The expansion of the kingdom of Strathclyde

The kingdom of Strathclyde was focused on the Clyde Valley and ruled by a Brittonic-speaking dynasty. Historians have traditionally argued that the kingdom expanded southwards in the early tenth century, with the result that there was a revival of Brittonic language. Several scholars have recently challenged this interpretation, but in this article I defend the view that Strathclyde expanded southwards, and I propose a new model for the process. I argue that the kings of Strathclyde took submissions from the local nobility, who included Northumbrian and Gaelic-Scandinavian magnates. This accounts for the multicultural nature of the kingdom in its heyday.
The history of the kingdom of Strathclyde is notoriously obscure. The kingdom is first attested in 872 and it endured until at least 1018, but no extended account of its history survives. Strathclyde is mentioned in chronicles composed in neighbouring areas, but this meagre documentation often raises more questions than it answers. Even so, the kingdom encompassed an area that was of immense strategic importance and its history has a bearing on some of the most significant developments in medieval northern Britain: Scandinavian settlement, conflict between the kings of the Scots and the English, and the eventual emergence of the Anglo-Scottish border. At its greatest extent Strathclyde was inhabited by speakers of several different languages, and so a study of the kingdom’s expansion also has the potential to clarify the relationship between political and cultural identity in the early medieval period.

Although the internal history of the kingdom is poorly attested, scholars have sketched out the development of Strathclyde’s political geography. The kingdom evolved from a polity that was known by the name of its chief citadel: Al Clut or Dumbarton rock, the great fortress on the north side of the Clyde. This stronghold was captured by Scandinavian rulers in 870; thereafter the kingdom’s centre of gravity shifted southwards.¹ A major political and ecclesiastical centre flourished at Govan, in the Clyde Valley, whereas the lands north of the Clyde (the Lennox) were no longer the epicentre.² The kingdom became known as (Y)strat Clut (‘the valley of the Clyde’), but at some point in the late ninth or early tenth century it enjoyed a spectacular phase of expansion to the south, taking in a swathe of land that extended down to Penrith in the English county of Cumberland.³
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This view of Strathclyde’s development has attained something of a consensus, but some of the props supporting the argument seem insubstantial. Much weight has been placed on the distribution of Brittonic place-names, but it is difficult to ascertain when these place-names were coined and whether they should be associated with the expansion of Strathclyde. In addition, scholars have become wary of attributing language change merely to political takeover; other explanations may be available for a revival of the Brittonic tongue. Charles Phythian-Adams offered an important challenge to the traditional view of Strathclyde’s history in his book *Land of the Cumbrians*, published in 1996. In this original and insightful work Phythian-Adams argues that enclaves of Brittonic-speakers survived south of the Solway during the period of Northumbrian domination. Upon the collapse of the Northumbrian kingdom in 867, Brittonic identity re-emerged in a cultural and political sense, and the area became the heartland of a ‘Cumbrian’ kingdom. Thus, in Phythian-Adams’s view, the expansion of Strathclyde is not necessary in order to account for the flourishing of Brittonic language south of the Solway in the tenth and eleventh centuries; neither is it clear that the area was part of a large kingdom stretching from Glasgow to Penrith.

Phythian-Adams’s hypothesis has been tacitly rejected by some historians, but the reasons have never been set out in detail. Other scholars have presented the new model as an alternative to the traditional notion of Strathclyde’s expansion. In what follows it will be clear that I do not accept Phythian-Adams’s hypothesis, but I should like to acknowledge my debt to his book for stimulating fresh thinking on the subject. His work demonstrates the
enduring importance of local units, and this has provided a stimulus for the new model for Strathclyde’s expansion that I propose in this article.

In the past, the expansion of Strathclyde has been presented as a single event that occurred in a relatively short space of time. Instead, I will argue that the expansion occurred in a piecemeal fashion, as leaders of local units submitted to Strathclyde kings. I suggest that the initial phase focused on the Roman roads through Annandale and the Eden Valley, and that the western coastal plain was a relatively late and tenuous acquisition. Whilst I support the traditional view that the kings of Strathclyde made significant territorial gains, I offer a more nuanced picture of linguistic developments in the region. There is no straightforward correlation between Strathclyde’s expansion and the revival of Brittonic, given that English-, Norse- and Gaelic-speakers continued to reside in parts of the kingdom. The coastal areas seem to have been dominated by Norse-speaking chieftains, who accepted only loose overlordship of Strathclyde kings. In contrast, in the inland core of the expanded kingdom, Brittonic-speakers from the Clyde Valley may have taken over and developed estates. I therefore stress local variation in both the method of Strathclyde’s expansion and in subsequent linguistic developments. This interpretation has the potential to explain the mix of Brittonic, Gaelic, English and Norse language and culture within the kingdom at its height.  

Britons in the Northumbrian kingdom

I shall begin by assessing Phythian-Adams’s suggestion that Brittonic political and cultural identity survived the era of Northumbrian dominance and enjoyed resurgence thereafter. In principle the idea is attractive since the local nobility are likely to have retained political importance in the more distant parts of the Northumbrian realm. The question is whether they
preserved their Brittonic language and identity down to the early tenth century, the era traditionally associated with Strathclyde’s expansion.

Brittonic-speaking kings ruled the area between Cumberland and Clydesdale in the sixth century. Rheged was apparently the most prominent of these kingdoms, although there is no certainty about its location. During the seventh century Northumbrian kings started a process of westward expansion that lasted for at least a century and had patchy effects. The Northumbrians may have removed Brittonic ruling dynasties entirely, but there was another option available to expansive early medieval kings: to relegate former rulers to the level of noblemen. Would this strategy have preserved Brittonic culture at an elite level in the west of the Northumbrian kingdom?

At this point it is worth considering broader scholarly approaches to Brittonic survival. The laws of Ine, king of Wessex (d. 726) contain several references to wealas (‘foreigners’), which indicate the survival of identifiable groups of Britons at various social levels. However, several factors discouraged their continued adherence to Brittonic identity: their wergild was only half that of a Saxon of comparable status and the compensation arrangements ensured that property would pass from Britons to Saxons in the long run. Recently scholars have argued that these arrangements prompted acculturation: Britons would have adopted markers of Anglo-Saxon identity, including the English language. Language was by no means always a significant component of early medieval identity, but by 700 Cymraeg had become the key factor that bound communities of Britons to one another and distinguished them from their neighbours. Thus the displacement of Brittonic as an elite language within Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was a blow to the persistence of an identifiably Brittonic nobility.
Focusing once again on the Northumbrian kingdom, it is worth considering regional variation in the intensity of acculturation. Brittonic noblemen may have continued to act as local leaders and tribute-payers in areas that experienced ephemeral Northumbrian control, such as the plain of Kyle (Ayrshire). Yet some of the areas into which Strathclyde would expand during the tenth century had formerly been linked with Northumbrian royalty, such as Carlisle. It is questionable whether an identifiably Brittonic nobility would have persisted in such places, but Phythian-Adams has suggested that ‘Anglo-Celtic’ sub-rulers were based Carlisle down to the ninth century at least. He traces their authority back to the marriage of the Northumbrian king Oswiu (d. 670) to Rhiainfellt, whom he takes to be a Rheged princess. This marriage is mentioned in Historia Brittonum, a text compiled in North Wales c. 829–30. Phythian-Adams identifies the sub-rulers with the line of Oslaf, which descended from Oswiu via Ecgfrith Ailguin (Brittonic ‘white-browed’) according to a pedigree in Historia Brittonum. Yet even if Phythian-Adams is correct to associate this dynasty with Carlisle, it is not clear that they retained an ‘Anglo-Celtic’ identity. All of their personal names are English, and Ecgfrith’s Brittonic epithet could have been added when material was brought together in Wales c. 829/30. We know of few other western Northumbrian noblemen, but those who fled Viking raids at the start of the tenth century also had English names.

Ecclesiastical developments further discouraged the survival of identifiably Brittonic institutions. By the late seventh century, some Northumbrian writers equated the Britons’ Easter observance with that of the Quartodeciman heretics. Bede did not hold this view, but he wrote in harsh terms about the Britons’ Easter observance and offered Biblical parallels for their perfidia (‘treachery’). Meanwhile, Northumbrian ecclesiastical institutions
promoted the English language in the more distant parts of the kingdom, as the Old English/runic inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross (Annandale) and the Bewcastle Cross (Gilsland) demonstrate. Some British churchmen may have continued to operate in the Northumbrian kingdom, such as the Neitan(o) sacerdos who is commemorated on a seventh- or eighth-century monument in Peebles Museum. Nonetheless, distinctive Brittonic ecclesiastical practices would not have been openly tolerated within the Northumbrian kingdom by the end of the seventh century.

These factors render it unlikely that Brittonic-speaking noblemen survived under Northumbrian rule down to the tenth century, the era of the Brittonic revival in the North. Enclaves of non-noble Brittonic speakers are likely to have endured on estates that were under the control of Northumbrian lords, as indicated by English place-names in w(e)alh-and perhaps also Norse Bretar place-names. It is possible that the Bretar (‘Britons’) travelled to the area with Scandinavian settlers, but in Cartmel (Lancashire, now Cumbria), Walton Hall and Birkby (Bretby) Hall occur close together and probably refer to a group of Britons surviving down to the tenth century. These groups have sometimes been associated enclaves of Brittonic place-names, and this matter deserves further discussion in line with the broader matter of Brittonic linguistic resurgence, below. For current purposes, it is worth noting that these lower-status groups are unlikely to have had the power to forge a new polity with a Brittonic (‘Cumbrian’) identity; an external stimulus seems much more likely.

From Strathclyde to Cumbria

The expansion of Strathclyde offers a plausible explanation for this phenomenon since the kingdom was ruled by a Brittonic-speaking dynasty and Brittonic language was strong in Clydesdale. Yet as Charles Phythian-Adams has noted, the evidence for the kingdom’s
expansion is meagre and historians have often simply taken its occurrence for granted.\textsuperscript{29} The flourishing of the Brittonic language is not in itself proof of the expansion because there are other conceivable explanations for a revival in Brittonic.\textsuperscript{30} It is therefore necessary to assess other possible evidence for the growth of Strathclyde, that is, the application of Cumbrian terminology to areas north and south of the Solway and the location of political borders.

I have recently explored the emergence of the Cumbrian kingdom in detail elsewhere, and so I shall briefly summarise the relevant points here.\textsuperscript{31} Cumbrian terminology derives from the word \textit{Cymry} (*\textit{com-brogi}), which evolved in the late Roman period and originally meant ‘inhabitants of the same \textit{bro} (local area)’. The term was borrowed into English as \textit{Cumbras} no later than the seventh century, and so it is likely that the ruling dynasty of Dumbarton/Strathclyde considered themselves to be \textit{Cymry} long before our period.\textsuperscript{32} Why, then, did neighbouring writers start to apply Cumbrian terminology to a northern British kingdom as late as the tenth century? The answer seems to lie in political developments, given that the term is used in combination with references to kings or territory. Examples include \textit{terra Cumbrorum}, which was ruled by king \textit{Douenaldus} (Dyfnwal) according to the Life of St Cathroe of Metz. This text emerged shortly after the saint’s death in 971×976, and the writer was well-informed about Northern British politics.\textsuperscript{33} The emergence of Cumbrian terminology coincides with other changes in political nomenclature in Northern Britain, such as the development of new names for the Scottish kingdom.\textsuperscript{34}

Several scholars have argued that a Cumbrian polity emerged to the south of the Solway in the early tenth century, and that it was ruled separately from Strathclyde.\textsuperscript{35} This interpretation is problematic, however, because it relies on the difficult testimony of the fourteenth-century chronicler John of Fordun.\textsuperscript{36} In contrast, P.A. Wilson argued that ‘Strathclyde’ and
‘Cumbria’/Cumberland were different names for the same polity.\textsuperscript{37} The difficulty with his argument is that Cumbrian terminology emerged later than the terms relating to Strathclyde. My explanation is that Strathclyde evolved into Cumbria: Cumbrian terminology began to be used in a political sense once the kingdom had expanded beyond the limits of \textit{Ystrat Clut} (Strathclyde, ‘the valley of the Clyde’).

The kingdom name ‘Strathclyde’ first appears in texts of English and Irish origin during the 870s; for example, \textit{Strecledwalas} (‘Strathclyde Britons’) are mentioned in the common stock of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 875.\textsuperscript{38} In contrast, Cumbrian terminology is first attested in various versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 945: ‘In this year King Edmund ravaged all \textit{Cumbra land} and granted it to Máel Coluim, king of the Scots, on condition that he should be his ally both on sea and on land’.\textsuperscript{39} Latin and Norse texts support the notion that Cumbrian terminology superseded the kingdom name ‘Strathclyde’ during the mid-tenth century. Welsh writers were, however, unwilling to apply Cumbrian terminology to a specific northern British kingdom because the inhabitants of the various Welsh kingdoms were also \textit{Cymry}.\textsuperscript{40} Taking all of the tenth-century texts together, it is clear that the Cumbrian polity extended from the Clyde Valley to the south of the Solway.\textsuperscript{41}

It is uncertain how long this larger Cumbrian kingdom endured, but it had ceased to function as a political unit by the late eleventh century. The memory of the Cumbrian polity lingered for longer, as witnessed by the text known as David’s Inquest. David \textit{Cumbrensis regionis princeps} (‘prince of the Cumbrian region’) conducted this investigation into the lands of the church of Glasgow before he became king of Scots in 1124. The Inquest listed estates in Glasgow, Upper Clydesdale, Annandale, Tweeddale and Teviotdale (see map), but the writer admitted ‘he (David) did not in fact rule all of the Cumbrian region’.\textsuperscript{42} This is presumably a
reference to the area south of Solway, which became part of the Anglo-Norman realm in 1092. Thus there was a lingering concept that *Cumbria* straddled the Solway, as the tenth-century texts also suggest.

An analysis of tenth-century political borders helps to substantiate the notion that the northern Brittonic kingdom expanded far to the south of Clydesdale. This approach was pioneered by Frank Stenton, who suggested that the kings of Strathclyde established a stable southern borderline along the River Eamont (near Penrith). Recent work calls into question this characterisation of medieval political frontiers: scholars now focus on extensive zones of interaction, not simply on linear features. Indeed, early medieval kingdoms were often based on rulership of peoples rather than defined territories, and so they fluctuated considerably in extent. It may not be possible to determine a precise southern borderline for the expanded kingdom, but it seems that the Strathclyde kings were active far to the south of Clydesdale.

The earliest indication of the kingdom’s expansion is the royal meeting at the River Eamont (near Penrith) in 927. Border areas were often chosen for treaty-negotiations, and the area around Eamont has the appearance of a frontier: it was located just south of the wooded core of Inglewood Forest and was inhabited by people with varying cultural affiliations. The D version of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reports the attendance of Athelstan, Constantín of Alba, Hywel Dda, Ealdred of Bamburgh and Owain of Gwent. In contrast William of Malmesbury, writing in 1125, designated Owain *rex Cumbrorum* (‘king of the Cumbrians’). It is plausible that northern Britons attended the meeting since they had a diplomatic matter to resolve with Athelstan: they had been harbouring the Dublin ruler Guðrøðr, whom Athelstan expelled. Another possible reference to this border region is found in the Life of St Cathroe,
which relates that the saint travelled through the Cumbrian kingdom to ‘the boundary of the lands of the Cumbrians and the Northmen’.\textsuperscript{50} He journeyed \textit{usque Loidam civitatem}, but unfortunately this \textit{civitas} has not been conclusively identified. There are, however, several possible candidates in the vicinity of Penrith and the River Eamont.\textsuperscript{51}

Scholars have proposed other southern boundary-lines for Strathclyde/Cumbria, but these suggestions rely on later, problematic texts. The most southerly is Dunmail Raise, which bears the name of the Cumbrian king Dyfnwal. It lay on the boundary between the dioceses of York and Carlisle, but unfortunately its significance in the early medieval period cannot be proven.\textsuperscript{52} Another possibility is the Rey Cross on Stainmore, an extensive swathe of Pennine moorland. In 1265 Bishop John of Cheam claimed that the diocese of Glasgow extended to this landmark, but he was inspired by an erroneous reference in a Scottish king-list.\textsuperscript{53} An earlier reference to Stainmore is found in the so-called ‘Chronicle of the Kings of Alba’, which contains some late tenth-century material, although it continued to be updated until the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{54} It reports that Cináed son of Máel Coluim (d. 995) and his army ‘plundered England as far as Stainmore, as far as Cluia and as far as the pools of the Derwent’.\textsuperscript{55} The entry underlines the strategic importance of Stainmore, but it does not necessarily reveal the borders of the Cumbrian kingdom. Indeed, Stainmore was separated from the Eamont/Penrith area by \textit{westmoringa land} (‘the land of the people of the western moors’), which was controlled by semi-independent lords.\textsuperscript{56}

Several boundaries have been proposed on the western coast (see map), but these suggestions again rely on late-medieval evidence. The ‘Chronicle of Carlisle’ (1291) was influenced by the bounds of the county of Cumberland when it designated the River Duddon as a border of the Cumbrian kingdom.\textsuperscript{57} Another possibility is the River Derwent, but this idea was inspired
by its twelfth-century role as a boundary of the diocese of Carlisle. A more plausible candidate is the River Esk, which lies between the Duddon and the Derwent. The Esk marked the northern extent of the area dominated by the Northumbrian earl Tostig c.1065, according to a geld list that was included in Domesday Book. Yet Tostig’s landholding was a fairly recent creation; the area between Esk and Duddon had formerly been a self-sufficient territory dominated by a Gaelic-Scandinavian lord.

To sum up, contemporary evidence for the southern extent of the kingdom focuses on an inland border zone that comprised Inglewood Forest and the Eamont/Penrith area. Interestingly, this area retained associations with Cumbrian kings in early modern times; for example, Owain was linked with Castle Hewin and the collection of monuments known as the Giant’s Grave at Penrith. I would argue that Strathclyde’s early phase of expansion focused on an inland axis along the Roman roads through Annandale, Carlisle and the Eden Valley to the border area. In contrast, the western coastal zone had ill-defined and ephemeral boundaries, and the Cumbrian kingdom may have exercised only loose authority there.

Brittonic place-names

Scholars have frequently plotted the distribution of Brittonic place-names in order to trace Strathclyde’s expansion and its southern borders. This approach assumes that conquest can induce a language shift, prompting place-names to be coined in a newly dominant language. According to broader studies of language contact, there are instances of subject peoples shifting to the language of their new rulers on account of its prestige. However, it is also possible for rulers to shift, in the longer term, to the language of their subjects. A third possibility is the development of a Sprachbund, that is, the interaction of speakers of several different languages, and the eventual convergence of several linguistic features. For example,
political developments and migrations in the Balkans precipitated the development a

*Sprachbund* rather than dominance of one language across the area.\(^63\) Thus, it would be

hazardous simply to assume that expansion by Strathclyde rulers would eventually lead to the
dominance of Brittonic within the expanded kingdom.

There are, indeed, other possible explanations for a Brittonic revival in the tenth and eleventh
centuries. Charles Phythian-Adams has argued that clusters of Brittonic place-names relate to
enclaves of Britons who survived throughout the period of Northumbrian domination. The
end of Northumbrian rule enabled Brittonic culture to thrive once again, prompting the
coinage of some new Brittonic place-names.\(^64\) Alan James has suggested that Brittonic-
speakers migrated throughout southern Scotland and northern England during the Viking Age
in search of economic opportunities and to flee turbulent conditions.\(^65\) It is therefore
important to consider what relationship, if any, Brittonic place-names have to the expansion
of the kingdom of Strathclyde. First, it is necessary to be aware of a disparity in place-name
studies north and south of the Solway. The counties of Cumberland and Westmorland have
been surveyed in detail, whereas there is no comprehensive survey of Dumfriesshire.\(^66\)
Nevertheless, some recent studies of Brittonic place-names have investigated areas on both
sides of the modern Anglo-Scottish border.\(^67\)

The first difficulty is dating the place-names, a tricky enterprise given that first attestations
generally date from the twelfth century or later. According to Phythian-Adams’s model, some
enclaves of Brittonic-speakers would have endured throughout the Northumbrian period,
perpetuating place-names intact.\(^68\) As I have noted, the survival of enclaves of Britons under
Northumbrian rule seems highly likely, and elsewhere I have identified one such group with
some Brittonic place-names at the tip of the Furness peninsula.\(^69\) However, Furness lies well
to the south of the areas in which Brittonic place-names were demonstrably being coined and modified as late as the tenth century. A different set of circumstances seems to account for the presence of late Brittonic place-names in the Solway basin and further north. The place-names in question were still in mint condition by the time of their recording; that is, they show no sign of interference from English-speakers. A celebrated example is *Penteiacob*, Peebleshire, which was recorded c. 1120 with all three elements well preserved (*Pen-tai Iacob* ‘Jacob’s outhouses’). Other examples include Castle Hewin, Cumberland (*castell Ewain* ‘Owain’s castle’), which would have developed to *Kestlen* if it had been made subject to English first-syllable stress in the Northumbria period. It is hard to envisage these names being perpetuated by a surviving enclave of Britons unless they remained totally isolated from English-speakers. That scenario seems unlikely in parts of Cumberland such as Gilsland, where English parish names and the Bewcastle Cross demonstrate the presence of English-speakers.

There are several other reasons to suspect late coinage of Brittonic place-names in parts of the Cumbrian kingdom, as detailed studies by Davyth Hicks and Alan James have revealed. Semantic changes can be detected: in northern English and southern Scottish place-names the element *cair* - (modern Welsh *caer*) usually has the secondary sense ‘stockade farm’ rather than the original meaning ‘fortress’. Furthermore, a number of place-names in *tref* - (‘farm’) take the form ‘noun + article + noun’, which seems to be a relatively late type of Brittonic naming-phrase. One example is Trailtrow (Dumfriesshire), which is recorded as *Trevertrold* in David’s Inquest c. 1120. Some scholars associate the Brittonic place-names in this part of Annandale with an enclave that persisted under Northumbrian rule, but Trailtrow is more likely to have been coined in the tenth or eleventh century. This raises the possibility that nearby Pennersaugh (*pen y(r) *Sechs* ‘hill of the Englishman’) was coined by a now-
dominant Brittonic-speaking community who perceived English-speakers to be in the minority. This scenario also explains the adoption of pre-existing English and Norse place-names by Brittonic-speakers to the south of Solway. In the name Cumwhitton (Cumwyntinton, 1279) the English place-name Hwītingtūn acquired the Brittonic prefix cum (modern Welsh cwm). Carlatton (Carlatun, 1158) originated as English ceorla-tūn (‘farm/estate of the peasants’) but was subsequently influenced by Old Norse karl in the tenth or eleventh century. The name was then exposed to Brittonic penultimate stress, hence the preservation of the medial -a-inflection. These names reveal the spread of Brittonic language into areas formerly dominated by English- and Norse-speakers, which would surely have required an external stimulus.

That said, the spread of Brittonic in the tenth and eleventh centuries is not necessarily incompatible with Phythian-Adams’s model. He suggests that Brittonic-speakers survived in peripheral lands and then expanded into surrounding areas after the collapse of the Northumbrian kingdom. However, Alan James has recently provided another explanation for the apparently peripheral location of Brittonic place-names, that is, a reorganisation of landholdings and agriculture in the tenth to twelfth centuries. He associates the cair-names with wealthy cattle barons, who exploited upland landscapes and transhumance routes. In a similar vein, I would argue that the Brittonic llanerch (‘clearing’) names in Gilsland parallel the þveit (‘thwaite, clearing’) names in Norse-speaking areas. The thwaites were often held in separate ownership after clearance, and a similar process would explain the Brittonic name Lanrequeitheil (llanerch Ithel, ‘the clearing of Ithel’, 1205 × 1237). Indeed, a considerable
number of the Brittonic place-names in Gilsland describe minor topographical features or fields on land that was beginning to be exploited more intensively.\textsuperscript{84}

Thus economic developments may have prompted the dispersal of Brittonic-speakers, but this does not rule out the impact of political expansion. Noble Strathclyde families may have been rewarded for their service with extensive estates for cattle farming; for example, Andrew Breeze has argued that Trailtrow derives from \textit{tre’r trulliad} (‘farm of the butler’), a high-ranking royal servant.\textsuperscript{85} The noble landowners could have offered advantageous terms to men from Strathclyde to develop these estates, leading to the coinage of new minor place-names in Brittonic. Such movements of colonisers are associated with language change on a much wider scale in eastern Europe in the central Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{86} This scenario would only apply to limited localities of the enlarged kingdom since other areas lack late-coined Brittonic place-names. The variation reflects later linguistic developments to some extent, but I also suggest that contemporary factors were at play. I propose that Brittonic-speakers from Strathclyde acquired lands in limited areas, such as Gilsland, whilst Norse- and English-speaking noblemen and lesser landowners remained in situ in other localities. This interpretation gives rise to a new model for the kingdom’s expansion, which I will outline in the next section.

\textbf{The process of expansion}

So far I have argued that the expansion of the kingdom of Strathclyde is the most plausible interpretation of the fate of the area between Clydesdale and Cumberland in the tenth century. It remains to consider how and why this expansion occurred, but exploration of this theme is again bedevilled by the paucity of the evidence. Previously Strathclyde has been portrayed as the junior partner in the enterprise; scholars seem uncomfortable with the idea that the kings of Strathclyde enlarged their own kingdom. However, these views are based on the
assumption that the expansion was a spectacular, one-off event, whereas I would argue that it was a piecemeal process. Kings of Strathclyde may have conquered some areas, but gained the allegiance of local leaders in other places. This helps to explain the kingdom’s multi-cultural dimension: Brittonic-speakers were among its inhabitants, but so too were Gaelic-, Norse- and English-speakers.

Strathclyde is traditionally portrayed as operating in the shadow of its more northerly neighbour, the nascent Scottish kingdom. From Strathclyde’s inception, Scottish kings interfered in its politics: in 872 Arthgal, king of Strathclyde, was killed by the counsel of Constantín mac Cináeda. Arthgal’s son, Rhun, was married to Constantín’s sister and their son Eochaid (a Gaelic name) is described as a king in the ‘Chronicle of the Kings of Alba’. Yet it is unclear whether Eochaid really did rule Alba: a certain Giric mac Dúngaile features in Scottish king-lists instead, and he is designated a king in the Dunkeld Litany, which may have a contemporary text at its core.

The traditional view of Scottish dominance also draws on John of Fordun’s notion that the Cumbrian kingdom became an appanage for heirs to Scottish kingship. Dauvit Broun has recently shown that this portrayal of Cumbria derives from Fordun’s source, which was influenced by the position of Gascony in 1259. Given the thirteenth-century gloss, it seems unwise to place any reliance on the account of Cumbria that Fordun transmitted. The ‘Chronicle of the Kings of Alba’ seems to contain an earlier reference to the election of a member of the Scottish royal line as a Cumbrian king. However, Benjamin Hudson has demonstrated that this is in fact a reference to an Irish king and has nothing to do with
Strathclyde/Cumbria. That leaves us with the various versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which record that Edmund raided *Cumbra land* and leased it to the Scots in 945. This can only have been a temporary arrangement since a king of the Cumbrians appeared in his own right at the great royal summit at Chester in 973. In short, the idea that the kingdom of Strathclyde expanded southwards under Scottish influence is not compelling.

David Dumville has provided an alternative interpretation, namely, that Strathclyde emerged and expanded as a client kingdom of the Scandinavian warriors Ívarr and Óláfr and their descendants. Indeed the siege of Dumbarton by Ívarr and Óláfr falls between the occupations of York (866/7) and Repton (873/4), which led to Scandinavian domination of Northumbrian and Mercian lands respectively. Yet this strategy cannot have destroyed the military capability of the Strathclyde Britons since the Scandinavian leader Hálfdan had to ravage them repeatedly in 875/6. Moreover, the ruling dynasty of Strathclyde seems to have survived, unlike the royal lines of Northumbria and Mercia.

I am not, therefore, convinced that Strathclyde expanded while under the control of Scandinavian leaders. Nevertheless, Scandinavian activity may have contributed in other ways to the kingdom’s growth. The fall of York in 866/7 caused the Northumbrian kingdom to fragment, leaving more westerly parts vulnerable to expansion by other powers. Periods of weakness in the dynasty of Ívarr would have offered opportunities for the king of Strathclyde. By the 920s, the Strathclyders were forming alliances with this Scandinavian dynasty, who benefited from the route-ways leading from the Clyde. This co-operation is unlikely to explain the first phase of Strathclyde’s growth since the kingdom already reached to the Eamont border zone by 927. However, agreements between Scandinavian leaders and Cumbrian kings may have encouraged the local rulers of the western coast to give their
allegiance to Cumbrian kings later in the tenth century. This background may also explain the incorporation of Scandinavian motifs into the sculptured monuments at Govan, alongside Insular artistic styles.\textsuperscript{99} Scandinavian influence is less evident elsewhere in Clydesdale, to judge by place-name and artefactual evidence. The scattered evidence is likely to reflect incorporation of settlers into Cumbrian estates rather than Scandinavian domination.\textsuperscript{100}

I would argue that Strathclyde’s kings expanded the kingdom on their own terms, and that the process was carried out in a piecemeal fashion. The Clyde Valley runs southward, and so further expansion in that direction seemed natural. It is notable that the Netherton (Hamilton) Cross in mid-Clydesdale has a serpent boss which resembles the ‘sun stone’ at Govan, the major political centre further north in Clydesdale. The cross stands near a twelfth-century motte, which was associated with a royal estate.\textsuperscript{101} It is easy to envisage the kings of Strathclyde casting their eyes from here towards Annandale, which was connected to Clydesdale by the Roman road over Beattock summit.\textsuperscript{102}

The circumstances of Annandale’s takeover are unknown, but I suggest that the king of Strathclyde achieved a rapid advance by gaining the allegiance of local noblemen. After the implosion of the Northumbrian kingdom, Annandale was left without a superior ruler, and the local nobility would have been seeking security. The importance of regional political units tends to be underestimated, but polities based on river-valleys are attested elsewhere in the Insular world, such as Ystrad Tywi in southern Wales.\textsuperscript{103} G. W. S. Barrow emphasised the importance of river-valleys as building-blocks of political units in northern England and southern Scotland.\textsuperscript{104} The people of Annandale are attested as a distinct group in Roman times – the Annavionenses – and this regional identity survived until David I gave Ystrad Anant to Robert de Brus in 1124.\textsuperscript{105} The king of Strathclyde may have made a similar bargain
with the leader of nearby Upper Nithsdale, where several monuments exhibit connections with Clydesdale. However, this area had fallen out of the Cumbrian political orbit by the early twelfth century, when it was ruled by a local, Gaelic-speaking dynasty. Historians have tended to focus on Strathclyde’s southward expansion, but it is possible that the kingdom’s authority extended eastwards into Upper Tweeddale and West Lothian, as Davyth Hicks has observed.

The main axis of the kingdom’s expansion to the south of Solway lay along the Roman road to Carlisle and the Eden Valley. The kings aimed for Carlisle because it was a Northumbrian political and ecclesiastical centre, and its continued occupation throughout the Viking Age is attested by graves found during the excavation of Carlisle Cathedral Treasury. In the Eden Valley, the kings of Strathclyde encountered a complex mixture of surviving Northumbrian aristocracy, possible enclaves of Brittonic-speakers and Scandinavian settlers. Nick Higham has suggested that the kings adopted a ‘zoning policy’ which encouraged Scandinavian elites to settle in specific localities. It is, however, worth considering whether some of the Scandinavian settlement predates the consolidation of the Cumbrian kingdom. There are a number of furnished mound burials in the Eden Valley, such as the Hesket-in-the-Forest burial, which contained equestrian equipment. In 2004 a cemetery of six furnished graves was discovered slightly further north at Cumwhitton; the artefacts include Insular strap-ends and spurs, but also some Scandinavian-style weapons and costumes. In general the furnished burials seem to date to the early tenth century and reflect pagan, Scandinavian traditions. Those responsible had little in common with the kings of Strathclyde in cultural and religious terms, and so it is uncertain whether they were susceptible to political accommodation. Indeed, the kings of Strathclyde would have encountered considerable competition during the 920s in the Eden Valley, which lay on a
major route-way between York and Dublin. The political turbulence may explain why a considerable amount of hacksilver and coins was deposited in the area at Flusco Pike c. 925, as well as some Hiberno-Scandinavian brooches.¹¹⁴

The Cumbrian kings may have sought to consolidate their control of parts of the Eden Valley in the mid- to late-tenth century by redistributing lands to their noblemen, who in turn brought in Brittonic-speaking settlers. This would explain why Cumwhitton, the location of the early tenth-century cemetery, bears a newly coined Brittonic place-name and another cluster of Brittonic names is found along Ullswater and north of the Eamont.¹¹⁵ Not far away, however, the lords of Lowther and Penrith were investing in fine hogback monuments, grave-slabs and free-standing crosses that reflect the sculptural traditions of the Insular Scandinavian world.¹¹⁶ The commissioning of these monuments at ecclesiastical sites reflects the Christianisation of the local Scandinavian elite, which may have facilitated interaction with the Cumbrian kings. It is worth noting that five hogbacks are located at Govan in the Clyde Valley, which was a political centre, ecclesiastical site and possible naval base.¹¹⁷ One of the Govan hogbacks has the same tall, narrow profile as the Penrith and Lowther monuments and its densely packed patterns are reminiscent of Viking-Age sculpture in Cumberland.¹¹⁸ One model for this cultural interaction is the marriage alliance between the Scandinavian dynasty of Ívarr and the Scottish kings in the mid-tenth century. There may have been a similar alliance between the Cumbrian kings and the rulers of Man and the Isles, and this would explain why English kings started to concern themselves with the western seaboard, as Clare Downham has observed.¹¹⁹ A Cumbrian king and a ruler of the Isles met with Edgar at Chester in 973, and Æthelred attacked both the Cumbrian kingdom and the Isle of Man in 1000.¹²⁰
Co-operation with the Islesmen may have enabled the Cumbrian kings to extend their influence along the coastal plain to the south of the Solway Firth. Allerdale (the valley of the River Ellen and surrounding areas; see map) must have fallen under the Cumbrian remit at this point. The mid- to late-eleventh-century text ‘Gospatric’s writ’ is addressed to retainers ‘in all the lands that were Cumbrian’, including Allerdale. This area seems to have been multi-cultural; for example the hogback stones at the churches of Bromfield and Aspatria attest links to the Insular Scandinavian world in the tenth century. There are some potentially late Brittonic place-names in the inland part of Allerdale, such as blain-tir ‘upland territory’ in Blennerhasset (Blennerheiseta 1188). Yet this place-name was subsequently compounded with Norse hey-sætr ‘hay-shieling’, which reflects the persistence of the Norse language. I would argue that the coastal plain further south was dominated by Gaelic-Scandinavian lords who controlled semi-independent ‘farmer republics’. If they remained in place under loose Cumbrian rule, their estates would not have been transferred to Cumbrian nobles; this would explain the ‘zoning’ of Scandinavian and Cumbrian influence detected by Nick Higham. In short, I would argue that the Cumbrian kings enjoyed only loose influence over the coastal plain, which was facilitated by their connections to Man and the Isles.

Why would lords of local polities be amenable to the overlordship of a Cumbrian king? It is worth drawing an analogy with the chieftains who dominated individual islands in the kingdom of the Isles; river valleys or peninsulas on the western coast would have been of comparable size to some of the islands, and shared some features of social organisation. The hierarchy of power in the Isles embraced farmers, local chieftains and their overlords, such as the kings of Man and the Isles. In times of strife, chieftains might invite in rulers from external polities, such as Ireland or Norway. Such arrangements are attested in the Chronicle...
of the kings of Man and the Isles, which was written down in the thirteenth century, but includes some earlier material. In the tenth century, the potentates of the coastal plain may have been prepared to make temporary accords with the Manx and Cumbrian rulers at times of threat from external parties, such as Æthelred. In return, the overlords would have received tribute and extended their sphere of influence. Ethnicity need not have been a significant factor in these arrangements, for tenth-century leaders across Britain and Ireland sought to appeal to a variety of ethnic groups.

In conclusion I have argued that the kingdom of Strathclyde expanded southwards in the early tenth century, prompting the emergence of Cumbrian political terminology. In my view, this model is preferable to Phythian-Adams’s suggestion that the Cumbrian polity emerged in an area of Brittonic survival to the south of Solway. Nevertheless, as Phythian-Adams has observed, the distribution of Brittonic place-names is not coterminous with the expanded kingdom. My new model for the expansion helps to explain this cultural diversity: the kings made accords with local leaders in some areas, a process that endured until the second half of the tenth century.

In the twelfth century, Glasgow’s hagiographers emphasised the distinctive Brittonic identity of the Cumbrian kingdom in order to make a case for independence from the proposed archbishopric of St Andrews. Yet even in this milieu the kingdom’s cultural diversity was recognised: the prologue to David’s Inquest describes the inhabitants of Cumbria as ‘different peoples of different nations from different regions’.
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