with Irish saints, but renewed controversy surrounding the dating and significance of these elements has produced a wide range of speculations, which throws doubt on their value as indicators of early origins. (22)

Dedications to Anglian saints, or those favoured by the Anglian Church, however, such as Andrew, Cuthbert, Michael and Oswald, occurring at Parton, Balmaghie, Kirkandrews and Kelton, (23) are of great importance in charting the spread of Northumbrian ecclesiastical influence. The nature of these sites, whether chapels, preaching-stations or monastic, is largely unknown. In the absence of more extensive research, therefore, it can only be said that the Christian tradition in Galloway survived the political upheavals which followed the collapse of Northumbrian power in the mid 9th century. The structure of the regional Church can only be hinted at, but it is probable that by about 1000 it was reduced to isolated groups of secular clergy in pseudo-monastic establishments, ministering to the needs of a dispersed population, rather than a regular hierarchy based on a diocese with a rudimentary parochial system, such as had begun to emerge in Anglo-Saxon England. (24) The local Church, however, could not operate entirely without the services of a bishop, and some provision must have been made. Whilst there is no firm indication of how such service was secured, the long-standing relationship with York should probably be seen as the key factor. When the diocese of Galloway reemerged in the early 12th century, the archbishops of York played a significant part in the process (see below 267-74). The implication of this is that the Northumbrian Church, rather than the Scots or Irish, maintained its links with Galloway after Anglian political control had terminated.

Ecclesiastical Survival c.1000-c.1128

Despite the social and political upheavals of the period down to c.1000, it is clear that Galloway had not lapsed into pagan barbarism. The Church may have been forced into retrenchment outwith certain key centres, but it is clear that at these sites Christian worship continued. Evidence for the organisation of the Church in the last century before the reorganisation of the diocese is slim, but the surviving source material points to a number of specific regional centres which served clear geographical districts.

The most significant evidence is provided by the sculptural remains. Groups of related sculptures can be shown to have precise, mutually exclusive spheres, focussing on one major church site. Whithorn is the most obvious example, but other groups of sculpture in the Glenkens region and in the district around Glenluce point to the existence of some important ecclesiastical foci in those places.

Kirkcudbright appears to occupy a similar role for the lower Dee valley. In this last instance, however, there is supporting documentary evidence, of 12th century date, for the existence of a minster-type church. This was visited in the late 1160s by Ailred of Rievaulx, at which time it was described as a small stone structure, dedicated to St.Cuthbert, standing in a walled cemetery. (25) It appears to have developed into a minor cult centre, one penitential pilgrim being described by Reginald of Durham as receiving absolution for his crimes whilst praying at the church during Ailred's visit. (26)

The minster or collegiate character of the Kirkcudbright establishment is suggested by the nature of the clerics attached to it. Reginald describes one as a scholar, (27) and others as clerks '...or in the language of the Picts Scollofthes...'. (28) The interpretation of the nature of this community by the 1160s is problematical, but it is certainly likely that what is being described is the Celticised survival of an earlier Anglian minster, perhaps retaining some role as a centre of teaching or clerical training. The only tangible remnant of this early Anglian church is part of the head of a Northumbrian cross of late 8th or early 9th century style (29). The most significant indicator of an educational role is the presence of 'scollofthes'. Robertson, in his study of the scholastic offices in the Celtic Church, described the scollofthes as members of the lowest grade in a hierarchy of positions, running from 'scoloc' to 'ferleiginn'. (30) Reginald of Durham, by his linking of the Latin forms clericus and scolasticus with the Gaelic scollofthe, was clearly aware of the inferior status of these men. Robertson, citing Continental sources, equated the Scottish examples with the 'clerici' and 'scholares' of Carolingian Europe, terms implying a position subordinate to that of a priest. The Kirkcudbright examples appear to be identical with the 'scolocs' or 'scologs' of north-east Scotland, associated with the late Celtic monasteries at Arbuthnott, Ellon and Monymusk. Unlike the north-eastern scolocs, however, the Kirkcudbright scollofthes appear to have retained a more strictly ecclesiastical function, serving in the church there. The scolocs of Aberdeenshire and the Mearns appear to have degenerated by the 12th century into some form of tenant bondsman of very low social status. (31)

Kirkcudbright's importance as an ecclesiastical centre continued after the end of the 12th century, but nothing more is heard of the scollofthes after Ailred's visit. It was probably their church which, as 'St.Cuthbert's of Desnesmor', (32) was granted to Holyrood Abbey by Uhtred. The title given to the church is most striking and suggests that it may have been the former head church of the territory which had become the deanery of Desnes or Desnesmor. Certainly, there was no other church dedicated to Cuthbert in the vicinity which might have necessitated the adoption of this distinction to avoid confusion. The deanery district could have developed from the original 'paruchia' of the former minster. St.Cuthbert's certainly had an exalted status in comparison with the other churches of the deanery, receiving gifts of land into the 13th century. Between 1200 and 1210 it received a portion of Sypland, (33) an estate in the extreme east of the medieval parish. Such grants to parish churches are more common in England, where former minsters declined to parish status as a regular system developed, but retained their former prominence on account of their possession of outlying chapels and superior landed resources.

Outstanding examples of this can be seen in the major Yorkshire parishes where the former minsters later became collegiate churches, as at Beverley, Howden or Ripon.

Within south-western Scotland as a whole it is possible to identify a group of churches which appear to have served as mother-churches for quite substantial areas. This group has a marked riverine distribution and the churches occupy central locations within the valleys of the major rivers flowing into the Solway. In Glasgow diocese Hoddam and Applegarth appear as early foci for Annandale, (34) and in Nithsdale it is possible that a site at Dumfries served the lower part of the valley, whilst the rich collection of Anglian sculpture around Thornhill and Closeburn might indicate the presence of a second centre further up the river. A third possibility in the lordship of Nithsdale is offered by Glencairn church, an unusually large and fine building, retaining some high quality 13th century details. Set in what was one of the principal subdivisions of Nithsdale, forming also one of the principal 'partes' of the diocese of Glasgow named by Pope Lucius in his general confirmation of the possessions of the Church of Glasgow, (35) Glencairn was one of the wealthiest churches in the region. (36) This later prominence may reflect an earlier tradition as mother-church of the valley before the 12th century.

Galloway proper, comprising both the diocese of Whithorn and that portion of Glasgow between the Urr and the Nith, can be divided into similar blocks, of which the latter district, Desnes Ioan, is one. Despite arguments advanced by Reid, however, there is no indication of any specific head church in this territory, (37) nor has any pre 12th century ecclesiastical sculpture been found in its limits. In this sense it is quite distinct from the remainder of Galloway, a position perhaps reflecting its long attachment to Glasgow and late inclusion within the political sphere of the lords of Galloway (see above 15-17). Kirkcudbright presumably exercised control over the coastal districts around the Fleet and Dee estuaries, a territory roughly coextensive with the medieval deanery of Desnes. Its sphere of influence may have extended over the short-lived deanery of Glenken also, but a distinctive group of sculpture in the district around Carsphairn, identified by Craig, (38) indicates the former existence of some independent focus. Whithorn, whose sphere of influence is marked by the Whithorn school crosses, appears to have served the Machars primarily, but perhaps also the sparsely settled uplands of the Cree basin. This would correspond roughly with the core of the medieval deanery of Farines. Evidence for the rest of the diocese is more flimsy. Kirkmadrine in the Rhins, undoubtedly important in the 6th to 9th centuries, has produced no evidence for its development into a major monastic centre, and its medieval successor-parish, Toskerton, was amongst the most poorly endowed in the deanery. (39) An alternative focus for the western portion of Galloway was proposed by Radford to lie on an island in Castle Loch at Mochrum. (40) Despite the existence of a large 13th century chapel on the island, no evidence of an earlier ecclesiastical establishment was found, and the hypothesis that this was the target for pilgrims landing at Chapel Finnian has little to commend it. (41) Craig, however, has identified a less sharply defined group of sculpture lying around the head of Luce Bay, and suggests that some major centre did exist west of Whithorn. (42)

It was probably on such churches that the main weight of responsibility for maintaining Christian worship was to fall before the revival of the bishopric in the early 12th century. The only evidence for an interest in Galwegian affairs from a major non-Galwegian ecclesiastical centre is the group of properties north of Kirkcudbright which belonged to Iona Abbey in the 12th century (see below 298-9). The circumstances by which Iona gained control of these properties is unknown, but may be of ancient origin and could possibly date from the period before the Synod of Whitby when Columban influence was dominant in Northumbria. This instance apart, there is little to suggest that the organisation of the Galwegian Church was based on a more elaborate system prior to the reorganisation of the see.

Like their English counterparts in their heyday, the minsters would have been head churches for extensive districts, acting as home-bases for clergy going out to serve the spiritual needs of inhabitants of more remote districts. Satellite chapels, dependent upon the mother-church, commonly developed in outlying areas and often later acquired full parochial status. Prior to the establishment of a regular network of parishes (a process not complete in Galloway until the close of the 13th century), Christian worship in the localities was conducted on a more ad hoc basis. Services may have been simple open-air assemblies, with a high cross forming the focus for devotions led by an itinerant priest. Galloway is not alone in producing evidence for such crosses, the most famous Scottish examples occurring in Nithsdale and Annandale, with superb survivals from Ruthwell, Closeburn and Nith Bridge. (43) Within Galloway the most remarkable lie at Corsewall House in the Rhins and the Monreith Cross, the latter moved to the museum at Whithorn. (44) Less impressive examples have been found at a number of later medieval parish church sites, such as Penninghame and Wigtown . (45) Where fragments of several crosses are recorded it is possible that gravestones are represented, indicating the growth of cemeteries around primary foci.

The distribution of the medieval church sites which have produced remains of 10th or 11th century crosses displays a strongly western bias. Its greatest concentration is in the Machars, indicating a clear link with Whithorn. This 'Whithorn school' is the most distinctive assemblage, in both stylistic and geographical terms. Its distribution is largely limited to the south and east of the peninsula, being contained to the north and west by the uplands of central Wigtownshire. The compact territory so defined represents the populous zone served by Whithorn, the crosses perhaps representing focal points at the main settlements in the pattern of multiple estates that made up the monastic properties. These preaching crosses may form the basis of an embryonic parish system that had begun to take on concrete form in the later 12th century. Its development may have been slow, but in the second quarter of the 12th century it received a major stimulus in the form of the revived see of Whithorn.

Episcopal Revival

In the first half of the 12th century the basic structure of the Scottish Church underwent a period of radical development, (46) with the old diocesan structure receiving a major overhaul. The earlier structure had fallen into decay, with few incumbents recorded in any of the ancient sees in the course of the 11th century. (47) Some sees may have been abandoned for prolonged periods. In Whithorn's case no known incumbent is recorded from the early 9th century until the appointment of Gilla-Aldan in the late 1120s. (48) This may be an extreme example, but even the principal Scottish see of St.Andrews did not enjoy an unbroken episcopal succession. (49) Certainly, the Scottish Church was never entirely without bishops, but irregular provision was intolerable in the reformed climate pervading the 12th century Church.

At this point the question of how the regional Church succeeded in maintaining its functions in the probable absence of a convenient local bishop must be addressed. Bishops were essential for many of the basic acts of the Church, notably ordination, consecration and the provision of chrism. In Galloway's case, where no bishop is recorded for over three centuries, some alternative long-term source must have satisfied the needs of the local clergy and people. The question of supply revolves around the location of the nearest convenient and politically acceptable source. This considerably narrows the available options.

The preeminent position of the bishops of Glasgow in southern Scotland in general makes them the most obvious contenders for this honour. Certainly, in the 10th century when Strathclyde-Cumbria was at its peak of territorial expansion, the bishops of Glasgow must have enjoyed a vastly-expanded sphere of influence, but to what extent this covered Galloway is open to serious question.

The political significance of the distinct status of Desnes Ioan has been discussed earlier, it therefore remains to address the question of the implications of its attachment to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishops of Glasgow. Past scholars have debated the significance of Desnes Ioan's inclusion within Glasgow diocese and the date of this arrangement. Reid proposed that the separation was effected by William the Lion, probably during the 1186-9 vacancy at Whithorn, and that it was bound up in the question of regional politics and strategy, (50) a view echoed by Scott but only with regard to the political motives. (51) Both saw the district as having formerly formed part of the diocese of Galloway. Skene, however, believed that before the revival of Whithorn the whole of Galloway had fallen under Glasgow's jurisdiction, (52) forming part of David I's territories. Retention of control over Desnes Ioan by the bishops of Glasgow, in his view, must date from the establishment of Whithorn in the late 1120s. Neither view takes into account the probability that the region between the Urr and the Nith was a late addition to the lordship, presumably attached originally to Nithsdale. Both preferred to regard the boundaries of the lordship as being fixed before 1160. The diocese of Galloway, therefore, covered the area of the lordship as it existed in the time of Fergus. By the time that Desnes Ioan was transferred to the possession of Uhtred, the ecclesiastical boundaries, presumably dating back to the Cumbrian period, had crystallised along the lines they were to preserve down to the Reformation.

In addition to the above point concerning the limitation of Glasgow's role in Galloway, there are further difficulties revolving around the evidence for prolonged breaks in the episcopal succession at Glasgow itself. Even in periods where there are recorded bishops, particularly in the later 11th century, there are serious doubts about their status and whether in fact they ever functioned within their nominal see. (53) It is quite probable that they served as suffragans of York in the region which later became the diocese of Carlisle, never exercising any real jurisdiction over the Scottish portion of the sprawling territories of Strathclyde-Cumbria. There is, moreover, evidence to suggest that in the course of vacancies at Glasgow the provincial clergy normally served by that see looked to the Anglian Church, York or its suffragan see at Durham, to meet its needs, especially in the provision of chrism. (54) This arrangement probably added force to York's later claims of metropolitan authority over the Scottish sees, but must have made considerable sense at the time.

The vacancies at Glasgow and provision for the supply of chrism to that see by the archbishops of York through the medium of the Church of Durham raise the question of how Galloway coped at such times, if it is to be accepted that Glasgow was the source of supply for the whole of the south-west. Whilst the other northern dioceses, including Durham and St.Andrews, experienced upheavals or vacancies, only at York was there almost unbroken continuity over the crucial period from the 9th to 12th centuries. In view of the historical links between Whithorn and York, dating from at least the 8th century, it was probably from the latter that Galloway was served. Considering that it was deemed viable for York to arrange for provision of chrism for Glasgow in the early 12th century, there is no difficulty in postulating an identical source of supply for Galloway from much earlier. There are alternative locations from which Galloway may have obtained ecclesiastical services, most notably in Man and the Isles or Ireland, but the traditional link with York points strongly in that direction.

It could be assumed that the connection between the two dioceses, evident from Whithorn's revival in c.1128, represented the resurrection of ties forged in the Anglian period. There is, however, no reason to suppose that communication with the Northumbrian Church ended in 867 with the fall of York to the Danes. At the end of the 9th century the Lindisfarne community found temporary shelter at Whithorn (55) in what was undoubtedly still an Anglian monastery. The Danish conquest of York may in fact have stimulated ties with Galloway, as Scandinavian colonisation of north-western England and southern Dumfriesshire (56) preserved a corridor of contact between the former Northumbrian heartland and the Solway region. The development of ties between York and Dublin opened up other possible means of maintaining contacts between York and Galloway, particularly after the southwards expansion of Strathclyde in the 10th century may have closed off the land routes. Integration into the pattern of seaways and mercantile links of the Hiberno-Norse world of the Irish Sea province, connected with the east-west routes between northern England and Dublin, may have kept open the lines of communication with the Church of York.

The reappearance of a bishop of Whithorn some three and a quarter centuries after the consecration of his last known predecessor has occasioned much debate as to his origins and the implications attendant upon the revival of the see. The documentation concerning the event is singularly uninformative. What survives is a mandate of Pope Honorius II, (57) dated to December 1128, ordering an un-named bishop-elect of Whithorn to present himself to his 'appropriate metropolitan', Archbishop Thurstan of York, for consecration. This is followed by a record of an oath of obedience sworn by Gilla-Aldan, elect of Whithorn, to Thurstan at York between c.1128 and 1140, (58) presumably made at the time of the bishop's consecration. These simple documents screen a complex background of political and ecclesiastical manoeuvres, deeply concerned with the issue of York's claims to metropolitan supremacy over the Scottish sees, and also the relationship between Galloway, its rulers and the Scottish Crown.

More questions are posed than answered by these two documents. The most contentious regards the identity of the agency responsible for Gilla-Aldan's appointment, with two main rival candidates contending for that distinction. David I's role as the driving force behind the reorganisation of the Scottish Church (59) has led on occasion to the revival at Whithorn being attributed to him. (60) The opposing view is that Fergus of Galloway revived the see independently of the Crown. (61) Both interpretations are burdened with difficulties. In David's case there are serious doubts concerning the extent of his authority over the lordship at that time. With Fergus the problem is similar but simpler: there is no conclusive evidence for his control of the lordship much before 1136.

In favour of David, it has been pointed out that the diocese of Galloway was not coextensive with the bounds of the lordship, as it could be expected to have been if the lord of Galloway was the agent responsible for the revival of the see. That the remaining portion of Galloway lay under the jurisdiction of Glasgow, David's own favoured revival, may be taken as further evidence for his involvement. If it is accepted that Desnes Ioan was not appended to the lordship lands until the later 1160s, however, this argument loses strength. The diocese, as created, would then have matched the bounds of the secular lordship. There is nothing sinister, however, in this ecclesiatical division within Galloway; it simply represented an earlier political arrangement, superseded by later developments. But although it can be shown that the diocese of Galloway was coextensive with the lordship as it existed until c.1165, this in itself is not sufficient proof that its revival was the work of the local secular power rather than the king of Scots. Comparisons can be drawn with Caithness, where the bishopric initially matched the territories dominated by the earl of Orkney, but was the creation of the king of Scots, not the earl.

David's concern with the episcopal organisation of his kingdom had as many political and secular considerations at its root as pious ones. Familiarity with the elaborate system of ecclesiastical government in England and its uses in extending royal authority must certainly have been influencing factors. The bishoprics of Moray, Ross and Caithness form the clearest examples of his attempts to use bishops as royal agents. (62) The appointment of a bishop in Galloway could be seen as a precursor of this policy, representing an attempt both to install a reliable servant into a position of local power and to circumvent the influence of the archbishop of York, whom David was seeking to exclude from a say in the government of the Scottish Church. (63) Honorius's instructions to the bishop-elect to go to York for consecration and the resulting profession of obedience would represent the failure of such a policy. In one main feature, moreover, the appointment made to Whithorn diverges from the pattern which would mark it down as a royally-inspired move: the candidate elected was clearly of native origin. This contrasts strongly with David's clear preference for Anglo-Norman clergy, schooled in reformed ideals and associated with his court or the royal monasteries, as is displayed by his choice of candidates for the sees of Glasgow and

St.Andrews. At Dunkeld, Ross and Aberdeen, where there were clearly Celtic incumbents, Donaldson argues that these men were already in harness at the time of David's accession. After their deaths, however, they were replaced by non-Celtic clerics. (64) In Galloway, where the Crown lacked any land-based influence it is possible that installation of a native cleric was an expedient forced on the king, but it would thus be diametrically opposed to the approach adopted in Caithness. There a similar dearth of Crown lands did not prevent David from installing a royal candidate, although whether he was able to exercise any real or long-term episcopal authority in his see is an altogether different matter. These factors combine to argue very strongly against any significant Scottish involvement in Gilla-Aldan's appointment.

Fergus of Galloway is generally presented as the only viable alternative agency through whom the see was revived. Certainly, he played an important part in the growth of the Galwegian Church down to his overthrow in 1160, and is inseparably linked with the foundation of the priory at Whithorn. (65) This later involvement may have given rise to the belief in an earlier interest in the establishment of the see, but there is no concrete proof to link him with the appointment of Gilla-Aldan. Such an action, though, would certainly tally with Fergus's pretensions. The restoration of an independent see of Whithorn would have lent credence to his claims to royalty. Ecclesiastical independence was undoubtedly a useful tool in establishing political separation. David himself had set a precedent for this in southern Scotland with his efforts to secure a single episcopal authority within his Cumbrian territories, and was to carry this policy to its logical conclusion in his efforts to exclude York from influence in his kingdom. Fergus may simply have been emulating David's actions, although similar policies may have been adopted earlier by the native rulers of Moray and Ross. (66) In Galloway's case this could represent an assertion of independence, seeking to ensure freedom from possible ecclesiastical domination by Glasgow, a bishopric associated closely with King David.

Politics underlay the revival of the see and politics dictated the adherence of Galloway to York's metropolitan authority. This factor more than any other argues against David's involvement in the process other than as an on-looker. At the time of Whithorn's revival the king had been seeking the establishment of a Scottish province with its own archbishop. (67) David had sought to secure the consecration of the bishop-elect of St.Andrews, Robert of Scone, but was not prepared to allow him to compromise his status and that of the Scottish Church by going to York. His consecration by Thurstan came only after considerable pressure had been put on the archbishop by both David and Henry I of England. Even then, however, the issue was merely set aside temporarily, (68) leaving the crucial question of York's rights open for future settlement. Had David been instrumental in the appointment of Gilla-Aldan to the see of Whithorn it is unlikely that he would have been any less consistent in his opposition to York's claims to metropolitan authority over that see than he was with regard to St.Andrews. To have acquiesced on this occasion and allowed Gilla-Aldan to submit to Thurstan would have undermined his own stance, strengthening that of the archbishop. Only if the king's compliance represented part of the price for Thurstan's temporary relaxation of his demands over Bishop Robert would a royally-sanctioned submission make any sense. This hypothesis does have some attractions in its favour. Firstly, David must have conceded something to gain Thurstan's assistance in the consecration of Robert. The king appears to have dropped his efforts to secure a pallium for Robert at this time, a concession clearly designed to mollify York. Acknowledgement of Thurstan's metropolitan supremacy over Galloway, a region where David exercised little real influence, could have been an additional sop that would have cost the king little. Secondly, Thurstan desperately needed additional suffragan bishops to support him, both in the administration of his sprawling see and against encroachments from Canterbury. Another suffragan must have represented a considerable gain on Thurstan's part.

Against this must be measured the degree to which Thurstan's supremacy over Whithorn would have strengthened his claims concerning Scotland as a whole. Regardless of whether David was the motivating force behind the revival at Whithorn or not, in view of his efforts to avoid any recognition of York's claims over Glasgow and St.Andrews before 1126, it is unlikely that he would have conceded the point over Galloway, so defeating his own efforts to exclude Thurstan's claims of metropolitan supremacy over any part of the Scottish Church. This must be taken as a indicative of royal indifference to the fate of the Galwegian diocese. The steady maintenance of obedience to York by successive bishops of Whithorn and the absence of evidence for any royal attempt to reverse the effects of Gilla-Aldan's oath must surely indicate that they, or their political masters, were satisfied with the arrangement.

From York's viewpoint, the restoration of the see of Whithorn came at an opportune time, indeed so opportune that it is perhaps possible to see Thurstan's hand in the business. The archbishop lacked any support from within the Scottish Church and was in desperate need of improving his position before the reopening of the dispute. Support from one Scottish suffragan would boost York's claims and would go some way towards negating the value of the united front of the Scottish bishops and king opposing him. Such a move would also have suited Galwegian interests in excluding the influences of the Scottish Crown from the lordship. Gilla-Aldan's initial approach to Rome may have been engineered to gauge papal support for Thurstan. Certainly, as Innocent II's insistence on the submission of Bishop John of Glasgow to York was to show, this was beginning to swing in favour of the archbishop. (69) An additional factor to be borne in mind was Thurstan's critical lack of suffragans. York was a metropolitan see with almost no subordinate bishoprics. The strain this would have put on the functioning of the ecclesiastical government of the archdiocese is obvious, and to a reform-minded cleric like Thurstan would have been intolerable. Without the appointment of a suffragan bishop to Whithorn, the death in 1128 of Ranulf Flambard, bishop of Durham, and the subsequent five year vacancy in that see would have precipitated a grave crisis for the archbishop, as he would have had only the titular bishop of Orkney, whom he maintained in his household, to assist him in his pastoral duties. Henry I's deliberate policy of prolonging vacancies (70) ensured that Durham remained vacant. It is possible that Thurstan anticipated such a crisis and, to ease the burden of pastoral duties in his vast archdiocese, had worked to reorganise the old Northumbrian see at Whithorn.

Whithorn and York

The close links with York, re-established on a formal basis by Gilla-Aldan's profession of obedience to Thurstan, placed Galloway in a unique position amongst the Scottish sees as the archbishop's only willing suffragan in Scotland. The revived connection was maintained and strengthened in the episcopate of Gilla-Aldan's successor, Christian. He had been consecrated at Bermondsey in 1154 by the archbishop of Rouen, (71) the latter probably acting as proxy for the archbishop-elect of York. It would seem that Christian swore obedience to the new archbishop, Roger of Pont l'Évêque, continuing his predecessor's policy, but no record of this event survives. His episcopate was marked by the first clear evidence that the diocese of Candida Casa, alone amongst the Scottish sees, was firm in its intention to preserve its close links with York. This contrasts sharply with the efforts of the other bishoprics to escape from York's metropolitan supervision. In 1175, in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Falaise, the Scottish bishops had been commanded to submit to York, or more generally, to the English Church. (72) Fulfilment of that obligation was deferred until after the pope had sent a legate to England for a council to be held in 1176. A royal council, held at Northampton, degenerated into an unseemly wrangle between the archbishops of York and Canterbury over their rival claims to supremacy over the Scottish Church. (73) A second legatine mission, sent specifically to Scotland, led effectively to the freeing of the Scottish clergy from further threat from York. The bull *Super anxietatibus* (74) effectively released them from oaths of fealty extorted in 1175, and placed the onus on York to prove its rights of superiority. As stated by Duncan, (75) this bull secured the freedom of the Scottish Church, its successor *Cum universi*, issued in either 1189 or 1192. (see below 280-81) merely confirmed and strengthened the earlier arrangements.

Super anxietatibus may have provided the Scottish bishops with the means of escape which they had sought from York's metropolitan control, but it also strengthened the position of Whithorn as the archbishop's most active suffragan. In July 1177, the papal legate, Cardinal Vivian, summoned a general council of the Scottish Church to assemble at Edinburgh, (76) commanding the attendance of all the bishops. Christian of Whithorn, who may earlier have met Vivian when the legate took ship from Galloway to visit Man and Ireland, (77) defied this mandate and refused to attend the council on the grounds that his obedience lay with York, who also held a legatine commission. (78) This stance should not have been entirely unexpected, as in March 1177 Christian had been present at a council in London, (79) the only 'Scottish' bishop in attendance. As a suffragan of York Christian ought not to have been summoned by Vivian, whose legatine powers did not extend into the sphere of the legatine commission exercised by Archbishop Roger. Legally, the bishop was pursuing the correct course. Vivian's response, however, was to excommunicate Christian and to suspend him from episcopal office. Christian, relying on support from York, ignored this sentence and continued in office. (80) Although the bishop was to chose to be buried at Holmcultram in Cumbria, (81) rather than in his own cathedral, this need not be taken to imply that he had been exiled on account of his pro-York stance, but his presence in Galloway after 1177 is difficult to establish. Moreover, despite his nominal suspension from office, never revoked by Vivian, there is no record of any attempt to substitute a replacement.

If the Scots had possessed the power to remove Christian, or the bishop had lacked the support of the lord of Galloway, such a move could have been expected. Clearly, Christian's adherence to York was no mere cynical posturing aimed at playing off the two rival legates, for his subsequent career showed his true attachment to Archbishop Roger. Nor did his death in 1186 bring about a reversal of the Galwegian position, despite the major political upheavals in the lordship at that time. His successor, John, made his profession of obedience to Geoffrey, archbishop-elect of York, soon after his consecration as bishop of Whithorn, (82) and was to preserve his loyalty throughout his episcopate. Thus, when the independence of the Scottish Church was confirmed, Whithorn alone of the mainland sees was expressly omitted, being regarded both in Britain and at Rome as a suffragan of York. (83)

The political background against which Christian's stance in 1177 must be viewed shows clearly the degree to which secular interests dictated his position. Some ten months after the council at Northampton, Galloway had been placed effectively outwith the political sphere of the Scottish Crown. The rebellion against William the Lion's overlordship, triggered by the king's capture at Alnwick in 1174, had sputtered on into Autumn 1176. Henry II had dispatched William in the previous year to secure Gilbert's submission, (84) but it was not until October 1176 that the rebel lord finally made peace. (85) Significantly, despite Henry's refusal to accept the overlordship of Galloway in 1174, it is clear that he accepted the homage and fealty of Gilbert against all men, i.e. without the intermediate lordship of the king of Scots. Thus, by the terms of the peace, the Galwegians had secured most of the objectives aimed for in the rebellion, most notably freedom from Scottish overlordship. In this context, Christian's actions take on added significance. In no way could the lord of Galloway have countenanced the submission of his bishop to the Scottish Church at a time when he himself had just recently gained his independence from Scottish secular controls. The Scottish bishops were clearly associated with the political aspirations of the Canmore dynasty, serving frequently as royal agents in the drive to extend royal influence into the peripheral areas of the kingdom. But such interference would have been intolerable to Gilbert. Adherence to York, moreover, underlined Gilbert's submission to King Henry, a pointed warning to the Scots against attempting to restore their controls over Galloway. Christian's alignment with York thus represented in ecclesiastical terms Gilbert's alignment with Henry.

Despite future opportunities to reverse the effects of Christian's actions in 1177, successive bishops of Galloway maintained that link with York. The main chance came in 1185 with the death of Gilbert and seizure of power by his nephew, Roland. When this was followed in October 1186 by the death of Bishop Christian, (86) the last obstacle to drawing Galloway from the orbit of York had apparently been removed. It was at this point, however, that the full extent of Henry II's control over Galloway can be seen. Despite his initial opposition to Henry, Roland had submitted to the king at Carlisle and taken oaths of fealty and homage, (87) no less binding than Gilbert's in 1176. Galloway thus remained under the direct lordship of the English Crown and Henry continued to exploit this control to his own advantage. It is probable that the three year vacancy at Whithorn which followed Christian's death was prolonged by the king, matching his behaviour in regards to vacancies in English sees. This hypothesis is supported by the speedy provision of a candidate to the vacant diocese soon after Henry's death in July 1189, in accordance with Richard I's policy of filling vacancies.

The appointment of John in late summer 1189 must surely be taken as indicative of the control of the patronage of Whithorn by the English Crown. This would certainly tally with Angevin policies concerning episcopal elections and appointments: Crown interest was paramount and other secular interests were to be excluded from any say in the process. Henry's acceptance of the overlordship of Galloway created an anomaly, a diocese which may have been in the gift of a vassal ruler. Considering Henry's efforts to maintain control of Galloway in 1186, it must be accepted that he was seeking to preserve his grip over the lordship, being unwilling to lose the political and fiscal benefits which he had succeeded in wringing out of the situation. It cannot be doubted that one of the advantages which Henry derived from overlordship was control of patronage of the see. It must be admitted that the evidence is largely circumstantial, but the dating of the appointment of Bishop John, the location of his consecration in Northamptonshire and the nature of his first acts argue strongly in favour of his being an English appointee, a candidate either provided or approved by King Richard.

Bishop John makes his first appearance, as bishop-elect, less than three months after Henry II's death, at Richard's coronation in Westminster Abbey on 3rd September. (88) A fortnight later, at Pipewell Abbey, John was consecrated by the archbishops of Dublin and Trier and the bishop of Annaghdown, (89) acting on behalf of Geoffrey Plantagenet, archbishop-elect of York. Despite attempts by Baldwin of

Canterbury to secure the right to ordain Geoffrey priest and consecrate him archbishop (90) (in pursuit of the aims of establishing Canterbury's primacy over York) John, who had not been included in Baldwin's prohibition, ordained the archbishop-elect as a priest at Southwell on 23rd September. (91) These events link John closely with the English interest and point to a strong connection with York.

It must be stressed that had William the Lion or Roland had the wish or the power to instal their own candidate at Whithorn, there were sufficient bishops in Scotland to officiate at a consecration without the necessity of recourse to assistance from an English bishop. There is no evidence to link them in any way with John's appointment. King Richard retained control of Galloway until December 1189, when by the Quitclaim of Canterbury (92) he renounced his overlordship of Scotland. Galloway is mentioned nowhere in the text, but such affairs as King William's eventual settlement of the dispute between Roland and Duncan point to a return to Scottish control. Until early December 1189, therefore, Richard continued to act as overlord of Galloway, exercising the same rights as his father had enjoyed. Significantly, ecclesiastical affairs receive no mention in the terms of the Quitclaim, and it is possible that control of the Galwegian Church remained in English hands even after 1189.

A second indication of Henry II' and Richard I's control over the lordship and the diocese is the omission of the latter from the Scottish sees listed in the papal bull Cum universi. (93) This bull is generally ascribed to Pope Celestine III, and dated to March 1192, (94) but certain internal features suggest that the original bull, or one of very similar form, was issued at least three years earlier, in March 1189, by Clement III and that Celestine's bull may only have been a ratification of an earlier document. (95) Certainly, the omission of Argyll from the list of Scottish sees in Cum universi, a problematical point concerning dating, becomes understandable if the earlier date is accepted. Argyll may have been separated from Dunkeld only between October 1188 and May 1189. (96) If March 1189 is accepted as the date for the issue of an earlier version of Cum universi, Whithorn's omission from the list can be explained by its inclusion within the territories under direct English lordship. The appointment later in 1189 of a man who was probably an English cleric, who had demonstrated a clear association with York within days of his consecration and who was to continue to serve as a loyal suffragan throughout his episcopate, (97) served to ensure the preservation of the link with the archbishopric even after the Quitclaim had removed the political obstacles from the path of future moves towards the severance of that tie. This is demonstrated clearly by the failure of Bishop John, or the Scottish Crown, to attempt to engineer that separation when the opportunity once again presented itself in 1192. when the Scots secured the ratification of the earlier bull of Clement III. By March 1192, the accepted date for Celestine III's issue of Cum universi, there were no political obstacles to union with the Scottish Church.

The failure to detatch Whithorn from York in 1189 and 1192 represented the end of all serious efforts to secure that goal until the 14th century. Although for purposes of papal taxation, which was collected with regards to temporal rather than ecclesiastical boundaries, Galloway was included within the Scottish sphere, the diocese remained technically subject to York into the later Middle Ages. Throughout the 13th century the connection remained a potent force, with the archbishops becoming involved in election disputes in 1235, 1253 and 1293. (98) In the last case in particular, Archbishop Romeyn succeeded in securing control of the diocese for the duration of the vacancy following the death of Bishop Henry of Holyrood, appointing an official to administer the see in the face of opposition from both the canons of Whithorn and the archdeacon of Galloway. (99)

The relationship was not one-sided, for the bishops of Whithorn served as active suffragans of York, deputising for the archbishop in his vast territories. The economic importance of this role is demonstrated at various periods throughout the 13th century, with, for example, John's successor Walter being granted expenses for 'ministering' in York diocese. (100) The financial aspect is again demonstrated towards the end of the episcopate of Bishop Henry (1253/4-1293). In September 1286 Henry was excused on account of his age and infirmity from his obligation to pay an annual visit to York. (101) Archbishop Romeyn sent a sympathetic letter to the bishop, but invited him to come to York to deputise for him in his absence (Romeyn went south on business from April 1287), promising Henry that it would be to his financial advantage. (102) This inducement appears to have worked a miracle cure and in April 1287 Henry was in the archdiocese, reconciling the church of Hornby. (103) Four years later, in October 1291, Henry was once again acting as Romeyn's deputy at York, receiving a commission to perform pontifical duties in the archbishop's absence. (104) The connection continued to function in the episcopate of Henry's successor, Thomas (1294-1326), who spent considerable periods in northern England acting as deputy for Archbishop Greenfield, (105) but as the main periods of his activity there coincide with the Bruce campaigns in Galloway after 1307, it is probable that he had been expelled or had fled.

The Anglo-Scottish wars from 1296 onwards signalled the death-knell of Whithorn's close relationship with York. From 1235, the bishops of Whithorn had been Scots, men associated with the Crown or the leading magnate houses of Comyn, Balliol or Bruce. The gradual integration of the lordship into the administrative structure of the kingdom saw the bishops serving more regularly in a Scottish context, being accounted amongst the prelates of the realm and attending the Scottish court. Bishop Thomas's service to Archbishop Greenfield represented the last flourishing of the tie with York, for, although Simon of Wedale, his successor, was confirmed by York and consecrated at Westminster by the archbishop's deputies, there is little indication that he paid much heed to his metropolitan. This nominal arrangement continued down to the election of Michael de Malconhalgh in 1355, the last bishop to be confirmed by York and consecrated by his commissioners. (106) Although Whithorn was to remain nominally subject to York until its inclusion in 1472 within the metropolitan see of St.Andrews, (107) from the middle of the 14th century there had been an increasing tendency to regard it as a regular member of the Scottish Church. (108) Long before its formal separation from York, therefore, the relationship had ceased to have any real meaning.

Patronage, Presentation and Election

Inextricably bound up with the whole question of the identity of who instigated the revival of the see of Whithorn is the vexed issue of who controlled the patronage and influenced the process of election. Until the contentious elections of Gilbert and Odo in 1235, there is little concrete evidence relating to appointments to the see.

In view of the later struggles of 'clergy and people' against the chapter of Whithorn, particular features of the elections in 1235, 1253 and 1293, (109) it is probable that the process of election initially at least nominally lay in the hands of the secular clergy of the diocese. Considering the uncertainty surrounding the origins of Bishop Gilla-Aldan, appearing at a time when there is no clear evidence for a dominant secular authority in Galloway, election by the clergy seems the most viable position. It must be stressed that he is the first known bishop of the see since the early 9th century, and it is by no means definite that he had no immediate predecessors. In view of the evidence for ecclesiastical continuity at the Whithorn site, it is possible that the secular clergy there continued to appoint bishops, functioning in much the same way as the Celi Dei at St.Andrews. Was it the replacement of such a body at Whithorn by the priory of regular canons in the later 12th century that gave rise to the disputes of the 13th century, with the canons regarding themselves as successors to the privileges of their secular predecessors?

As stated in the preceding section, there is nothing to suggest that Gilla-Aldan was appointed by David I. Similarly, there is nothing to support the belief that he owed his elevation to Fergus of Galloway. Obscurity likewise surrounds the origins of Bishop Christian, but his later career and staunch opposition to Scottish claims argue strongly against his being a royal nominee. It is possible that Christian owed some loyalty to the lord of Galloway, but his consecration at Bermondsey in 1154 on the same day as Henry II's coronation (110) may indicate that he was provided by the English. It is here that the question of who was responsible for the probable revival at Whithorn becomes of crucial importance. If David I was the agent under whose direction Gilla-Aldan was appointed, it should be expected that the Scots were responsible for the appointment of Christian also. If Fergus was responsible, we should expect firm evidence for his successors having continued to enjoy control of the patronage of the see in much the same way as the earls of Strathearn controlled Dunblane. (111) The only suggestion of the lords of Galloway possessing any significant influence in the process of election was to come with the appointment in 1209 of Walter, former chamberlain of Alan of Galloway. (112) The election of his predecessor John in 1189, however, shows most clearly that patronage of the see then lay with the English Crown, derived probably from either the earlier involvement of York in the process of revival or from Henry II's overlordship of Galloway. It may be purely coincidental that Christian's appointment and consecration had coincided with the termination of a vacancy at York through the election of Roger of Pont-l'Évêque, and also with Henry II's coronation, but this is exactly paralleled by the events of 1189. John's election was clearly an act of Richard I, fitting in with his policy of ending the vacancies prolonged by his father. Christian's election in 1154 may similarly have been influenced by the Crown, with Henry gaining control by default through the vacancy at York.

The Quitclaim of Canterbury in December 1189 may have terminated this English involvement in the see of Whithorn, although ecclesiastical affairs are mentioned nowhere in documentary records relating to this settlement. If the 1189 agreement had handed full rights of overlordship in Galloway to the Scottish Crown, including the patronage of the see, one might reasonably expect to see the hand of William the Lion in the next election. There is no evidence for such involvement. Bishop Walter's former position as chamberlain to Alan might indicate the influence of his old master in securing his appointment, but this evidence is too slender to support the view that the bishops down to 1235 were clients of the lords of Galloway. (113) Considering Alan of Galloway's good service to King John in his foreign ventures, (see above 126-30) the possibility must at least be considered that Walter's election was engineered as an especial favour by the English king and that patronage of the see remained in Plantagenet hands even after 1189.

This already confusing picture is further complicated by the events of 1235, which saw rival candidates being presented by two opposing bodies: the prior and canons of Whithorn as the cathedral chapter on the one hand and the 'clergy and people of the diocese' supported by King Alexander II on the other. In crude terms, this affair can be represented as illustrative of the rearguard action of the traditional rights of 'clergy and people' against the papal innovation which sought to vest such powers of election in the hands of the cathedral chapter, (114) but the political background to the Galloway dispute adds further colour. Whilst previous incumbents of the see appear to have been associated with the English Church or the household of the lords of Galloway, there is no evidence for the procedure followed in their election, or the formula used to describe the nominal electors. In view of the situation arising in 1235, it is probable that election was ascribed to the wishes of 'clergy and people', this 'customary' procedure being used as a means of opposition to the probably innovatory claims of the Premonstratensians at Whithorn.

In February 1235, Gilbert of Melrose was elected to the vacant see of Whithorn. A Cistercian from a non-Galwegian house, it is easy to see him as a candidate drawn from a royal monastery being installed at Whithorn as an act of royal policy following the suppression of the Galwegian rebellion on behalf of Thomas, son of Alan. Certainly the political instability of the lordship made it vitally important that a reliable agent was established in this influential position. Indeed, the alacrity with which he was elected points to an anxiety to secure the installation of a pro-Scottish cleric in an office which could easily have become a focus for native opposition. Gilbert, however, was not a complete outsider, unfamiliar with the politics and traditions of the lordship. Although he was by 1235 master of the novices at Melrose, he had previously been abbot of Glenluce (115) and his election shows a keen awareness on the part of the Scots of the need to appoint a man with previous experience of the Galwegian situation.

Gilbert's election was followed three weeks later by that of Odo Ydonc, the former abbot of Holywood (Dercongal) in Nithsdale and a canon of Whithorn. (116) His electors, the prior and canons of Whithorn, clearly regarded themselves as constituting the cathedral chapter. In accordance with current papal policy and the general trend in elections, their claim to constitute the true electoral body carried much weight. His nomination may represent the native reaction against 'foreign' involvement in Gilbert's election, the traditional interpretation of this affair, and certain features of the canons' appeals to both archbishop and pope seem to support this hypotheis, but the foreign involvement in previous elections renders this argument spurious. Self-interest in securing the appointment of one of their own number as bishop probably outweighed all other considerations. Certainly, Donaldson points to the evidence of tensions between previous bishops at Whithorn and the canons there, (117) probably arising from the introduction of English or non-Premonstratensian clerics into the see.

Documentation concerning the double election and the ensuing litigation is plentiful and has been the subject of exhaustive study. The rival merits of both parties have been examined by a number of scholars (118) and need not be rehearsed in full here. All reach the same general conclusions concerning the affair, which highlighted the degree to which secular interests and factionalism had gained influence in ecclesiastical affairs. Alexander claimed unanimous election by clergy and people, (119) thus having recourse to the formula largely replaced in his own kingdom by the rights of the individual cathedral chapters. This claim, made over a month after Odo's election, was patently untrue, as Gilbert clearly lacked the support of the canons of Whithorn. Odo's counter-claims deny the rights of any body other than the chapter of Whithorn in the election and go so far as to state that certain non-Galwegian clerics and unspecified 'secular powers' had been instrumental in appointing Gilbert. (120) Allusions to the king of Scots 'who now holds Galloway', (121) and to 'the war being waged against Galloway by the king of Scots', (122) leave little doubt as to the secular powers in question. The most obvious impression conveyed by such statements is that Whithorn was assuming the mantle of defender of native rights, opposing the arbitrary and unjust interference of the Scottish Crown. Ashley goes so far as to state that Whithorn appears to have associated itself with the cause of Thomas, son of Alan. (123) There is nothing to support this proposal, however, which fails to recognise that the issue on which Whithorn was concentrating its effort was to gain recognition of its the right to elect bishops, not the novelty of Scottish interference.

The claims of the canons seem ultimately to have rested upon belief in their right to constitute the chapter of the cathedral. There was nothing inherently wrong in this. Whilst colleges of secular canons were being established as cathedral chapters around this time in most Scottish dioceses, the Augustinians at St.Andrews were in the process of securing that role for themselves in the principal see of the kingdom, (124) and in England there was ample precedent for monastic chapters. Papal convention, moreover, enacted as recently as 1215, supported the rights of the cathedral chapters. The prolonged dispute at Whithorn, and Odo's regular successes at York and Rome in prolonging uncertainty over the legality of Gilbert's election, argue strongly that the inherent strength of his case was recognised by canon lawyers in these respective courts. The ultimate failure of Odo to secure election, therefore, can be attributed less to the weakness of his canonical position and more to the diplomatic successes of King Alexander, representing a triumph for Scottish realpolitik.

Gilbert's consecration at York in September 1235 (125) temporarily silenced the issue of control of the elections. The only factor which appears to have been decided firmly was that henceforth the patronage of the see lay with the Scottish Crown, Alexander's conquest of Galloway in that year having wrested that right firmly from the control of any local interest. Royal control of the patronage was demonstrated in 1253/4 when the Comyn-dominated royal council secured the election of Henry of Holyrood, (126) perhaps through the agency of the chapter at Whithorn, but more likely through straight presentation in the king's name. The involvement of the chapter would seem to be indicated by the protest made by John Balliol, who challenged the election in defence of the rights of the people of Galloway. (127) It has generally been held that Balliol's objection was over the question of patronage, (128) which is clearly stated in the Lanercost Chronicle's entry for 1255 concerning Henry's consecration. The wording of the entry for 1253 which records the bishop's election, however, is very ambiguous and opens the possibility that John was seeking to preserve the precedent set in 1235 and maintain the role of 'clergy and people'. In a manner of speaking this was certainly a dispute over patronage, for, as the principal landowner in Galloway, Balliol could have exercised considerable influence in the deliberations of the diocesan clergy and the chief lay interests. It would be simplistic to believe that John's interest was purely altruistic in this context.

Balliol's objections to Henry's election proved fruitless and the bishop was duly consecrated at York. His failure ended the role of 'clergy and people' in the process of future elections and it was clear that by the time of the next election, in 1293, the chapter had established its rights. (129) Despite the evidence for royal interference as patron in the two preceding elections, it is clear that the elevation of Bishop Thomas not entirely welcomed at first by the king, who complained to the archbishop of York in an attempt to prevent his consecration. (130) In this he proved unsuccessful, and Thomas was confirmed as bishop. Thomas's two successors, Simon and Michael, were also elected by the chapter of Whithorn, although both may have been royal nominees. Simon was certainly associated with the Bruce party, and his appointment as bishop was probably part of royal moves to consolidate the king's hold over the traditionally pro-Balliol and Comyn lordship. That patronage of the see was reserved for the Crown is made clear in the reign of David II. In a royal charter of 1341 erecting the sheriffdom of Wigtown into an earldom for Malcolm Fleming, the right was expressly excluded from the new earl's privileges. (131)

Notes

1. *Wigtownshire Charters*, 1-113.
2. e.g. *The Register, or Rolls, of Walter Grey, Lord Archbishop of York*, ed. J.Raine (Surtees Society, 1870); *The Register of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York* (Surtees Society, 1913-6).
3. *Bede*, Bk.III, c.4.
4. N.K.Chadwick, 'St.Ninian: a preliminary study of the sources', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 9-53; W.D.Simpson, 'The Ninianic Controversy', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 155-62; W.D.Simpson, *The Celtic Church in Scotland: A Study of the Penetration Lines and Art Relationships* (Aberdeen, 1935), c.3-4; P.A.Wilson, 'St.Ninian and Candida Casa: Literary evidence from Ireland', *TDGAS*, xli (1962-3), 156-85; A.A.M.Duncan, 'Bede, Iona and the Picts', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages*, ed R.H.C.Davis and J.M.Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), 29-30, 32-34.
5. Simpson, 'Ninianic Controversy', 159-60.
6. Hill, *Bruce Street, Whithorn*, 32-57.
7. C.A.R.Radford and G.Donaldson, *Whithorn and Kirkmadrine* (Edinburgh, 1953), 46-48.
8. C.Thomas, 'An Early Christian cemetery and chapel site on Ardwall Isle, Kirkcudbright', *Medieval Archaeology*, xi (1967), 127-88; C.Thomas, 'Ardwall Island, The Excavation of an Early Christian site of Irish type', *TDGAS*, xliii (1966), 84-116.
9. Reid, 'Feudalisation of lower Nithsdale', 107-8.
10. E.G.Bowen, *Britain and the Western Seaways* (London, 1972), c.5.
11. Wilson, 'St.Ninian and Candida Casa', 156-85 passim; Radford and Donaldson, *Whithorn and Kirkmadrine*, 6-8.
12. C.Thomas, 'Two early ecclesiastical sites (Isle of Whithorn and Ardwall Island) and their significance', *TDGAS*, xxxviii (1959-60), 71-79.
13. D.J.Craig, 'Pre-Norman Sculpture in Galloway: some territorial implications', in *Galloway in the Early Middle Ages* (Forthcoming, 1988).
14. Hill, *Bruce Street, Whithorn*, 34-37.
15. *Bede*, Bk.V, c.23; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 57.
16. *Baedae Continuatio*, 362.
17. Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, 69.
18. Hill, *Bruce Street, Whithorn*, 36-37.
19. Thomas, 'An early cemetery', 167, 174, 177.
20. I am indebted to Morag Redford of the University of Edinburgh for providing me with information about dedications to St.Brioc in Scotland. It his her view that the double dedication (St.Mary and St.Brioc) at Dunrod, which is paralleled at Bute, represents the preservation of the original ancient dedication to which a more orthodox cult saint was attached. The Mary dedication was probably a 12th cent addition.
21. E.G.Bowen, *Saints Seaways and Settlements in the Celtic Lands* (Cardiff, 1969), c.3.
22. MacQueen, 'Gaelic Speakers', 17-33; Brooke, 'Kirk-compound place-names', 57-71.
23. For occurrences of these dedications, see Brooke, 'Kirk-compound place-names', 68-71.

24. F.M.Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd edition, Oxford, 1971), 148-52; I.B.Cowan, 'The development of the parochial system in medieval Scotland', *SHR*, xl (1961), 43-55.
25. *Reginald of Durham*, 179.
26. ibid., 177-8.
27. ibid., 179, 'De scolastico quodam Pictorum ..'
28. ibid., 179, 'Quem clerici illi, qui in ecclesia illa commorantur, qui Pictorum lingua Scollofthes cognominantur...'.
29. R.Gourlay and A.Turner, *Historic Kirkcudbright: the Archaeological Implications of Development* (Glasgow University, 1977), Scottish Burgh Survey, ix, 9 no.5.
30. J.Robertson, *On Scholastic Offices in the Scottish Church in the 12th and 13th centuries* (Private Circulation, 1853), 7-11.
31. W.D.Simpson, *The Province of Mar* (Aberdeen, 1944), 84-106; Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 329-30.
32. *Holyrood Liber*, No.27.
33. *RRS*, ii, No.489.
34. R.C.Reid, 'The monastery at Applegarth', *TDGAS*, xxxv (1956-7), 14-19.
35. *Glasgow Registrum*, No.57.
36. A.I.Dunlop (ed.), 'Bagimond's Roll for the Archdeaconry of Teviotdale', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, v (1933), 100.
37. Reid, 'Feudalisation of Lower Nithsdale', 107-8.
38. Craig, 'Pre-Norman Sculpture',
39. A.I.Dunlop (ed.), 'Bagimond's Roll: Statement of the Tenths of the Kingdom of Scotland', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vi (1939), 75.
40. C.A.R.Radford, 'Castle Loch, Mochrum', *TDGAS*, xxviii (1949-50), 41-63.
41. ibid., 52.
42. Craig, 'Pre-Norman Sculpture',
43. *RCAHMS*, Dumfries, Nos.514, 531, 538.
44. *RCAHMS*, Wigtownshire, Nos.73, 227.
45. *RCAHMS*, Wigtownshire, Nos.401, 526.
46. Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, 256-80.
47. G.Donaldson, *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh, 1985), 11-24.
48. R.J.Brentano, 'Whithorn and York', *SHR*, xxxii (1953), 144-6.
49. Watt, *Fasti*, 289-90.
50. Reid, 'Feudalisation of Lower Nithsdale', 108-9.
51. Scott, 'An early sheriff?', 90-91.
52. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii, 375.
53. N.F.Shead, 'The origins of the medieval diocese of Glasgow', *SHR*, xlviii (1969), 220-5.
54. Craster, 'Pontificate of Ranulf Flambard', 39.
55. *Symeon of Durham*, i, 67.
56. G.Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West* (Copenhagen, 1985), 5-7.
57. *Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops*, ed. J.Raine (1880), ii, 48-49.
    'Honorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilecto filio electo de Candida Casa, salutem in Apostolicem benedictionem. Cui alii a Domino praeesse conceditur, nulla suis digne subesse praelatis superbia convincatur; ideoque per presentia scripta tibi mandamus, ut ad karissimum fratrem nostrum, Turstinum

Eboracensi archiepiscopum, tanquam ad proprium metropolitanum tuum, consecrandus accedas, et ab ipsius manu, praesente Sancti Spiritus gratia, cum humilitatis devotione consecrationem accipias. Datum Laterani, v.idus Decembris.

58. *Historians of York*, ii, 60:
Domino et patri suo reverendo, T., Dei gratia Eboracensi ecclesiae Metropolitano, Gilla-Aldan, humilis electus Candidae Case, salutem et obedientiam. Cognovi tam scriptis palam autenticis quam veredicis antiquorum virorum testimoniis, quod episcopus Candidae Case ab antiquo debeat ad matrem suam Eboracensem metropolim respicere, et ei, in hiis quae ad Deum pertinent, obtemperare; quapropter Ego, Gilla-Aldan, Candidae Casae electus, sanctae Eboracensi ecclesiae, et tibi Turstine archiepiscope, et successoribus tuis canonice instituendis, debitam subjectionem a sanctis patribus institam, et canonicam obedientiam me amodo servaturum promitto'.
59. Donaldson, *Scottish Church History*, 11-12; Duncan, *The Making of the Kingdom*, c.10.
60. M'Kerlie, *Lands and Their Owners in Galloway*, ii, 423-4.
61. Radford and Donaldson, *Whithorn and Kirkmadrine*, 15; G.W.Sprott, 'The ancient cathedrals of Scotland', *TSES*, ii (1906-9), 2; Cowan and Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses*, 212.
62. e.g. B.E.Crawford, 'The earldom of Caithness and the Kingdom of the Scots, 1150-1266', *Northern Scotland*, ii (1974-7), 97-117 at 99-101.
63. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 256-61.
64. Watt, *Fasti*, 58; Donaldson, *Scottish Church History*, 23; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 67-68.
65. Cowan and Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses*, 103; N.Backmund, 'The Praemonstratensian Order in Scotland', *Innes Review*, iv (1952-3) pt.i, 25-41
66. Donaldson, *Scottish Church History*, 21.
67. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 259-60.
68. ibid., 259-60.
69. ibid., 260.
70. Poole, *Domesday Book to Magna Carta*, 182.
71. *Chron.Holyrood*, 127.
72. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 95, 96-97.
73. ibid., ii, 111-2.
74. G.Donaldson, *Scottish Historical Documents* (Edinburgh, 1970), 28-29.
75. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 264.
76. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 166.
77. ibid., 136-7.
78. ibid., 166-7.
79. ibid., 145.
80. ibid., 166-7.
81. *Holm Cultram Register*, No.141.
82. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, II, i, 56.
83. *Benedict of Peterborough*, ii, 234.
84. ibid., 99.
85. ibid.,126.
86. *Chron.Melrose*, 45.
87. *Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 348-9.
88. *Benedict of Peterborough*, ii, 79.
89. ibid., 87.

90. ibid., 86.
91. ibid., 88.
92. ibid., 102-3.
93. *Roger of Howden*, iii, 173-4.
94. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 275.
95. I am indebted to Andrew Barrell of the University of St.Andrews for making this information available to me.
96. Watt, *Fasti*, 26.
97. e.g. *Roger of Howden*, iii, 314-15.
98. *Archbishop Grey's Register*, 120-2, 170-3; *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, i, Nos.1386, 1388, 1389, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1396.
99. R.J.Brentano, 'Re-Dating a Whithorn Document', *TDGAS*, xxx (1951-2), 192-3; R.J.Brentano, 'The Whithorn Vacancy 1293-94', *Innes Review*, iv (1953), 71-83.
100. *CDS*, i, No.614.
101. *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, i, 85.
102. ibid., 87-88.
103. ibid., 88.
104. ibid., 100.
105. *Archbishop Greenfield's Register*, i, e.g. 41, 60, 143-4, 223-4, 227; ii, 162-3; iii, 94-95, 98-99, 164-5, 220, 235 etc.
106. Watt, *Fasti*, 130.
107. Donaldson, *Scottish Historical Documents*, 88-89.
108. G.Donaldson, 'The Bishops and Priors of Whithorn', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-9), 127-54 at 132-4.
109. Donaldson, 'Bishops and priors' 134-9.
110. *Chron.Holyrood*, 127.
111. Cockburn, *Bishops of Dunblane*, 3-4.
112. *Chron.Melrose*, 54.
113. Donaldson, 'Bishops and priors', 135-6.
114. Donaldson, *Scottish Church History*, 25-30.
115. *Chron.Melrose*, 111.
116. ibid., 113.
117. Donaldson, 'Bishops and priors', 136 and note 17a.
118. J.Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912), 356-7; Donaldson, 'Bishops and priors', 136-7; A.Ashley, 'Odo, elect of Whithern, 1235', *TDGAS*, xxxvii (1958-9), 62-69.
119. *Historians of York*, iii, 148-9.
120. *CPL*, i, 193.
121. *Archbishop Grey's Register*, 170.
122. ibid., 171.
123. Ashley, 'Odo, elect of Whithern', 66-67.
124. Barrow, *Kingdom of the Scots*, C.7.
125. *Chron.Melrose*, 83.
126. Watt, *Fasti*, 129.
127. *Chron.Lanercost*, 59, 62.
128. ibid., 62; Donaldson, 'Bishops and priors', 137.
129. Watt, *Fasti*, 129.
130. *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, ii, 115-6.
131. *RRS*, vi, No.39.

Chapter 6, pt.ii: The Structure and Administration of the Diocese

Parish Development

Material relating to the development of the basic elements in the diocesan structure, the parishes, is extremely scanty for Galloway. As discussed in an earlier section, (see 235-8) there is some evidence to suggest the emergence of a rudimentary system, based perhaps on the chief population centres of the Whithorn estates and evolving out of preaching-stations and small chapels at such foci. The dating of this development cannot be fixed with precision, but, based on the evidence of the sculpture associated with these early sites, some stage in the 10th or early 11th century is the most likely period. It is not until the 12th century, however, that units which can be genuinely termed 'parishes' can be detected. Evidence for the 12th century origins of the major parishes of the lordship remains scanty, relying heavily on fragmentary documentation and limited evidence from archaeology and surviving architectural remains. The chief sources, however, are the charters recording grants to monasteries or confirming their possession of churches, and lists in papal documents preserved in episcopal registers detailing churches held by the bishop in specific areas. In the case of the lordship, only Desnes Ioan is so covered, through its inclusion within Glasgow diocese. Any similar documents in the Whithorn registers have been lost along with the bulk of the records of the diocese. The most comprehensive list of parishes in medieval Galloway is to be gleaned from the records of the 13th century papal tax-collector, Master Boiamund de Vicci, known as Bagimond's Rolls. (1) These provide unique evidence for the pattern of parishes in its almost fully-developed form, charting also the progress of the trend towards appropriation of parish revenues by monastic institutions.

The evolutionary process leading to the development of the 13th century pattern was of considerable duration and drew on a number of trends, including degeneration of minsters and the development of lesser preaching-stations. A third process was the establishment of proprietory chapels and churches and their gradual transformation into churches performing parochial functions, chiefly provision of vital sacraments such as baptism. (2) This could see the establishment of lesser chapels in outlying portions of minster lands, gradually gaining independence as baptismal churches, or the establishment of private chapels on lay or ecclesiastical estates. In the latter case, the building of the church, appointment of the priest and control of future patronage rendered such foundations essentially the property of the estate-owner, whether lay or ecclesiastic. Such proprietory churches are not a phenomenon restricted to a specific period, for cases can be identified in Galloway alone ranging from the 12th century to the later Middle Ages, with Dunrod and Anwoth apparently being the creations of Fergus of Galloway and David, son of Terrus in the mid-12th century, and Kirkchrist, formerly a chapel on an episcopal manor, gaining parish status by the 15th century at the latest. These are not the only documented examples, but other recorded instances are rare. Elsewhere, however, the relationship between the church site and the caput of the local lord is often indicative of an origin as a chapel serving the inhabitants of the stronghold.

The foundation of chapels on outlying minster estates may lie at the roots of most of the churches later recorded as belonging to the priory at Whithorn. Glasserton certainly, where a portion of a cross of Whithorn school type has been found, (3) formed an important element in the priory properties and was probably appropriated at an early date. Its omission from the lists in Bagimond's Roll must imply that both vicarage and parsonage revenues had been appropriated by the 1270s at the latest. Similarly, Mochrum, lying further to the west, has produced early sculptural remains, (4) but is likewise omitted from Bagimond. Kirkmaiden, lying between Mochrum and Glasserton, forms a third example where early sculpture has been found, (5) and here there are structural remains of an apparently 12th century church. As with its neighbours, Kirkmaiden is not listed in Bagimond but appears amongst Whithorn properties later in the Middle Ages. In all three cases, it is probable that the priory's possession pre-dated the the compilation of Bagimond's lists in the 1270s, and, in view of the presence of early Whithorn school sculpture, may derive from these sites having been attached to the pre-12th century community at Whithorn.

Similar origins as proprietory chapels may be ascribed to a group of churches lying in the Dee valley to the north of Kirkcudbright. This group, comprising the churches of Kirkcormack, Kelton, Balmaghie and Barncrosh, are described in a charter of William the Lion dated to 1172 x 1174 as previously having belonged to the monastery of Iona. (6) Most writers on this subject attribute Iona's possession of the churches to the period of Norse rule in Galloway, (7) ruling out the possibility of an earlier Columban mission to the region. The origins of the group, however, and the reasons for their grant to Iona remain unclear. Reid attributed their foundation to the period of 'Norse-Gaelic occupation' in Galloway, espousing the tradition of colonisation of the Solway region by Hebridean settlers in the 10th and 11th centuries. Whilst the dedication of Kirkcormack to a Celtic saint may support such a hypothesis in its case, the dedication of the three other establishments are to Anglian saints (or those especially favoured by the Northumbrian Church). Kelton is dedicated to St.Oswald the Martyr, Balmaghie to St.Andrew and Barncrosh to St.Michael. (8) The dedications of the neighbouring parishes of Gelston, Kirkcudbright, Crossmichael and Parton are also to saints of the Anglian Church, which suggests that this group in the lower Dee valley may owe its origins to earlier mission work, based perhaps on the minster at Kirkcudbright, rather than to later efforts by clergy from Iona. The four churches stripped from Iona's possession are of further interest in that they show the development of chapels into established parishes. Barncrosh, listed with no distinguishing title as church or chapel at the time of its original grant to Holyrood, was in c.1200 noted as a chapel linked with the adjacent parish of Kirkcormack. (9) By the early 14th century it had gained independent status as '...the kirk of Michis (St.Michael) within the toun of Balncrose'. (10)

Foundations associated with lay estates may have been even more numerous than the above examples of Church-directed development. Of this type three important examples are Buittle, Dunrod and Cruggleton, two of which are associated with early seats of lordship. At Buittle the church served the caput of the later Balliol lordship in eastern Galloway, but may have developed out of a chapel serving the Anglian lordly hall or botl which preceded the medieval fortress. Certainly, the ruins of the medieval parish church are of a 13th century structure of high quality considerably extended in the 14th century, clearly the product of considerable expense. (11) The parish remained a free parsonage until 1347, when it was granted to the abbey of Sweetheart, (12) which indicates that the lavish spending must be attributable to its former Balliol or later Douglas patrons.

A particularly noteworthy example of an early proprietorial chapel is the church of St.Mary and St.Brioc at Dunrod. The ruined church of this now defunct parish lies some 2.5 miles to the south of Kirkcudbright, in the midst of the earthwork remains of the deserted village. This church and village, along with their northern neighbour, Galtway, formed Holyrood Abbey's first acquisitions in the region, (13) being donated by Fergus and Uhtred respectively. In both cases the grants involved the churches, with all rights and dues pertaining to them, and also the entire lands of their dependent vills. These territories formed compact blocks, Dunrod itself covering little more than six square miles; and it is argued elsewhere (see below Chap 7) that both it and Galtway had comprised unitary elements within the personal estates of the lords. At the time of the grants, neither church was termed parochial, but that both probably served as baptismal churches for the vills in which they stood cannot be doubted. Amongst the few objects recovered from Dunrod is a massive stone font of early 12th century style, providing concrete evidence of this baptismal role. (14)

In western Galloway, the link between lordship estates and early parishes, evident at Dunrod, Galtway and Buittle, is less well attested, but one outstanding example is to be found in Cruggleton Church. This small medieval parish, now amalgamated with Sorbie and

Kirkmadrine-in-Farines, constituted a compact block on the coast to the east of Whithorn. References to a distinct parish do not appear in documentary sources until the early 14th century, (15) but there is record of a village here in about 1140. (16) There is no trace of this today, and the heavily restored church stands in isolation in a field. Sufficient original features survive to indicate a date of construction in the mid 12th century, the moulded work displaying a close similarity to the earliest Romanesque remains at Whithorn. (17) The church lies a short distance away from the ruins of the clifftop stronghold of the lords at Cruggleton, long recognised as the chief seat of power in western Galloway. This juxtaposition of church and castle must indicate an original function as a chapel serving the lordly household and the local dependent population.

Links between early parishes and secular estates are common phenomena throughout Britain. The close relationship between secular and ecclesiastical units can be identified at a number of Galwegian sites where the church stands or stood adjacent to the earthwork remains of the 12th century manorial caput. (18) This is demonstrated clearly at Dalry, Parton, Gelston, Kelton, Kirkcormack and Minnigaff, whilst at Anwoth, Kirkandrews and Mochrum the mottes lie more distantly, at convenient defensive sites. In most cases it is impossible to determine whether the secular estate preceded the parish, or whether the 12th century manorial lords were siting their caputs adjacent to pre-existing foci. The regular correspondence between the bounds of single estates and parishes, however, would argue that the pattern of secular lordship determined the pattern of the parish system. The crystallisation of the parish network, occurring later in the 12th and 13th centuries, looks like the rational adaptation of secular boundaries. This, however, should not be taken to imply that most churches, as opposed to parishes, were creations of the later 12th century; rather the districts which they served were not defined with precision until that date.

The clearest manifestation of the boundary of an estate determining the eventual extent of a parish is to be seen at Kirkgunzeon, which lies in that portion of Galloway under Glasgow's jurisdiction. It can be argued that here full development to parochial status was arrested in the 12th century and was not achieved until after c.1300. The grant of the entire vill to the monks of Holmcultram, probably in the late 1160s, (19) appears to have impeded the growth of full parish functions until the 14th century. (20) Records of perambulations of its boundaries (21) show the modern parish to share the same bounds as the medieval estate. (22) Kirkgunzeon's importance lies in the sequence of documents preserved in the Holmcultram register which chart a series of disputes concerning the status of the church which arose between the monks and the bishops of Glasgow. Uhtred's initial grant involved just landed property, no mention occurring of any chapel or ecclesiastical revenues, and it is simply as property that it is dealt with until shortly before 1200. At this time, Bishop Jocelin, in a charter confirming exemption from episcopal visitations and levies, referred to the 'place and chapel...called Kyrkewinnin'. (23) In 1222, however, Bishop Walter of Glasgow complained to Pope Honorius III that '...the monks of Holm have taken possession of parochial churches in [his] diocese and made them into granges and chapels, expelling the clergy and tenantry'. (24) Former parish status was being claimed for Kirkgunzeon, with the monks of Holm being accused of its deliberate degradation to facilitate the conversion of the vill into a monastic grange. Walter, however, failed to prove his case and the monks remained undisturbed until the 14th century, when the tensions of war and schism forced their abandonment of the lands of Kirkgunzeon.

The legal disputes concerning Kirkgunzeon, which recurred throughout the later 13th century, cast some light on aspects of parish evolution and the attendant difficulties of that process. Unfortunately, however, there are still major gaps in the records and several important questions remain unanswered, particularly regarding the church at the time of the grant of Kirkgunzeon to Holmcultram and the date at which it began to provide the services of a regular parish church. All documentation prior to the 1222 dispute dealt with solely secular business, treating Kirkgunzeon as a piece of valuable commercial property. No mention is made of spiritual matters, which is unusual in that Uhtred's grants to religious corporations are otherwise solely concerned with patronage and church property. (25) This may, however, simply reflect the early Cistercian prohibition against accepting control of a church of parochial status. Nevertheless, tithes and other renders set aside for the maintenance of the church and priest are recorded, though the reference is admittedly late, (26) and it is made clear in a 14th century document that a monk from Holm was serving as priest some time before 1296. (27) These features suggest that by the 1290s at the latest, with relaxation of the strictures on holding benefices, the monks had taken steps to ensure that the parish revenues remained in the hands of the abbey. This, however, leaves unanswered the question of how Kirkgunzeon and its residents were served spiritually before the easing of that prohibition.

A document of Pope Alexander IV, dated c.1254-61, forbidding Scottish parish priests from interference in the affairs of the monks and lay brothers of Holmcultram, may hold part of the answer. (28) Although no reference is made to Kirkgunzeon in particular, there is little doubt that this is the matter with which the pope was concerned. The prohibition on interference must surely imply that some such action had occurred. Presumably the priests from adjacent parishes had been seeking to augment their incomes by extending their services into Holmcultram's sphere. Certainly, if the monks were hindered by the prohibition on holding benefices from allowing full parish functions to be performed in their chapel, any native population must have looked elsewhere for provision of certain sacraments. Whilst a reference occurs in the late 13th century to a cemetery and to chapel altars, (29) no mention is made of baptism, the key role of a parish church. Unless the charges of depopulation and degradation are accepted, and such occurrences are not unknown on Cistercian properties, (30) local residents must have gone to one of the adjacent parishes (the church of Urr is three miles from Kirkgunzeon) for the administration of such sacraments. The implication behind Pope Alexander's prohibition is that Kirkgunzeon had not gained full parish status by the time of its grant to Holmcultram in the 1160s and that its possession by a Cistercian house had prevented it from acquiring full parish status until later in the 13th century. Local residents requiring baptism, or marriage, were forced to look to adjoining parishes, diverting the fees paid to the officiating cleric away from Holmcultram's coffers. Relaxation of the prohibition on holding benefices enabled the monks to appoint one of their number as officiating parish priest, ensuring payment of such fees to the controlling monastery, and Pope Alexander's command to the parish clergy may have been designed to prevent any future diversion of revenues.

Similar circumstances probably obtained in the cases of the home parishes of the two 12th century Cistercian foundations in the diocese of Galloway. At both Dundrennan and Glenluce there is no record of the status of the local churches at the time of the foundation of the abbeys, but it is clear from later documents that parish duties were performed by one of the brethren. (31) At both places, however, there are no known medieval parish church sites, and the use of most of the nave space of both monasteries by the lay-brothers into the 13th century would appear to have precluded, but not entirely ruled out, their use in this capacity before the late 1200s. Within the parish of Old Luce, however, there are three recorded chapel sites, (32) which may have served the local community in most of its needs.

The Growth of the Diocesan Government

It would appear that the developments in the network of parishes in Galloway were contemporaneous with the organisation of the administrative machinery of the diocese. What officials assisted Gilla-Aldan in the early work in the diocese is unknown, but by the end of the episcopate of his successor, both archdeacon and dean are recorded. (33) In a diocese where centres of population were dispersed and isolated by difficult terrain, and where the parochial organisation was still in a highly underdeveloped form in the 1150s, such officers were essential for smooth administration. They were also indispensible in a diocese where the bishop may have been a regular absentee, acting as suffragan for the archbishop of York. Christian was certainly active for regular periods outwith his diocese, and it is perhaps significant that it is in his episcopate that these two offices are first recorded. With the archdeacon acting as deputy for the bishop in all functions other than where episcopal orders were necessary, and with the dean operating as an executive or judicial officer, (34) the diocese was receiving machinery adequate to ensure the continued function of spiritual life in all but the most protracted absences of a bishop.

Until c.1200 it would seem that only one dean performed regular functions throughout the diocese, (35) but shortly after that date deans appear for the three main divisions of the medieval see: Desnes, Farines and Rhins. (36) There is no record of any incumbent of the fourth deanery, Glenken, and its dates of establishment and disappearance remain areas of uncertainty. (37) The proliferation of the office probably relates to the progress made in the development of the parish system, with a more extensive system requiring greater supervision. Such a responsibility for the whole diocese was clearly beyond the capabilities of one man, and the grouping of parishes into four deaneries by the 1270s (38) represents an attempt to divide the diocese into manageable units, which would not involve the dean in difficult or extended journeys in pursuit of his duties. Each deanery can be seen to correspond approximately to the natural topographical divisions of the lordship, but they may also correspond with some older territorial subdivisions. Understandably, the division of responsibilty may have brought about a decline in status. It is noticeable that after c.1209 the deans almost disappear as witnesses to episcopal or lordly charters, this role being taken over largely by the regular clergy of the main monasteries, or the clerks of the bishop's and lord's households. (39) This decline is paralleled elsewhere in the Scottish dioceses and may have been the result of the appearance in the episcopal households of qualified canon lawyers or magistri, who would have assumed most of the legal functions of the deans. (40) It is noticeable that in Galloway this decline coincided with the first record of a new office, that of Official, (41) a qualified lawyer who acted specifically as the bishop's judicial representative.

The Official, who performed the judicial functions of the bishop that did not require episcopal orders, developed as one of the key officers in diocesan administration. In Galloway, where the bishop was frequently absent from his see, the position may have developed more importance than in other dioceses. Its principal importance, however, may have been in the administration of the see during episcopal vacancies, as in 1254-5 and 1293-4. (42) The archdeacon of Galloway, Geoffrey, was appointed Official 'sede vacante' in 1254, (43) and in 1293 his 'custos', John Nepos, attempted to gain control in his name, although the archdeacon at that time was described as old and blind. (44) It would appear from these circumstances that the post of Official was not permanent and terminated with the death of the bishop responsible for making the appointment. Certainly, in both 1254-5 and 1293-4, Officials were specifically appointed for the duration of the vacancies and their powers ended with the appointment of the new bishop. (45) In both cases the commission to act as Official was bestowed by the archbishop of York, as metropolitan of the see. (46) There is no record of the procedure adopted in 1235, but it is possible that the Official, Durand, recorded c.1209 x 1222, may have been appointed in the vacancy after Bishop John's death. (47)

Other than these few brief notices of the the structure of the diocesan government, it is only possible to talk in the most general terms about the offices and personnel. Little is known about the background or training of such men, but they are unlikely to have been simple parish clerks. John Nepos, appointed as curator for Archdeacon Geoffrey in the 1290s, was described as 'professor of civil law', (48) and Geoffrey was himself a Master of Arts. (49) The rewards of control of the position of Official, especially 'sede vacante', may have been great, hence the disputes over its control, but other offices may have been less lucrative. The archdeaconry appears to have been particularly poorly endowed, with efforts being made in the 14th century to remedy that deficiency, (50) and again in the course of the 15th century. (51)

The Monasteries and Monastic Properties

The early monastic tradition in Galloway, at centres like Whithorn and Kirkcudbright, has been touched upon briefly in an earlier section (see above 243-4). Only at Whithorn, however, does it appear that the community survived to have a significant impact upon the development of the later priory, especially in terms of its landed possessions. (52) The lamentable destruction of both priory and episcopal rolls renders it impossible to chart with certainty the lands which came into the possession of the canons through their replacement of the earlier community, but Craig has suggested a distribution of properties throughout the south and east of the Machars peninsula, (53) with a particular concentration around Whithorn itself. It has been argued above that churches like Glasserton, Kirkmaiden and Mochrum, which are omitted from Bagimond's

Rolls, represented early proprietorial chapels of the Whithorn community. Sculptural remains from all three locations confirm this link. Specifically landed property, however, is more difficult to trace in the absence of a cartulary, and the earliest surviving Whithorn charter dates from no earlier than 1327. (54) Nevertheless a considerable amount of information on the properties of the priory can be gleaned from late sources, particularly from 16th century records of feus, tacks and other instruments of sasine involving tenants. (55) Unfortunately, however, the dates at which the properties in question came into the hands of the prior and canons remain open to argument.

Similar problems obtain in the cases of the other major monasteries of the lordship, where only a few early fragments, supported by later documentation, give an incomplete picture of the monastic properties. Of the records of Dundrennan, the earliest of the Cistercian houses in the south-west, only a few isolated notices remain. The greatest loss is probably the foundation charter of the abbey, but this is compensated for in part by the survival of a charter of Edward I, which lists the 'demesne' lands of the monks. (56) The bulk of these lie within the southern and western portions of the modern parish of Rerrick, with most of the individual properties named corresponding with the chief modern farms in those areas. This compact block must constitute the core of the property bestowed on the abbey in 1142. By the 1160s, however, Dundrennan was clearly seeking to expand its agricultural operations, particularly with regards to animal husbandry, but appears to have failed initially to attract further patronage from the lords of Galloway. There is record of a dispute with the monks of Holmcultram concerning Kirkgunzeon (57) and the rights of pannage in Uhtred's demesne woods between Kirkgunzeon and the Nith. The details of the settlement imply that Dundrennan expected to acquire some land in the vicinity of Kirkgunzeon. Edward I's charter mentions land in Kirkpatrick Durham, which must correspond with 'The site of the old grange (that was) formerly Dundrennan's' noted in Devorgilla's charter to the monks of Sweetheart. (58)

In comparison to records relating to the five other major independent religious institutions in Galloway, founded by c.1250, Dundrennan is abundantly documented. Glenluce, Roland's chief foundation, has no original early charters surviving and the 15th and 16th century documents which do exist give only a fragmentary image of a large block of territory spanning the modern parishes of New and Old Luce. (59) Similarly, with Soulseat there is a complete absence of early material, but late 15th and 16th century surveys of the monastic properties show a major concentration of land around the abbey itself, with some outlying properties in the Rhins and Machars. (60) No records of the Dominican Friary at Wigtown have been preserved. The Benedictine nunnery at Lincluden is similarly served, although some idea of its endowments can be reconstructed from the possessions of its 14th century replacement, the collegiate church founded by Archibald Douglas. (61) The last of the major monasteries, Alan's foundation at Tongland, has also left no original medieval documents, and even the fabric of its building has all but vanished. Its late foundation [in 1219] in a district where much property had already been acquired by non-Galwegian establishments, may have limited its prospects for expansion, but a solid core of land appears to have been built up in the immediate vicinity of the abbey. The church of Tongland and its vill, and those of Barncrosh, all at an earlier date part of the extensive possessions of the canons of Holyrood, constituted the bulk of its early properties, augmented by an interest in Troqueer on the Nith. (62) The general impression conveyed by the sparsity of the documentation is that Dundrennan, Glenluce and Whithorn had attracted the bulk of the early property endowments amongst local houses, it not being until the foundation of Sweetheart that a similar scale of endowment was again reached. It was non-Galwegian monasteries, however, which appear to have benefitted most from the generosity of the lords of Galloway, to the obvious detriment of Galwegian foundations.

The most striking feature of any survey of the monastic properties of the lordship in the 12th and 13th centuries is the scale of the 'foreign' interest in the south-west. Substantial amounts of landed property, plus control of patronage and parish revenues, were concentrated in the hands of a few Scottish and English monasteries or religious corporations. Chief amongst these were the abbeys of Holyrood and Holmcultram, with Dryburgh, Melrose, Kelso and Lindores also possessing a significant interest, and the Hospital of St.Peter at York and the priory of St.Bees in Cumbria holding smaller properties. In several cases, these 'foreign' interests were bought out in the later Middle Ages, but in the period under consideration here they were being exploited by the original recipients.

Holyrood's interest in Galloway dates from c.1160 when Fergus granted the canons the church and vill of Dunrod. (63) This property consisted of a substantial block of agricultural land and was to be exploited direcly by the canons. This initial gift was augmented by the addition of the neighbouring vill of Galtway, (64) giving Holyrood control of a block of land comparable in scale to the original endowment of Dundrennan. It is clear from the outset that the canons were determined to exploit their possessions, irrespective of the distance from Holyrood. Between 1161 and 1164 Malcolm IV extended his protection to the canons' agents travelling to Dunrod and dwelling there, and in 1244 Alexander II granted them judicial powers over their lands there. (65) In addiion to this main block of land, the abbey acquired the unidentified properties of 'Artun' and 'Hirtun', granted originally to the Knights Hospitaller, and a sizeable piece of land in Twynholm. (66) Apart from these strictly landed possessions, Holyrood gained control of eleven parish churches, with rights of presentation, control of tithes and the rights, privileges and pertinents of the churches. (67) Indeed, such was the scale of Holyrood's interest in the region that a dependent cell, the priory of St.Mary's Isle, was established on the abbey's lands of Traill on the Dee estuary. (68) The priory itself does not appear to have played any significant part in local affairs, although one of its priors may have gained his office through service to Alan of Galloway, (69) having apparently been his clerk. The cell, however, did attract bequests of its own, receiving the church of Eggerness (Kirkmadrine in Farines) and two carucates of land there, plus a number of fiscal privileges from Roland. (70)

Something has already been said of Holmcultram's possessions in the lordship. Kirkgunzeon formed their chief property, managed from a grange on the site of the modern village nucleus. Outwith this core, however, it possessed lands in Kirkconnel and Mabie, two manors which lay on the Nith, (71) grants in this region generally involving fishing stations on the river estuary, or clay pits. In addition to these, the monks attracted gifts of land in Colvend and Urr, (72) appended to their main Kirkgunzeon estate. Smaller grants, including saltpans and fishing stations, (73) built up to a substantial holding, again challenging the Dundrennan demesne in scale.

By way of contrast, those other monasteries with a landed interest in Galloway held properties on a substantially smaller scale. The most important was Melrose, which acquired land formerly held by the abbey of Vauday in Lincolnshire. (74) This land, granted to Vauday by Thomas Colville of Dalmellington, consisted of the upland district around Carsphairn, and was used probably as sheep pasture. Brooke, however, has pointed to the rich mineral deposits in this region, and has suggested that the monks may have been involved in the extraction of ores. (75)

Dryburgh's interest was restricted largely to control of parish churches, but involved small amounts of land in Sorbie. (76) St. Bees, however, received a series of grants of a more 'industrial' nature, gaining two saltworks in Colvend and a third in Preston, with tofts and pasture for the support of the men working there. (77) Small grants on this sort of scale were made to St. Peter's Hospital at York, which gained a carucate and a toft in the lordship manor of Troqueer, (78) and to Kelso, which received a saltwork on the Solway at Lochkindeloch. (79) At the bottom of the scale lay Lindores Abbey, which received an annual payment of three merks from the lands of Castleton of Borgue. (80)

Despite the fragmentary nature of the sources, it is quite apparent that by c.1250 monastic properties occupied a considerable percentage of the total land area of the lordship. Additional grants after that date must have pushed the total up to c.33% of the good land in Galloway, including extensive tracts of upland pasture. Over and above this there must be taken into consideration the numerous saltworks, fishing stations and clay pits which dotted the coastline, especially in the estuaries of the Dee, Urr and Nith. Most of these gifts were made by members of the lordly family, with Uhtred, Roland and Alan being especially generous in their endowment of monasteries. A few of their tenants followed suit, with the lead being taken by the more prominent families, such as the Campanias, Colvends, Berkeleys and Viponts. In general, however, these knightly families restricted their generosity to gifts of advowsons or cash donations, rather than eat into their landed possessions.

Parish Appropriation (81)

From the time of their foundation the monasteries attracted gifts in the form of control over churches and parish revenues. The popularity of this form of endowment might stem from the shortage of good land in many areas with which grants might otherwise have been made. Gifts of patronage, church buildings and small amounts of land to support the clergy did not deplete landed holdings to such a significant degree. Only the top rank of the nobility could truly afford to be generous with land. As the parish system developed it became increasingly common for secular owners of proprietary churches to make over their rights to monasteries or similar religious institutions. Initially, such grants were concerned primarily with patronage of the churches and control of the revenues assigned for the parson's maintenance. Full appropriation, signified in Scotland by the charter formula 'in proprios usus', generally followed, with all rights and privileges being vested solely in the appropriator. Parish revenues were placed entirely within the control of the appropriating body, who would then assign what was considered a suitble amount for the support of a vicar. Various attempts were made to control the movement towards full apppropriation, and it is clear that one of the chief concerns of the bishop involved was to ensure that adequate funds were set aside for the support of the vicars. (82) Such efforts formed part of the general move towards curbing abuses in the parish system, which was to culminate in 1215 in Innocent III's decree at the Fourth Lateran Council, that '...as he who lives of the altar serves of the altar...a sufficient portion be assigned for the priest'. (83)

Whilst the loss of the bulk of the information relating to the Galwegian monasteries makes it difficult to assess the extent to which the process of appropriation had progressed by 1215, the rolls of the papal tax-collector, Bagimond, dating from the 1270s, can be used to give a general view of the situation. The pattern by that date shows widespread appropriations of parsonage revenues and omissions from the list would seem to indicate appropriations of both parsonage and vicarage teinds, though some omissions are due to possession by Cistercian monasteries, which were not assessed for this tax. (84) Except perhaps for the northern Glenken district, no part of Galloway appears to have been unaffected by the later 13th century, with certain areas of the rich and fertile south of the lordship having almost every component parish appropriated to some monastery or another.

The lower Dee valley was one such area of high density, with Holyrood Abbey enjoying the revenues of nine parishes in the region by c.1200. In the area around Kirkcudbright , and in Uhtred's new territories east of the Urr, the canons were conspicuously successful in attracting gifts of land and control over parishes. By c.1200, to Fergus's initial gifts of Dunrod and Galtway, Uhtred had added Kirkcudbright, Tongland, Kirkcormack, Kelton, Balmaghie and Barncrosh, whilst Twynholm and Anwoth had been given to the abbey by vassals of the lords. (85) The bulk of the gifts date to before 1174, but it is clear that in many cases full appropriation was achieved only after a considerable period had elapsed. It was not until c.1207 that Bishop John issued a charter granting all these parishes 'in proprios usus', (86) and it is stated that only three, namely Kirkcormack, Kelton and Barncrosh, had been so granted at an earlier date by Bishop Christian. Similarly, in Desnes Ioan, where the canons held the churches of Urr and Blacket by the gift of Uhtred, full appropriation of revenues did not occur until 1250. (87)

No other abbey matched Holyrood's success in securing control of churches in the lordship. Of the other non-Galwegian houses with interests in the southwest, namely Dryburgh, Melrose, Kelso, Holmcultram and St.Bees, only the first numbered appropriated churches amongst its possessions. Dryburgh's control of Borgue and Sorbie (88) stemmed from links with the Morvilles. Borgue was held by Hugh de Morville the Younger before 1174, and the two parishes of Greater and Lesser Sorbie formed the lordship of his Vipont relatives. At Borgue, the abbey's interest was developed in stages from Hugh's initial grant of the church in the late 1160s or early 1170s. His initial general grant was augmented in the early 13th century by a series of awards made by the new lords of Borgue, the Campanias, but it was not until the episcopate of Bishop Gilbert, some sixty years after the initial gift, that the church was confirmed 'in proprios usus'. (89) Even at this stage, however, the bishop imposed conditions, taking steps to ensure that adequate provision was made for the vicar. Thus, an annual stipend of ten marks of silver, plus six acres of arable and one of meadow were set aside for his support. At Sorbie, however, the process was more rapid, with Ivo de Vipont's initial grant of the church of Greater Sorbie, made between c.1186 and 1200, being confirmed 'in proprios usus' by Bishop John before 1209 (90), and Lesser Sorbie being similarly granted by 1234. (91)

The dearth of materials associated with the Galloway Cistercian houses makes it almost impossible to determine the manner in which they administered their appropriated parishes in the 12th and 13th centuries. Prior to the relaxation of the strictures against their holding benefices with the exercise of cure of souls which prevented them from serving as parish priests, the Cistercians were obliged to instal vicars. It is not until the end of the 13th century in Galloway that there is evidence for one of the three Cistercian monasteries exercising the right to instal one of their own brethren as a parish priest. This was Sweetheart, where the home parish of Lochkindeloch appears to have been served by one of the monks since the 1270s. (92) At Dundrennan and Glenluce, however, there is no clear indication of the arrangements made in the earlier Middle Ages, although monks appear to have served both parishes by the 14th century. (93) Further problems manifest themselves with regard to the location of the parish churches in both instances. Whilst it is possible that no regular parish existed at Dundrennan at the time of the abbey's foundation, it is almost certain that by the date of the establishment of Glenluce in 1190 a church providing parochial services must have existed. There is, however, no indication as to where this possible church lay. It has been suggested that parish services were performed in the naves of the abbey churches, (94) but at both the bulk of this area was occupied by the quires of the lay-brethern, leaving only the aisles and the western bays vacant. Such an arrangement went against the rules concerning monastic seclusion, but in the absence of a regular parish church, such strictures may have been bent.

The effects of parish appropriation lie beyond the scope of this present work, and form matters of great contention to the present day. Within Galloway, there is little evidence for the charges of neglect that were later levelled against appropriating monasteries elsewhere in Scotland, but this may be due primarily to the poverty of the documentation. One most obvious effect, however, was to retard the development of the parish churches themselves, with little of the diverted revenues being spent on embellishing the buildings. The few surviving remains of medieval date in Galloway point in general towards the simple uni- or bicameral structures familiar to most students of Scottish ecclesiastical architecture. Where elaboration occurred, as at Buittle, (98) the building work can be attributed to lay patronage. It is in the architecture of the abbeys that much of the fruits of the appropriated parishes can be seen to have been spent.

Footnotes to Chapter Six

1. Cameron, 'Bagimond's Roll', 74-75.
2. For a general survey of the development of the parish in Scotland see: I B Cowan, 'The development of the parochial system in medieval Scotland'. SHR, xl (1961), 43-55.
3. RCAHMS, Wigtownshire, 1.
4. Ibid, 85.
5. Ibid, 2-3.
6. RRS, ii, No 141.
7. Radford, 'Excavations at Whithorn, First Season', 100; Reid, 'Feudalisation of Nithsdale', 108.
8. RRS, ii, Nos 141, 489; RMS, i, app i, No 85.
9. Holyrood Liber, No 49, '...ecclesiam de Kyrkecormac cum capella de Balnecross...'
10. RMS. i, app 11, No 85.
11. RCAHMS, Kirkcudbright, No 73; Stell, Dumfries and Galloway, No 68.
12. CPL, iii, 396; Cowan, Parishes, 23.
13. Holyrood Liber, Nos 25, 27.
14. RCAHMS, Kirkcudbright, No 217.
15. RMS. i, app i, No 20.
16. Lawlor, Life of St.Malachy, 76-79.
17. MacGibbon and Ross, Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland. i, 212-5; C A Radford, 'Cruggleton Church', TDGAS, xxviii (1949-50), 92-95; Stell, Dumfries and Galloway, 148.
18. For a comparative study of the 12th century parish/manor system see, Tabraham, 'Norman settement in Clydesdale', 117-8, 126.
19. Holm Cultram Register, No 120.
20. Ibid, No 141j, 255.
21. Ibid, No 121.
22. R C Reid, 'The early ecclesiastical records of Kirkgunzeon', TDGAS, xiv (1926-28), 114-8.
23. Holm Cultram Register, No 136.
24. Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, v, No 82, '...quasdam parochiales ecclesias suas diocesis indebite usurpantes, parochianis et colonis ipsorum expulsis, ipsas in grangias et oratoria simplicia converterunt...'.
25. e.g. Holyrood Liber, No 23; SRO GD 141/No A.
26. Holm Cultram Register, No 141a.
27. Ibid, 89.
28. Ibid, No 133b.
29. Ibid, No 141c.
30. L Butler and C Given-Wilson, Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain (London. 1979), 37; Poole, Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 187 and n.4.
31. Cowan, Parishes, 76, 170.
32. RCAHMS, Wigtownshire, Nos 376-8.
33. Holm Cultram Register, No 141; Holyrood Liber, No 52.
34. Duncan, Making of the Kingdom, 284.
35. Watt, Fasti, 138.
36. Ibid, 139.
37. It is recorded in Bagimond's Roll, SHS Miscellany, vi, 74; For a suggested date and reason for its demise see: D Brooke, 'The Glenkens', passim.
38. Bagimond's Roll, SHS Miscellany, vi, 74-75.

39. Watt, *Fasti*, 139.
40. Duncan, *Making of the kingdom*, 284.
41. Watt, *Fasti*, 140.
42. Ibid.
43. *Archbishop Grey's Register*, 272.
44. *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, ii, 119-24; Brentano, 'The Whithorn Vacancy', 71-83.
45. *Archbishop Grey's Register*, 273; *Arcbishop Romeyn's Register*, ii, 129.
46. *Archbishop Grey's Register*, 272; *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, 117-9
47. Watt, *Fasti*, 140.
48. *Archbishop Romeyn's Register*, ii, 119, No 1392.
49. Watt, *Dictionary*, 224-5; see also entries on 425-6, 431, 468, 530 and 549-50 for other magistri holding offices in the diocese.
50. *RMS*, i, app ii, No 95.
51. *Wigtownshire Charters*, No 132.
52. For the survival of the Anglian community see: P H Hill, *Whithorn 1. Excavations 1984-86, Interim Report* (Whithorn, 1987), 6.
53. Craig, 'Pre-Norman Sculpture'.
54. *RMS*, i, app i, No 20.
55. *Wigtownshire Charters*, 1-36, esp. Nos 7, 11-13, 22, 25, 29, 23.
56. *CDS*, ii, No 1702.
57. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 133.
58. *RRS*, vi, No 235.
59. *Wigtownshire Charters*, 37-84.
60. Ibid, 85-113.
61. Cowan, *Parishes*, 34, 117, 136, 196.
62. *RMS*, i, app ii, No 85; Cowan, *Parishes*, 198, 200.
63. *Holyrood Liber*, No 25.
64. Ibid, No 27.
65. Ibid, Nos 26, 74.
66. Ibid, Nos 54, 72.
67. Ibid, Nos 49, 73.
68. Cowan and Easson, *Religious Houses*, 96-97; R C Reid, 'The priory of St.Mary's Isle', *TDGAS*, xxxvi (1957-58), 9-26.
69. *CDS*, i, No 754.
70. *RRS*, ii, No 293.
71. *Holm Cultram Register*, Nos 116, 142, 143, 146, 148, 149.
72. Ibid, Nos 120a, 122, 123, 127, 131.
73. Ibid, Nos 120, 121, 128, 140a, 149.
74. *Melrose Liber*, i, Nos 192-5.
75. Brooke, 'The Glenkens', 75.
76. *Dryburgh Liber*, No 73.
77. *St.Bees Register*, Nos 60-62.
78. *CDS*, ii, No 1606 (6).
79. *Kelso Liber*, ii, No 468.
80. *Lindores Cartulary*, No cxii.
81. For a general survey of the process as a whole in Scotland see: I B Cowan, 'Some aspects of the appropriation of parish churches in medieval Scotland', *RSCHS*, xiii (1957-59), 202-22.
82. *Glasgow Registrum*, i, Nos 60, 94.
83. *English Historical Documents*, iii, ed H.Rothwell (London, 1975), 643-76 at 658-9; Canon 32 of the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council, cited in R A R Hartridge, *A History of Vicarages in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1930), 20-21.

84. For details of the pattern of appropriations by c.1275, see my contribution to the forthcoming revised Atlas of Scottish History.
85. Holyrood Liber, Nos 25, 27, 49, 51, 72.
86. Ibid, Nos 49, 50.
87. Ibid, Nos 23, 80; SRO GD 141/ No A.
88. Dryburgh Liber, Nos 68, 71, 73, 75-77.
89. Ibid, No 65.
90. Ibid, Nos 75, 78.
91. Ibid, No 74.
92. Cowan, Parishes, 135.
93. Ibid, 76, 170.
94. Ibid, 76.
95. Stell, Dumfries and Galloway, 146, RCAHMS, Galloway, ii, No 73.

CHAPTER 7

People, Land and Society

The highly complex Galwegian society which had evolved by the close of the 11th century drew on roots stretching back at least as far as the pre-Roman Iron Age, and probably earlier still. But those formative years spanning the age of migrations which followed the Roman withdrawal from Britain remain an area of uncertainty and debate, with some recent work adding to our limited understanding of this period. (1) The great complexity of the population make-up of the south-western peninsula is however certain, and elements from all the major racial groups common to Dark Age Britain are represented. Before progressing with an analysis of Galwegian society in the lordship period, it is therefore necessary to examine these population groups briefly.

BRYTHONIC

In the immediate post-Roman period the population of south-western Scotland was known from Latin sources as the Novantae, (2) an Iron Age 'B' people. They were part of the European La Tène cultural tradition and members of the P-Celtic or Brythonic linguistic group. As such, they were closely related to the Britons of Strathclyde and Cumbria. By the 6th century AD the Novantae had merged with other tribes around the head of the Solway to form the kingdom of Rheged, which constituted one of the principal bulwarks against the westwards expansion of the Northumbrian kingdom. After the assassination of King Urien in c 590 Rheged fell into decline and was destined to fall piecemeal under Anglian domination. In the mid 7th century, the remainder of the kingdom passed to the Anglians, a process aided by the marriage of Urien's great-granddaughter, Riemmelth, to Oswiu, future king of Northumbria.

The political demise of Rheged does not appear to have led to an obliteration of Brythonic culture within its former bounds, although certain districts in the north-west of England saw a significant migration of English-speaking settlers. Some of the Brythonic aristocracy may have preferred exile to life under Anglian domination, such men perhaps forming the British war-bands recorded in Ulster between 682 and 709. (3) This fits with the evidence which would suggest that there was widespread replacement of Brythonic nobles by Angles. The bulk of the rural population, however, probably remained Brythonic speaking.

Place-names remain the chief source of evidence for Brythonic settlement within the lordship region, with little work of an archaeological nature having been undertaken outwith key sites such as the Mote of Mark or Trusty's Hill, (4) with which to augment this limited source. Current research is serving to stress the wide distribution of Brythonic name forms throughout Galloway, and the early dominance and great longevity of Cumbric speech. Name forms containing the habitative element tref- or -tref, meaning a homestead or farming settlement, have long been recognised as important constituents of this pattern, but less common names e.g. those containing men- (a stone), such as Menhungion, Monreith and Minnigaff, have been identified. It is perhaps significant that a high proportion of lordship seats bear Brythonic names, e.g. Threave, (5) seat of the Douglases, where the name is the simplex form of tref, and

Menhungion (the modern Craichlaw), which was an important Balliol manor. Whilst research in this area is still limited, initial indications are that the Brythonic population maintained considerable dominance within Galloway throughout the period of Anglian settlement, and only gradually yielded ground to the other linguistic groups.

Gaelic

Studies of place-names in the Rhins peninsula have revealed the presence of some very early Q-Celtic elements. These indicate the start of the settlement of the region by Gaelic-speakers from north-eastern Ireland. Presumably part of the colonising movement which led to the formation of Dalriada, the Gaelic settlers of Galloway showed no such political precociousness and appear never to have achieved political unity. The nature of the predominant settlement names, particularly the topographically descriptive sliabh (small hill) or carraig (coastal rock), (6) suggests that the first group of Gaelic settlers was composed chiefly of inshore fishermen and small farmers. The distribution of these elements is restricted mainly to the Rhins, with outliers in Carrick and along the Solway coast. Slewcairn (NX 9261), a shoulder of the Criffel massif, is the most easterly example. Sliabh is wholly absent from the upland region of central Galloway, nor does it figure in the Machars, where Brythonic names survive in large numbers. This suggests that initial Gaelic settlement and native Brythonic were mutually exclusive.

It had been generally assumed that the decline of Rheged sparked a major expansion of Gaelic settlement, but there is little concrete evidence to support this. It appears rather to have been the Angles who exploited this situation. The precarious position of the Gaelic colony in Dalriada may have seen a switch in interest away from Argyll towards Galloway, but the Irish sources give no indication of such a development. The major shift towards Gaelic speech in Galloway, which is recorded in the place-names, appears to stem from later settlement, probably in the 10th and 11th centuries, with new colonists perhaps benefitting from a decline in Anglian power. This later phase of Gaelic settlement, which led to the eventual Gaelicising of the south-west, however, appears to have stemmed from completely different sources to those of the initial colonisation of the Rhins.

ANGLIAN

Historical sources for the expansion of Northumbria focus on its advances into Lothian and Pictland, with little indication surviving of any western push along the Solway coast. Aethelfrith's victory in 600 at Degsastan over a coalition of northern powers, led by the Scots of Dalriada, may have secured control of the region around Carlisle, but the victorious Northumbrians do not appear to have marched on into Galloway. If Smyth's hypothesis that the late 7th century crosses at Bewcastle and Ruthwell represent works of propaganda erected in a frontier zone is correct, (7) then the annexation of Galloway could date from as late as c 700. Certainly, the appointment of the first Anglian bishop at Whithorn in 731 suggests that the Northumbrian grip was being consolidated in the early decades of the 8th century.

The late date at which the Anglian hegemony in Galloway was established may account for the evidence for only limited colonisation by Anglian settlers. This forms a sharp contrast with the earlier occupation of Lothian. By the date of the establishment of an Anglian bishopric at Whithorn, Northumbria had reached its peak and from the late 750s was to pass into decline. The internal divisions which tore the kingdom were not conducive towards colonising ventures. English did not displace the Celtic languages of Galloway, and only small pockets of settlement can be isolated on the place-name map, mainly around the head of the Solway and in small groups along its northern shores. Unsurprisingly, it is in regions of good, cultivable land that the majority of the Anglian settlements are to be found. Farming communities are implicit in the -tūn and -hām names, as typified by such examples as Edingham near Dalbeattie or Myrton in the Machars. (8)

One very common settlement name overlooked by place-name scholars is OE aerne, meaning a house. This is not to be confused with the Gaelic earann, meaning a share or portion (see below 374). The outstanding instance is Whithorn (the White House), but other examples, such as Halferne (NX 758669), Blackerne (NX 785643), Chapelerne (NX 771672) or Clasherne (NX 202621) are to be found scattered throughout Galloway. In terms of numbers within the overall place-name pattern, however, the narrow range of early Anglian names, with very few topographical or fieldname forms, indicates a limited colonising movement. It is perhaps significant in this respect that certain of the naming elements suggest settlement in nucleated centres rather than dispersed rural locations.

Little can be said of the overall Anglian settlement pattern at the lower levels, but there are clear indications of change at the top of the social hierarchy, where certain high status sites can be traced. The clearest examples of this are the bōtl (lordly hall) sites of the Stewartry, at Buittle and "Arsbutill" (Burned Island in Loch Ken). Both were centres of lordship power in the 13th and 14th centuries. They probably derived this later importance from earlier local prominence as the centres of major Anglian-controlled estates.

The few place-name examples outlined above date from the period after the colonists had established themselves. Archaeology, however, has provided some evidence for the early years of the settlement, when the colonists had achieved only a precarious toe-hold. Excavations at the Mote of Mark produced evidence for its capture, sack and dismantlement in c 600. perhaps in the aftermath of Degsastan. This destruction was followed by a phase of abandonment which appears to have lasted into the closing years of the 7th century, when occupation was renewed. This was described by the excavators as "...of an impermanent character..." possibly of only "...a few squatters with their animals". (9) The new settlers were shown by artefactual evidence (including two pieces of Anglian runic inscription) to have been of Northumbrian origin and they may have formed part of the colonising movement of the late 7th century. Their occupation was impermanent, but there is no sign of their violent ejection. This suggests instead that the earlier ruinous fortifications were utilised only as a temporary defence. They were abandoned once a more secure grip on the neighbourhood had been obtained.

SCANDINAVIAN

Local traditions and the work of past historians have combined to over-inflate the importance of the Norse element in the overall settlement pattern of Galloway. (10) Archaeological discoveries from the excavations at Whithorn show that 'Hiberno-Norse' influence was strong in the southern part of the Machars, (11) but the lack of similar work elsewhere in Galloway has given rise to a considerable imbalance in current views as to the nature and development of Scandinavian settlement in the region. Place-names remain the principal source of evidence for the spread of Scandinavian colonists, displaying a scattered distribution along the Galwegian littoral, but with major clusters in the southern Machars and around Kirkcudbright. This coastal distribution has been taken as indicative of secondary colonisation from the earlier Norse colonies in the Hebrides, which spread southwards into the Irish Sea. Recent work by Fellows-Jensen, however, points towards an origin in the Danish colonies centred on York, (12) which is acceptable for some parts of eastern Galloway and Dumfriesshire. The nature of the finds from Whithorn, however, provide direct evidence for links with the Norse west and must imply that two colonising movements are present. One came by land from northern England, the other was sea-borne and derived from Ireland, Man and the Hebrides.

The Scandinavian place-name forms in Galloway fall into two distinct groups: the purely topographical and the habitative. The former are linked predominantly with coastal navigational features, e.g. Eggerness, Satterness (Southerness) or Estholm (Hestan Island), an aspect which lends support to the theory of sea-borne colonisation. Other forms include names in *bekkr* (stream), *þveit* (paddock/clearing), *fjall* (hill) and *dalr* (valley), (13) but all these elements are more common in Dumfriesshire than in Galloway. The distribution suggests that they were largely a product of secondary colonisation from earlier centres in the Danish settlements of northern England. With all four elements, however, it must be noted that they passed into common English usage as loan-words. This gives rise to considerable difficulties when it is attempted to use these eleements to assist in the construction of a chronology for Scandinavian settlement in this region.

In comparison to topographical names, those containing habitative elements are very scarce. The most common form contains *býr* or *bóer* (farm), e.g. Sorbie, Bysbie or Bagbie. The distribution of this element is more restricted, with most examples occurring around the Cree and Fleet estuaries, and especially in the Machars. With only seven definite examples of this form being recorded in Galloway, the traditional belief in Scandinavian conquest appears untenable. The evidence instead points towards limited colonisation, probably infilling the gaps in an already well-established settlement pattern.

One element used in the past to argue for Scandinavian colonisation was the noun *kirkja* (church), especially in the inversion compound form. The 'kirk-compound' place-names of south-western Scotland have long been a source of debate, and the argument has recently been rekindled by Brooke, who has brought into doubt the direct Scandinavian role in the name-forming process and called into question the chronologies proposed by earlier scholars. (14) Place-name scholars, such as MacQueen, sought to place these names in a 10th century context and to link them to the Gall-Gaidhil. (15) Nicolaisen raised the possibility of a derivation of these forms from

Anglian examples, but regarded this as less plausible than arguments in favour of a direct Scandinavian origin. Brooke, however, has pointed to the fluidity of place-name forms in Galloway throughout the Middle Ages and, focussing particularly on the kirk and kil elements in parish names, has argued a strong case in favour of a later date for the formation of the kirk-compound names. The intricacies of the rival arguments lie beyond the scope of this current work and need not be pursued further.

In addition to these four main population groups, two other elements have long been associated with the ethnic make-up of the Galwegians: the Gall-Gaidhil and the Picts. The Galloway Picts are a myth which, despite many attempts to lay its ghost, persist in current local tradition and popular literature. The Gall-Gaidhil, however, were for long accepted as 'real' inhabitants, who even gave their name to the region which they occupied. (16) Recent research is calling their presence in Galloway into doubt.

GALL-GAIDHIL

For many years it was the trend to identify a 9th or 10th century Gaelic-speaking element as arriving in Galloway in conjunction with the influx of Norse settlers. This group was identified as the Gall-Gaidhil, a hybrid race of Norse-Celtic ancestry who earned a reputation for unbridled ferocity and violent opposition to Christianity. The belief in their settlement in Galloway depended on the assumption that the Norse had been arriving in large numbers in the Solway region. It was argued that the Gall-Gaidhil had followed in the wake of this colonisation from areas of primary Norse settlement in Ireland or the Hebrides, or that some were members of the early Gaelic-speaking population of the Rhins region who had adopted the Norse lifestyle. (17) Later Irish sources describe them as apostates, Gaels who had accepted Scandinavian culture. The most quoted description is from the 17th century composition known as the 'Three Fragments':

> 'They were a people who had renounced their Baptism and they were usually called Northmen, for they had the customs of the Northmen, and had been fostered by them, and though the original Northmen were bad to churches these were worse, in whatever part of Ireland they were'. (18)

Macqueen seized upon this aspect of anti-clericalism and compared it with descriptions of the Galwegians in the northern English campaigns of the 12th century, thereby strengthening his arguments in favour of an identification of the Gall-Gaidhil with Galloway.

In view of the categoric statements made by Smyth and MacQueen amongst others, it is surprising to find that there is little concrete evidence relating to the origins and activities of the Gall-Gaidhil. Indeed, this very lack of evidence has led Brooke to question the very basis of the argument which seeks to locate them in Galloway. (19) Early Irish sources give no geographical location to this group, but the sphere of activities of their supposed leader in the mid 9th century, Ketil Flatnose, points to a Hebridean location. It is generally assumed that they were 'wandering bands of mixed Irish and Norse renegades', (20) or 'half Irish half Norse marauders', (21) who preyed on the Irish monasteries, and this hybrid nature remains unchallenged. Their 'homeland', however, is a matter of debate. As Ireland was a major target for their attentions it is unlikely that it was their original home, although some limited settlement may have occurred at a later date. The earlier Norse settlement of the Hebrides from c 800. and the survival of a substantial Gaelic population in those islands, however, seems to form an ideal combination for their development. (22)

Whilst it is acceptable that the mixed culture of the Western Isles would form a more appropriate source for the Gall-Gaidhil, the traditional link with Galloway in the 10th century is one that persists. (23) Despite the growing body of evidence in favour of a limited Norse settlement within Galloway, there is nothing yet to suggest that the Gall-Gaidhil participated in that process. There is, however, a considerable amount of material from Cumbria which points instead to settlement in that region. There, as Smyth suggests, existed a society to which the Gall-Gaidhil of the Irish sources bear a striking resemblance. It was 'half-pagan, half-Christian in religion; and ethnically... half-Norse, half-Celtic'. (24) The most striking monuments to this hybrid culture are the Cumbrian high crosses, such as that at Gosforth, with its oddly juxtaposed pagan and Christian motifs. This argument in favour of mixed Norse-Celtic settlement, probably from the Hebrides, has been expanded by Higham, (25) who has high-lighted the Gaelic element in the colonisation of the region. Cumbria, then, with its clear evidence for mixed-culture settlement, forms a more probable centre of Gall-Gaidhil activity than Galloway, where evidence for colonisation is extremely slender.

The chief prop of the argument in favour of a Gall-Gaidhil identification with Galloway lies in the 12th and 13th century associations of that people with the lordship. In Irish sources of the period, notably the Annals of Ulster, the head of the Galwegian ruling house is accorded the title 'Ri Gall-Gaidhil', (26) which is seemingly incontrovertible evidence for such a connection. Similarly, the early 13th century Orkneyinga Saga describes Galloway as 'Gaddgedlar', the Old Norse form of Gall-Gaidhil. (27) Brooke, however, argues that the attachment of the name may have arisen through some phonetic similarity with the true local name of the region. (28) That the term was applied to the inhabitants of the south-west by a non-native is quite clear. No people is going to use a name for themselves which implies their foreign-ness or which had certain derogatory overtones. The only evidence for a name used by the Galwegians themselves is in the 'Feregus Rex Galwitensium' (29) preserved in the list of lands granted to the Hospitallers. The de-Latinised nominative from this would be something like 'Galwite', which is perhaps sufficiently close to Gall-Gaidhil in foreign ears for the latter form to be substituted in the non-Galwegian writings. The argument, however, remains open and in the absence of more conclusive evidence on either side, a verdict of 'Not Proven' must be returned.

THE GALLOWAY PICTS

Whilst it has long been accepted that the historical period of the Picts is from the 4th to 9th centuries and their geographical location lies north of the Forth-Clyde isthmus, a separate tradition of Picts in Galloway survives. This is derived from the writings of certain 12th century English chroniclers and, despite the best efforts of modern scholarship, persists to the present. The tradition is commonly dismissed as stemming from the mistaken transmission of information in early sources, or simple errors on the parts of ill-informed chroniclers. That references to Picts in Galloway occur only in English sources has been used as an argument against placing any value on them, presumably because they were the work of 'foreigners' who were in no position to pass comment upon the complex ethnic mix of Galloway. Such dismissive arguments fail to take into account that these early writers, such as Richard of Hexham, were compiling their narratives in places which had suffered from direct contact with the Galwegians, or were receiving first hand information from men like St Ailred, who had visited Galloway in person. It was not until MacQueen's study of the 'Picts in Galloway', which focussed particular attention on the value of the 12th century sources, that any serious attempt was made to provide a reasoned explanation for the insistence of these chroniclers on an identification of the Picts with Galloway.

The 'problem' of the Galloway Picts, as identified by MacQueen, revolved around two opposing literary and chronological traditions. The earlier, which originated with Bede, (30) developed out of 8th century hagiographies concerned with St Ninian. These presented him as the evangelist of the Southern Picts, as opposed to those dwelling north of the Mounth who were converted by Columba. The second tradition originates in the works of a group of northern English monastic chroniclers, written in the mid 12th century. These either directly refer to the Galwegians as Picts, as in Richard of Hexham, or imply the presence of Picts in Galloway, as in Reginald of Durham.

(31) It is difficult to reconcile these two traditions, for it would seem that both are talking about unrelated situations, and attempts to draw the two together have often been tendentious.

Bede was in a position to obtain much information concerning the Picts, his source perhaps being Bishop Trumwine of Abercorn, whose diocese had been set up ostensibly as a bishopric over that people. In his writings, Bede showed a good knowledge of Pictish affairs and it is unlikely that he would have committed so basic a mistake as to mislocate their homeland. Some historians, notably Skene, (32) have suggested that Bede's reference to 'Niduarian Picts', expressed by them as 'Picts of the Nith', made in his Life of St Cuthbert, (33) is conclusive proof for their existence in the south-west. The section in question, however, deals with a people who were reached by sea from eastern Northumbria, which implies a location elsewhere on the eastern sea-board. The arguments in favour of their being a south-western people rely substantially upon the similarities between 'Nidua' and Nith, but this equation is not supported by the etymology of the river's name. Rivet and Smith's study of late Roman sources produced a number of forms, all derived from a common root 'Novius', but the later development of the name cannot be traced satisfactorily due to the changes in the linguistic background of the population of the valley. (34) Hunter Blair, however, whilst pointing out that Bede's source apparently referred to 'Niuduera regio', and admitting also that 'Niud' could evolve into Nith, proposes a location in Fife. (35) This view is endorsed by other writers, including Duncan. The present consensus, while not entirely ruling out the possibility of a south-western location, has swung in favour of the identification of the Niduari as a people of south Pictland.

The lack of documentation relating to Galloway from c 800 to c 1100 prevents a satisfactory attempt at tracing the development of the 12th century tradition out of the earlier sources. The writers concerned, Richard of Hexham, Ailred of Rievaulx, Reginald of Durham and Walter Daniel, were all in positions of first hand knowledge, or were reporting from reliable informants. All, it must be noted, were familiar with the works of Bede, and Ailred's Life of St Ninian represents a continuation of the tradition of the saint's missionary work amongst the Picts. Only Richard of Hexham, however, makes the specific identification of the Picts with Galwegians. Reginald makes the identification by implication, but Ailred and Walter Daniel omit any firm identification of the Picts with south-west Scotland.

Richard of Hexham was the earliest of the group, writing his chronicle at Hexham Priory shortly before 1141, when he was elected prior there. The Galwegians figure in his entries which relate to the campaign of 1138. The priory lay in the direct path of David I's army, and Richard must have had first hand knowledge of events. In the course of his narration he refers to '...Picts, who are commonly called Galwegians...', (36) and enters into considerable detail regarding their role in the invasion. It is the easiest answer to dismiss Richard's testimony on the grounds that he was simply introducing another exotic element to add colour to his list of the groups following King David. After all, since their involvement in the Barbarian Conspiracy of 367, the Picts had been represented as the enemy of civilised, and by extension Christian, southern Britain. They had been the traditional enemies of Northumbria, and the Scottish push to the Tweed in the 10th and 11th centuries was the realisation of the previous efforts of their Pictish precursors. It would be natural, therefore, to list this people as one of the barbaric elements which formed '...that detestable army, worse than all pagan peoples...'. (37) which the heroic English army, in its guise as the saviours of Christian civilisation, were to vanquish. The problem remains, however, that his personal experience at Hexham should have put him in a position to comment upon the ethnic make-up of David's army, without recourse to literary embellishment.

Ailred of Rievaulx's prose composition De Standardo, written in the mid 1150s, formed the next link in the development of the tradition. Ailred's unique social position put him in an eminently well-informed situation, and it is clear that much of his work is drawn from eye-witness accounts. Although it was written mainly as a panegyric for Walter L'Espec, the proximity of the abbey of Rievaulx to the battlefield at Northallerton adds weight to De Standardo's influence as a source. It contains the stock list of Galwegian attrocities, but presents their conduct in the battle in a favourable light. (39) Ailred, it must be remembered, was the only one of the writers reporting these events who had visited Galloway in person. Bearing this in mind, his avoidance of the term 'Pict' is perhaps more significant, and his consistent use of 'Galwenses' or 'Galwalenses' is more likely to be indicative of the term used by the natives of Galloway to describe themselves. Ailred's biographer, Walter Daniel, writing soon after his subject's death in 1167 and before the Galloway rebellion of 1174, similarly avoids giving a specific name to the Galwegians. He does, however, refer to the region as 'Galwadiam'. (39)

The final writer in this group, Reginald of Durham, was a correspondent of Ailred's, writing in the later 1160s. He is one of the main sources of detail relating to the abbot's visit to Galloway, and preserves details of Ailred's presence in Kirkcudbright in his work on the miracles of St Cuthbert, the Libellus de admirandis Beati Cuthberti. (40) To Reginald, Galloway is the land of the Picts and, to show that he was not mislocating events, Kirkcudbright is described as '...in the land of the Picts'. (41) He refers to a 'Pictish scholar' and describes the clergy serving the church at Kirkcudbright as '...certain clerks, who are called Scollofthes in the Pictish tongue...'. Clearly, Reginald viewed the Picts and Galwegians as one and the same. It is MacQueen's contention that by the mid 12th century Gaelic was the dominant language in Galloway, (42) and that by the 'Pictish tongue' Reginald must therefore mean Gaelic speech.

The use of the term 'Picti' dies out in the later decades of the 12th century, when material relating to Galloway starts to draw on the writings of Roger of Howden, who was personally acquainted with the region in the period from 1174 to 1186. For him the Galwegians are consistently 'Galwalenses', and it is this and several variant forms of the name that become the basis for all subsequent Latin works. The tradition of Galloway Picts in the 12th century is, therefore, a phenomenon of short duration and originates apparently with the work of Richard of Hexham. While it is unsafe simply to reject Richard's use of the term out of hand, due to his unique position in 1138, it is most probable that his use of the term 'Picti' derives from unsound antiquarianism and the misapplication of an obsolete name. The structure of Richard's references shows that 'Galwegians' was the name used for the inhabitants of south-western Scotland at the time of even his writings, but his dismissal of the term as vulgar in origin may reveal his thinking. In his use of the term Pict Richard was perhaps seeking to demonstrate his superior knowledge of northern history, and his persistent references to Picts may be nothing more than a pedantic insistence upon the use of the 'correct' term, as opposed to 'Galwegian', a term used by the 'uneducated masses'.

Even when the Gall-Gaidhil and the Picts are left to one side, it is clear that by c 1100 the ethnic make-up of Galloway had taken on a highly complex character. To this mixture of Celtic and Germanic populations further exotic minority elements were to be introduced from northern England and Lowland Scotland, settlers who came in the wake of the Anglo-Norman vassals of the lords of Galloway. An understanding of this complex background of migration and colonisation goes a considerable way towards easing an analysis of the culture and social structure upon which the lordship was founded.

Units of Assessment

As would be expected in an area with a complex cultural background, the structures upon which the socio-economic framework of Galloway was based reveal the existence of a variety of conflicting systems. In particular, the units of assessment used in land valuation, which can be traced through place-name evidence and limited documentary material, show the presence of an array of types which can be assigned sequentially in either chronological terms, or in terms of the dominance of a particular ethnic group. It must be stressed, however, that the record is fragmentary, and that no overall pattern can be determined. The pieces which survive from these earlier systems are, moreover, largely submerged in the pattern of assessments which were devised in the later Middle Ages which were based on merklands. These later systems, apparently bear little relation to the earlier valuations,

The very variety of valuation units in Galloway speaks of an eclecticism which may not have been solely the result of its multi-cultural population. Indeed, it is tempting to suggest that different elements drawn from a number of systems were adapted to suit the particular needs of the region. Thus, elements more common to north-eastern Scotland, i.e. davochs, are found alongside those utilised in the western Highlands and Islands, i.e. the pennyland, whilst alongside these fiscal measures the Anglian carucate is found used as a measure of extent or capacity. (43) It is not the intention here to embark upon an extended analysis of the development of these normally opposed systems, but it is necessary in the present context to set them in their proper background.

Two main systems of assessment dominated most of northern and western Scotland before the 13th century, namely those based on either the davoch or ounceland as the principal units. Neither system is strictly mutually exclusive, except in Caithness and the Northern Isles where the davoch is not found, and Galloway where the ounceland is absent but its smaller subdivisions are known. Both systems are based on a grade of smaller elements, possibly representing a development from an original levy based on households. The ounceland in particular, with its subdivisions into twenty pennylands, shows the full development of this graded scale. It is found mainly in areas of Scandinavian settlement, where it is assumed to represent the adaptation of a pre-existing structure to suit the administrative needs of the new colonists. The davoch, by contrast, is regarded as a Celtic phenomenon, and appears to be associated more closely with agrarian production than the ounceland, which is more difficult to associate with measures of productivity. (44)

The association of the davoch with agricultural production is mainly a north-eastern Scottish phenomenon, the bulk of the evidence linking it with the former Pictish territories. (45) It was believed that its distribution was confined to the region north of the Forth-Clyde isthmus, but place-name research has revealed its presence in Galloway and Carrick. (46) The apparent close link with arable production led McKerral to argue originally that it was specifically an arable measure, (47) but of variable extent in acreage. Such variation was interpreted as a reflection of the quality of the land and the level of advancement of its arable development. The crux of his view was that the davoch represented the collective productive acreage of the agricultural community. In a later development of his argument, McKerral accepted an administrative function for the davoch, but retained his interpretation of it as primarily a measure of production. He did, however, change his views concerning how it was structured, regarding it instead as a collective entity assessed on a set number of households and forming the basis of liability to certain dues and renders. (48) To facilitate the operation of this scheme, each davoch was divided into quarterlands (ceathramh) not necessarily comprising a quarter of its total territory, but responsible for a quarter of its taxation.

This fiscal role was later rejected by some historians, most notably Barrow, (49) who instead favoured a strict role as a measure of capacity with a possibility of a set acreage. This is supported by documentation from the North East, in which it is implicit that a davoch could be made up from a set number of carucates. Geographical variations in acreage have been identified, which range from four hundred and sixteen acres in the north and east of Scotland, down to forty-eight in parts of the west. (50) The greater variation in extent apparent in the west might imply that the davoch there was less firmly tied to a concept of a fixed measure and held more of a function as a fiscal unit.

The regional variations in size and mode of subdivision point to major differences in the purpose and organisation of the systems. In the west it followed the structure of the ounceland, with subdivisions into quarterlands or individual pennylands (pheighinn), themselves lesser fiscal units. The Anglian carucate is unknown in the Gaelic west, but is common throughout eastern Scotland, where Northumbrian influence was strongest. The Gaelic origins of the name davoch, and its easy equation with the ounceland in the west, point to its early development in that region, from whence it was brought east by Dalriadan colonists. Certainly, its application in the north-east in conjunction with non-Gaelic subdivisions suggests an adaptation to meet an agricultural organisation radically different from that for which it was devised. It is possible, then, that the davoch only gained dominance in the east after the mid 9th century, when its original homeland was passing under Scandinavian domination. In the former Pictish territories the fiscal davoch underwent metamorphosis to meet the problems posed by a system based on substantial arable districts rather than a notional grouping based on households. This could explain the dual character which the davoch displays, both as a unit of fixed extent and as an expression of the render from that unit.

It is with the fiscal role of the davoch that studies into its development in western Scotland have been concerned. Bannerman's work on the Senchus Fer nAlban has stressed the unit's probable Dalriadan origins. (51) There, households were grouped into twenties for the purpose of naval assessment and recruitment, and it is argued that these units, although never so designated in the Senchus text, formed the progenitors of the davoch/ounceland system. The association between the twenty household and twenty pennyland divisions is inescapable. (52) The equation of household and pennyland is strengthened by charter evidence, as in the grant made to Paisley Abbey in c 1200 by Reginald, son of Somerled, of the annual render of one penny from every house in his territories which had a hearth. (53)

The continuing role of the davoch/ounceland as a unit upon which naval levies were based provides firmer evidence for this link. This aspect is illustrated in a letter dated to 1304, from John, earl of Atholl, to Edward I, which stated that a certain 'Lochlann' was to raise a galley of twenty oars from every davoch in his possession, (54) presumably crewed by one man from each pennyland. This western and Gaelic character of the davoch, and its use as a means of military assessment, may serve to explain its existence in Galloway. The possible cultural relationship between the Solway region and the Hebrides in the 9th and 10th centuries, coupled with the early evidence for Gaelic settlement in parts of Galloway and Carrick, may have provided the means for the transmission of the system to the south-west.

The nature of the Galwegian davoch remains open to question. The subdivisions into quarterlands and pennylands are present, but the dating of their introduction is debated. A later date seems most likely, probably at a time when familiarity with its uses elsewhere had high-lighted the administrative uses of such sub-units. (55) The complicating factor in Galloway is the existence of carucates, which could date to the period of Anglian domination rather than the 12th century. There must remain a question, moreover, as to whether the carucate had ever any real physical existence in Galloway or was not a scribal fiction created by a monastic clerk unfamiliar with Galwegian terminology. The presence of the pennylands and quarterlands in both charters and place-name forms points towards the western-style davoch with its primarily fiscal role, but the 14th century evidence is in direct contradiction of this. Robert I's grant of various lands in Claunch and Kilsture to Richard McCuffog included an award of eight bovates, (56) which represent one carucate or a quarter of a north-eastern davoch of four hundred and sixteen acres. It is possible, however, that exotic nomenclature has been applied to the Gaelic system, or that Robert was introducing new methods of land division into Galloway as part of his radical redistribution of territory following the victory over the Balliol party in the lordship.

This apparently contradictory evidence may point to a blend of systems, with the purely fiscal and notional on the one hand and the practical on the other. There is evidence for the equation of the Galwegian with the western davoch in the records of the naval power of the lords of Galloway in the 13th century, but the basis on which the fleets were levied and manned is unknown. The presence of davochs, however, implies a system akin to the old Dalriadan levy.

The place-names containing the `davoch` element are restricted mainly to the southern part of the Stewartry, with a small group in Carrick. Only one example is known from Wigtownshire (see map 3). The noun has been corrupted to <u>doach</u> or <u>doch</u> and figures as both prefix and suffix. It is most frequently associated with farm names, but others now only survive as topographical elements. Their main distribution in the fertile south-eastern part of the Stewartry preserves the association of the davoch with arable cultivation.

Lesser Units

The proliferation of place-names in the south-west which relate to subdivisions of the davoch lends support to the equation of the Dalriadic and Galwegian units. The main sub-unit is the quarterland (ceathramh), which is restricted almost exclusively to the bounds of the lordship, but with a small group in the Glencairn district (see map 4). Five-pennyland groupings, equal to a quarterland, also occur in Carrick. The place-name form survives, generally as a prefix in Kirrie-, kir- or cor-, very occasionally corrupted to kil- (eg. Killantrae, NX 350451, is Kerintray in 1494 (57)). Its distribution is mainly in lower-lying agricultural districts, or in the upper reaches of the major river valleys, such as that of the Ken. The name today is linked primarily with some of the larger farms.

Quarterland divisions are commom to the davoch and ounceland systems, and also to the later Irish equivalent, the baile-biataigh. Bannerman has shown that the minimum number of households held by the leader of a cenel was five, and that the household groupings in the Senchus are expressed in multiples of that figure. (58) It is noticeable that amongst Robert I's grants quarterlands or five pennyland groupings formed the largest single awards made in Galloway. (59) This implies the survival of some residual sense of status attached to the holders of such units. Even the grant to Richard McCuffog, expressed in terms of bovates, represents a holding of a quarter davoch in its north-eastern form.

The most common unit found in the charters and in place-names is the single pennyland (pheighinn). This occurs in its greatest density in central Carrick and more thinly throughout the lordship proper (see map 5). In place-names it is represented by the prefix *pen*- or *pin*-, and occasionally by the suffix -*fin* or -*phin*. (60) Grants of single pennylands are common from the early 13th century onwards. (61)

The pennyland's prominence as a land-holding of men of substance makes its relative lowliness in the scale of fiscal units difficult to accept. Later Highland and Hebridean evidence shows it as a unit of perhaps no more than four acres extent. This contrast with 13th century material from Carrick, where the pennyland occurs as a clearly valuable and extensive holding. In the 1260 'Extent' of Carrick, estates such as the fourteen pennyland of Straiton, or the ten pennyland of Drumfad and 'Glenop' are shown as giving an annual return of seventy-six merks for the former and forty merks for the latter, (62) which gives an annual value of from four to six merks per pennyland. McKerral pointed out that this gave in turn an annual value to the davoch in Carrick of nearly ten times the maximum found in the west. (63) This implies, as he went on to argue, that the pennyland in Carrick had lost its purely fiscal meaning by the mid 13th century and had become a vague term applied to blocks of land of varying worth.

As with the davoch, the pennyland in its fiscal sense had apparently no fixed acreage. If it can be equated with the 'household' in the *Senchus*, then presumably it comprised sufficient arable and pasture to support a substantial group. This argues against it being a small unit, and that its Hebridean transformation into a tiny area paying a fixed rent must be a late development. In some parts of the Isles it took on the meaning of a penny-*worth* of land, but in Galloway it preserved its former importance. Certainly, in the south-west it came to form large named units of apparently variable extent, which contained varying proportions of good and bad land. THis accounts for the widely ranging values of the Carrick 'Extent'. In no instance in the south-west can the pennyland be shown to take on the meaning of land of the annual value of one penny of rent.

Where pennylands survive in Galloway and Carrick as place-names, it is mainly as farms in the mixed-farming hill districts. It is possible that this reflects a recognition, made at the time of their establishment, of the unsuitability of such terrain for division into quarterlands. The pennylands may have been formed in isolation and expanded through assarts into the surrounding marginal, or through acquisition of rights to large tracts of upland pasture. Through such processes, they may have grown into large scale estates, many times greater in extent than the original pennyland assessments.

A few place-names preserve the memory of smaller units, but such subdivisions are rarely mentioned in the medieval documentation. The two divisions which occur are the half-pennyland (*leathpheighinn*) and farthingland (*fairdean*), but their occurrence as place-names is restricted entirely to Carrick and Nithsdale. The half-pennyland is unknown in Galwegian charter sources, but there is a 14th century record of a grant of a farthingland. This is in the charter of Robert I to John MacNeil of Carrick, which granted the latter the pennyland of Craigcaffie and the farthingland of Beoch on the eastern shore of Loch Ryan. (64) This rarity in charter sources must reflect the insignificance of the quarter pennyland in terms of the general land-holding pattern, an eightieth of a davoch being a fairly minor unit. In the Highlands and Islands it later came to be associated with single acres of land. (65) The one farthingland in Galloway, being a piece of named property which now forms a farm, suggests that like the pennyland in the south-west these minor units had lost their fiscal role and came to possess a far greater value than their original assessed level.

In conclusion, it seems that the south-western davoch and its components represented the blending of two systems. Like its north-eastern counterpart, it could be broken down into carucates and oxgangs or bovates, and was associated with arable land. This link with the north-east of Scotland probably stems from common Northumbrian influences. In Galloway, however, it appears to have a close affinity with the early Dalriadic system of naval assessment, fulfilling the role which the ounceland came to occupy in the Gaelic west. This, with its basis in twenty pennyland groupings, appears to have been adopted as the principal fiscal mechanism in pre-13th century Galloway.

The Structure of Rural Society

The fiscal divisions of the land were of direct relevance in the relationship of Crown and vassal. They formed the basis for the levying of dues and renders to the superior lords, but would have been of secondary importance to the bulk of the populace. Certainly, they were an imposition which had to be borne alongside cain and later tithes to the Church, but they were largely an administrative fiction which often lacked reality on the ground. The agricultural communities themselves were of greater importance, as they represented the basis of rural society. These also served as the practical administrative divisions of the land. Many came to correspond with the bounds of individual estates or parishes.

Minimal surviving documentation prevents the development of an overview of the complete pattern of estates and component farm settlements in the lordship. Individual units can be traced in isolation, but the charters give little indication of organisation or of the nature of the farmers themselves. Groups of charters such as those relating to Dunrod or Kirkgunzeon (66) are rarities in that they give quite extensive information concerning the build-up of the estates, but even these contain little of the minutiae of estate management. In the absence of written sources, therefore, place-name and archaeological evidence represent the principal means through which an examination of Galwegian rural society in the 12th and 13th centuries can be conducted.

Settlement and Agricultural Origins (Place-Name and Archaeological Evidence)

Agricultural activity in Galloway can be traced from the Neolithic period, when the Solway coasts were settled by migrant peoples from Continental Europe. The medieval farming tradition, however, has more recent roots in the practices of the amalgam of Celtic and Germanic peoples who had become established in Galloway in the post-Roman period. The Brythonic roots of much of the early agrarian settlement are explicit in the place-name forms, still visible through the later Germanic overlay. Anglian elements are likewise visible, settlements being recorded by a spread of names across the fertile southern districts. The Scandinavian elements are less clearly associated with good farming districts, although the concentration of their settlements in the Machars might indicate efforts to acquire good land.

Brythonic settlement names have been the target of a number of studies, which have shown trends of development from forms which indicate defended settlements (eg cair), through to unenclosed homesteads (eg tref). (67) These names point towards the development of a dispersed settlement pattern, with the population occupying homesteads of a non-defensive nature, rather than an entrenched population clustered in fortified sites. Fieldwork within Galloway, necessary for the establishment of some indication of the distribution of these early sites, has been undertaken only on a limited scale, and as yet there is only patchy evidence for the existence of these unenclosed sites of post-Roman date. A single example, of apparently 2nd century date, has been excavated at Moss Raploch in the Galloway uplands. (68) The simple hut circle at Moss Raploch stands in stark contrast to the contemporary massive rectilinear earthworks at Rispain, which appear to have enclosed a substantial agricultural community. (69) These contrasting sites highlight the dangers of such generalisations as have been made on the basis of place-names alone.

Archaeological work on later Iron Age sites in Galloway is severely limited, which prevents the clear establishment of any links between such early sites as Rispain and their apparent successors. Work has been largely limited to two fortified sites, Mote of Mark and Trusty's Hill, both of which were occupied in the 6th century by Brythonic peoples. (70) The development of fortifications at both sites suggests a response to raiding parties. The early date indicates that Gaelic or Pictish peoples rather than Angles were the enemy. At the Mote of Mark, however, it was Angles who displaced the native population. Both sites came to violent ends in the 6th or 7th centuries.

Evidence from these sites, in the form of Germanic glass and pottery imported from the Continent alongside the moulds for casting high-quality metal-work, indicates a high social status. These forts presumably represented the strongholds of the warrior-aristocracy and are thus atypical of the settlement form occupied by the majority of the population. Low status sites of similar date are, however, as yet unknown in Galloway, although fieldwork has revealed large numbers of unenclosed huts associated with field-systems, some of which may be contemporary with the fortified centres. (71)

Most known examples of hut circles in Galloway lie in marginal districts, but this distribution is probably due to fortuitous survival. Obliteration through later agricultural operations does not entirely explain their absence from lowland districts. This dearth may be partially explained by the use of crannogs rather than land-based sites, and, indeed, the former plethora of marshy lochans in Galloway favoured the development of that kind of monument. Crannogs in Carlingwark Loch (NX 765615), Milton Loch (NX 839718), Dowalton Loch (NX 4074) and Black Loch (NX 114612), have produced artefactual evidence for occupation into the Roman period, whilst at Lochrutton (NX 898730), the Iron Age crannog was occupied into at least the 13th century. (72)

The nature of the rural economy within which these sites operated is an area of continuing debate. The traditional view inclines towards a pastoral society, which practised only limited arable cultivation. This interpretation was epitomised by Piggott's description of 'foot-loose Celtic cowboys', (73), who drifted with their herds. Based on the absence of any significant association between hut circles and the arable lowlands, this myth has been exploded by the advent of aerial photography, which has demonstrated the former presence of these monuments in what are now cultivated regions. Similarly, more intensive surveys of upland regions are showing that large areas of what is now grassland were formerly under the plough. The emphasis is now towards the evidence for arable cultivation, which has been supported by the physical remains of ploughs, quernstones and carbonised grain from excavated sites. Pollen analysis, however, has as yet produced no clear picture, although in the uplands of the Stewartry the pattern would appear to be forest clearance followed by the development of grasslands rather than a move to cereal production. (74)

On the basis of the present evidence from field surveys and place-name studies, it would appear that the Brythonic population of Galloway did depend on a largely pastoral economy. Arable cultivation was not unknown, but evidence for its extent is scanty. There is as yet no sign of the higher altitude agriculture known in the eastern Borders, but the wetter climate of Galloway may always have rendered the south-western uplands less suitable for arable exploitation. Where there is activity in these upland zones, forest clearance has given rise to stretches of open grassland rather than extensive areas of cultivation. This is complimented by the absence of remains of clustered settlements and field systems, which point towards a dispersed society based predominantly on livestock management. (75)

The emphasis so far has been on the Brythonic population, but it can be seen that Gaelic colonists were moving into Galloway by the 5th century. No settlement types of diagnostically Gaelic form have yet been recognised, and the known early place-name elements are of a topographic nature. Nicolaisen argued for an early spread of Gaelic from these initial communities, (76) and proposed that the language and culture had become established throughout the region by c 800. Serious doubts, however, must be cast on his chronology, as two of the name elements selected to illustrate his thesis, cill (church) and baile (village/farm), remained in common usage throughout the Middle Ages. Irish evidence suggests that baile may not have developed as a name-forming element until the 12th century. (77) Certainly, in Galloway, names in bal- continued to be coined into the 15th century, e.g. Balmaclellan. (78) When the apparent late survival of Brythonic speech in Galloway is borne in mind, it is probable that the chronological position of baile and the associated achadh (field) elements used to support Nicolaisen's thesis, should be pushed forward. A date in the late 10th century at the earliest, which would place these names in the context of the steady Gaelicisation of the Southern Uplands, would accord better with the Irish chronologies.

Regardless of dating controversies, these Gaelic elements remain of value as evidence for the development of a settled Gaelic-speaking population. The density of their distribution, moreover, testifies to the degree of that settlement and the degree of dominance gained over Brythonic speech forms. The two elements, *baile* and *achadh*, record the growth in intensity of settlement, with the former representing the primary settlement site and the latter the secondary settlements established within its bounds. Thus, the formerly non-habitative *achadh*, referring to the fields associated with the *baile* community, came to be applied to new settlement sites.

The earliest phase of Gaelic expansion in Galloway appears to have been concurrent with the Anglian occupation of the region. Evidence for extensive colonisation associated with the political and ecclesiastical take-over of south-western Scotland by the Northumbrians is slim, but a few settlement names of early type can be traced. (79) All the examples known, such as those which contain the habitative elements *ingaham* (eg Edingham NX 836628, Penninghame NX 406608), or *tūn* (eg Kelton NX 743597, Carleton NX 392379), imply a settled population. The general distribution of these names shows a marked preference for the lowland districts of Galloway. More exotic forms, such as *bōtl* (lordly hall), with a thin distribution over the south-west (eg Buittle and Erisbutil in the Stewartry and Maybole in Carrick) may represent later developments in the Anglian social hierarchy. Generics which relate to minor sites, such as *wic* (outlying grange), are absent from Galloway place-names.

The rarity of the surviviing Anglian settlement names in Galloway is counterbalanced by the apparently disproportionately important position which these locations retained throughout the Middle Ages. Buittle, for example, survived as one of the principal seats of the later lords down to the middle of the 14th century, whilst Erisbutil still formed part of the lordly demesne in the lands seized by the Crown in the Douglas forfeitures of 1455. Penninghame developed into an important parish centre, one of the wealthiest benefices in the diocese of Whithorn. The later importance of these sites, coupled with the apparent lack of secondary or subsidiary settlements, argues for the creation of important estates and the introduction of a relatively small group of high-ranking colonists. The survival of any of these Anglian names against a later predominantly Gaelic background must be indicative of an early date for establishment. Old, established names could pass into common usage and be adopted by the expanding Q-Celtic element in the population without being lost when Gaelic gained dominance. The high-status nature of the surviving names, when taken in conjunction with the scarcity of Anglian farming-community names, suggests that the Northumbrians formed an upper stratum exercising lordship over the old established Brythonic and emergent Gaelic populations.

Physical evidence for Northumbrian secular settlement is extremely scanty. Few sites have been identified, let alone excavated. At the Mote of Mark the Anglian occupation formed a brief post-script to the Brythonic settlement, (80) whilst at Cruggleton the possible Anglian hall complex is much disturbed by later medieval buildings. (81) The timber hall excavated at Kirkconnel in

Dumfriesshire, (82) closely related to remains found at Doon Hill in East Lothian, (83) gives some clearer indication of what could be expected at an early Anglian site in Galloway. At Kirkconnel, however, the site declined in importance after c 700, and there is little indication of its physical development in the later Anglian period.

Whithorn

Little can be said about the social structure upon which the Anglian estate pattern may have been built, although some evidence is coming to light at Whithorn. There, however, we are operating in an ecclesiastical context and are dealing with a centre considerably older than the Anglian period. Anomalies in its nature and probable development should therefore be expected, and it cannot be taken as a model for the pattern of secular estates of Anglian date. It would appear that the Anglian monastery lay at the heart of a manorial complex, which may in some way be reflected in the distribution pattern of the Whithorn School crosses in the Machars. These crosses may have been located at or near manorial centres which served also as outlying preaching-stations. The dispersed nature of the cross distribution may be indicative of a multiple estate pattern, a known phenomenon at other Anglian monasteries, where the estates were scattered over a wide geographical area rather than focussed on the monastic centre. Concrete proof for such a situation at Whithorn is lacking, but material from the excavations can be used to infer its existence. Bone remains from the Anglian midden deposits were remarkable for the limited variety of the species recognised and, more strikingly, for the age of the animals and the portions of the anatomy represented. The skeletal remains showed that the beasts had been butchered into joints, and that young animals in particular were selected. (84) This has been taken as indicative of the render of selected meat and young live animals, and the quantity represented argues against such renders being drawn solely from the immediate vicinity of the monastery. Joints of venison figure prominently in the bone remains, and this would certainly seem to indicate renders in kind from outlying estates, perhaps involving rights to shares in hunting. Grants of such rights to monasteries are recorded locally, one later example being Uhtred's gift to Holyrood of the tithe of his hunting in Desnes Ioan. (85)

The particular importance of Whithorn lies in the evidence which it has provided for the establishment of Scandinavian settlement in Galloway. Some form of trading community appears to have developed adjacent to the monastic site, (86) whilst the scatter of Scandinavian place-names throughout the southern Machars might be indicative of the introduction of settlers into the established estate pattern of monastic lands, although the accepted 9th century date attributed to the *by*-names makes this doubtful. Evidence for intensive settlement and the evolution of a site hierarchy, as represented by the *stathr*, *saetr* or *bolstathr* farms of the Scandinavian north and west, is lacking in Galloway, and the density of settlement names is markedly thinner than in Dumfriesshire.

The single Scandinavian habitative generic present in Galloway is mapped by the suffix -*by* or-*bie*. The -*by* names of eastern Galloway and Dumfriesshire probably derive from the old Danish *by* rather than the Old East Norse *býr*, as they appear to constitute a north-westerly expansion from the Danish colonies of Yorkshire. (87) The examples around Wigtown Bay, however, argue in favour of an introduction by Norse-speaking colonists arriving by sea from the west. The term itself, in both forms, can be used to describe almost any type of settlement from single farmsteads to important towns, but the Galwegian examples appear to refer solely to small farming communities.

The origins of the *by* and *byr* settlements in Galloway is a thorny question. Unlike Dumfriesshire and the Cumbrian examples, the specific element in Galloway is never a personal name. Fellows-Jensen argues that personal name prefixes are indicative of grants to specific individuals, probably where larger estates were being broken up, whereas appelatival specifics are indicative of the takeover of the pre-Scandinavian settlement unit itself. In Galloway only appelatival specifics are recorded, which suggests that the settlers were moving into an already defined settlement pattern. The lack of personal name forms must indicate that the immigration was not sufficiently intensive for these initial settlements to be broken down into smaller farms. (88) Indeed, it may be argued that the scale of Scandinavian settlements was limited, and that the Norse were introduced into the region by agreement. The manner in which these sites are slotted into the Whithorn estates and form an arc around the northern and western boundary of the distribution district of the Whithorn School sculptures, would appear to support this hypothesis. Further conjecture is pointless in the absence of more concrete evidence. Future work at Whithorn may provide us with more firm evidence of the nature of Scandinavian settlement in the Machars.

Despite the place-names, physical evidence for Scandinavian settlement was disappointingly meagre until the start of new excavation work at Whithorn in 1984. There, evidence for an apparently Scandinavian or Anglo-Scandinavian community has been found on the southern slopes of the low hill occupied by the monastic site. Traces of Norse-period structures overlying Anglian monastic remains have been located, but it has not been possible to determine whether these were of a secular or an ecclesiastical nature. The hill-top remains have been considerably disturbed by later burials, but remains of a large timber building with a floor of massive slabs has been unearthed. This suggests the survival of a hill-top focus for the community clustered around the foot of the hill.

The remains of this community are not strictly of an agricultural nature and fit more comfortably into an 'urban' context. The site is low-lying and liable to flood, hemmed in by the elevated ground occupied by the monastic buildings and the present town. This cramped and unsavoury location could imply that the incomers were obliged to integrate into an existing pattern, where the better sites were already occupied. Large quantities of animal bone have been found in association with the 9th to 11th century Anglo-Scandinavian structures. The nature of the site, however, indicates that the bone dumps here were related to industrial activity rather than domestic consumption of home-reared cattle on the parts of the Scandinavian settlers. The animal remains are clearly the waste-product from working in antler, bone, leather and hides, with numerous offcuts from bone-combs, horn utensils and leather goods having been preserved in the water-logged deposits. The settlers appear, therefore, to have found a niche as craftsmen, utilising the by-products of the local agricultural communities. Parallels with York Coppergate and Dublin Woodquay are obvious.

Involvement in agriculture on the parts of the Scandinavian population at Whithorn is not ruled out. The contents of the middens associated with the house/workshops suggest that some livestock and fowls may have been reared. Such occupations, however, were probably secondary to the settlers principal function as craftsmen. It is as manufacturers and traders that the Norse at Whithorn were established, not as agriculturalists. (89)

Whilst place-names of purely Scandinavian derivation are rare in Galloway, one element of Gaelic origin, recognised as a commonplace in regions of Norse or mixed Norse-Gaelic settlement, occurs with great frequency. This is the element airigh (shieling), which represents the adoption of a native Irish or Hebridean term by the incoming settlers. It has a widespread distribution throughout Galloway, Man and Cumbria, where the common link appears to be some degree of Norse settlement from primary colonies in the Hebrides. In Cumbria it is clearly an importation, but the Gaelic-speaking populations of Man and Galloway could provide a pre-Norse linguistic origin for the term in those areas.

The origins and development of the shieling system have been studied in depth in various regions, particularly in Man (90) and Cumbria. (91) Eleanor Megaw demonstrated the Gaelic origins of the Manx eary, and proposed a pre-Norse origin for the majority of those which developed into permanent settlements. The absence of saetr names (the Norse equivalent term) suggests that the new settlers found a fully-developed shieling system and adopted the existing

Gaelic terminology. Both *saetr* and *airigh* occur in Cumbria, which may indicate that the latter had not entirely supplanted its counterpart in the vocabulary of Norse colonists arriving in that region from the older colonies in the Isles. The absence of *saetr* names in Galloway parallels the Manx situation, and is probably indicative of a pre-Norse origin.

Megaw's research produced two distinctive groups of evidence. Firstly, where modern *eary* names, now in enclosed farmland, indicated a prior existence as a shieling, and secondly where there were un-named abandoned sites. The former lie mainly around the 600ft contour at the limit of cultivation, and are generally recorded in the earliest surviving Manx estate records. Many continue to function as farms. Manorial records reveal a past existence as upland holdings, commonly linked to a lowland farm. Many *eary* names have personal names as specifics, which implies individual possession. Less can be said about the abandoned un-named sites. These survive generally as shieling mounds in open moorland, beyond the limits of enclosed farming, and normally between the 900 and 100ft contours. None developed into a permanent farm.

Manx documentation showed that the named *earys* developed throughout the Middle Ages, with many having become permanent settlements by c 1500. Significantly, some are recorded as treens (ouncelands), which signifies considerable value in their own right. In all cases where the eary is valued as a treen, the settlement is associated with a keill (chapel). There is a clear association between treens and keills, which may date from the formative years of the valuation system based on ouncelands. Where an *eary* appears as a treen and possesses a keill an early date for its development into a permanent settlement can be postulated. It can be implied that where such transformations had occurred, the eary was probably of pre-Norse origin. The development into a permanent site may have been triggered by Norse colonisation, which put pressure on the available land and led to an infilling of the settlement pattern and a move to occupation of previously seasonal settlements on a permanent basis. The bulk of these sites lie near to the primary farming zone, at low altitudes. Megaw compared this with the later Norwegian and Scottish 'home-shieling', which was used in spring and autumn when poor weather rendered the upland shielings still unusable. The un-named upland shielings, therefore, may be the original summer sites, occupied for only a few months annually.

Galwegian sources are greatly inferior to the Manx records. Documentation concerned with the airie or airy, as the Galwegian sites are known, is non-existent from the medieval period. Most named airigh sites in Galloway are now long-established farms, but some names are attached to unsettled areas of land. The physical distribution of the Galwegian form is closely similar to its Manx counterpart, with none being sited above the 750ft contour and most lying at the modern limits of the arable, on good pasture land. The majority lie in Wigtownshire, particularly in the Machars where areas of arable are interspersed with higher rocky tracts. In the Stewartry, they are restricted to parishes with a high proportion of mixed agriculture, eg Kelton and Rerrick (see map 6). Kirkcolm in the Rhins, however, provides the most useful illustration. There, the open grassland of the west side is isolated from the more fertile east by a low range of hills. The western district is called Airies, and is subdivided into the modern farms of Mains of Airies and Little

Airies. These probably represent the summer pastures used to keep the herds away from the ripening crops on the east side. (92)

The linguistic structure of the Galloway airigh-names is almost exclusively Gaelic, in that the specific follows the name-forming generic, or occurs in its simplex form. This, with the absence of saetr names, argues for a pre-Norse, Gaelic ancestry, and yet they lie in their greatest concentration in the region of apparently heaviest Norse settlement. This parallels the Manx situation, with the Norse providing the catalyst for the transformation from seasonal to permanent habitation sites. Their concentration in the regions where by names are most common could indicate a speedy taking-up of the best available land, with a subsequent switch to settlement on the secondary, seasonal sites. Megaw, however, noted that airigh and baile have closely matching distributions and proposed that the latter may have been the primary settlements to which the shielings were attached. There is, however, no documentation to prove this case, and the long use of baile as a name-forming element raises further chronological difficulties. Such factors, therefore, render the precise origin and dating of the Galwegian shieling system unanswerable questions.

The Medieval Farming Community

The cultural mix which contributed to the character of the Galwegian population clearly had an impact upon the structure of the rural community, but it did not produce some peculiar hybrid agricultural regime. As might be expected, regional topography and climatic conditions played a greater role in the development of the rural society than the cultural traditions of the various ethnic groups. Thus, where soil conditions permitted, communities of arable farmers became established in nucleated settlements, whilst the extensive upland grass areas favoured the development of a dispersed pastoral society. This dichotomy reflects no cultural cleavage, as early arable communities can be shown to bear Brythonic, Anglian, Gaelic and Scandinavian names, eg Troqueer, Twynholm, Dunrod and Sorbie, but is a result of a local response to the limitations imposed by the south-western geology. The pattern which emerged by c 1100 has remained largely unaltered to the present day, despite the enclosures and 'improvements' of the 18th century, with the only significant upheaval occurring during the Wars of Independence. It must be remembered, however, that the documentation is exceedingly sparse, with few pre-15th century records to illustrate the evolution of the medieval communities. What survives is concerned primarily with the upper strata of society and the inclusion of information pertaining to the social state of the 'common man' is purely coincidental.

The chief body of material is formed by the monastic cartularies, particularly those of Holyrood and Holmcultram. The pattern of estates possessed by the monasteries has been discussed at length in the previous chapter and requires little expansion here. It is the additional information relating to the income derived from these estates and the manner of their exploitation that is of concern here.

The surviving Holyrood charters are not greatly informative about the management of the abbey's two main Galwegian estates, Dunrod and Galtway. It would appear that both were coextensive with the early parishes, which consisted of compact blocks of territory centred upon the cultivable areas around the village nuclei, with extensive upland pasture hinterlands. At both sites, the villages were abandoned in the late Middle Ages and their former lands given over almost solely to pasture. This has resulted in the survival of considerable earthwork remains at both sites. At Dunrod these are almost certainly late features, as the village maintained a precarious existence into the early 17th century. Two key elements, however, the church and a large ditched earthwork enclosure, certainly belong to the medieval period, the former dating from at least the middle of the 12th century. The moated site was excavated in part in the 1960s and was demonstrated by the quality of the pottery recovered to have been a site of high status, possibly a 'manor-house'. (93) Occupation was shown to commence in at least the 13th century and continued down to the 16th century. It lies to one side of the main settlement area, which is instead clusterd round the church. This suggests that the 'manor' was a late insertion. This aspect is reinforced by the manner in which it is enclosed by cultivation furrows, and separated from the village proper by a network of rigs. A late date for its construction is compatible with the suggestion that Dunrod was former lordly demesne (see above 311). The manor-house was probably constructed by the new monastic owners as a centre for the administration of their estates. As early as 1165 the Crown was extending its protection to

Holyrood's men who were being sent out to reside in their recently-acquired possession. (94)

Material which relates to the Holmcultram estate at Kirkgunzeon is more informative in its evidence relating to the actual functioning of the estate, although no physical remains of the grange itself have been identified. The country which formed the estate is a mix of upland grass areas and lowland scrub, which would never have been regarded as prime arable land. From the outset, pig-rearing and sheep-farming rather than cereal cultivation was planned, (95) and by the 1180s pig-herds of up to five hundred head were permitted to graze in the demesne woods of the lords of Galloway adjacent to the grange. (96) The importance of pigs in the medieval Galwegian economy is generally overlooked, but their significance is demonstrated not only by the Kirkgunzeon information, but also by Gilbert's attempts in 1174-5 to bribe Henry II with offers of tribute in cash and kind, which included five hundred pigs. Dundrennan was also involved in pig-farming in the 12th century, and came to an agreement with Holmcultram over rights to graze on the mast in the demesne woods of the lords. (97) The dispute resolved by this settlement, however, was concerned principally with problems relating to sheep-farming, and it was in that sphere that monasteries holding estates in Galloway were to become heavily involved.

Between 1161 and 1174 Holmcultram was seeking to acquire land for the raising of flocks in the region west of the Nith, a move which the under-endowed Dundrennan may have viewed as an infringement of its rights and interests. Wool production was to become especially profitable in the 13th and 14th centuries, with bulk exports to the Flemish and Italian markets. Dundrennan, by the mid 13th century, was exporting wool to England, (98) and at the end of the century Sweetheart was similarly engaged, complaining bitterly about eight and a half sacks seized at Holmcultram in 1297 by the English authorities. (99) It is clear that all three Galloway Cistercian houses were important centres of wool production, although none operated on a scale to equal the likes of Melrose or Newbattle. The account of the 14th century Italian merchant Francesco Pegolotti, show Dundrennan and Glenluce as producing fifteen sacks of wool apiece annually, which was half of that produced by Newbattle and just over a third of Melrose's output. (100) At an estimation of one thousand sheep necessary to produce between four and five sacks of wool, then both Dundrennan and Glenluce were running flocks of between at least three and four thousand head.

Besides this evidence for sheep-rearing, there is no record earlier than the 14th century for the intensive exploitation of the monastic demesne at any of the Galloway monasteries. The structure of the demesne lands of Dundrennan is preserved in a document of 1305, wherein Edward I confirmed the monastic estates in free warren. (101) These were concentrated around the abbey itself and comprised the southern portion of the parish of Rerrick. The remaining section may have formed the fief of the Rerrick family, who were probably vassals of the abbey. Edward's confirmation listed the component farms into which the demesne was subdivided, and most of these can be identified with the major farms of the present parish. The bulk of the land is upland grass or rocky coastal heath, unsuitable for arable cultivation and probably given over largely to sheep and cattle.

Evidence for the nature of demesne exploitation on secular estates is even more scanty than the ecclesiastical record. Of the lordship estates, it is possible to isolate those such as Buittle, Glasserton and Kells which were held directly by the lords, and contributed directly to the support of their household. Even here, however, it is not until the late 14th century with the Douglas Rental, or the mid 15th century with the accounts of the Chamberlain of Galloway, that the internal structure of these substantial estates can be discerned. (102) There are no such records for the smaller baronies until the 16th century.

The proximity of mottes to early village sites, as at Kelton, Kirkcormack and Twynholm indicates that new tiers of lordship were being superimposed upon an established agricultural system, presumably being supported by the traditional renders in labour and kind of the indigenous population. That the lords of these new baronies exploited land in their own right, however, is beyond question. The main evidence for this lies in the boreland farms, which are the precursors of the mains or home-farms of the post medieval period. It is generally accepted that the name derives from bord or 'table' land, ie the mensal lands of the lordship. This interpretation has been questioned in England, where it is held by some to refer to land held by bordage tenure. Later Scottish evidence, however, provides incontrovertible proof that mensal land is meant. An inquest, dated 1648, refers to 'the demesne land of Twynholm called Bordland of Cumpstoun', which is an estate just north of Kirkcudbright. (103) The modern farm is Mains of Cumstoun.

In terms of date, the Galloway examples are probably creations of the 12th to 14th centuries. Their close association with the caputs of the later 12th century baronies (see map 7) suggests their development by the Anglo-Norman knights introduced into Galloway in the post 1160 period. In view of the trend away from demesne cultivation by the middle of the 14th century, and the fragmentation of the early, substantial baronies, it is probable that most were established before c 1300.

A study of bordland/boreland place-names by Angus Winchester (104) shows that most lay near to the caputs of particular baronies on good, fertile land. This further clashes with the interpretation of bordland as land held by bordage tenure, which sees such land as consisting of assarts into the waste. In general, except where the modern parish represents a post-Reformation amalgam, there is only one per parish. Winchester stresses the close relationship between the borelands and the parish nuclei, with the farms in question in general lying close to the caput site. In such cases as Boreland of Anwoth, Boreland of Borgue and Boreland of Colvend, the mottes themselves lie on the farms of those names, completing the identification between the caput and the mensal lands.

Village and Farm Organisation

Charter sources and place-name evidence indicate that in the more fertile south and east of Galloway, a number of 'nucleated' villages had developed by the middle of the 12th century. The majority were to fail in the later Middle Ages, or became casualties to the ambitions of 18th century improving landlords. Of Dunrod and Galtway only earthworks remain, with less still at Kirkcormack.

Preston-under-Criffel is now marked only by its village cross, no other trace remaining visible above ground. Girthon was supplanted in the 18th century by Gatehouse of Fleet, and Glasserton was relocated when the Stewart lords of the manor decided to include its original site within the parklands which were to surround their new mansion. Twynholm and Sorbie are the only villages of any significance of earlier medieval origin. The majority of the other small towns and villages which dot the countryside of Galloway are of late medieval or post-16th century development.

The nucleated villages came generally to form the 'central places' of compact estates, where the parish and lordship shared the same bounds, and the church or caput in such cases normally lay close to or within the settlement itself. The physical layout of these villages is largely unknown. At Twynholm the medieval remains underlie the present village, which is clustered around the parish church. The caput of the late 12th century lordship lies either on the periphery of the village at Twynholm Motte, or two miles to the north at Trostrie. In either case, the village plan evolved independently of the location of the motte. In the early 13th century William, son of Gamell, lord of Twynholm, gave the canons of Holyrood a landed interest in the village, and his charter gives some indication of its organisation by that date. (105) The village territory was clearly divided into the common land, demesne and the land held in severalty. William assigned the canons four acres of his personal demesne, to be measured out by 'responsible men' and held apart from the land held by the villagers in common. In addition, they received a 'house' within the village and rights in the common pasture sufficient for the grazing of sixteen sheep and a horse, plus a proportionate share in the common easements of the villagers. Physical evidence for these territorial divisions within the village have been obliterated by post-Medieval developments, but at Dunrod the sharp distinction between the arable and the pasture can be seen quite clearly.

The remains at Dunrod must belong largely to the 16th century, but there is little reason to believe that they are in any way radically different to the layout of its 12th century precursor. the focal point is the 12th century church, which occupies a rocky outcrop rising above the general level of the village. Surrounding the church is a sub-circular cemetery enclosure, bounded to the east and north by a small stream which formed the village's sole source of water. To the west of the churchyard, and running in a broad arc around it, are six artificially levelled platforms which represent the sites of timber houses. The platforms average five metres in width by ten long, dimensions which suggest that some form of longhouse is represented. There are no traces of tofts or yards, but the clustered arrangement of the platforms makes such features unlikely to have existed. The village itself is unenclosed, although now-obliterated hedges may have separated the settlement from the fields and the pasture from the arable. The rig and furrow lies entirely to the north and east of the village, not around it as generally occurs in the eastern Scottish ferm touns, and extends up to three quarters of a mile from the village nucleus almost to the boundary with the neighbouring parish of Rerrick. To the south and west is pasture, with no trace of medieval cultivation, nor any sign of a barrier between it and the adjoining arable. The village lies between the arable and the pasture, and it is possible that the space formed by the arc of houses and the churchyard may have served as a stockyard.

Evidence concerned with the dispersed rural population is less forthcoming. Charter references to isolated homesteads, such as the 'house of Gilleker' and the 'gate of Gillecolum son of Patin' mentioned in connection with Holmcultram's estate at Mabie, (106) are exceptions to the rule. The social status of these men is indeterminable at this remove, and it is possible that substantial native land-holders are represented here. Dispersed population is evident in a number of the medieval parishes and lordships. The clearest example is Buittle, where the 1376 Rental shows the division of the lordship into a large number of minor settlements. Apart from an abortive attempt in the late 13th century to develop a burgh adjacent to Buittle Castle, there was no single dominant community within the barony. There are similar situations at Kells, Balmaghie, Kirkpatrick Irongray, Colvend and Southwick. All these baronies possessed high proportions of upland grazing relative to arable, which would give rise naturally to a preponderance towards stock-rearing. Animal husbandry is less labour intensive than arable cultivation and less likely to give rise to the development of large settled communities. No physical remains to which a positive 12th or 13th century date can be assigned have been identified, although the Royal Commission have recorded a number of possibilities in the Rhins. (107) Without the excavation of such sites, no firm interpretation or date can be given to them.

The expansion and contraction of the medieval rural community within Galloway can be discerned in a few cases. The bulk of the evidence relates to the Glenkens, and stems from the early 14th century military campaigns in this region which caused widespread destruction and depopulation. In her examination of the recolonisation of this district in the 15th century, Daphne Brooke has drawn attention to one particular place-name element which apparently charts the process of bringing land from the waste into cultivation. (108) This is the Gaelic noun earann (a share), which survives in the prefixes arn-, ern- or iron-. THe earliest recorded form of the name does not occur until 1408, in a charter concerning land in Balmaclellan parish, (109) but there is no reason to rule out an earlier date for its use as a name-forming element. Certain of the names, such as Arnmannoch (the Monks' Share) and Ernespie (the Bishop's Share), point to ecclesiastical involvement in the formation of assarts. Arnmannoch in Kirkgunzeon (NX 858605) lies on land which formed part of the Holmcultram estate. It is probably the 'Clochoc of the Monks' mentioned in a perambulation of the estate boundary in 1289. This described it as lying opposite the land known as 'Clochoc beg of Culwen'. (110) The farms which lie immediately across the parish boundary from Arnmannoch today are Meikle and Little Cloak. A second Arnmannoch lies on the northern boundary of Lochrutton (NX 888753), and may have pertained to Dundrennan's grange in this district. In both cases, the farms lie on marginal land and may represent areas recovered from the waste by monastic estate managers.

Evidence from outwith Galloway supports the interpretation of earann sites as assarted land. In Stirlingshire, in the region of Flanders Moss on the lands of Inchmahome Priory, there is a major concentration of earann-names, which include a number that are indicative of an ecclesiastical involvement. Four, Arnprior, Arngibbon, Arnbeg and Arngomerie, lie on the lower slopes of the Fintry and Gargunnock Hills, and, with Arntamie in the Menteith Hills, represent assarts taken out of the moorland. Arnvicar and Arnclerich, which lie in former marshland, are certainly areas of reclamation from the Moss. The two latter display clear ecclesiastical links in their specifics, and the prior in Arnprior is undoubtedly the head of the monastery at Inchmahome.

Moor and woodland reclamation were not the only ways in which land was taken into cultivation. Inchmahome was reclaiming land from Flanders Moss, and Inchaffray in Strathearn from the marshes in which it stood, such ventures reflecting in a small way the efforts of the great Fenland abbeys, such as Ramsey. (111) In Galloway, tracts of coastal saltmarsh were reclaimed, with Holmcultram extending its possessions in Kirkconnel on the Nith through drainage of the tidal flats. (112) The aim was probably to gain more pasture, a situation similar to the reclamations undertaken in Kent and Sussex by the monks of Christchurch Canterbury. (113) The peak of such assarting activity appears to have occurred in the later 13th century, which would coincide with the so-called High Farming period in England. The wars of the early 14th century were almost certainly responsible for the ending of further ambitious schemes in this sphere, and it was not until the early 15th century that renewed reclamation work can be traced in Galloway.

The Basis of the Rural Economy

The modern predominance of cattle-rearing in Galloway has given rise to a general assumption that dairy and meat herds were always the basis of the agricultural economy. The evidence for the involvement of the Cistercians in pig and sheep-farming supports the view that animal husbandry was preponderant. As has been discussed above, however, there is a substantial body of evidence to support the contention that arable cultivation was as important in certain parts of the region, but this material is generally overwhelmed by the mass of evidence concerned with stock-rearing.

From the early 12th century, charter sources begin to underline the importance of animal husbandry in the south-west of Scotland in general. Grants such as David I's gift of a render of cheeses to the monks of Selkirk, or the tithe of royal cain in pigs and cattle to Glasgow, and Malcolm IV's grant of cattle, cheese and pigs to Kelso, underscore this pastoral aspect. (114) The cattle and pigs offered by Gilbert to Henry II in 1174 again reinforce the emphasis on livestock, as does the record of the graded table of fines drawn up at Lanark and Dumfries in 1186 (115) for application in legal cases relating to Galloway. Aimed in particular at debtors to the Crown, it was assessed in terms of head of cattle, or in pigs where cattle were unavailable. The scale ranged from 240 cattle as a fine for interference in a judicial combat, to 10 for the first instance of default of payment of royal cain. Clearly, cattle formed an important measure of wealth in Galloway, in much the same way as in Ireland where the size of one's herd determined social status. The seizing of herds during the campaigns in England in 1138 and 1174 reflect this emphasis on the value placed on livestock. Early 14th century sources show the continuing importance of herds. In 1307, Edward II ordered Robert de Clifford, his northern Justiciar of the Forest, to allow refugees from Galloway to graze their flocks and herds in Inglewood Forest in Cumbria. (116) Whilst the Galwegians were prepared to abandon their homes and fields, they were not prepared to lose their chief means of survival and source of wealth, their livestock.

A cursory examination of the documentary sources would lead one to support the belief in a deficiency in arable cultivation in medieval Galloway. A number of trading licences issued by the English authorities in the mid 13th century show the Galloway abbeys as being actively involved in the importing of grain from Ireland. As early as 1220, Glenluce was licensed to 'buy in Ireland, corn, meal and other necessary victuals'. (117) Further licenses were issued in 1226, for two years in 1227, and for seven years in 1252, all of which authorised the import of grain for the provisioning of the abbey. (118) Later in the century, Dundrennan was trading with the English and received letters of safe conduct for its representatives in 1266 which permitted them to sell wool and other goods in England and to buy grain in return. (119) A further permit issued in 1267 and reconfirmed in 1280 gave the monks licence to purchase up to two hundred and forty 'crannoks' of wheat and as much oats, meal and wine as required, from the burgesses of Dublin and Drogheda. (120)

The monasteries were not alone in importing grain. In 1237 Erkin, merchant of Kirkcudbright, was licenced to buy produce in Ireland for Roger de Quincy. (121) The prolonged period for which there is evidence for the importing of grain implies a deficiency in local cereal production. Later material, however, shows that grain was being produced on a large scale, and it is most likely that the over-emphasis on sheep for wool as a source of income had led to relative neglect of arable cultivation. The imports from Ireland may have been to make up for any shortfall in quantity or quality in the local product.

In contrast to the evidence provided by the trading licences, a number of charters and details recorded in the Exchequer Rolls emphasise the importance of arable production in the south-western economy. There is record of specific grants of arable land for the support of the clergy, (122) or of 'ploughed fields' such as the 'Mustardgarth' granted in 1272 to the monks of Holmcultram. (123) The Exchequer Rolls provide only fragmentary evidence for the renders to the Crown from Dumfriesshire and Wigtownshire in the 13th century. The incomplete returns for 1264-6, concerned with the returns from the two portions of the lands of Roger de Quincy in the custody of Alexander Comyn, include references to unspecified amounts of oat-flour, malted barley, malted oats and wheat. (124) Further records, from 1329, detail the sale for cash of payments in kind from Galloway. (125) This included on one occasion thirteen chalders of wheat, twenty chalders of milled oats and over thirty-two chalders of malted barley.

The figures quoted in the 1329 rolls are probably roughly representative of the proportions of the various cereals produced in Galloway at the start of the 14th century. Oats and barley, with their greater tolerance for cold and wet conditions, together form approximately 80% of the cereals produced. Wheat, which requires a longer and drier growing season, forms just under one fifth of the total. The preponderance towards oats and barley is attested elsewhere in the kingdom, but most commonly in eastern districts. There, too, wheat formed a small but significant proportion of overall production, supplemented by grain imported from East Anglia. (126) In the east of Scotland, wheat was being produced mainly for consumption by the royal or magnate households, or for important monastic communities, any shortfall being supplemented by imported grain. The situation in Galloway almost certainly reflects this picture.

It is clear that wheat figured as a high-status product on the market, probably outwith the purchasing power of most individuals. The prices fetched in 1329 show wheat selling at two merks per chalder, which was equivalent to the rental of a ferm toun at Buittle in 1376. By way of contrast, milled oats or malt barley sold for only one merk per chalder. In the 13th century, Scottish wheat prices had varied between 12s and 20s per chalder, with oats and barley at *circa* 12-14s. The sharp rise in wheat prices in the early 14th century was certainly due to the wars with England in large part, but also to a series of poor harvests in the south. English wheat prices show similar inflationary increases, with oats and barley remaining stable.

The high price and the social status of its purchasers or importers indicate that wheat was in high demand mainly amongst the upper levels of society. Fine white wheat-bread was a mark of social distinction, the lower classes mainly consuming bread made from oats or barley. (127) Consumption of wheat was high in monastic communities, where a higher standard of diet in general was enjoyed. The grain imported by Dundrennan and Glenluce probably represented attempts to supplement the produce from the monastic demesne, which in both cases would appear to have been given over mainly to sheep and, in any case, was generally land unsuitable for cereal production. The necessity to import indicates that the local product was either available in insufficient quantities to satisfactorily augment the demesne-grown grain, or was regarded as being of inferior quality.

When taken together, the above evidence points towards the existence of a more mixed agricultural economy than is generally assumed. Animal husbandry was certainly dominant, as the use of cattle as a measure of wealth and the abundant place-name evidence for dairying activity indicate, but the evidence for arable cultivation is sufficient to demonstrate that it played a significant role. Under monastic influence, the traditional reliance on pigs, which are a prominent element in 12th century sources, may have given way to an increased involvement in sheep-farming in the 13th century. Cattle, however, remained the most well-known product of Galloway, and in the post-medieval period came to form the region's chief export.

The Burghs

The final element in the social structure of Galloway to be considered here is the group of towns and burghs which emerged as the administrative and market centres of the region. Their origins are obscure, with only fragmentary documentation and little archaeological work to compensate for the poverty of the written records. In comparison with the burghs of eastern Scotland, or even with Ayr and Dumfries in the west, the towns of Galloway developed into little more than large villages. Within the lordship, however, they commanded positions of importance which were maintained until the development of rival centres in the 18th and 19th centuries. Prior to the growth of Stranraer, Newton Stewart and Castle Douglas, Galloway was dominated by Kirkcudbright and Wigtown, with Whithorn contending for a position alongside the latter. Kirkcudbright maintained its administrative role, but lost its commercial pre-eminence to Castle Douglas. Wigtown declined continuously from the late 18th century and lost both roles to Newton Stewart and Stranraer. Whithorn, which was wholly dependent on the pilgrim traffic to the cathedral, withered away after the Reformation and has only a limited local importance today.

The earliest documented reference to a town in Galloway is Reginald of Durham's brief mention of Kirkcudbright in 1168. (128) This portrays the 'little town (villula) of Kirkcudbright', with the waters of the Dee flowing sweetly and smoothly through its suburbs. It is not until the following century, however, that there is any indication of the degree of sophistication of the settlement. The general dearth of written sources concerned with the burghs in Galloway has served to generate the belief that the south-western towns had a retarded development, a view which appears to be reinforced by the late dates for their elevation into royal burghs. There is an unfortunate tendency in some quarters to regard the granting of the royal charter as being representative of the physical foundation of the town, rather than the bestowal of specific rights and privileges on a community. Few burghs can have been created 'de novo' on a virgin site. At Dumfries, the burgh is said to have been 'founded' in 1186/7 by William the Lion, but it is certain that a settled community existed there before it gained burghal status. Dumfries was probably an important stronghold of the lordship of Nithsdale, sited to control the lowest crossing of the Nith at the limits of its tidal reach. As early as c 1140, Radulf of Nithsdale was bestowing land in Dumfries on the monks of Kelso, (129) an award which formed the core of a considerable landed interest in the burgh in the later Middle Ages. It is possible that Radulf's castle at Dumfries attracted an associated settlement, and it was this to which William the Lion awarded burghal status with the intention of creating a royal bulwark in an unsettled region.

At Whithorn, physical evidence for a pre-12th century commercial community with 'town-like' characteristics has been located in the course of excavations adjacent to the medieval cathedral-priory. Whithorn did not become a royal burgh until 1511, but had been the prior's burgh from the early 14th century, (130) when, as the 'clachan of Whithorn', it had been granted in free burgh to the prior and canons. The grant of burgh status also included the right to tolls from the port at the Isle of Whithorn, which gave status as a trade centre which was to be a source of continual annoyance to the established trading-burgh of Wigtown. The excavations at Whithorn, however, have shown that it was an important commercial centre in the 10th and 11th centuries, probably long before the development of Wigtown.

The extent of the community at Whithorn, and its exact nature, are questions that cannot be answered in full on the basis of the evidence as it stands at present. It is clear that the settlement was a long-term establishment, as the structures uncovered so far show several phases of development. More significantly, the buildings appear to be both of a domestic and an industrial nature, which raises obvious parallels with Coppergate at York. This similarity is sharpened by the portable objects recovered, which point to close contacts with the Norse colonies around the Irish Sea, but with Dublin in particular. The quantity of Scandinavian-style material, such as bone combs and bronze pins, indicates that a permanent colony of probably Dublin-Norse became established there, rather than all such material being imported. Trade, however, is indicated by finds such as a silver Dublin penny of c 1035, and a fine merchant's weight of lead, inlayed with copper and gilt decoration.

Trade may have been the principal attraction of the Norse to Whithorn, but its inland position is atypical of any major Scandinavian trading-station in the British Isles. Clearly, some pre-existing focus, presumably the monastery, served to attract their attention. The location of the Norse structures, in a boggy hollow at the base of the hill on which the monastic community lay, suggests that the incomers were fitting into an established settlement pattern. Structural remains from the pre-Anglian period at Whithorn, which underlie the site occupied later by the Norse settlement, indicate that a high degree of sophistication was attained in the planning of the site at a comparatively early date. Buildings in this early context appear to have been laid out along either side of a metalled roadway. The Norse buildings, then, appear simply to follow a long-established tradition of planned street lines.

An alternative reason for the siting of the Norse community may have been the industrial nature of the work pursued by its inhabitants, which carried both an increased fire risk and produced noxious fumes. Such activity included leatherworking, with vast quantities of trimmings and off-cuts being preserved in the house-middens, and it is possible that tanning was carried out nearby. Bone and antler were worked extensively. with numerous pieces of sawn horn and antler stubs being recovered from middens and floors. Large amounts of slag and hammerscale indicate the smelting and smithing of metal, whilst remains of crucibles and moulds points to the production of finer cast pieces. There is considerable evidence for the working of lead, which was mined in both the Galloway Hills and in the coastal districts around Burrow Head. It is probable that this ready availability of raw materials, both in terms of mineral ores and animal by-products from the local pastoral economy, attracted the craftsmen to Whithorn. (131)

It is in the context of the Irish Sea trade, particularly with Dublin, that we are provided with our first concrete documentary record of established burghs within Galloway. The Dublin Freedom Rolls record the names of a number of Galloway men who were permitted to trade in the Irish port. The earliest is one Benedict, son of Thomas of 'Kilcumbriht', (132) who may have been active in trade as early as the 1180s. He is followed in the early 13th century by William of Galloway, Robert Rot of 'Kilcudbricht', William the Clerk of Galloway, Richard of Galloway and Thomas of Galloway. (133) Three of this group were Dublin guild-merchants and two were entered in the rolls of the free citizenry. The most important record, in terms of proof for trade, is that of Erkin, described in 1237 as tenant of the earl of Winchester in Kirkcudbright, and as a merchant of that town. (134) In November 1237, Erkin was licensed to go to Ireland with his ship to convey grain and other victuals to Roger de Quincy's lands in Kirkcudbright.

Two further Kirkcudbright men are listed in the unpublished sections of the Dublin Rolls. James of 'Kilcobrihd', who paid his fee in c 1219, and his compatriot, Laurence of 'Kilcobriht',who is registered for the following year. (135) The latter, however, is the more significant, as he is described as 'son of the provost of Kilcobriht', which provides us with the earliest evidence for burgh administration in that town. At what date this had been formed is unknown, but it is probable that the lords of Galloway, familiar with the commercial successes of trading burghs in both Scotland and England, and with the example of Dumfries on their doorstep, had sought to gain for their territories the economic benefits which an organised trade-centre brought. The maritime tradition in the lordship must have helped foster trade, and an international reputation for ship-building appears to have become established in the early 13th century. In 1218, Saier de Quincy had a ship fitted out at Kirkcudbright to carry him on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem. (136) Unfortunately, this group of 13th century records represents our only documentary evidence for the development of the burgh prior to the mid 14th century, for after c 1250 evidence dries up. This hiatus in Kirkcudbright's records probably reflects the absorption of eastern Galloway into the sheriffdom of Dumfries after 1235, and the town's loss of local pre-eminence to that burgh.

The administrative partitioning of Galloway in the 1230s was probably the factor which contributed most to the development of Wigtown. Two Wigtown men, Michael Ruffus and Peter Longus 'de Wiketune' figure in the unpublished section of the Dublin Rolls, (137) but there is no further record of burgesses until 1327-8 when an un-named provost gave account at Dumbarton for the burgh-ferme. (138) The destruction of most of the 13th century Exchequer Rolls probably accounts for this alarming deficiency in Wigtown's records for, in view of the town's administrative importance as the seat of the royal sheriff, it is unlikely to have failed to exploit the commercial benefits which that role afforded. Indeed, it probably received a royal charter about the time of the establishment of the sheriffdom, which guaranteed it the economic supremacy of the region west of the Cree.

Only limited archaeological work has been carried out at Kirkcudbright or Wigtown. At the latter, this is restricted solely to work at the castle site (unpublished), and at the former to excavations at the 13th century fortress at Castledykes. (139) The morphology of both towns, however, gives some indication of their medieval form and development. At Kirkcudbright, the fortuitous existence of a curving gravel bank in the marshes at the head of the Dee estuary, adjacent to the lowest fording point of the river, provided a natural location for a settlement. The early community formed on the spine of this bank as a single street, linear development. Its one street followed the crest of the ridge and changed direction to meet the curves in its line. At the head of the ridge, on Moat Brae, may have been a small timber fortification, which would have overlooked the adjacent harbour and ford. This stronghold was probably superseded in the 13th century by the enceinte fortress at Castledykes. The remains of this castle form the most striking medieval feature in the burgh. Its position in the midst of now-drained marsh to the south-west of the burgh, and its total lack of influence on the street plan, indicate that it was a late insertion into an already crystallised layout. (140)

Wigtown's street plan is similarly simple. It is situated on the crest of a long ridge which runs out into the tidal flats of the Cree estuary. The town is laid out around a spacious market square, with the tolbooth lying across the narrow north-eastern end of the enclosed space. From either side of the tolbooth secondary streets run down to the medieval church site on the north and the castle on the south.

The castle, as at Kirkcudbright, was a 13th century foundation, sited away from the burgh on the low ground beside the medieval harbour, rather than on the more strategically positioned ridge occupied by the town. The burgh itself is laid out on a much grander scale than Kirkcudbright, which probably reflects both its less restricted position and its own pretensions as a commercial and administrative centre. Certainly, it would appear to have outstripped its eastern rival in both sectors, and also as a population centre. An indication of its importance can be seen in the establishment at Wigtown in c 1267 of a Dominican friary. (141) The mendicant orders gravitated towards the towns, which provided them with a settled population to whom they could minister and from whom they could gain support. Wigtown, an established burgh and apparently thriving port, was an ideal location. That the main layout of the streets had been established by the date of Devorgilla's foundation of the priory is shown by the lack of influence it played on the pattern of streets and allignment of burgage plots, access to it also being along a side lane. (142)

Footnotes to Chapter 7

1. eg D.Brooke, 'Gall Gaidhil and Galloway'. G Fellows-Jensen, 'Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire and Galloway: the place-name evidence'.
2. A.L.F.Rivet and C.Smith, *The Place-Names of Roman Britain* (London, 1979), 425-6.
3. Smyth, *Warlords and Holymen*, 26.
4. A.C.Thomas, 'Excavations at Trusty's Hill, Anwoth, 1960', *TDGAS*, xxxviii (1961), 58-70.
5. D.Brooke, 'Kirk-Compound place-names in Galloway and Carrick', *TDGAS*, lviii (1983), 56-71 at 59-60, 63-65; SRO RH6/11/296.
6. W.F.H.Nicolaisen, 'Slew- and Sliabh', *Scottish Studies*, ix (1965), 91-106.
7. Smyth, *Warlords and Holymen*, 26-27.
8. *Holyrood Liber*, No 52.
9. L.Laing, 'The Angles in Scotland and the Mote of Mark', *TDGAS*, 1 (1973), 37-38.
10. For a new critique of this past work see E.Cowan, 'The Vikings in Galloway: A review of the evidence', (Forthcoming).
11. Hill, *Whithorn*, 6-9.
12. Fellows-Jensen, 'Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire and Galloway'.
13. W.F.H.Nicolaisen, 'Norse place-names in South-West Scotland', *Scottish Studies*, iv (1960), 49-70 at 52-68.
14. Brooke, 'Kirk-Compound place-names', 58-59, 61-63, 65-67.
15, J.MacQueen, 'The Gaelic-speakers of Galloway and Carrick', *Scottish Studies*, xvii (1973), 17-23.
16. A.P.Smyth, *Scandinavian York and Dublin*, i (Dublin, 1975), 81-82; ii (Dublin, 1979), 117, 132; A.P.Smyth, *Scandinavian Kings in the British Isles, 850-880* (OUP, 1977), 114-5; W.F.Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i (2nd ed, Edinburgh, 1886), 311.
17. MacQueen, 'Gaelic-speakers', 26-28.
18. *Annals of Ireland. Three Fragments by Dubhaltach mac Firbisigh*, ed.J.O'Donovan, (Dublin, 1860), 138-9.
19. Brooke. 'Kirk-Compound place-names', 61-62; 'Gall-Gaidhil and Galloway.
20. F.J.Byrne, *Irish Kings and High Kings* (London, 1973), 264.
21. D.O'Corrain, *Ireland Before the Normans* (Dublin, 1972), 70.
22. S~yth, *Warlords and Holymen*, 157; J.MacQueen, 'The Picts in Galloway', *TDGAS*, xxxix (1960-61), 143.
23. Smyth, *Warlords and Holymen*, 157.
24. Smyth, *Scandinavian York and Dublin*, ii, 265.
25. N.Higham, 'The Scandinavians in North Cumbria: Raids and Settlement in the later 9th to mid 10th centuries', in J.R.Baldwin and I.D.Whyte (eds), *The Scandinavians in Cumbria* (Edinburgh, 1985), 37-51.
26. *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 234, 291.
27. *Orkneyinga Saga* (Taylor), 174 and note.
28. Brooke, 'Gall-Gaidhil and Galloway'.
29. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vi pt.ii, 838.
30. Bede, *Historiam Ecclesiasticam*, ii, 133.
31. *Richard of Hexham*, 152, 157; *Reginald of Durham*, i, 177-9.
32. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, i, 131-2 and note 19.
33. Bede, *Vita Cuthberti*, in *Two Lives of St.Cuthbert*, ed and trans B.Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), 83, 193.
34. Rivet and Smith, *Place-Names of Roman Britain*, 428.

35. P.Hunter-Blair, , in *Studies in Early British History*, ed N.K.Chadwick (Cambridge, 1954), 165-8; Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 78.
36. *Richard of Hexham*, 157, "...Pictis, qui vulgo Gallweienses dicuntur...".
37. Ibid., 151, "...ille detestandus exercitus, omni paganorum genere atrocior...".
38. Ailred, *De Standardo*, 196-7.
39. *Walter Daniel*, 45, 74.
40. *Reginald of Durham*, 177-9.
41. Ibid., 177-8,
42. MacQueen, 'The Picts in Galloway', 141.
43. R.D.Oram, 'Pennyland and Davoch in South-West Scotland; A review of the evidence', in B.E.Crawford and L.J.Macgregor, *Ouncelands and Pennylands in Norse and Celtic Scotland* (St.Andrews, 1987), 46-59.
44. K.Jackson, *The Gaelic Notes in the Book of Deer* (Cambridge, 1972), 116; R.A.Dodgshon, *Land and Society in Early Scotland* (Oxford, 1981), 75-6.
45. A.C.McKerral, 'Ancient denominations of land in Eastern Scotland', *PSAS*, lxxviii (1943-44), 39-80; G.W.S.Barrow, 'Rural settlement in central and eastern Scotland, the medieval evidence', *Scottish Studies*, vi (1962), 123-44; Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 318.
46. J.MacQueen, 'Pennyland and Davoch in South-Western Scotland', *Scottish Studies*, xxiii (1979), 69-74; B.Megaw, 'A note on "Pennyland and Davoch in South-West Scotland" ', *Scottish Studies*, xxiii (1979), 75-77.
47. McKerral, 'Ancient Denominations', 39-45.
48. A.C.McKerral, 'The lesser land and administrative divisions of Celtic Scotland', *PSAS*, lxxxv (1950-51), 52-64.
49. Barrow, 'Rural settlement', 138-40.
50. Dodgshon, *Land and Society*, 76.
51. J.Bannerman, *Studies in the Early History of Dalriada* (Edinburgh, 1974), 140-6.
52. W.D.Lamont, '"House" and "Pennyland" in the Highlands and Isles', *Scottish Studies*, xxv (1981), 65-76.
53. *Paisley Registrum*, 125.
54. *CDS*, ii, No 1633; Bannerman, *Dalriada*, 141.
55. B.E.Crawford, *Scandinavian Scotland* (Leicester, 1987), 88-91.
56. *RMS*,i, app i, No 101.
57. MacQueen, 'Pennyland and Davoch', 72.
58. Bannerman, *Dalriada*, 141.
59. *RMS*, i, app 1, Nos 20, 102; app ii, No 625.
60. MacQueen, 'Pennyland and Davoch', 69-70.
61. *Melrose Liber*, No 202; *Wigtownshire Charters*, No 130.
62. I.A.Milne, 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *SHR*, xxxiv (1955), 46-49.
63. A.C.McKerral, 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *SHR*,xxxiv (1955), 189-90.
64. MacQueen, 'Pennyland and Davoch', 69; *Wigtownshire Charters*, No 130.
65. Dodgshon, *Land and Society*, 78.
66. *Holyrood Liber*, Nos 25-27, 49, 74; *Holm Cultram Register*, Nos 120-41.
67. K.H.Jackson, 'Angles and Britons in Northumbria and Cumbria', in

Angles and Britons, ed H.Lewis (Cardiff, 1963), 60-84; W.F.H.Nicolaisen, 'Celts and Anglo-Saxons in the Scottish Border Counties. The place-name evidence', *Scottish Studies*, viii (1964), 141-71.

68. J.Condry and M.Ansell, 'The excavation of a hut circle at Moss Raploch, Clatteringshaws', *TDGAS*, liii (1977-78), 105-8.
69. A. and G.Haggarty, 'Excavations at Rispain Camp, Whithorn, 1978-81', *TDGAS*, lviii (1983), 21-51.
70. A.C.Thomas, 'Trusty's Hill', 58-70; A.O.Curle, 'Report on excavations of a vitrified fort at Rockcliffe, known as the Mote of Mark', *PSAS*, xlviii (1913-14), 125-68; Laing, 'Angles in Scotland', 40-41.
71. RCAHMS, 'West Rhins', *Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Scotland*, xxiv (Edinburgh, 1985), Nos 100-6.
72. RCAHMS, *Galloway*, i, Nos 32, 423; ii, No 201; *PSAS*, lxxxvii (1952-53), 134-52; Tabraham, 'Norman Settlement', 87-124.
73. S.Piggott, 'Native economies and the Roman occupation of North Britain', in I.A.Richmond (ed), *Roman and Native in North Britain* (London, 1958), 1-27.
74. cf: Condry and Ansell, 'Moss Raploch', 112; J.Jobey, 'Burnswark Hill, Dumfriesshire, *TDGAS*, liii (1977-78), Appendix, R.Squires, "The pollen analysis of a short core from Burnswark Hill', 99-104; H.H.Birks, 'Studies in the vegetational history of Scotland, ii. Two pollen diagrams from the Galloway Hills, Kirkcudbrightshire', *Journal of Ecology*, lx (1970), 183-217; H.Nichols, 'Vegetational change, shoreline displacement and the Human factor in the late Quaternary history of South-West Scotland', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, lxvii (1968), 145-87.
75. For discussions of environmental change in Galloway see e.g.Squires, 'Pollen ananlysis of a short core from Burnswark Hill'; Birks, 'Two pollen diagrams from the Galloway Hills; Nichols, 'Vegetational change'.
76. W.F.H.Nicolaisen, 'Gaelic place-names in Southern Scotland', *Studia Celtica*, v (1970), 15-35; Nicolaisen, *Scottish Place-Names*, 121-48.
77. M.Oftedal, 'Scandinavian place-names in Ireland' in *Proceedings of the Seventh Viking Congress* (Dublin, 1973), 125-33 at 127.
78. Brooke, 'Glenkens', 42; SRO RH6/ii/219.
79. Nicolaisen, 'Celts and Anglo-Saxons', passim; Nicolaisen, *Scottish Place-Names*, 168-83.
80. Laing, 'Angles in Scotland', 40-41.
81. Ewart, *Cruggleton Castle*, 14-18.
82. T.H.McK.Clough and L Laing, 'Excavations at Kirkconnel, Waterbeck, Dumfriesshire, 1968', *TDGAS*, xlvi (1969), 123-39.
83. *Med Arch*, x (1966), 175-6.
84. Hill, *Bruce Street, Whithorn*, 6-9.
85. *Holyrood Liber*, No 23.
86. Hill, *Whithorn*, 6-9.
87. Nicolaisen, *Scottish Place-Names*, 101-3; Fellows-Jensen, 'Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire and Galloway'.
88. Fellows-Jensen, 'Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire and Galloway'.
89. Hill, *Whithorn*, 5-6.
90. E.Megaw, 'The Manx "Eary" and its significance', in P.Davey

(ed), *Man and Environment in the Isle of Man* ii, B.A.R. British Series, liv (1978), 327-45.

91. I.A.Whyte, 'Shielings and the upland pastoral economy of the Lake District in Medieval and Early Modern Times', in Baldwin and Whyte, *Scandinavians in Cumbria*, 103-18; see also G.Fellows-Jensen, 'Common Gaelic *Airge*, Old Scandinavian *Aergi* or *Erg*?', *Nomina*, iv (1980), 67-74.
92. MacQueen, 'Gaelic-speakers', 31.
93. E.F.Burdon-Davies, 'The moated manor at Dunrod, Kirkcudbright', *TDGAS*, xliii (1966), 121-36.
94. *Holyrood Liber*, No 26.
95. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 120.
96. Ibid, No 121.
97. Ibid, No 133.
98. *CDS*, i, No 2414.
99. Ibid, ii, No 1123.
100. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 230.
101. *CDS*, ii, No 1702.
102. *Morton Registrum*, i, Appendix, Doc 16; *ER*, vi, 557-8.
103. 1648 *Inquis. Retorn. Abbrev.*, (Records Commission), Kirkcudbright, No 250.
104. A.J.L.Winchester, 'The distribution and significance of "Bordland" in Medieval Britain', *Agricultural History Review*, 34 (1986) pt ii, 129-39.
105. *Holyrood Liber*, No 72.
106. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 142.
107. RCAHMS, 'West Rhins', Nos 213-25, 227-9, 231, 233.
108. Brooke, *Glenkens*, 49.
109. SRO RH6/ii/219.
110. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 255.
111. J.A.Raftis, 'The estates of Ramsey Abbey: a study of economic growth and organisation', *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Studies and Texts*, 8 (Toronto, 1957).
112. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 119.
113. R.A.L.Smith, *Canterbury Cathedral Priory: A Study in Monastic Administration* (Cambridge, 1943).
114. *Glasgow Registrum*, No 9; *RRS*, i, No 131.
115. *APS*, i, 378, c.xxii, xxiii; Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 185-6.
116. *CDS*, iii, No 14.
117. Ibid, i, No 765.
118. Ibid, i, Nos 933, 974, 1891.
119. Ibid, i, No 2414.
120. Ibid, ii, No 182.
121. Ibid, i, No 1372.
122. eg *Dryburgh Liber*, No 66.
123. *Holm Cultram Register*, No 18, '...dedit totam culturam terrae in territorio de Kirkconevill, quae vocatur Mustardgarth...'.
124. *ER*, i, 22-23.
125. Ibid, i, 151-4.
126. Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 322-4.
127. For a discussion of the social significance of different types of bread see W.E.Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North, the Region and its Transformation* (London,

1979), 215-27.
128. *Reginald of Durham*, 177-8.
129. *Kelso Liber*, i, NO 11.
130. *RMS*, i, app i, No 20.
131. Hill, *Whithorn*, passim.
132. *Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland, AD 1172-1320*, J.T.Gilbert (ed), (Rolls Series, 1870), 44.
133. Ibid, 83, 84, 87, 115, 121.
134. *CDI*, i, Nos 2380, 2424.
135. Dublin, City Archives, 1/1, 2m.11vb; 1/1, 2m.12a. I am indebted to Kenneth Nicholls of University College, Cork, for assistance in making this footnote and no 137 below.
136. *CDS*, i, No 703.
137. Dublin, City Archives, 1/1, 2m.20a; 1/1, 2m.30b.
138. *ER*, i, 69.
139. Robison, *Kirkcudbright*, 72-86.
140. Gourlay and Turner, *Historic Kirkcudbright*, 4-6.
141. Cowan and Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses*, 121.
142. Turner-Simpson and Stevenson, *Historic Wigtown*, 18-20.

Conclusion

Traditions of the past play a strong part in modern Galwegian thinking on the history of the region. Old ideas die hard, particularly those which paint the history of Galloway in glowing terms of a glorious Gall-Gaidhil heritage, of a mingling of Picts and Vikings, and of a magnificent era of independence from the Scots which was ended only by deceit and the overwhelming might of foreign armies. This picture is gross distortion of the historical reality and has been created largely in the last 150 years through the work of antiquarian writers. Much of the tradition is spurious, or builds from elaborate hypotheses which have little basis in fact. Beneath the fiction, however, runs an undercurrent of reality.

Where tradition and fact run closest is in their agreement on the complexity of the cultural background of the Galwegians. Leaving aside the Galloway Picts and the Gall-Gaidhil, the region has produced evidence for settlement by all the major population groups to move through Britain in the post-Roman period. This cultural mix created a highly distinctive society, quite different from the bulk of mainland Scotland, a feature which seems to make the region stand out in stark isolation against the rest of the country. But Galloway was not unique, for it shared many cultural traditions in common with its neighbouring regions in Man and the Hebrides.

The apparent differences between Galloway and the rest of Scotland, and its geographical isolation from the centres of Scottish royal power, fuelled belief in its independent status as the 'Kingdom of Galloway'. Yet, even as the region emerges from the 'Dark Ages' into recorded history at the end of the 11th century it is seen in close relationship with the Scots, sending warriors to serve in the armies of Malcolm III. Whether the Galwegians were allies or vassals is unclear, but there are signs that the Scots were held at bay as distant and often ignored overlords. Whilst the Crown was weak or remote the Galwegians were left to themselves, but the dynamic kings of the Canmore dynasty were little-inclined to let any rights of overlordship slip away.

The century from the first appearance of Fergus down to the defeat of Thomas in 1235 had seen Galloway undergo a process of continuous and unavoidable change. Whilst the basic structure of its culture remained firmly rooted in its Celtic and Germanic past, which guaranteed the preservation of many distinct characteristics for a century and a half to come, the institutions of secular and ecclesiastical government had been transformed beyond recognition. The key to this transformation lay in the very success of the lords, who had adapted to survive in a constantly changing political environment, but through adapting had gradually merged into the ranks of the Anglo-Scottish nobility. The survival of Galloway as a distinct entity came increasingly to depend upon the survival of the male line. Whilst the lords reached the apogee of their powers under Alan, who exercised truly regal powers but at the same time served as a vassal of the kings of both Scotland and England, the fragility of that power could not be hidden. Alan's failure to produce a legitimate male heir signalled the end of Galwegian autonomy.

In many ways the rebellion of 1235 showed the depth of the change. Its essential character was intensely conservative and old-fashioned, an echo from the lordship's turbulent past. But it was just that, an echo with no real substance. Rebellion was the traditional reaction against too rigorous Scottish interference, and had a formidable precedent in the success of Gilbert against William the Lion. But success depended upon unity at home and the ability to keep the enemy at arm's length. Even Gilbert had been forced to compromise in the face of the united hostility of Roland, William the Lion and Henry II. In 1235 the climate was even less favourable for the Galwegians, who lacked the support of the English to sustain them against a king whose power greatly surpassed that of his father. Galloway was also no longer remote from the centres of royal government, and when Alexander II moved against the lordship it was with the strength of his kingdom at his back.

The success of the lords in carving a niche for themselves within the political framework of Britain aided the erosion of Galwegian isolation. As they developed their network of alliances, through marriage and dynastic agreement, so they were drawn into the interplay of political intrigue and military power in a wider region. Ties of kinship secured Galwegian autonomy for a while, but helped to blur the uniquely Galwegian character of the lordly line. While they were still Celtic warlords, Uhtred and his sons and grandsons operated more easily in the milieu of the Anglo-Scottish state. This gradual dilution of the distinct 'Galwegian-ness' of the lords was not limited to the ruling dynasty alone, as settlers filtered slowly into the region, to occupy high office in the service of the lords or the Galwegian Church. Through such processes the isolation of Galloway from Scotland was gradually blurred, and the complexities of the land-holding pattern within the kingdom caught the nobility of the lordship in a dynastic mesh. By 1235 many of the leading Galwegian families held lands outwith Galloway, or were families of non-Galwegian origins for whom their Galloway lands were of little interest. Thus, although military conquest settled the issue beyond doubt in 1235, it is clear that Galloway had become inextricably bound up in Scotland and was undergoing slow assimilation. Had Alexander II not intervened in the succession dispute in the lordship, there is little doubt that the process of assimilation would have continued at its own pace and Galloway would have been slowly absorbed.

FERGUS + i. Illegitimate daughter of HENRY I
ii. ?
i UHTRED + Gunnilda
ii GILBERT + ?
ROLAND + Helen de Morville
son
Fergus
Malcolm
DUNCAN + Avelina Stewart
Earls of Carrick
ALAN + i ?de Lacy
ii Margaret
iii Rose de Lacy
THOMAS + Isabel of Atholl
Patrick
son
Ada + Walter Bisset
?Devorgilla + Nicholas de Stutville
THOMAS
i HELEN + Roger de Quincy
i daughter
ii CHRISTINA + William de Forz
ii DEVORGILLA + John Balliol
MARGARET + William de Ferrars
de Ferrars
HELEN + Alan de la Zouche
Eleanor
Ada
ISOBEL + Alexander Comyn
(Elizabeth)
JOHN COMYN
JOHN
EDWARD
Henry

Simplified family tree of the Lords of Galloway.

KYLE
CARRICK
NITHSDALE
ANNANDALE
GALLOWAY
CASTLES AND FORTIFICATION
KEY : ● 13th Cent. stone castles.
◆ " " unknown type.
◐ Mottes.
○ " possible.

MAP ONE

The Parishes of Galloway in 1275

1. Kirkmaiden
2. Kirkmadrine
3. Stoneykirk
4. Leswalt
5. Kirkcolm
6. Inch
7. Soulseat
8. Clayshant
9. Glenluce
10. Mochrum
11. Kirkmaiden
12. Glasserton
13. Whithorn
14. Cruggleton
15. Kirkmadrine
16. Sorbie
17. Longcastle
18. Kirkinner
19. Wigtown
20. Penninghame
21. Minnigaff
22. Kirkmabreck
23. Kirkdale
24. Anwoth
25. Girthon
26. Kirkandrews
27. Borgue
28. Senwick
29. Kirkchrist
30. Twynholm
30. Twynholm
31. Kells
32. Dalry
33. Balmaclellan
34. Parton
35. Balmaghie
36. Crossmichael
37. Kelton
38. Barncrosh
39. Kirkcormack
40. Tongland
41. Kirkcudbright
42. Galtway
43. Dunrod
44. Rerrick
45. Gelston
46. Buittle
47. Kirkpatrick-Durham
48. Blaiket
49. Urr
50. Kirkgunzeon
51. Colvend
52. Southwick
53. Kirkbean
54. Lochkindeloch
55. Kirkconnel
56. Lochrutton
57. Troqueer
58. Terregles
59. Kirkpatrick-Irongray

APPROPRIATED
FREE PARSONAGES.
MILES 0
10
20
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

MAP TWO

GALLOWAY: PARISHES c. 1275.

MAP THREE

DABHACH - DAVOCH.

1. DRUMDOCH
2. DOCHROYLE
3. DOCHERNEIL
4. KILDOACH
5. CULLENDOCH
6. CULDOACH
7. CULDOACH.
8. DOACH
9. CULLENDOCH
10. KNOCKENDOCH.
MILES
0
5
10
15
20
25
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

MAP FOUR

CEATHRAMH (QUARTERLAND).

1. GARCHRIE
2. KIRMINNOCH
3. KIRRANRAE
4. SALCHRIE
5. KIRKLAUCHLINE
6. DUCHRA
7. KIRKLACHIE
8. KIRMINNOCH
9. QUARTER
10. GARGRIE
11. KILLANTRAE
12. KIRWAUGH
13. KIRVENNIE
14. BLACKQUARTER
15. KIRRIEDARROCH
16. CORRAFECKLOCH
17. KIRRIEMORE
18. KIRRIEREOCH
19. KIRSHINNOCH
20. KIRREOCH
21. KIRKCLAUGH
22. QUARTERLAND
23. DUCHRAE.
24. CORRIEDOO
25. DUCHRAE
26. CARMINNOW
27. TORKIRRA.
0
5
10
15
20
25 MILES

MAP FIVE
PHEIGHINN (PENNYLAND) ●
LETHPHEIGHINN (HALF-PENNYLAND) ◐
FÀIRDEAN (FARTHINGLAND) ◒
0 5 10 15 20 25 MILES
1. PINMINNOCH.
2. COLFIN
3. PINWHERRIE
4. PENWHIRN
5. PENKILN.
6. DAFFIN
7. PENWHAILE
a. LEFFNOLL
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
a

1. Airies
2. Airyhemming
3. Airyolland
4. Craig Airie Fell
5. Craigairie
6. Airieclasson
7. High Airies.
8. Airylick
9. Airyolland
10. Airiequhillart
11. Airlour
12. Airyhassen
13. Meikle Airies
14. Little Airies
15. Airlies
16. Airie Bennan
17. Upper Airie
18. Airie
19. Airiehill
20. Airieland
21. Airieland Moor
22. Airyhill.
0
5
10
15
20
25 miles

MAP SIX

ÀIRIGH (SHEILING - SUMMER PASTURE)

MAP SEVEN

BORELAND

1. HIGH & LOW BORELAND.
2. BORELAND.
3. BORELAND OF LONGCASTLE
4. BORELAND
5. BORELAND
6. BORELAND (GREENTOWER)
7. BORELAND
8. BORELAND.
9. BORELAND.
10. BORELAND OF PARTON
11. BORELAND.
12. BORELAND OF GELSTON
13. BORELAND OF COLVEND.
14. BORELAND OF SOUTHWICK & OLD BORELAND OF SOUTHWICK
15. BORELAND.
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
0
5
10
15
20
25 MILES

Bibliography

Unpublished Sources

Cumbria Record Office	D/LONS/L5/1/S1
Dublin, City Archives	1/1, 2m.11vb 1/1, 2m.12a 1/1, 2m.20a 1/1, 2m.30b
Scottish Record Office	GD 141/No A RH.1/1/2 1 December 1352

Published Sources

A Scottish Chronicle Known as the Chronicle of Holyrood, ed A.O. and M.O. Anderson (Scottish History Society, 1938).

Acts of Parliaments of Scotland, edd T. Thompson and C. Innes (Edinburgh, 1814-75).

Androw of Wyntoun's Orygynal Cronykil of Scotland, ed. D. Laing (Edinburgh, 1872-79)

Ailred of Rievaulx, *Saints of Hexham*, in *The Priory of Hexham, The History and Annals of the House* (Surtees Society, 1863).

Ailred of Rievaulx, *Relatio Venerabilis Aelredi, Abbatis Rievallensis, de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc, ed R.Howlett (London, 1886).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, trans G.N. Garmonsway (London, 1972).

Annales Prioratus de Dunstaplia, in *Annales Monastici*, ed R. Luard, iii (london, 1866).

Annals of Ireland. The Fragments by Dubhaltach MacFirbisigh, ed J. O'Donovan (Dublin, 1860)

Annals of Loch Cé, ed and trans W. Hennessy, i (London, 1871).

Annals of Ulster, ed and trans W. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy, (london, 1887-93).

Baedae Continuatio, in *Baedae Opera Historica*, Ed C. Plummer (Oxford, 1986).

Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, trans L. Sherley-Price (London 1896).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *St Bernard's Life of St Malachy of Armagh*, ed and trans H. J. Lawlor (London, 1920).

'Brevis Descriptio Regni Scotie', in *Miscellany of the Maitland Club*, iv (Glasgow, 1847).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland, ed H. Sweetman (Dublin, 1875-86).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, ed J. Bain (Edinburgh, 1881-88).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland, edd G. C Simpson and J. D. Galbraith, v [supplementary] (Edinburgh, 1986).

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: *Papal Letters*, ed W. H. Bliss and others (London, 1893-).

Carte Monialium de Northberwic (Bannatyne Club, 1847).

Charters of the Hospital of Soltre, of Trinity College, Edinburgh, and Other Collegiate Churches in Midlothian (Bannatyne Club, 1861).

The Chartulary of Lindores Abbey 1195-1479, ed J. Dowden (Scottish History Society, 1903).

Chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough, ed W. Stubbs (London, 1867).

Chronicon de Lanercost (Maitland Club, 1839).

Chronica de Mailros (Bannatyne Club, 1835).

The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, edd P. A. Munch and the Rev Dr. Goss (Manx Society, Douglas, 1874).

The Chronicle of Melrose (Facsimile Edition), edd A. O. Anderson and others (London, 1936).

The Chronicle of Robert of Torigny, in *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, Richard I*, ed R. Howlett, iv (London, 1889).

Chronica Rogeri de Hovedon, ed W. Stubbs (London, 1868-71).

The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough, ed H. Rothwell (Camden Society, 1957).

Cronica Regum Mannie et Insularum, trans G. Broderick (Belfast, 1979).

Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents of Great Britain and Ireland, edd A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs (Oxford, 1869-79).

Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland, ed F. Palgrave (London, 1837).

Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland, ed J. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1870).

Early Scottish Charters Prior to AD 1153, ed A. C. Lawrie (Glasgow, 1905).

Early Sources of Scottish History 500-1286, ed A. O. Anderson (Edinburgh, 1922).

English Historical Documents, ed H. Rothwell, iii (London, 1975).

The Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, edd J. Stuart, G. Burnett and others (Edinburgh, 1878-1908).

Extracta E Variis Cronicis Scocie (Abbotsford Club, 1842).

Fergus, ed E. Martin (Halle, 1872).

Joannis de Fordun, *Chronica Gentis Scotorum*, ed W. F. Skene (Edinburgh, 1870-71).

Furness Coucher Book, iii, pt. iii (Chetham Society, 1919).

Guillaume le Clerc, *The Romance of Fergus*, ed W. Frescolin (Philadelphia, 1983).

Hacon's Saga, in *Icelandic Sagas*, trans G. W. Dasent, iv (London, 1894).

'Historia Fundacionis Prioratus Insule de Traile', in *Bannatyne Miscellany*, ii (Bannatyne Club, 1836).

Historians of the Church of York and Its Archbishops, ed J. Raine (London, 1879-94).

Historical and Municipal Documents of Ireland AD 1172-1320, ed J. T Gilbert (London, 1870).

Inquisitionum ad Capellam Domini Regis Retornatum, quae in publicis archivis Scotiae adhuc servantur, Abbreviatio, ed T. Thomson (Records Commission, 1811-16).

Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle, ed and trans R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981).

The Legends of St Ninian and St Machor, ed W. H. Metcalfe (Edinburgh, 1904).

Liber Cartarum Sancte Crucis (Bannatyne Club, 1840)

Liber Pluscardensis, ed F. J. H. Skene (Edinburgh, 1877-80).

Liber Sancte Marie de Calchou (Bannatyne Club, 1846).

Liber Sancte Marie de Dryburgh, (Bannatyne Club, 1847).

Liber Sancte Marie de Melros (Bannatyne Club, 1837).

Njal's Saga, trans M. Magnussson and H. Palsson (London,' 1960).

Orkneyinga Saga, trans A. B. Taylor (Edinburgh 1938).

Orkneyinga Saga, trans H. Palsson and P. Edwards, (London, 1981).

The Oxford Deeds of Balliol College, ed H. E. Salter (Oxford Historical Society, 1913).

Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (London, 1872-83).

Patrologia Latina, ed J. P. Migne, clix, pt. ii (Paris, 1854).

Pont, Timothy, *Galloway Topographised*.

Regesta Regum Scotorum, edd G.W.S. Barrow, B. Webster and others (Edinburgh, 1960).

Reginald Monachi Dunelmensis Libellus de Admirandis Beati Cuthberti Virtutibus (Surtees Society, 1835).

Register and Records of Holm Cultram, edd F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological and Antiquarian Society, 1929).

Register of William Greenfield, Lord Archbishop of York, edd A. H. Thompson and W. Brown (Surtees Society, 1931-38).

Register of Walter Gray, Lord Archbishop of York, ed J. Raine (surtees Society, 1870).

Register of John le Romeyn, Lord Archbishop of York, (Surtees Society, 1913-16).

Register of the Priory of St Bees, ed J. Wilson (Surtees Society, 1915).

Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis (Bannatyne Club, 1843).

Registrum Honoris de Morton (Bannatyne Club, 1853).

Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum, edd J. M. Thompson and others (Edinburgh, 1882-1914).

Registrum Monasterii de Passelet (Maitland Club, 1832).

Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Regis Stephani et de Bello Standardii*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc, ed R. Howlett, iii (London, 1886).

Rishanger, William, *Chronica et Annales*, ed M. T. Riley (London, 1865).

Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum, ed T. Duffus-Hardy (Record Commission, 1833).

Rotoli Scotiae in Turri Londiniensi et in Domo Capitulari Westmonasteriensi Asservati, edd D. MacPherson and others (1814-19).

Scottish Annals from English Chronicles 500 to 1286, ed A. O. Anderson (London, 1908).

Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiae Thesaurus, ed J. Anderson (Edinburgh, 1739).

Symson, Andrew, *A Large Description of Galloway*, (Edinburgh, 1823).

Two Lives of St Cuthbert, ed and trans B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940).

Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam Illustrantia, ed A, Theiner (Rome, 1864).

Walter Daniel, *The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed and trans F. M. Powicke (London, 1950).

Wigtownshire Charters, ed R.C. Reid (Scottish History Society, 1960).

William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of Stephen* etc, R. Howlett, i-ii (London, 1884-85).

Works of Reference

A Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Graduates to 1410, ed D. E. R. Watt (Oxford, 1977).

The Complete Peerage, edd G. E. Cockayne and others, xi (London, 1949).

Cowan, I. B., *The Parishes of Medieval Scotland* (Scottish Record Society 1967).

Cowan, I. B., and Easson, D.E., *Medieval Religious Houses of Scotland* 2nd edition (London, 1976).

Dowden, J., *The Bishops of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1912).

Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae Medii Aevi Ad Annum 1638, ed D. E. R. Watt (Scottish Record Society, 1969).

Inventories of Ancient Monuments: Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Constructions of Scotland, Fourth Report and Inventory of Monuments and Constructions in Galloway, i, County of Wigtown (Edinburgh, 1912); Fifth Report etc, ii, Stewarty of Kirkcudbright (Edinburgh, 1914); County of Dumfries (Edinburgh, 1920).

The Scots Peerage, ed J. Balfour-Paul (Edinburgh, 1904-14).

Secondary Works

Agnew, A., A History of the Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway, (Edinburgh, 1864).

Anderson, J., Scotland in Early Christian Times 2nd Edition (Edinburgh, 1881).

Baldwin, J. R., and Whyte, I. D. (eds), The Scandinavians in Cumbria (Edinburgh, 1985).

Bannerman, J., Studies in the History of Dalriada (Edinburgh, 1974).

Barrow, G. W. S., Feudal Britain. The Completion of the Medieval Kingdoms 1066-1314 (London, 1936).

Barrow, G. W. S., Kingship and Unity, Scotland 1000-1306 (London, 1981).

Barrow, G. W. S., Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland (London, 1965).

Barrow, G. W. S., The Kingdom of the Scots (London, 1973).

Barrow, G. W. S., David I of Scotland (1124-1153), The Balance of New and Old (Reading, 1985).

Bowen, E.G., Saints, Seaways and Settlements in the Celtic Lands (Cardiff, 1969).

Bowen, E.G., Britain and the Western Seaways (London, 1972).

Breeze, D. (ed), Studies in Scottish Antiquity Presented to Stewart Cruden (Edinburgh, 1984).

Burke, B., The General Armory of England, Scotland, Ireland & Wales (london, 1878).

Butler, L. and Given-Wilson, C. J., *Medieval Monasteries of Great Britain* (London, 1979).

Byrne, F. J., *Irish Kings and High Kings* (London, 1973).

Chadwick, H. M., *Early Scotland, The Picts, The Scots and the Welsh in Southern Scotland* (Cambridge, 1949).

Chadwick, N. K. (ed), *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge, 1958).

Chalmers, G., *Caledonia* (Glasgow, 1887-1902).

Cockburn, J. H., *The Medieval Bishops of Dunblane and Their Church* (Edinburgh, 1959).

Crawford, B. E., *Scandinavian Scotland* (Leicester, 1987).

Crawford, B. E. And MacGregor, L. J. (edd), *Pennyland and Ounceland in Norse and Celtic Scotland* (St Andrews, 1987).

Cruden, S., *Scottish Abbeys* (Edinburgh, 1960).

Cruden, S., *The Scottish Castle* (Edinburgh, 1960).

Cruden, S., *Scottish Medieval Church Architecture* (Edinburgh, 1987).

Dodgshon, R. A., *Land and Society in Early Scotland* (Oxford, 1981).

Donaldson, G., *Scottish Church History* (Edinburgh, 1985).

Duncan, A.A.M., *Scotland, The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1975).

Ewart, G., *Cruggleton Castle* (Dumfries, 1986).

Fellows-Jensen, G., *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West* (Copenhagen, 1985).

Given-Wilson, C.J. and Curteis, A., *The Royal Bastards of Medieval England* (London, 1984).

Gourlay, R. and Turner, A., *Historic Kirkcudbright: The Archaeological Implications of Development* (Glasgow, 1977).

Haddan, A.W. and Stubbs, W., *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents of Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1869-79).

Hartridge, R.A.R., *A History of Vicarages in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1930).

Hill. P.H., *Excavations at Bruce Street Whithorn 1984*. *Interim Report* (Edinburgh, 1985).

Hill, P.H., *Whithorn 1* (Whithorn, 1987).

Huyshe, W., *Dervorgilla, Lady of Galloway and Her Abbey of the Sweetheart* (Edinburgh, 1913).

Huyshe, W., *Grey Galloway, Its Lords and Its Saints* (Edinburgh, 1914).

Jackson, K.H., The Gaelic Notes in the Book of Deer (Cambridge, 1972).

Kappelle, W.E., The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and Its Transformation 1000-1135 (London, 1979).

Kevan MacDowall, J., Carrick Gallovidian (Ayr, 1947).

Laing, L., The Archaeology of Late Celtic Britain and Ireland c.400-1200AD (London, 1975).

Lloyd, A., King John (Newton Abbott, 1973).

Morrison, A., Rural Settlement Studies (Glasgow, 1980).

M'Kerlie, P.H., History of the Lands and Their Owners in Galloway 1st edition (Paisley, 1877), 2nd edition (Paisley, 1906).

MacGibbon, D. and Ross, T., The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1896-97).

Mackenzie, W., The History of Galloway From the Earliest Period to the Present Time (Kirkcudbright, 1841).

MacNeill, T.E., Anglo-Norman Ulster. The History and Archaeology of an Irish Barony 1177-1400 (Edinburgh, 1980).

O'Corrain, D., Ireland Before the Normans (Dublin, 1972).

Orpen, G.H., Ireland Under the Normans (Oxford, 1911).

Poole, A.L., *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta 1087-1216* (Oxford, 1955).

RCAHMS, 'West Rhins', *Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Scotland*, xxiv (Edinburgh, 1985).

Radford, C.A.R. and Donaldson, G., *Whithorn and the Ecclesiastical Monuments of Wigtown District* (Edinburgh, 1953).

Richmond, I.A.(ed), *Roman and Native in North Britain* (Edinburgh, 1961).

Rivet, A.L.F. and Smith, C., *The Place-Names of Roman Britain* (London, 1979).

Robertson, J., *On Scholastic Offices in the Scottish Church in the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Private Circulation, 1853).

Robertson, J.F., *The Story of Galloway* (Castle Douglas, 1964).

Robison, J., *Kirkcudbright (St.Cuthbert's Town): Its Mote, Castles, Monastery and Parish Churches* (Dumfries, 1926).

Simpson, W.D., *The Celtic Church in Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1935).

Simpson, W.D., *The Province of Mar* (Aberdeen, 1944).

Skene, W.F., *Celtic Scotland* 2nd edition (Edinburgh, 1886-90).

Smith, R.A.L., Canterbury Cathedral Priory: A Study in Monastic Administration (Cambridge, 1943).

Smyth, A.P., Scandinavian York and Dublin (Dublin, 1975-79).

Smyth, A.P., Scandinavian Kings in the British Isles 850-880 (Oxford, 1977).

Smyth, A.P., Warlords and Holy Men. Scotland AD80-1000 (London, 1984).

Stell, G., Dumfries and Galloway (Edinburgh, 1986).

Stenton, F.M., Anglo-Saxon England (Oxford, 1971).

Stones, E.L.G.(ed), Anglo-Scottish Relations 1174-1328 (Oxford, 1970).

Stringer, K.J.(ed), Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland (Edinburgh, 1985).

Sumption, J, Pilgrimage, An Image of Religion (London, 1975).

Turner-Simpson, A. and Stevenson, W., Historic Wigtown: The Archaeological Implications of Development (Scottish Burgh Survey, Glasgow, 1981).

Watt, J., The Church in Medieval Ireland (Dublin, 1972).

Articles and Shorter Notes

Ashley, A., 'Odo, Elect of Whithorn, 1235', *TDGAS*, xxxvii (1958-59), 62-69.

Backmund, N., 'The Praemonstratensian Order in Scotland', *Innes Review*, iv (1952-53), 25-41.

Barbour, J., 'An account of excavations at Lochrutton lake-dwelling', *TDGAS*, 2nd series xvii (1902-03), 246-54.

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The beginnings of feudalism in Scotland', *BIHR*, xxix, 1-31.

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The pattern of lordship and feudal settlement in Cumbria', *Journal of Medieval History*, i (1975), 117-37.

Barrow, G.W.S. and Royan, A., 'James Fifth Stewart of Scotland, 1260(9)-1309', in K.J.Stringer (ed), *Scottish Nobility*.

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The Scottish Judex in the 12th and 13th centuries', *SHR*, xlv (1966), 16-26.

Barrow, G.W.S., 'Rural Settlement in Central and Eastern Scotland, the Medieval evidence', *Scottish Studies*, vi (1963), 123-44.

Birks, H., 'Studies in the vegetational history of Scotland ii, Two pollen diagrams from the Galloway hills, Kirkcudbrightshire', *Journal of Ecology*, lx (1970), 183-217.

Brentano, R,J., 'Re-dating a Whithorn document', *TDGAS,* xxx (1951-52), 192-3.

Brentano, R.J., 'Whithorn and York', *SHR*, xxxii (1953), 144-6.

Brentano, R.J., 'The Whithorn Vacancy', *Innes Review,* iv (1953), 71-83.

Brooke, D., 'Kirk-compound place-names in Galloway and Carrick', *TDGAS*, lviii (1983), 56-71.

Brooke, D., 'The Glenkens 1275-1456: Snapshots of a Medieval countryside', *TDGAS,* lix (1984), 41-56.

Brooke, D., 'The Gall Gaidhil and Galloway', in Oram and Stell, *Early Historic Galloway* (Forthcoming, 1989).

Burdon-Davies, E.F., 'The moated manor at Dunrod, Kirkcudbright', *TDGAS*, xliii (1966), 121-36.

Cameron, A.I., 'Bagimond's Roll for the Archdeaconry of Teviotdale', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, v (1933), 79-106.

Chadwick, N.K., 'St.Ninian: A Preliminary study of the sources', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 9-53.

Clay, C.T., 'Two Dervorguillas', *EHR*, lxv (1950), 89-91.

Clough, T.H.McK. and Laing, L., 'Excavations at Kirkconnel, Waterbeck, Dumfriesshire 1968', *TDGAS*, xlvi (1969), 128-39.

Condry, J. and Ansell, M., 'The excavations of a hut circle at Moss Raploch, Clatteringshaws', *TDGAS*, liii (1977-78), 105-13.

Corner, D., 'The Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi and Chronica of Roger, Parson of Howden', *BIHR*, lvi (1983), 126-44.

Cowan, E., 'The Vikings in Galloway: A review of the evidence', in Oram and Stell, *Early Historic Galloway*.

Cowan, I.B., 'Some aspects of the appropriation of parish churches in medieval Scotland', *Scottish Church History Society Records*, xiii (1957-59), 203-22.

Cowan, I.B., 'The development of the parochial system in Medieval Scotland', *SHR*, xl (1961), 43-55.

Graig, D.J., 'Pre-Norman sculpture in Galloway: Some territorial implications', in Oram and Stell, *Early Historic Galloway*.

Craster, H.H.E.. 'A contemporary record of the pontificate of Ranulf Flambard', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, vii (1930), 33-56.

Crowe, C., 'Excavations at Brydekirk, Annan, 1982-84', *TDGAS*, lix (1984), 33-40.

Cruden, S., 'Glenluce Abbey. Finds recovered during excavation', *TDGAS*, xxix (1950-51), 177-94 and xxx. (1951-52), 179-90.

Curle, A.O., 'Report on excavations of a vitrified fort at Rockcliffe, known as the Mote of Mark', *PSAS*, xlviii (1913-14), 125-68.

Dickinson, W.C., 'Surdit de Sergaunt', *SHR*, xxxix (1960), 170-5.

Donaldson, G., 'The bishops and priors of Whithorn', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 127-54.

Duncan, A.A.M. and Brown, A.L., 'Argyll and the Isles in the Earlier Middle Ages', *PSAS*, xc (1956-57), 192-220.

Duncan, A.A.M., 'The earldom of Atholl in the thirteenth century', *Scottish Genealogist*, vii (1960), 2-10.

Duncan, A.A.M., 'Bede, Iona and the Picts', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages*, ed R.H.C.Davis and J.M.Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981).

Dunlop, A.I., 'Bagimond's Roll - Statement of the tenths of the Kingdom of Scotland', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, vi (1939).

Dunning, G.C., Hodges, H.W.M. and Jope, E.M., 'Kirkcudbright Castle, its pottery and ironwork', *PSAS*, xci (1957-58), 117-38.

Durkan, J., 'The bishops' barony of Glasgow in Pre-Reformation times', *RHCHS*, xxii (1986), 277-301.

Fellows-Jensen, G., 'Common Gaelic Airge, Old Scandinavian Aergi or

Erg?', Nomina, iv (1980), 67-74.

Fellows-Jensen, G., 'Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire and Galloway, the place-name evidence', in Oram and Stell, Early Historic Galloway.

Fergusson, J., 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', SHR, xxxiv (1955), 190-2.

Greeves, R., 'The Galloway lands in Ulster', TDGAS, xxxvi (1957-58), 115-21.

Greenberg, J., 'Guillaume le Clerc and Alan of Galloway', Proceedings of the Modern Language Association, lxvi (1957), 524-33.

Haggarty, A. and Haggarty, G., 'Excavations at Rispain Camp, Whithorn, 1978-81', TDGAS, lviii (1985). 21-51.

Higham, N., 'The Scandinavians in North Cumbria: Raids and settlement in the later 9th to mid 10th centuries', in Baldwin and Whyte (edd), The Scandinavians in Cumbria.

Hope-Taylor, B., 'Excavations at Mote of Urr. Interim report 1951 season', TDGAS, xxix (1950-51), 167-72.

Hunter-Blair, P., in Studies in Early British History, ed N.K.Chadwick (Cambridge, 1954), 165-8.

Jackson, K.H. 'The Britons in Southern Scotland', Antiquity, xxix (1955), 77-88.

Jackson, K.H., 'The sources for the Life of St.Kentigern', in Chadwick, *Studies in the Early British Church*, 273-357.

Jobey, J., 'Burnswark Hill, Dumfriesshire, *TDGAS*, liii (1977-78).

Kerr, H.F., 'The priory church of Whithorn', *TSES*, xi (1934-6).

Kirkby. D.P., 'Strathclyde and Cumbria: A survey of the historical development to 1093', *TCWAAS*, lxxii (1962), 77-94.

Laing, L.R., 'Timber halls in Dark Age Britain, some problems', *TDGAS*, xlvi (1969), 110-27.

Laing, L.R., 'Medieval settlement archaeology in Scotland', *Scottish Archaeological Forum*, i (Glasgow, 1969).

Laing, L.R., 'The Angles in Scotland and the Mote of Mark', *TDGAS*, l (1973), 37-52.

Lamont, W.D., '"House" and "Pennyland" in the Highlands and Islands', *Scottish Studies*, xxv (1981), 65-76.

Lawlor, H.C., 'The vassals of the earls of Ulster', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, iii (1940), 16-26.

Legge, M.D., 'Some notes on the Roman de Fergus', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 163-72.

Legge, M.D., 'The father of Fergus of Galloway', *SHR*, xliii (1964), 86-87.

Megaw, B., 'Pennyland and davoch in south-western Scotland', *Scottish Studies*, xxiii (1979), 75-77.

Megaw, B., 'The barony of St.Trinians in the Isle of Man', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 173-82.

Megaw, E., 'The Manx "Eary" and its significance', in p.Davey (ed), *Man and the Environment in the Isle of Man,* (BAR British Series), liv, pt.ii (1978), 327-45.

Milne, I.A., 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *SHR*, xxxiv (1955), 46-49.

McGill, J.M.. 'A genealogical survey of the ancient lords of Galloway', *Scottish Genealogist*, ii (1955), 3-6.

McKerral, A., 'Ancient denominations of agricultural land in Scotland', *PSAS*, lxxviii (1943-44), 39-80.

McKerral, A., 'The Kintyre properties of Whithorn Priory and the bishopric of Galloway', *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 183-92.

McKerral, A., 'The lesser land and administrative divisions of Celtic Scotland', *PSAS*, lxxxv (1950-51), 52-64.

McKerral, A., 'An extent of Carrick in 1269', *SHR*, xxxiv (1955), 189-90.

MacQueen, J., 'The Picts in Galloway', *TDGAS*, xxxix (1960-61), 127-43.

MacQueen, J., 'The Gaelic speakers of Galloway and Carrick', *Scottish Studies*, xvii (1973), 17-33.

MacQueen, J., 'Pennyland and davoch in south-western Scotland', *Scottish Studies*, xxiii (1979), 69-74.

MacQueen, W.W., 'The Miracula Nynie Episcopi', *TDGAS*, xxxviii (1959-60), 21-57.

Nichols, H., 'Vegetational change, shoreline displacement and the Human factor in the late Quaternary history of South West Scotland', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, lxvii (1968), 145-87.

Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 'Norse place-names in south-west Scotland', *Scottish Studies*, iv (1960), 49-70.

Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 'Celts and Anglo-Saxons in the Scottish border counties. The place-name evidence', *Scottish Studies*, viii (1964), 141-71.

Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 'Scottish place-names, 24, Slew- and Sliabh', *Scottish Studies*, ix (1965), 91-106.

Nicolaisen, W.F.H., 'Gaelic place-names in Southern Scotland', *Studia Celtica*, v (1970), 15-35.

Oftedal, M., 'Scandinavian place-names in Ireland', in *The Proceedings* of the Seventh Viking Congress (Dublin, 1973), 125-33.

Oram, R.D., 'Pennyland and Davoch in south-west Scotland: A review of the evidence', in Crawford and Macgregor, Ouncelands and Pennylands, 46-59.

Owen, D.D.R., 'The craft of Guillaume le Clerc's Fergus', in The Craft of Fiction: Essays in Medieval Poetics, ed L.Arrathoon (Rochester, Michigan, 1984), 47-81.

Pigott, S., 'Native economies and the Roman occupation of North Britain', in Richmond, Roman and Native in North Britain.

Pryde, G.S., 'The burghs of Dumfriesshire and Galloway: Their origin and status', TDGAS, xxix (1950-51), 81-131.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Castle Loch, Mochrum', TDGAS, xxviii (1949-50), 41-63.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Cruggleton Church', TDGAS, xxviii (1949-50), 92-95.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Excavations at Chapel Finian', TDGAS, xxviii (1949-50), 28-40.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Balliol's manor house on Hestan Island', TDGAS, xxxv (1956-57), 33-37.

Radford, C.A.R., 'The Churches of Dumfriesshire and Galloway', TDGAS, xl (1961-62), 102-16.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Excavations at Whithorn, First Season, 1949), *TDGAS*, xxvii (1948-49), 85-126.

Radford, C.A.R., 'Excavations at Whithorn (Final Report)', *TDGAS*, xxxiv (1955-56), 131-94.

Raftis, J.A., 'The estates of Ramsey Abbey: A study in economic growth and organisation', *Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Studies and Texts*, vii (Toronto, 1957).

Ragg, F.W., 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters - four concerning Cardew, and one the Westmorland Newbigging', *TDGAS*, v (1916-18), 231-64.

Reid, R.C., 'The early ecclesiastical history of Kirkgunzeon', *TDGAS*, xiv (1926-28), 201-18.

Reid, R.C., 'The history of Southwick prior to the Reformation', *TDGAS*, xic (1926-28), 218-23.

Reid, R.C., 'Cruggleton Castle', *TDGAS*, xvi (1929-30), 152-60.

Reid, R.C., 'The early Kirkpatricks', *TDGAS*, xxx (1951-52), 61-84.

Reid, R.C., 'THe feudalisation of Lower Nithsdale, *TDGAS*, xxxiv (1955-56), 102-13.

Reid, R.C., 'The monastery of Applegarth', *TDGAS*, xxxv (1956-57), 14-19.

Reid, R.C., 'The priory of St.Mary's Isle', TDGAS, xxxvi (1957-58), 9-26.

Rusk, J.M., 'The Abbey of Luce', TSES, xi (1934-36), 14-30.

Scmolke-Hasselmann, B., 'Der arthurische Versroman, et "Le Roman de Fergus": technique narrative et intention politique', in An Arthurian Tapestry: Essays in Memory of Lewis Thorpe, ed K.Varty (Glasgow, 1981).

Scott, J.G., 'An early sheriff of Dumfries?', TDGAS, lvii (1982), 90-91.

Scott, J.G., 'A note on Viking settlement in Galloway', TDGAS, lviii (1983), 52-55.

Sellar, W.D.H., 'The origins and ancestry of Somerled', SHR, xlv (1966), 123-42.

Sellar, W.D.H., 'Marriage, Divorce and Concubinage in Gaelic Scotland', Transactions of the Gaelic Society of Inverness, li (1978-80), 463-93.

Shead, N.F., 'The origins of the medieval diocese of Glasgow', SHR, xlviii (1969), 220-5.

Simpson, W.D., 'The Ninianic Controversy', TDGAS, xxvii (1948-49), 155-62.

Sprott, G.W., 'The ancient cathedrals of Scotland', TSES, ii (1906-09).

Stringer, K.J., 'A new wife for Alan of Galloway', TDGAS, xlix (1972), 49-55.

Stringer, K.J., 'Galloway and the abbeys of Rievaulx and Dundrennan', TDGAS, liv (1979), 174-7.

Stringer, K.J., 'The early lords of Lauderdale, Druburgh Abbey and St.Andrews Priory at Northampton', in Stringer, Nobility.

Tabraham, C.J., 'Norman settlement in Upper Clydesdale: Recent archaeological fieldwork', TDGAS, liii (1977-78), 114-28.

Tabraham, C.J., 'Norman settlement in Galloway: Recent fieldwork in the Stewartry', in Breeze, Studies in Scottish Antiquity, 87-124.

Tabraham, C.J., 'Excavations at Whithorn Priory, Wigtown District, 1972 and 1975', TDGAS, liv (1979-80), 29-38.

Taylor, A.B., 'Karl Hundasson, King of Scots', PSAS, lxxi (1937).

Thomas, C., 'Two early ecclesiastical sites (Isle of Whithorn and Ardwall Island) and their significance', TDGAS, xxxviii (1959-60), 71-82.

Thomas, C., 'Excavations at Trusty's Hill, Anwoth, 1960', TDGAS, xxxviii (1961), 58-70.

Thomas, C., 'Ardwall Island, the excavation of an early Christian site of Irish type', TDGAS, xliii (1966), 84-116.

Thomas, C., 'An Early Christian cemetery and chapel site on Ardwall Isle, Kirkcudbright', Medieval Archaeology, xi (1967), 127-88.

Watt, D.E.R., 'The minority of Alexander III of Scotland', TRHS, xxi (1971), 1-23.

Webster, K., 'Galloway and the Romances', Modern Language Notes, lv (1940), 363-6.

Whyte, I.D., 'Shielings in the upland pastoral economy of the Lake District in Medieval and Early Modern times', in Baldwin and Whyte (edd), Scandinavians in Cumbria.

Williams, J., 'A crannog at Loch Arthur, New Abbey', TDGAS, xlviii (1971), 121-4.

Wilson, P.A., 'St.Ninian and Candida Casa: Literary evidence from Ireland', TDGAS, xli (1962-63), 156-85.

Winchester, A.L., 'The distribution and significance of the place-name "bordland" in medieval Britain', Agricultural History Review, xxxiv (1986), 129-39.

Young, A., 'The political role of Walter Comyn, earl of Menteith, during the minority of Alexander III of Scotland', SHR, lvii (1978), 121-42.