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0.1 Summary

Colonialism, Continuity and Change: A Multidisciplinary Study of the Relationship between Colonialism and Iron Age and Medieval Settlement in the North Channel

This dissertation investigates the relationship between colonialism and settlement. It examines three episodes of colonialism in two case-study regions facing each other across the North Channel, corresponding to eastern Northern Ireland (‘Ulidia’), and mid-western Scotland (‘Ergadia’). By comparing different forms of colonial activity across several time periods and between two regions, the dissertation improves our understanding of colonialism and migration across time and space. The first episode involved the purported elite migration of the Dál Riata from northeast Ireland to western Scotland c.AD500. The second involved the arrival in both regions and beyond of raiders and settlers from Scandinavia c.AD790–850. The third involved a group of settlers mainly from England and Wales, who established the earldom of Ulster as part of a wider expansion into Ireland c.AD1167–1200.

The analysis of the continuities and discontinuities in both case studies was based on a series of chronological syntheses drawing together the archaeological, architectural and documentary evidence for settlement in each region c.800BC–AD1400. It was further augmented by employing burial and toponymic evidence as proxies for settlement. Combined with the textual narrative, the archaeological syntheses enabled an examination of, firstly, whether colonial activity actually occurred, and, secondly, the form of colonialism that took place and the processes that lay behind it. To structure the interpretation, each colonial episode was broken down into contact, expansion, consolidation and domination phases, with further phases based on their socio-political and transcultural outcomes.

The Dál Riata episode was probably not an example of colonialism. The documentary evidence was found to be unreliable and related to a late reshaping of a usable past. Moreover, there was no visible shift in settlement practices identifiable with incoming colonists. The Scandinavian episode differed on either side of the North Channel. There is no evidence that settlers got beyond a consolidation phase in Ulidia, with very little impact on traditional burial practices, settlement, and language use. Conversely, in Ergadia a major shift was apparent in secular settlement and burial practices. The appearance of a large number of Old Norse placenames also indicates settlement involving several social orders. This heavily influenced the socio-political makeup of the region to at least the fourteenth century. In the third episode, a domination phase was also reached in Ulidia. It involved the establishment of a new extractive elite, with shifts in settlement and toponymic, but not burial, practice.
## 0.2 Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-S</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon, Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eDIL</td>
<td>Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LatDict</td>
<td>Online Latin Dictionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Mean Gaeilge; Mean Gàidhlig; Middle Irish, Middle Gaelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Nua Gaeilge; Nua Gàidhlig; Modern/Contemporary Irish, Modern Gaelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISMR</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Sites and Monuments Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>National Library of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>Old Norse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI</td>
<td>Ordnance Survey, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAHMS</td>
<td>Royal Commission of Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Sean Gaeilge, Sean Gàidhlig; Old Irish, Old Gaelic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chronological

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>Late Neolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Middle Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>Middle Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIA</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Early medieval period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Viking Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMP</td>
<td>High medieval period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMP</td>
<td>Late medieval period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM</td>
<td>High or late medieval in date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMod</td>
<td>Early modern period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACam.A</td>
<td>Annales Cambriae A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AClon</td>
<td>Annals of Clonmacnoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AClyn</td>
<td>Clyn’s Annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACon</td>
<td>Annals of Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>Airgíalla Charter Poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>Annals of the Four Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrip</td>
<td>Ágríp af Noregskonungsogum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHG</td>
<td>Grace’s Annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>Pembridge’s Annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Annals of Inisfallen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td>Annals of Loch Cé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMF</td>
<td>Annals of Multifarnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Annales Regii C (Icelandic Annals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF.C</td>
<td>Annales Regni Francorum C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARos</td>
<td>Annals of Roscrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>Annals of St Bertin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC/D</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Recension D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Annals of Tigernach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Annals of Ulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B503</td>
<td>Rawlinson B503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBM</td>
<td>Book of Ballymote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Baile Chuinn Chêchathaig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower</td>
<td>Scotichronicon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brut</td>
<td>Brut y Tywysogion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CÆ</td>
<td>Chronicon Æthelweardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cathríchim Cellacháin Chaisil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland Preserved in the Public Records office, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS</td>
<td>Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in the Public Records office, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGG</td>
<td>Cogadh Gaedhle Gallaib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGH</td>
<td>Corpus Genealogiarum Hibeniæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHex</td>
<td>Chronicle of John of Hexham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHol</td>
<td>Chronicle of Holyrood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*CI</td>
<td>*Chronicle of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLan</td>
<td>Chronicle of Lanercost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMel</td>
<td>Chronicle of Melrose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPDR</td>
<td>Ceithre primchenéla Dáil Riata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMRH</td>
<td>Roger of Howden’s Chronica Magistri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRMCI</td>
<td>Chronicle of Kings of Man and the Isles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Chronicon Scottorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Duan Albanach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Epitoma Chronicon (AKA Prosper’s Chronicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCRA</td>
<td>Item [Genelach Clainde] Rig Alban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>Genelach Rig nAlban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRRH</td>
<td>Gesta Regis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.7</td>
<td>Trinity College Dublin MS H.2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>Historia Regem Symeonis Dunelmensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRegA</td>
<td>Historia Rerum Anglicarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Icelandic Annals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L610</td>
<td>Laud 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGE</td>
<td>Lebor Gabála Érann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>Lebor Laignechn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LML</td>
<td>Great Book of Lecan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUM</td>
<td>Book of Uí Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB</td>
<td>McCarthaigh’s Book (Miscellaneous Irish Annals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MScot</td>
<td>Marianus Scottus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSFA</td>
<td>Miniugud Senchasa Fher n-Alban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIE</td>
<td>Great rolls of the Pipe of the Irish Exchequer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B502</td>
<td>Rawlinson B502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLCH</td>
<td>Irish close rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLPH</td>
<td>Irish patent rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scal</td>
<td>Scalacronica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Senchas Dáil Fiatach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>Senchus Síl hIr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Táin Bó Cúailgne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSB</td>
<td>Vita Sancti Blaitmaici</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSC</td>
<td>Adomán’s Life of St Colum Cille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Tripartite Life of St Patrick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standing Remains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standing Remains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material Culture**

**Pottery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pottery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iHUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Metalwork**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPPB</td>
<td>Bossed pseudo-penannular brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RHP</td>
<td>Copper-alloy ring-headed pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Penannular brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPB</td>
<td>Pseudo-penannular brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHP</td>
<td>Ring-headed pin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stonework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Cross-inscribed stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Cross slab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>High cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHGS</td>
<td>West Highland grave slab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0.3 A note on orthography
This project uses names for monument forms derived from a variety of languages. In the interests of accessibility, if a noun has become commonly used in English, once introduced, I have adopted the anglicised form here, dropping the accents and pluralised it accordingly to English morphology. This is at once an effort to remain as politically neutral as possible, and avoid conflicting systems of accents and pluralisation, such as the differences between Gaeilge (Irish) and Gàidhlig (Scottish Gaelic) in these respects. Hence the use of dun, longphort, etc. as English loanwords throughout.

In terms of named individuals and dynasties, I have largely tried to avoid representing their names in modern English orthography, bar the most famous of names, such as Patrick or Alfred, deciding instead to use the names as their holders might have used them. Where several variants are available, I have tried to choose one form for all examples of that name, usually the oldest, but occasionally the form appearing most frequently in the sources. In general, mac is used in the sense of ‘son of’ and Mac as a surname over generation, e.g. Eógan mac Donnchada Mac Dubgaill for Eógan Mac Dubgaill, son of Donnchad.
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Figure 3.61. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in the Hebrides, using timescale B.
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Figure 4.1. Chronological diagram for unenclosed settlements in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [S] after the name of the site indicates souterrains, while the shape after the name of the site indicates whether circular or
rectilinear domestic structures were found in association.

Figure 4.2. Chronological diagram for souterrains associated with enclosed or ecclesiastic settlement in Ulidia, using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [S] after the name of the site indicates souterrains, while the shape after the name of the site indicates whether circular or rectilinear domestic structures were found in association.

Figure 4.3. Chronological diagram for univallate raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.4. Chronological diagram for miscellaneous enclosures in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.5. Chronological diagram for cashels in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.6. Chronological diagram for conjoined raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.7. Chronological diagram for platform raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.8. Chronological diagram for raised raths in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.9. Chronological diagram for enclosed outcrops in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the
blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.10. Chronological diagram for bivalla te raths in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.11. Chronological diagram for multivallate raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.12. Chronological diagram for island enclosures in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.13. Chronological diagram for crannogs in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [N] = Neolithic enclosure reused for later settlement activity.

Figure 4.14. Chronological diagram for hilltop enclosures in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.15. Chronological diagram for enclosed promontories (EPs) in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [V] indicates the presence of an enclosing vallum.

Figure 4.16. Chronological diagram for ecclesiastic settlement in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.17. Chronological diagram for furnished burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.18. Chronological diagram for non-ecclesiastic burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.19. Chronological diagram for ecclesiastic burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.20. Chronological diagram for Iron Age burials in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.21. Chronological diagram for ringworks in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.22. Chronological diagram for mottes in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.23. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. Asterisk = earlier phase at later medieval masonry castle.

Figure 4.24. Chronological diagram for platform castles in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. Asterisk = earlier phase at later medieval masonry castle.

Figure 4.25. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlement in Ulidia, with all forms of castle omitted (due to better associated documentary evidence), but furnished
burials included. Note that unenclosed settlement is more normally distributed, and that ‘native’ forms of enclosed settlement continue in use past AD1200.

Figure 4.26. Sum of annalistic references to major ecclesiastic sites in Ulidia, AD500–1100.
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0.10 Dedication

To my wife, Ina: I could never have finished this without you.
Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

“The history of humanity is a history of migration” (Harzig and Hoerder 2009). Migration has certainly figured as a strong theme in historiography from Herodotus to present, and it is a dominant element in origin legends across the world. One aspect/cause/outcome of migration is colonialism, defined here, as Said (1993, 8) does, as “the implanting of settlements on distant territory”. Further, more complex definitions will be discussed in 1.5. There are few areas of the planet unaffected by colonialism, considering the nature of global history over the past two centuries. Thus, it would be uncontroversial to state that the modern Insular Zone—preferred here as a more politically neutral term than ‘British Isles’ to refer to Britain and Ireland and their smaller offshore islands—has been greatly impacted by colonialism, and perhaps continues to be.

Participation in the British Empire in recent centuries has left a lasting, if varying, imprint on each region of the Insular Zone; but interaction with populations from Continental Europe in the deeper past has been equally as formative. For example, most of the island of Britain was part of the Roman Empire for several centuries and groups from Northern Europe played an important, if debated, role in the establishment of several early medieval Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in Britain (see Fleming 2010, 61–119; Halsall 2013, 184–299). Further groups from Northern Europe posed a major threat to all of the kingdoms across the Insular Zone in later centuries in what is referred to as the Viking Age. Subsequently, the Normans, a group from a principality in what is now northern France who saw their origins in Scandinavia, conquered England in the twenty years after AD1066. Their descendants would go on to form what has been referred to as ‘the first English Empire’ (Davies 2000; Duffy and Foran 2013) in subsequent centuries, demonstrating that asymmetric interaction between the constituent regions of the Insular Zone is also an important consideration. These events and processes represent a useful set of test cases for exploring nature of pre-modern colonial activity in the Insular Zone involving groups from within and outside the islands.

The period under examination in this thesis extends from the introduction of ironworking in the centuries centred on 800BC to the period AD1300–1400, which was the closest the Insular Zone came to a unified political order prior to the formation of the United Kingdom in AD1706–7 and its extension in AD1800–1. This timeframe covers the centuries either side of the emergence of Britain and Ireland into the written record. It is also in this broader period
that almost all Insular identities are rooted—part of a wider phenomenon. Geary (2002; 2013a; 2013b; 2015) has demonstrated that many European national identities have been constructed and legitimated by selective recourse to a deep, usually medieval past, perceived as a starting point for an immutable national character and identity, usually described in pseudo-biological terms, such as ‘race’, ‘blood’, etc. Groups identifying themselves by an act of collective imagination (see Anderson 1991) as English, Irish, Scottish and Welsh all look to this period as the era in which their identities emerged, even though there were many other Insular identities and socio-political figurations to choose from and the boundaries were never very distinct between them. It is these identitive templates that underlie the interpretation of much of the later interaction between different areas of the Insular Zone, with the roles played by migrant groups often underplayed or subverted in the rhetoric used to form and legitimate such identities. Archaeology has an important part to play in this, providing the material props to support such identities via museum displays, school curricula, and media practices (see Trigger 1984; papers in both Atkinson et al. 1996; Ó Ríagáin and Popa 2012), which means that it can also play an important part in their examination.

Whether consciously or unconsciously, a society’s collective experience and its bases for group identity shape the individual habitus through their active and passive praxis within that society. We might consciously choose to reject certain traditions and ways of seeing, but that is to nonetheless remain shaped by our physical and social environments. As researchers, whether consciously or not, we carry parts of ourselves into the texts we produce, and those texts might often tell more about the author than the object of inquiry (Barthes 1967; Jenkins 1991, 1–32). Furthermore, just as every researcher becomes a part of their research; the outcomes of research become part of the researcher, by changing or confirming that researcher’s set of ontological categories through which they make sense of the world. Moreover, the findings of research into a past that is used to shape present-day political discourse can impact that discourse (e.g., the legitimacy of national identity or of social stratification). It might also reshape the scholarly community of practice (Wenger 1998; cf. Cox 2005), field (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 16–8, 94–114), or stage/scene (Goffman 1959, 28–82), by altering the dominant paradigms or the rules and techniques required for successful participation within them, set and maintained by a self-appointed elite of successful actors (Foucault 1974) or ‘keepers of a/the symbolic universe of explanation’ (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 110–46). Therefore, there is much (usually subtle) constraint on the individual agent to adopt wholesale the ‘way of doing’ a particular subject, biases and all.

The principal aims of this thesis are to investigate the relationship between colonialism
and settlement, to identify the processes at work within and after episodes of colonial activity, and to thus contribute to the understanding of different forms of colonialism across space and time. Combined with a source-critical transdisciplinary approach, the use of a long timeframe enables the contextualisation and analysis of political events and long-term processes such as the movement of people and shifts in identity and language within the same geographic space. Three colonial episodes attested in the textual record involving groups from within and without the Insular Zone form the basis of the dissertation. The historicity of each episode is assessed by recourse to settlement, burial, portable material culture, toponomy and textual evidence. Of these, settlement evidence is employed as the principal base for exploring each of the colonial encounters, due to its relatively continual presence in the archaeological record and association with a wider portion of any given society than textual evidence. Where necessary, proxies such as burials and place-names are employed in the absence of direct settlement evidence. The same categories of evidence are used to explore the processes at work in each episode according to a working typological model of colonialism introduced in 1.3.1, as well as issues such as transculturation and identity formation.

The first of these textually attested colonial episodes examined in this thesis involved the conquest or settlement of western Scotland from north-eastern Ireland, c.AD500. The second episode is related to the ninth-century arrival of Scandinavian(-diasporic) raiders, traders and settlers in the Insular Zone and the varying fates of their descendants in Ireland and Scotland over the subsequent four centuries. The third is concerned with the Anglo-Normans in Ireland from the late-twelfth century onward, temporally paralleled by the emergence of the Kingdom of the Isles and the infiltration of settlers sponsored by the kings of Scotland into the western portion of northern Britain. A case-study region in northeast Ireland (‘Ulidia’) and one in western Scotland (‘Ergadia’) are utilised to explore the issues across a time period extending from the Iron Age to the late medieval period (c.800BC–AD1400). The extended timeframe reflects the long periods of use of certain forms of settlement and material culture, which serves to emphasise both the continuities and discontinuities in settlement and their relationship to colonial activity.

Each case-study region (extents discussed further in 1.4) offers an opportunity to investigate quite different colonial episodes occurring over time within the same geographical space. Despite facing each other across the North Channel, there are many divergences between the two regions in relation to settlement and the form and outcome of colonial processes, despite the evidence for extensive socio-political interaction between the two regions. This particularly important in the first episode, since it examines the evidence for colonial activity
involving a group from one region in the other, but it also in relation to how colonialism involving the same groups could play out quite differently even in geographically proximate regions.

While some extremely important insights have been gained from the huge body of colonial and post-colonial scholarship, it might be argued that it is in some cases overly hodiecentric and/or synchronic (see Goudsblom 1977, 7). Gosden (2004, 24) points to “the need to discard the nineteenth-century lens, which still supplies its very particular perspectives into the twenty-first century”. Doing so enables the exploration of the considerable variations in colonialism across time and space, rather than focussing on its post-Columbian and industrial forms. Several of these variations are discussed in Stein (2005). It is hoped that the current study might further contribute to this growing body of literature by examining the nature of the different forms of colonialism and the social processes associated with them gained by studying how different forms of colonialism played out over the course of several hundred years in the same geographical space.

For example, understanding the interactions between different identity groups within Iberia c.AD400–1500 is extremely important for understanding Spanish and Portuguese colonialism from the fifteenth century onwards (Colás 2007, 48–62). Similarly, much insight might also be gained into the practices and ideology of the later British Empire by understanding the processes and strategies at work in the various colonial episodes in the medieval Insular Zone. That is not to say, though, that there was anything inevitable or in-built in medieval Insular society that resulted in the formation of the British Empire; past experiences were only some of a huge array of contributary factors involved in its formation.

1.2 Historical foundations

1.2.1 Dál Riata

According to the traditional narrative, a group from the northeast corner of Ireland, the Dál Riata, established a colony in western Scotland under Fergus, Óengus, and Loarn, three sons of Erc (king of Dál Riata in Ireland). Two of the principal lineages of Dál Riata in Scotland, the Cenél Loairn and Cenél nÓengussa, were descended from two of these sons, with the Cenél nGabráin and Cenél Comgaill, named for two of Fergus’s grandsons via his son Domangart. Fergus’s descendants went on to become the kings of the Picts, creating a unified state, Alba, consisting of the entire area north of the Clyde–Forth region, expanding southward to become Scotland in the high medieval period (e.g. Smyth 1984, 176–7; Lynch 1992, 40; Barrell 2000,
4–6). The details of this narrative were generated and propagated in chronicles, genealogies, hagiographies and synthetic histories of varying reliability, bias and date, and have become woven into the very fabric of the official version of Scottish history.

The traditional narrative of the Dál Riata moving from Antrim to western Scotland c.AD500 is deeply, if not always uncritically, imbedded in scholarship on Iron Age and medieval Scotland (e.g., Alcock 1971, 130–1, 265–7; Bannerman 1974; Duncan 1975, 41–3; Smyth 1984, 47; Nieke and Duncan 1988, 6–9; Lynch 1992, 17–9; Ritchie 1997, 62; McDonald 2008[1998], 21; Herbert 1999, 1–3; Barrell 2000, 2–3) and Ireland (e.g. Mac Niocaill 1972, 14; Byrne 1973, 9; Charles-Edwards 2000, 54; Ó Cróínín 2005, 216). Some recent scholarship has sought to re-evaluate the Dál Riata narrative, most prominently the critical re-evaluations of the textual evidence by Dumville (2000a; 2000b; 2007; 2011), Sharpe (2000), and Fraser (2005; 2009; 2010), the archaeological and linguistic arguments of Campbell (2001; 2009; cf. Armit 2004, 57–8; Woolf 2012), and the linguistic arguments of Clancy (2010). The aim in this dissertation is to continue in this revisionist vein while bringing material evidence further into argument than has previously been the case.

1.2.2 Scandinavian diaspora

Groups from Scandinavia are recorded as raiding monastic sites in England, northern Britain, Frankia and Aquitaine from the AD790s onward—a series of events normally taken as indicating the beginning of the Viking Age (Sawyer 1971; Farrell 1982; Jones 1984; Myhre 1993; 1998; Roesdahl 1998; Clarke, Ní Mhaonaigh and Ó Floinn 1998, Barrett 2003a; 2010; Hines, Lane and Redknapp 2004; Brink and Price 2008; Sheehan and Ó Corráin 2010; Griffiths 2010; Clarke and Johnson 2015; Jesch 2015). From as least as early as the AD830s, camps and bases were established in the same regions, some of which were abandoned with others developing urban characteristics later in the same century. Their occupants would go on to acquire large swathes of territory in eastern and northern England (Richards 2000; Hadley 2006; Downham 2003; 2004; 2007; 2009; 2017; Townend 2014), the western and northern areas of Northern Britain (Wilson 1976; Morris 1982; 1992; 1998; Crawford 1987; 1995; Batey and Campbell 1998; Barrett 2003b; 2004; 2010; 2012; Woolf 2004; 2007; see regional studies by Crawford 1971; 2013; Jennings 1994; 1998; Jennings and Kruse 2009a; 2009b; Brown 1997; Macniven 2006; 2013a; 2013b; 2015; Downham 2015; Ó Riagáin 2016), the Isle of Man (Wilson 2008a; 2008b; Duffy 2015), Wales (Etchingham 2001; 2007), Iceland, and possibly also the immediate agricultural hinterlands of settlements in Ireland such as Dublin, Limerick,

The level of centrality and numbers of agents involved in each region vary, as do the fates of each of these regions. The territories in England were absorbed into a newly centralized Kingdom of the English c.AD930–1050. The urban settlements in Ireland losing their independence first to a polity centred on York and Dublin, c.AD900–980, before each settlement was absorbed into the spheres of influence of a succession of Irish kings c.AD980–1050. This period also saw the emergence of *Innsi Gall* [the Islands of the Foreigners] or the Kingdom of (Man and) the Isles in the textual sources (McDonald 2004; 2008a; 2008b; 2015a; 2015b; Beuermann 2010; Duffy and Mytum ed. 2015), as well as another polity centred on Orkney (Beuermann 2011; Crawford 2013), both of which were involved in the politics of the Irish Sea region and in the politics of the North Atlantic and Norway into the thirteenth century and beyond. Further sub-regnal polities also emerged in the Irish Sea region—seemingly from nowhere under leaders about whom little is known of their backgrounds—in this period and played possibly more important roles. The most prominent of these were Argyll, which emerged under Somerled mac Gille-Bhrighde (Duncan and Brown 1956–7; Sellar 1971; 2000; McDonald 1995; Beuermann 2002; 2011; Oram 2011), and Galloway under Fergus (Oram 1991; 1993; 2000; Duffy 2004).

1.2.3 Anglo Norman

The period AD1050–1350 saw an acceleration in the process of political centralisation in the Insular Zone. By AD1350, most of the heterogenous polities arranged both heterarchically and hierarchically had been subsumed into a political system dominated by the kings of England (Flanagan 1989; 2010; Davies 1990; 2000; see also Frame 1990; Duffy and Foran 2013), and to lesser degree, the kings of Scotland (Duncan 1975; Barrow 1980; 1981; 1989; 1991; 1992; 2003, 2005; Grant 1984; Webster 1997; Barrell 2000; Brown 2004; Oram 2011; Stevenson 2014; Taylor 2016; see also Duffy 1999; 2000; 2002).

One example of this process is demonstrated in the case of Diarmait Mac Murchadha, king of the Irish overkingdom Laigin, who, having been expelled from his position in the AD1160s, turned to Henry II of England for support, resulting in his retaking Laigin with the aid of a group of nobles based in southern Wales. Their success in seizing land in Ireland AD1167–1171 resulted in Henry II landing in Ireland and taking the submission of both the
Anglo-/Cambro-Norman knights in Ireland and several Irish kings and overkings. This colony was to grow to cover a large part of Ireland by AD1300, consisting of a ‘colony proper’ ruled from England through a series of lords and a series of marcher territories ruled by Irish kings who acknowledged the king of England as their (theoretical) overlord.

The expansion into Ireland offered opportunities for non-inheriting sons and cadet branches of Anglo-Norman families. John de Courcy was one such individual, who established himself by right of conquest in the northeast from AD1177 and who was active in the northern Irish Sea region in general (Duffy 1995; 2007; Flanagan 1999; Flanders 2008). His arrival in the northeast forms the point of departure for the Anglo-Norman case study, with the territory he conquered going on to form the Earldom of Ulster, governed alternately by Hugh de Lacy, the de Burghs and the Crown (McNeill 1980; Mallory and McNeill 1991, 238–298; Duffy 1996; 2004; Veach 2014; Brown 2016).

For this period in Ireland in general, Orpen’s four-volume *Ireland Under the Normans* (1911–20) remains of great importance, even if it might be criticised for at times being a colonialist apology, a criticism also levelled at Otway-Ruthven (1968), despite the high-level of scholarship in both works (Duffy 1997, 4–5). Further secondary surveys on aspects of this period include Dolley (1972); Nicholls (1972; 2003); Lydon (1972), Cosgrove (1981; ed. 1987); Barry (1987), O’Conor (1997), O’Keeffe (2000), and MacCotter (2008).

### 1.3 Theoretical foundations

Various scholars differ in how they distinguish between concepts such as *migration, diaspora, empire, imperialism, colony, colonisation, colonialism*, and on how they relate to each another (cf. e.g. Osterhammel 2005, 3–22; Osterhammel and Jansen 2017, 7–22; Veracini 2010, 1–15; Young 2001; 2003; 2015, 52–8). Therefore, it is important to define in basic terms how they are being employed in this study, contextualised within the wider body of associated scholarship.

A discussion of the socio-cultural processes related to individuals and groups coming into contact is similarly important. Therefore, the second portion of this section will discuss identity, the individual and transculturation.

#### 1.3.1 Migration, empire, colonialism

**Migration and diaspora**

*Migration*, in its most basic sense, refers to the movement of human or animal agents, a
mobility that “may be many-directional and multiple, temporary or long-term, voluntary or forced” (Harzig and Hoerder 2009, 3). It can involve small groups engaged in pioneer migration, or it might involve the movement of large numbers of people along established routes, mass migration (Harzig and Hoerder 2009, 5), with flows of people and things moving along migration streams and counter-streams (Ravenstein 1885; 1889; Lee 1966; Mandal 1981, 16–7; Uyanga 1981). Migrants sharing a common identity rooted in a perceived homeland might be regarded—by themselves, or by scholars—as members of a diaspora, initially used in reference to dispersed Greek and Jewish communities (Cohen 1997, 1–25; Harzig and Hoerder 2009, 81–2). More recently, it has come to be commonly applied to many dispersed communities (Safran 1991; Brubaker 2005; Cohen 1997), such as the Irish (Delaney 2006; 2011; Kenny 2006; MacRaild 2006), the Scottish (Devine 2011; 2012) diasporas, or to Viking Age and medieval communities sharing a perceived common origin in Scandinavia (Barrett 2010; Jesch 2015).

Empire and imperialism

Empire is a term whose meaning is derived from the Latin imperium, ‘command’ or ‘authority’, which shifted over time to refer to ‘power’ before becoming a proper noun referring to a socio-political entity, the Roman Empire itself, which formed the example for the term’s importation into Middle English via Old French (OED s.v. ‘empire’; Koebner 1955; 1965; Koebner and Schmidt 1964; Morrison 2001; Colás 2007, 5–11; Kumar 2017, 1–36). The form various empires take is historically specific; the organisation of political space and exercise of authority differs between cases (Colás 2007, 4–5). Here, an empire is defined as a political entity consisting of a core polity in an asymmetric socio-political, economic and/or cultural relationship with one or more other polities, either through direct political dominance or vassalage. Empires are part of a spectrum containing other socio-political configurations, such as chiefdoms, city states, kingdoms, and, most commonly in the present day, national states—polities usually governed centrally, with defined physical and cultural/identitive boundaries. A polity might move between these other forms at different points in its history (Mann 1986; Tilly 1992; Colás 2007).

Imperialism is an active derivation from the term empire, and both terms have considerable historical, cultural and emotional baggage associated with them (Colás 2007, 3). Imperialism can be usefully defined as “the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory” (Said 1993, 8; cf. Colás 2007, 7).
While it should be differentiated from hegemony (dominance by consent), imperialism can be said to exist without empire, in that the theory and attitudes can outlast the political structures of an empire, as indeed can asymmetric market relations (Colás 2007).

**Colony, colonisation, colonialism**

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), the English term *colony* has been used in original English-language texts since the sixteenth century to refer to:

a. A settlement in a new country; a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a community subject to or connected with their parent state; the community so formed, consisting of the original settlers and their descendants and successors, as long as the connection with the parent state is kept up.

b. The territory peopled by such a community. (In early use not clearly distinguished.)

The OED also describes the use of colony to translate the Latin *colōnia*, used to refer to a ‘farm’, ‘landed estate’ or ‘settlement’, originally derived from *colōnus* ['farmer', ‘cultivator’], which was in turn derived from *colere* ['to inhabit', ‘to till or cultivate’ (LatDict)]. The OED notes that *colōnia* later “was especially the proper term for a public settlement of Roman citizens in a hostile or newly conquered country, where they, retaining their Roman citizenship, received lands, and acted as a garrison, being mostly formed of veteran soldiers who had served their time”. *Colony* has also been used in English to translate the Ancient Greek *ἀποικία* [*apoikia* ‘a settlement of people from home’ (Liddell et al. 1940, 200)].

The OED’s definitions (a. and b.), combined with the later Latin use of the term and its Greek equivalent form are the definitions that inform the analysis in this dissertation. Also kept in consideration is Veracini’s (2010, 2–3) definition of *colony* as referring to both “a political body dominated by an exogenous agency, and an exogenous entity that reproduces itself in a given environment”. This duality is important when discussing colonies diachronically, as it forms the basis of the tensions between colonial settlers and the colonial homeland found in all colonial episodes.

The more controversial terms *colonisation* and *colonialism* are often used interchangeably (e.g. Ashcroft et al. 2000, 11, 40). Both terms can be used in relation to the creation of a colony, whereas *colonialism* might also be used to refer to the maintenance of that colony and any ideological formations associated with both its creation and maintenance. Another useful distinction (and the one preferred in this dissertation) is seeing *colonisation* as
exercised over land and colonialism as exercised over people, with the caveat that the former is often used in national historiographies to gloss over the displacement/replacement of a land’s indigenous occupants (Veracini 2010, 14).

The use of the term ‘colonisation’ often accompanies justifications of land seizure through claims it was vacuum domicilium [devoid of habitation], or terra/territorium nullius [‘nobody’s land/territory’]. The use of such terms often traced back to Locke (1690; e.g. Gosden 2004, 25–30). However, Corcoran (2018, 240–1) demonstrates that any such terms can only be retrofitted to Locke’s work—nor does it appear in any official documents on either side of the Atlantic, even if it is employed as a biblical justification for expropriation in a small number of private diaries. The problematic use of such Latin terms to describe the ideological and legal underpinnings of colonial activity is further discussed by Benton and Straumann (2010), who draw attention to terra nullius being a relatively late derivation from the Roman legal concept of res nullius [nobody’s thing]. The term terra nullius has been principally used in international law texts to claim genuinely uninhabited territories (see Howland 2018) such as Svalbard (Rudmose Brown 1919; Ulfstein 1995). Therefore, it is avoided in this dissertation.

However, while the terminology is inappropriate, evidence for such an expropriative mode of thought justified by accusations of ‘improper’ usage and couched in moral, legalistic and religious terms is to be found in settlers’ attitudes in North America toward Native Americans (Jennings 1975). Evidence of this mentality is found, for example, in More’s 1516 Utopia, where the fictional island’s inhabitants were instructed to

plant a colony of their own laws on the mainland near them wherever the natives have plenty of unoccupied and uncultivated land […] and] those who refuse to live under their [the Utopians] laws they drive out of the land they claim for themselves; and against those who resist them, they wage war. They think it is perfectly justifiable to make war on people who leave their land idle and waste yet forbid the use and possession of it to others who, by the law of nature, ought be supported from it (More 2016[1516]: 57).

When discussing the above passage, Finley (1976, 179–80) draws attention to related debates in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Similar appropriative and expropriative attitudes are to be found in a letter by President Andrew Jackson read to the US Congress (Jackson 1830, 25–7) and the attendant Indian Removal Act (1830) and in documents such as Bourke’s Proclamation in relation to land rights in Australia (Bourke 1835; cf. Scott 1941; Buchan 2001; Connor 2004), and in the numerous breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand (New Zealand Ministry of Justice 2017). The evidence for such attitudes in the colonial episodes
discussed in this thesis will be discussed in Chapter 7.

**Caveats**

The applicability of terms such as *colonialism, colonisation, and imperialism* to Irish (and Insular) history has been a matter of some dispute (summarized Howe 2000b, 7–20; cf. Smith 1999, 1–9; Ruane 1992), often rooted in variations of nationalist, loyalist and unionist discourse across the two islands. This has especially been the case since groups in Northern Ireland seeking to leave the United Kingdom began to portray their political and paramilitary campaigns as an anti-colonial struggle from the 1960s onward (Howe 2000b, 169–243). The dispute can also be seen as rooted in contrasting approaches to Insular history based on state-formation and colonialism respectively (cf. Pocock 1975; 1982; Ellis 1986; 1991; 1996; 1999; Davies 1990; 2000; Grant and Stringer ed. 1995). Such a division is a false binary; there is no reason that certain historical phenomena cannot be both, especially when approached diachronically—no colony exists outside history, after all.

A further issue is that many of the debates about colonialism in the deeper past and especially colonialism in the Insular Zone employ too monolithic a view of the nature of colonialism. This has been particularly of issue in literature-based Irish scholarship, where the work of post-colonial theorists such as Fanon (e.g. 2008[1952]; 1967[1961]) has been applied synchronically to the analysis of a very small group of literary texts without recontextualising Fanon’s content in historical evidence or the wider body of literature (Howe 2000b, 146–68). Moreover, such studies have tended to ‘black-box’ (adapted from Latour 1999, 183–5, 304) or reify the terms ‘colonialism’, ‘colony’ and ‘empire’. This limits the impact of such approaches, even if they might lead to a useful transdisciplinary cross-pollination in the future.

Furthermore, these debates, like all recent intellectual activity have taken place in an intellectual culture situated in a world shaped by systems of imperialism and colonialism on a scale and intensity never before seen in human history, as Said (1993, 7–8) points out, leading to the interpretation of the past in terms of this particular present. Moreover, the subsequent collapse—or more accurately, metamorphosis—of these systems has been equally important in shaping the discourse of the past fifty years. All the more reason, then, to attempt to study pre-modern colonial episodes on their own terms, using a working model of colonialism that recognises that there were several forms of colonialism (modified from Ó Riagáin 2010c), while bearing in mind the distorting effects of later events and processes. This will hopefully help to avoid debates over whether certain episodes of Insular history were ‘colonial’ or not.
due to their not resembling the ‘classic’ conception of colonialism based on the history of the past two centuries.

**Typologies**

The division of colonial activity into typologies has a long history. Table 1.1 outlines three influential typologies, none of which are exclusive to one another, nor to the model used here. They are preferred to typologies such as Finley’s agricultural-land-based model (1976), which holds that a colony must maintain a subordinate connection to the metropole, leading to his excluding of several sub-categories of colony not meeting these criteria, including what he terms as ‘migratory conquests’ (1976, 175). In many respects, his model is in reaction to the “semantic clusters” of interpretative terms accompanying the word ‘colony’ that might only properly be used to discuss contemporary colonialism, e.g. “commercial domination, monopoly, even export drives” (Finley 1976, 174). His rejection of the existence of several forms of colony due to their unsuitability for description using hodiecentric terms and conditions indicates the fundamental problem with his model. However, his rejection of scholarship not paying enough attention to terminology is to be recommended. Although containing many important observations and references, Finley’s article has been perhaps unduly influential on the discussion of pre-modern colonial activity, especially where particular episodes are rejected, e.g., in the case of Ireland.

Leroy-Beaulieu (1902a, xviii–xix; 1902b, 563–70) makes a categorical division between colonies of commerce, of settlement, and of exploitation in his analysis of modern colonialism. As can be seen in Table 1.1, this demonstrates some overlap with the model employed by Osterhammel and Jansen (2017, 17–8; trans. Osterhammel 2005, 10–2). Both resemble the semantic difference drawn in much recent scholarship between settlers and migrants in cases of **settler colonialism**. Settler colonialism is characterised by the displacement of indigenous groups from land by incoming settlers, who form their own settler identity, often leading to socio-political divergence with the homeland and the denial of settler status to subsequent migrants (Denoon 1979; Wolfe 1999; 2006; Veracini 2010; 2011; Bateman and Pilkington 2011). This is an important distinction, as the tensions between colonised, coloniser, and colonial homeland are crucial for understanding any colonial episode and its outcomes. Gosden (2004, 24–40) takes a different approach to provide several important insights, especially with respect to social interaction and its material traces. The typological division employed in this dissertation operates on a slightly different plane from these three scholars, breaking colonial
episodes (settler or otherwise) down into three categories: opportunistic, elite-replacement and plantation colonialism. It should be noted that the three are not exclusive; a colonial episode might involve all three at different stages.

The dangers inherent to using categories and concepts to build taxonomic/classificatory systems are acknowledged in this dissertation (see James 1911, 47–112; Foucault 1974; Berlin 1999). The categorical model is not quantitative, rather it is qualitative. It does not seek to place colonial episodes and their associated spatial data in a classificatory iron cage, rather it seeks to provide a basis for understanding the processes at work. It is not a hypothetico-deductive model, to be tested in the data, falsified and/or improved. Rather, it is an ideal-type model, sensu Weber (1979, 20–1): a set of categories and processes that together outline how things would be expected to turn out under a perfect set of conditions, with the differences between the ideal and how things are in reality forming the basis for any subsequent explanation.

Table 1.1. Categories of colonialism employed by Leroy-Beaulieu (1902; my translations), Osterhammel (1995; 2005; and Jansen 2017; my alternative translations given in brackets) and Gosden (2004, 24–40). The examples are adapted from those provided by each of the authors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Osterhammel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime enclaves</td>
<td>defended commercial or naval strategic settlements, resources extracted by trade, or power exercised informally over hinterland</td>
<td>Hong Kong, Singapore, Aden, Batavia, Malacca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement colonies</td>
<td>permanent settlement of farming communities involving appropriation of land, natives exploited or displaced; settler identity forms early, often resulting in independence from homeland</td>
<td>New England, Canada, Australia; South Africa, Algeria, Rhodesia; Barbados, Jamaica, Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation colonies</td>
<td>conquered territory, tribute extracted from conquered population, resources extracted but no agricultural settlement, rule by class of administrators</td>
<td>British India, Indochina, Egypt, Philippines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leroy-Beaulieu</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial colonies</td>
<td>defended compact commercial settlements in populated areas to extract resources by trade; heavy naval presence</td>
<td>Hong Kong, Singapore, Aden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Settlement colonies
[colonies de peuplement; colonies agricoles, lit. ‘colonies of population’; ‘agricultural colonies’]
permanent settlement of farming communities involving appropriation of land, either displacing (A) or mixing with natives (B)
(A): Australia, United States
(B): Algeria

Exploitation colonies
[colonies exploitation; colonies de plantation]
mass production of material not available in metropole, e.g. on large, single-crop plantations; natives exploited or displaced, slavery often used
West Indies, Southeast Asia, southern United States

Terminology | Definition | Examples
---|---|---
(partially) Shared cultural milieu | between state and non-state polities, shared cultural package on elite level, non-elite excluded from colonial network, operates within shared behavioural norms | Mesopotamian and Greek city states, Aztecs, Incas, early Chinese, ‘Vikings’
Middle ground | regularised relations between coloniser and colonised, social experimentation, new modes of difference rather than acculturation | peripheries of Mesopotamian and Greek city states, early modern North America
Terra nullius | disregard of previous social systems, mass land appropriation, fixed categories of difference, mainly found in settler societies (A), but also in some empires (B) | (A): United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, eastern Russia; (B): Mongol Empire, Mexico, Peru

Gosden

The typologies used in this dissertation
Having introduced and discussed alternative typological systems of colonialism, the system used in this dissertation must be introduced. Opportunistic colonialism is usually economically motivated, e.g., related to the access to new resources such as land or trade goods, or indeed the extraction of such goods by violent means from a local population. It can be bottom-up and non-state centred, or vice versa. It is similar to Osterhammel and Jansen’s (2017, 17) Stützpunkt or Leroy-Beaulieu’s (1902) commercial colonialism categories, in that it is often the result of naval activity and involves a level of informal control outside of a central highly defended settlement. In some instances, these defended settlements might be part of a wider network of similar settlements, e.g. the northern European cities of the Hanseatic League in the high–late medieval period (Hammel-Kiesow 2014), Greek (Dillon and Garland 2000, 1–30), or Phoenician cities in the western Mediterranean in the first millennium BC (Aubet 2001). Their relationship to their hinterlands might in some instances be described in terms of Gosden’s ‘middle-ground’ category, or perhaps also his ‘shared cultural milieu’ category.
**Elite replacement colonialism** involves an incoming elite displacing and replacing a local elite, with society often carrying on as close to normal as possible otherwise. The new elite and its allies use the existing social system for the extraction of wealth and to maintain their new position. It can be state-centred, e.g. the British Raj in India (James 1997), or centred around a group with enough resources to impose themselves, e.g. the Normans in England in the eleventh–twelfth centuries AD (Carpenter 2003) or the ‘Hellenistic World’ in the aftermath of Alexander the Great (Braund 2005; Adams 2006). It might occur in an imperial context when an empire expands, e.g. the early decades of Roman Gaul (Woolf 1998), or beyond the confines of the core territory of an empire, e.g. Roman Germania (Wolters 2018). It might also occur when militaristic societies are displaced and impose themselves on another society, e.g. Visigothic Spain (Collins 1983). While often involving the extraction of tribute, it might also involve agricultural settlement, especially in terms of high-status farms that gather tribute or rents from other farms in a locality. It differs from Osterhammel’s *Beherrschungskolonie* category in this respect. Elite replacement colonies might involve any of the three of Gosden’s categories/processes at different times.

**Plantation colonialism** is far more totalising. It involves the movement of several social orders and the replacement/displacement of an existing population by a number of means. It might be state-centred and is usually related to imperialism. It bears a strong resemblance to most definitions of ‘settler colonialism’ in that it involves expropriation of land and the displacement of its previous occupants. It also resembles elements of both Leroy-Beaulieu’s settlement and exploitation colonies, as well as Osterhammel’s settler colonies and Gosden’s *terra nullius* colonies.

**Phasing and processes**
In general, colonial episodes are seen here as involving several related sub-phases, each of them defined by a certain process, in what is best described as the ‘colonial lifecycle’. Not all colonial episodes will experience all of these phases; however, their identification represents the first step to understanding any particular episode and identifying what form of colonialism was/is taking place. The processes might be placed in two groups, formative and resultive. Both sets of processes might be regarded as loosely, but not exclusively, sequential. They might be viewed as related to the success/failure of a particular colonial episode. None of these processes are exclusive, a colonial episode might in fact move through all of them or a selection of them, either concurrently or sequentially. **Formative processes** are related to the formation and initial
maintenance of a colony. Resultive processes are the various potential outcomes triggered once the colony has been formed, and they could follow any of the four formative phases.

![Diagram of formative and resultive processes](image)

**Figure 1.1.** Simplified visualisation of the formative and resultive processes associated with colonialism; black dots = incoming individuals/groups, non-black dots = individuals/groups already residing in territory prior to colonial episode (my thanks to Ina Huppertz for her help with the visualisation).

**Formative processes (Figure 1.1.)**

- **Contact** is taken here as indicating pre-colonial activity between groups later involved in colonial activity. This only occurs in certain instances. For example, England had pre-existing contacts with Ireland extending over several centuries (Otway-Ruthven 1968, 35–42; Martin 1987b; Flanagan 1989, 7–80; Wadden 2013; cf. Orpen 1911a; Davies 1990; 2000). In contrast, as little as a generation separated the arrival of Columbus in the Americas and Spain’s moving through the various phases in relation to Mexico and Peru (Díaz de Castillo 1963[1632]; de Xeres 1872[1547]; Prescott 1843; 1847; see also Elliot 1963, 45–76; Darwin 2007, 56–65). However, the processes took much longer for less-politically centralised areas of the Americas beyond these two former empires—a warning against over-generalisation (Hirst 2005, 86–91).

- **Expansion** is taken as the initial phases of colonial activity: the first wave of military
campaigning and settlement to establish the coloniser in the landscape. Associated settlement forms might be either military related or relatively ephemeral, as was the case with the construction of ringworks in the Norman Conquest of England (Allen Brown 1970; Platt 1978; O’Conor and de Meulemeester 2007).

**Consolidation** represents the coloniser preparing to remain in the landscape, and any associated settlement might be more elaborate, representing a greater investment of resources signifying the intentions of the settlers. The networks of newly founded late-nineteenth-century settlements in western North America (Paxson 1924) and eastern Russia (Etkind 2011) are examples of this phenomenon.

**Domination** occupies a unique position in the model, as it might be regarded as both a formative and resultive process. It represents the full establishment of the coloniser in the landscape, associated settlements might be conspicuous in their monumentality, but might also be, conversely, conspicuous in their non-military nature, evincing the confidence of the coloniser. Examples of this might be found in the various monumental administrative buildings of the British Raj in India (Metcalf 1989).

**Reslutive processes**

**Replacement** refers to the displacement of the original local population by colonists and their descendants, and as such is strongly related to the idealised outcome of settler colonialism.

**Separation** occurs in episodes of settler colonialism where settlers break with the homeland politically.

**Incorporation** represents the absorption of the coloniser into the native socio-political figuration, with or without the retention of their colonial identity and link to their area of origin/homeland, possibly in the form of a diasporic identity.

**Expulsion** represents the complete failure of a colonial endeavour, with colonists or their descendants removed from the colonised area.

**Assimilation** refers to either the colonists or colonised being assimilated into a larger polity, such as an empire or a national state, for example, in the successive expansion of the number of constituent states of the USA.

**Innovation** represents the formation of something new, where the coloniser and colonised are neither, replaced, expelled nor incorporated, rather a new society is formed, following a third way by breaking with the traditions of the metropolitan and the colony.
1.3.2 Identity

Ethnicity, language, culture and the individual are argued here as non-fixed and non-bounded—non-fixed because they are both open to change and choice, and non-bounded because the boundaries between such groupings of sentiments and practices are far from rigid. Therefore, any project where identity, ethnicity, material culture, cultural traits such as language, and the movement of humans in space are discussed together must proceed carefully. There are moments in human history when certain groups adhere to certain cultural packages, which were manifested in the forms of material culture they used, providing a basis for identity on a number of levels. There are other moments when this is not the case. Differentiating between them forms an important part of the analysis in this thesis, while also keeping in mind the epistemological and ontological issues regarding the conflation of material objects with supposedly discrete cultural units, ethnic and other identity groups (see Jones 1997; Gosden 2004). As Pappa (2013) points out, even archaeology informed by postcolonial theory runs the risk of the same sort of essentialism that underlies culture-historical archaeology, albeit using novel technical terminology.

Identity is flexible. All of us hold multiple, often conflicting, identities and yet we move between them with a virtuoso’s skill. Goffman (1959) and Elias (2000) discuss the adjusting of behaviour in various social situations, with Goffman seeing social interaction as taking place on various stages, upon which the individual is expected to play often very different roles. The same analogy can be applied to identity. We move between identities as the social situation demands.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity, based on the perception of some shared biological or cultural heritage with other individuals or groups, and thus different from other groups, is only one of a number of options upon which to construct an identity (Jones 1997, 13). As a concept and phenomenon, ethnicity is an excellent example of the reification process at work (see Lukács 1968[1922], 83–110; Berger and Luckmann 1966, 106–9; Craib 1984, 176–7). Here, something socially constructed, a particular identity group, is couched in terms derived from the natural sciences, and passed off as something governed by the laws of science, external to its human creators. Thus, the primordial, immutable and exclusive traits assigned to ethnicity are, in fact, socially constructed rather than ‘natural’; an individual might have more than one ethnic affiliation. This is discussed in a medieval context by both Nelson (2003) and Halsall (2013).
This must be kept in mind when addressing the results of a small number of population genetics studies that usually reduce human identity down to a small portion of the overall heritable biological material (Hallsall 2013, 245), either in relation to the father–son Y-chromosome (Jobling 2001; Capelli et al. 2003; McEvoy et al. 2006; Moore et al. 2006; Hill, Jobling and Bradley 2000) or (usually, but not exclusively: see McWilliams and Suomalainen 2019) maternally inherited mitochondrial genetic material (Helgason et al. 2000a; 2001; 2003; 2005). Many of these earlier studies relied on modal clusters of non-uniquely occurring mutations, but since 2010, singly occurring mutations (single nucleotide polymorphisms, or SNPs) have been primarily used. In many of the earlier studies, problematic assumptions are frequently made about the relation of surnames to genetic material. They employ suspect geographical sampling, or fail to consider the demographic impact of famines, plagues, changes in agriculture and industry, and wars, especially in relation to genetic drift (see Swift 2013; Jesch 2015, 33–7). Problems also remain in the comparison between distributions of ancient and modern genetic data (e.g. Ebneserssdóttir et al. 2018). Further potential problems are inherent to setting in context genetic data derived from certain forms of burials without data from all forms of contemporary burials in the same region, to take the example of furnished burials in the Insular Zone.

Procedures and sample-sizes are improving every year, especially in relation to genetic material from archaeologically derived human remains, ‘aDNA’ (e.g. Margaryan et al. 2019 for aDNA; Leslie et al. 2015 for the modern Insular Zone; cf. Kershaw and Røyrvik 2016). At present, though, the available datasets are not large enough to answer the question posed in this dissertation. The spatial and chronological resolution of such studies means that they are useful in terms of thinking globally over the longue durée but less so (thus far) for examining migration within confined geographic and temporal spaces.

**Culture and the individual**

To understand how individuals and groups interact and change in episodes of colonialism, it is important to see the individual not as some mentally, genetically or socially bounded entity—*homo clausus* separated from the world. It is proposed here that individuals are clusters of various cultural traits, practices, biases, dispositions, and identities positioned on multiple axes in multidimensional cultural space. These ‘modal selves’ interact with the world by being in it, to paraphrase Heidegger (1962), and interact with other individuals and groups of individuals, repositioning themselves in cultural space and leading to continual change. This also holds for
groups of individuals when treated together. A human agent is above all a social entity, best thought of in terms of the plural *hominès aperti* rather than the Cartesian singular *homo clausus* (Mennell 1992, 254–8), as much *homo socius* as *homo sapiens* (Berger and Luckmann 1966, 69) enmeshed in a web of (inter-)relations with humans, animals, and the environment (cf. e.g. Elias 2000[1939]; Strathern 1988; Deleuze 1992; Glissant 1997; Emirbayer 1997; Latour 2005 for different approaches to this). This is equally applicable to groups. If no individual is an internally homogeneous entity existing in splendid isolation from the social sphere and existing outside time, then it can hardly be expected that groups are to be. Serious ontological questions might then be asked about the tendency towards thinking in terms of what might be dubbed *gens clausa*, the notion of a discrete ‘culture’ or closed social system. Mann (1986, 2–3) is particularly critical of the latter notion. It is possible to talk about a cultural package in the most general, non-essentialist terms, but if—as outlined above—individuals overlap, then cultural packages overlap, and very few are as internally coherent as might be implied in some twentieth/twenty-first-century archaeological and scholarship.

**Language and identity**

If individuals and groups of individuals are non-bounded and overlapping, then the same holds for specific elements of these cultural packages, such as language, defined here as “the totality of the conventional auditory signs by which the members of a speech-community interact”, with an idiolect representing “[t]he totality of possible utterances of one speaker at one time in using a language” (Bloch 1948, 7). Both idiolect and speaker are open to change over time through their position(s) of chains of human interaction, leading to much internal variation within a speech community both synchronically and diachronically. When the potential for multilingual idiolects are factored in, it would be difficult to argue for rigid boundaries between speech-communities; any differences would be gradual, leading to the formation of intermittent speech-communities between larger linguistic clusters. A contemporary example of this would be the gradual changes between Germanic speech-communities such as Dutch, Limburgish, Kölsch and Hochdeutsch (König 1994).

With this in mind, it must be also considered that the boundaries between polities in the deeper past might not have been as rigid and fixed as they are in the contemporary system of national states—zones of interaction or marcher territories between the core areas of kingdoms were much more common (see Hirst 2005, 36–7). The same would hold for languages; the concept of a fixed ‘national language’ applied to an ethnically homogenous group is almost as
new as the idea of a geographically defined national state.

**Transculturation**

If individuals and groups of individuals are best seen in terms of a non-bounded set of clusters of cultural traits and practices, then they are particularly open to the adoption of new traits when coming into contact with other groups and individuals, especially in episodes of colonialism. Various metaphors have been employed to describe the outcomes of cultural interaction (summarised by Burke 2009, 34–65). Here, the term *transculturation* (Ortiz 1947, 97–103) is preferred to refer to all instances where cultural traits associated with one group are adopted by another, or where two or more cultural packages come together to form a new distinct set of cultural practices, often with a new attendant identity for its adherents. The former is often referred to as ‘acculturation’ and the latter as ‘hybridisation’. Transculturation is favoured in this dissertation due to its ability to refer to multiple and complex transmutations (Ortiz 1947, 98) working in multiple directions, whereas acculturation is more one directional, not to mention its tarnished image due to its weaponisation in the forced assimilation of Native Americans in the US and Canada (Dohrenwend and Smith 1962). Terms such as ‘miscegenation’ and *mestizaje*, are avoided here, due to their similarly negative historic connotations in relation to racialism.

The term *ossification* builds on the original sense of the Portuguese term *crioulo* (cf. Spanish *criollo* and French *créole*) used to refer to a person classed as ethnically Spanish, Portuguese or African, but born in colonies, before undergoing a semantic shift to refer to persons of mixed ancestry in a colonial setting. The later sense is the source of the term ‘creolisation’ in linguistics and social theory in relation to mixing reflects that later usage. Therefore, an alternative is required here (contra Ó Riagáin 2010c) to avoid potential confusion.

Ossification is defined here as the carrying on of cultural traits by migrants, colonists included, long after their obsolescence in their area of origin. As such, it might be regarded as a particular form of transculturation, brought about by not changing when other groups do change. An example of this might be found in the *españoles criollos* claiming ‘pure’ Spanish descent born in South and Central America. They carried on the use of certain linguistic traits, manners and material culture usage long after they had fallen out of use in Spain, leading to their being viewed as backward in Europe, or even degenerated by their environment, and assigned to the second position in the *sistema de castas*, below *peninsulares* (Brading 1991,
Another example of ossification might be the use of certain house types in the towns associated with the Scandinavian diaspora in Ireland, long after their falling out of use in Scandinavia (Wallace 2005, 828; Valente 2008, 63; Ó Ríagáin 2010c, 66, 131). The relationship between ossification and diasporas will be discussed further in the final chapter.

**Contact zones**

Transculturation and the sub-processes associated with colonialism take place simultaneously in physical space and conceptual/cognitive space, in what are referred to here as **contact zones**, defined as

social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftereffects as they are lived out in many parts of the world today (Pratt 1991, 34; cf. 1992, 6–7; Clifford 1997, 188–219).

This concept is preferred to alternatives, such as extending Bhabha’s ‘third space’ concept from the interface between individual(s) and culture, or between individuals (Bhabha 1994, 52–6) and applying it to interactions between social groups (Ó Ríagáin 2010c, 3, 67–8; Naum 2010).

**1.3.3 Political context and social stratification**

Open to the same sins of essentialism as the relationship between material culture and ethnicity or other forms of identity, reading social status from the archaeological record necessitates a degree of caution. It is very easy to read current conceptions of social status, class included, into the past. The dominant ideas of an age shape, either negatively or positively, all other ideas and interpretations of that age (Fichte 1794; Marx and Engels 1982[1932], 67; Berger and Luckmann 1966; cf. Kuhn 1970; Elias 1974).

It might still be possible to read status from the archaeological record, while keeping these caveats in mind. Drawing on Weber (1979[1922], 302–7), Elias and Scotson (1965), Bourdieu (1984) and Mann (1986), it is possible to identify several key axes on which asymmetries in social power are brought about: ideological, military, economic and political. How these are represented in societies is often specific to that society, thus a settlement needs to be compared against all contemporary settlements, trends in material culture and any available textual evidence.
Several legal tracts survive relating to status in early medieval Ireland (Hughes 1972, 46–49–56; Binchy 1975; 1976; Kelly 1988, 7–12, 26–36, 95–7; Ó Cróinin 1995, 120–146; Charles-Edwards 2000, 129–36). The principal collections and compilations of law texts date to the period AD690×740 (Binchy 1941, xiv–xv), but in many instances glosses and other additions have been added in the centuries between initial compilation and the composition of the manuscripts in which they survive. The most cited status text is the early-eighth century Crith Gablach (Binchy 1941; Charles-Edwards 1986; 1994). Binchy (1941, xix) draws attention to the theoretical nature of Crith Gablach, which “bears only a very limited relation to the realities of legal life in ancient Ireland”. Ó Corráin (1972, 29) notes these legal tracts are “At best […], a schematic pattern of the society which existed in Ireland before, and, less likely, during the period in which they were committed to writing,” while also drawing attention to a much more complex and dynamic structure of subordination in early medieval Ireland. The schematised and static nature of the society represented in such texts is contradicted by the evidence for a highly dynamic society from other sources such as the annals (2.7; Hughes 1972, 45; Edwards 1990, 8). Furthermore, as Hughes (1972, 49) notes, “the unfree are rarely discussed in the laws”.

Table 1.2 contains the various social orders discussed in a number of these legal texts. Keeping the above caveats in mind, they might at least be used to indicate the hierarchies at work. Stout (1997) explores the relationship between these social categories (from Crith Gablach in particular) and the distribution of enclosed settlements, and while he might be criticised on both historical and archaeological grounds (not least his dating methods), legal texts might at least be used to gain an idea of the potential inter-relationships and general degrees of status asymmetry between the occupants of various forms of settlement prior to the better-documented high medieval period.

This brings us to further caveats in relation to disentangling high-status human agents from high-status settlement monuments. Does the occupant of a settlement confer their status on that settlement, or vice versa? High-status sites might concentrate all power resources in one locale, just as their occupant(s) might represent a convergence of ideological, military, economic and political power resources. Thus, evidence might occur for the production, or importation, and redistribution of (often otherwise unavailable) items of material culture, the concentration and redistribution of agricultural produce, or the concentration of people via assemblies, military hostings or group rituals, the concentration of ritual, intellectual, administrative or military specialists. In some cases, that concentration exists outside individual agency, but in others it moves with individuals. In some instances, the restrictive use
of certain forms of conspicuously monumental settlements employing the ‘unusualness principle’ might be employed to demonstrate the high status of both settlement and its occupant, and in some cases, the settlement might function as a metonym for a system of governance—such as Westminster being used to refer to the British government, for example. In other instances, such concentrations might occur at non-unique sites similar to those occupied other social strata. Castles would be a good example of this; by definition, they are fortified elite residences (Allen Brown 1970, 14; see 2.3.3.a), but differentiating between royal and lordly castles is difficult without sufficient documentary evidence—an important lesson for discussing earlier elite settlements. Furthermore, status might also be represented by completely non-monumental means, with the high-status individuals/groups occupying settlements similar in form to those occupied by other social strata. The waters are further muddied by the consideration that individuals of similar social status might occupy different forms of settlement. The relationship of these issues to the datasets will be discussed further in Chapters 3–8.

Table 1.2. Idealised hierarchy of status from two early medieval Irish law texts, based on Kelly (1988) and Charles-Edwards (2000, 130–6); the latter leaves aire untranslated; it usually means ‘noble’, but can also be used in relation to ‘official’ or ‘officeholder’, etc. (see eDIL s.v. ‘aire’); translations supplemented by eDIL entries. Parentheses = theoretical rank from literary sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Críth Gablach</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Uraicecht Becc</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ri ruirech</td>
<td>king of great kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ri cóicid</td>
<td>king of a province;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(provincial king)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>king of overkings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ri buiden</td>
<td>king of war bands; king of several peoples</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ri buiden</td>
<td>overking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ri túaithe</td>
<td>king of a people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ri túaithe</td>
<td>king of a túatha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nobles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>aire forgaill</td>
<td>aire of superior testimony</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aire forgaill</td>
<td>aire of superior testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>aire tuísea</td>
<td>aire of leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>aire tuísea</td>
<td>aire of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>aire ard</td>
<td>high aire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>aire ard</td>
<td>high aire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>aire échta</td>
<td>aire of vengeance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>aire échta</td>
<td>aire of vengeance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>aire désa</td>
<td>aire of a client</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>aire désa</td>
<td>aire of a client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>aire coisring</td>
<td>aire of constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commoners (free clients)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 1.4 Core assumptions

Several core assumptions underlie the approach throughout this dissertation, founded on the critical theoretical discussion in 1.2.

**Core Assumption 1** is that the social status of the occupants of a settlement might *in certain instances* be read from the combined evidence associated with that settlement, and that this might be applied to morphologically similar settlements, thus enabling the examination of the roles played by sites and their occupants in contemporary social-power configurations.

**Core Assumption 2** is that discontinuities in pre-existing patterns and morphological traditions of settlement might be brought about by changes in social-power configurations.

**Core Assumption 3** is that localised novelty in terms of material culture, settlement morphology, or ritual and/or burial practice might also be related to the various ways in which humans move through space, just as it might on other occasions be brought about by internal
innovation. Migration represents one such possibility, although perhaps not to the same level implied by culture-historical archaeology or areas of traditional historiography favouring Völkerwanderung as the principal driver of change. Thus, in certain instances it might be possible to identify material traces of colonial activity, as a particular form of migration. This might be manifested in the appearance of new forms of settlement, the discontinuity of previous forms, or, where material evidence is lacking, the introduction of locally novel burial rites, as an indication of human presence in a landscape.

By extension, Core Assumption 4 is that shifts in language(s) employed in the naming of both habitational and natural features in the landscape might also stand as a proxy for such activity, where historically attested change might not otherwise be visible. Together, the core assumptions necessitate a source-critical approach where textual, archaeological and toponymic evidence are assessed in terms of each discipline’s internal epistemology and ontology, while also assessing, comparing and contrasting the evidence from all the disciplines involved. This enables the identification of the problematic nature of much of the source material and provides possible correctives to these problems.
Map 1.1. Extent of case study regions and their broader context.
Map 1.2. Basic physical (left) and early medieval political geography (right) of the Ergadia case study.
Map 1.3. Basic geography of Ulidia case study (left) and theorised political geography c.AD700–1100 (right), based on high-medieval dioceses and rural deaneries, see Reeves (1847) and MacCotter (2008).
1.5 Case studies

Two geographical case-studies were chosen to try and take in as many of the issues discussed in 1.2 as possible. The two case study regions (Maps 1.1–1.3) broadly correspond to the modern county of Argyll and Bute in Scotland and the eastern portion of the modern province of Ulster in Ireland. Argyll and Ulster have referred to different geographical/political spaces at different times and the same holds for historical terms such as *Aisır Goídel* and *Ulaid*; therefore, the slightly more neutral Latin terms *Ergadia* and *Ulidia* are used to refer to the case-study regions.

1.5.1 Ergadia

Ergadia broadly corresponds to the extents of the counties of Argyll and Buteshire established by the 1889–91 Boundary Commission (Shennan 1892, 288–292) and abolished in 1973–5 (Adams McGilp 2004). This 1889 extent provided the basis for the series of Argyll inventories produced by the Royal Commission of Ancient and Historic Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS 1971; 1975; 1980; 1982; 1984; 1988; 1992). In contrast to the modern county, the case study includes the island of Arran, moved from Buteshire to North Ayrshire in 1996 on the formation of the new county of Argyll and Bute, as well as Morvern, Ardgour and Ardnamurchan, ceded to the Highland council in 1975 (UK Government 1973). The portions of Dunbartonshire added to Argyll (UK Government 1994) are omitted here, due to their lack of historical association (contra Walker 2000 and Canmore).

Ergadia is approximately coterminous with the Scottish portion of the seventh–eighth-century overkingdom of Dál Riata, whose traditional constituent elements, the *Cenél Loairn*, *Cenél Comgaill*, *Cenél nGabraín* and *Cenél nÓengussa* occupied an area corresponding to the southern Hebrides and the adjacent area of the mainland west of the chain of mountains running north–south (Bannerman 1974; Sharpe 2000; Dumville 2002; 2011; Fraser 2005, 2009). The validity of this division, its history, further subdivisions and relationship to Ireland will be discussed in Chapter 5. The case study also corresponds to the core of a broader territory held by Somerled and his descendants c.AD1150–1350, itself a combination of a portion of the *Innsi Gall*, ‘Islands of the Foreigners,’ and *Aisır Goídel*, ‘Coast of the Gael(s),’ a division which arose in the ninth–eleventh centuries, and which is also partially represented in the later dioceses of Sodor and Argyll (MacDonald 2008; Woolf 2005; 2011). At various points in time, these areas extended beyond the confines of the case study, as will be discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
1.5.2 Ulidia

Ulidia is taken here as largely corresponding to the modern counties Antrim and Down. Better still, it corresponds to three twelfth-century dioceses shaped by contemporary political circumstances (Reeves 1847; MacCotter 2008; Flanagan 2010): Connor, Down, and Dromore. This warrants the inclusion of small areas of Counties Derry/Londonderry and Armagh. This area more-or-less corresponds to the territory controlled by the Ulaid and Cruithin dynasties in the early medieval period and broadly to the Earldom of Ulster established in the late twelfth century AD. The name Ulidia, following Mac Niocaill (1972) amongst others, is used to refer to the geographical area of the early over-kingship, as opposed to the population group the Ulaid within it, and the modern province of Ulster, which is much larger. The Upper and Lower River Bann, Lough Neagh and the marshy valley known as Gleann Ri or Clanrye containing the Newry River running to Carlingford Lough provide natural boundaries for the case study.

1.6 Thesis outline

Examining two inter-related case studies diachronically provides an opportunity to examine a whole range of varying forms of colonial activity and their aftermaths all within the same geographic space. The temporal terminology employed to do so (Table 1.3) is as general and neutral as possible in an effort to adhere to wider European phenomena on the one hand and relate to the specific processes ongoing in the case studies on the other. Chapter 2 discusses the methods employed in the research for this thesis and closes with a critical discussion of the categories of evidence used. Chapters 3–4 take the entirety of the settlement evidence together right through from c.800BC to 1500AD in order to identify the continuities, contrasts and changes which are to form the basis for the analysis that follows. Chapters 5–7 break the longer timeframe into three separate sections—the late Iron Age to early medieval transition (Chapter 5), the Viking Age (Chapter 6), and the high medieval period (Chapter 7) respectively. This makes it possible to examine the relationship between these (dis)continuities and the three historically attested colonial episodes associated with the Dál Riata, the Scandinavian diaspora and Anglo-Normans respectively (1.2). The concluding section of the thesis (Chapter 8) assesses the entire period together, the lessons learned from employing a multidisciplinary approach, before finishing with a re-evaluation of the approach to colonialism introduced in 1.3 in light of the evidence discussed in the dissertation.
Table 1.3. Temporal divisions used, and their abbreviations. Overlaps between periods are intentional; there are few zero-points in human history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>c.800BC–c300BC</td>
<td>EIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>c.300BC–AD100</td>
<td>MIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>c.AD100–AD500</td>
<td>LIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early medieval period</td>
<td>Proto-textual</td>
<td>c.AD450–c.AD600</td>
<td>EMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>c.AD600–c.AD800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viking Age</td>
<td>Raiding</td>
<td>c.AD790–c.AD835</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>c.AD835–c.AD915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>c.AD915–c.AD1050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High medieval period</td>
<td>Pre-Norman (Anglo-)Norman</td>
<td>c.AD1000–c.AD1170</td>
<td>HMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.AD1170–c.AD1380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late medieval period</td>
<td>Late Middle Ages</td>
<td>c.AD1350–AD1520</td>
<td>LMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-medieval</td>
<td>c.AD1500–c.AD1650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early modern period</td>
<td>Absolutist</td>
<td>c.AD1520–c.AD1700</td>
<td>EMod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proto-industrial</td>
<td>c.AD1700–c.AD1800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.AD1750–1950</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.AD1919–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2. Methods and Materials

2.1 Introduction
The aim of this project is to establish a sequence of settlement evidence and examine the role played by historically attested colonial episodes in this sequence. Therefore, it is first necessary to collect and classify the sum of available settlement evidence that falls within the temporal remit of the project (introduced and discussed in Section 2.2, with the potential identifiers of colonial activity discussed in 2.3). Following this is an outline of the methodology associated with overlaying the available dating material (2.4) on these categories of settlement to produce a sequence visualised in a series of diagrams (2.5) and maps (2.6). Following this, the sum of textual evidence (2.7) might be re-evaluated and the processes at work in each of the colonial episodes explored using the body of theoretical material introduced in Chapter 1.

2.2 Identifying settlement

2.2.1 Data collection
Located in Scotland and Northern Ireland respectively, each case study region has its own associated localised archaeological communities of practice (Wenger 1998; 2002; critique: Cox 2005), each with its own ontological and epistemological categories. There might be much variance within such communities based on who was taught by whom and at what time, leading to institutional and individual differences. The most adequate solution was to collect the data using the terminology employed within each discrete geographical area (Table 2.2), including as much information as possible in relation to geodata, morphological characteristics and measurements, associated excavated evidence, toponymic form, phasing, and documentary references. This information was collected in spreadsheets (A.2) and written up in gazetteer form A.3–A.4). To offset potential lacunae in the evidence, it was also decided to collect burial evidence and toponyms related to settlement but lacking corresponding physical evidence to better indicate the extent of human presence in landscapes over time (A.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Ergadia</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ulidia</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National online databases</strong></td>
<td>Canmore: National Record of the Historic Environment</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Sites and Monuments Record (NISMR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Published regional surveys</strong></td>
<td>Mid Argyll (Campbell and Sandeman 1961–2); Bute (Geddes and Hale 2010)</td>
<td>Strangford Lough (McErlean, McConkey and Forsythe 2009); Rathlin Island (Forsythe, McConkey and Scott 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excavation databases</strong></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Database of Irish Excavation Reports 1970–2013 (DIER); Mapping Death Database, c.AD1–800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Published excavation summaries</strong></td>
<td>Discovery and Excavation in Scotland (DES) yearly reports</td>
<td>Iron Age Ireland: Finding an Invisible People project (Becker et al. 2008; Becker 2010, 2012; Armit et al. 2013, 2014); Early Medieval Archaeology Project, c.AD400–1100 (EMAP 2009; 2010a; 2010b; 2011; 2012; 2013; final report O’Sullivan et al. 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radiocarbon databases</strong></td>
<td>Scottish Radiocarbon Database (SRDB) to 2006 on Canmore</td>
<td>Catalogue of Irish Radiocarbon and Dendrochronological Dates (Chapple 2013; 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radiocarbon collections</strong></td>
<td><em>DES</em> yearly radiocarbon appendix; Argyll to 1997 (Ashmore 1997)</td>
<td>Stout (1997); Kerr (2007); EMAP; Becker et al. (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Classification

Once the evidence was collected in full, it was then possible to adapt and expand the pre-existing system of classification (Table 2.2). The basic morphological and chronological features of the revised classes will now be introduced, beginning with those forms common to both case studies, before moving onto more localised forms, followed by a discussion of the classifications potentially linked to colonial activity.

Table 2.2. Initial monument classifications used for data collection; definitions provided in Table 2.3 and A.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ergadia</th>
<th>Ulidia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late Iron Age</strong></td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, broch, dun, fort, unclassified enclosure, hut circle</td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, hut circle, unenclosed house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMP</strong></td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, broch, dun, fort, unclassified enclosure, unenclosed house; cathedral, church, chapel, monastery, ecclesiastic enclosure</td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, rath, cashel, unclassified enclosure, souterrain, unenclosed house; cathedral, church, chapel, monastery, ecclesiastic enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viking Age</strong></td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, broch, dun, fort, longphort, unclassified enclosure, unenclosed house; cathedral, chapel, church, monastery, ecclesiastic enclosure</td>
<td>hillfort, promontory fort, crannog, longphort, rath, cashel unclassified enclosure, souterrain, unenclosed house; cathedral, chapel, church, monastery, ecclesiastic enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Medieval Period</strong></td>
<td>masonry castle, motte, ringwork, island settlement, unenclosed house; cathedral, chapel, church, monastery, religious house</td>
<td>masonry castle, motte, ringwork, island settlement, unenclosed house; cathedral, chapel, church, monastery, religious house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2.a Settlement forms common to both case studies

Table 2.3. Forms of settlement common to both case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crannog</td>
<td>Enclosed sites on artificial or augmented natural islands with a core of radially arranged timbers and packverk brush, often interspersed with layers of stone, clay, gravel or sand; occasionally with timber piles</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone islet</td>
<td>Stone-revetted natural islets or entirely artificial islets consisting entirely of stone, or with gravel, clay or sand layers</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island settlement</td>
<td>Small islands with several buildings (usually longhouses), occasionally enclosed or with kerbing or revetment</td>
<td>IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed promontory</td>
<td>Natural topography used to form &gt;66% of enclosing element</td>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenclosed settlement</td>
<td>Settlement with no obvious enclosing features</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Main Christian ritual centre with resident ritual specialist(s), with pastoral role associated with a territorial parish especially post-c.AD1100, pre-c.AD1100 catchment area less well-definable</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>Sub-parochial dependant ritual centre, mainly post-dating c.AD1100</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Seat of a bishop, main ritual centre of a diocese, i.e. territorial unit consisting of several parishes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early monastic site</td>
<td>Monastic institution pre-dating high-medieval standardisation of monasticism, may have had pastoral roles in the secular community, others did not, some sites potential foci for secular settlement, some sites part of wider federations, or paruchia, headed by high-status institutions</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious house</td>
<td>Monastic institution tied to one of the several Continental religious orders introduced into the Insular Zone in the high medieval period and subsequently</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unenclosed settlements

Raftery’s (1994) designation of Ireland’s Iron Age inhabitants as the “Invisible People” might equally be applied to unenclosed settlements in Ireland up to the eighteenth century, even in cases where there is associated documentary evidence. Traditionally, the identification of unenclosed settlements has been through two means. The first is through scatters of artefacts without visible associated structural remains (e.g., Beveridge 1903). The second is through the
outlines of structural foundations either alone or in small groups and dated by morphological analogy. Curvilinear remains “usually referred to (often with no very good reason) [sic] as hut circles” (O’Kelly 1989, 308–9) figure prominently. This designation is still used by Canmore (4085 examples in Scotland); ‘hut site’ or ‘hut circle’ is used by the NISMR (27 examples vs 37 uses of ‘house’), and ‘hut site’ by the ASI (1602), which also uses the form ‘house + period’ (90).

Conservatism in house-forms in both case studies means that curvilinear structural foundations could date to as early as the 3500BC and as late as AD1700, if early-modern illustrations are accurate (see O’Conor 1997, 94–6). Rectilinear houses in Ireland date to either 4000–3300BC (Ó Ríagáin 2010a) or to after c.AD800 (Lynn 1978), possibly paralleled in Scotland. Even then, it is difficult to distinguish between the remains of high–late-medieval longhouses and later Hebridean ‘Black Houses’ (Nesbitt et al. 2013), especially where sites were reused through several centuries.

A much higher level of infrastructure-related archaeology involving large, open-plan excavations has led to the identification of many previously unknown settlements, as such projects usually avoid known archaeology as much as possible. An increase in the number of radiocarbon-dated samples from all excavations has led to the identification of more Iron Age and medieval unenclosed settlements and phases at multi-period unenclosed settlements (Becker et al. 2011; O’Sullivan et al. 2013), moving on from the former over-reliance on diagnostic material culture criticised by Woodman (2000, 8–9).

Souterrains (Table 2.3), roofed passages and/or chambers dug into the ground are usually found in association with—or confused with (Morrison 2000, 215)—domestic structures, usually rectilinear houses in the case of Ireland (Lynn 1978; Clinton 2001). Therefore, souterrains found without any obvious settlement enclosure nearby might be taken as an indicator of unenclosed settlement. Finally, habitation evidence is known from several caves in both case studies, often in locations with occupation extending across several millennia, and while structural evidence might be confined to walls across the cave mouth, the material evidence indicates that they served as settlements (see Dowd 2015 for Ireland; Tolan-Smith 2001 for Ergadia.
Table 2.4. Distribution of souterrains in northwest Europe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Densest distributions</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>north coast, south coast</td>
<td>c.200</td>
<td>EIA–MIA</td>
<td>Giot 1960; Clinton 2001, 175–9; Henderson 2007, 144–7; van Beek et al. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall (fogou)</td>
<td>Land’s End, the Lizard</td>
<td>c.20</td>
<td>MIA–LIA</td>
<td>Cunliffe 1991, 182–5; Clinton 2001, 179–84; Henderson 2007, 142–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Orkney, northern Hebrides, eastern area north of the Forth</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>MIA–LIA</td>
<td>Canmore; Armit 1997, 71–3; Baines 1999; Morrison 2000, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Ireland</td>
<td>Cork–Kerry, Sligo, Louth, Clare–Galway,</td>
<td>4746</td>
<td>AD800–1100</td>
<td>ASI; Clinton 2001; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 106–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>north Antrim, south Down</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>AD800–1100</td>
<td>NISMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergadia</td>
<td>Coll, Tiree, Islay, Kintyre, Arran</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MIA–LIA</td>
<td>Canmore; Ritchie 1997, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulidia</td>
<td>north Antrim, south Down</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>AD800–1100</td>
<td>NISMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cemeteries and cemetery-settlements

An important but difficult distinction to make is that between early-medieval monastic sites and cemetery-settlements (Stout and Stout 2008; Ó Carragáin 2009; Kinsella 2010; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 56). Cemetery-settlements are enclosures containing evidence for both settlement and burial activity. A church or chapel might be present, but the occupants of the enclosure were not religious specialists. It is argued here that several settlements classified as early medieval monastic sites were in fact cemetery-settlements, probably the only evidence for clustered secular enclosed settlement dating to the EMP in the two case studies. Potentially connected are the familial and community burial grounds mentioned in legal texts (Charles-Edwards 2000, 104–5). Such cemeteries had a long period of use, perhaps extending back to the LIA. This might account for the presence of stone-lined extended burials of varying orientations in the early phases of cemeteries containing burials more in accord with standard Christian burial practices. It may also be the case that several of these cemeteries and settlement-cemeteries were later appropriated by the Church, with perhaps even a saintly patron assigned retrospectively.

It is difficult to extend this continuity back further than the use of stone-lined extended burials, which became common in northern Britain and Ireland c.AD300 (Maldonado 2011a;
Prior to this, Iron Age funerary activity tended to consist of the deposition of cremated remains in pits, ditches and/or barrows, a tradition extending back to at least the Bronze Age (Waddell 2000, 140–62). Where identifiable, the small series of dispersed Iron Age burials in Ulidia (McGarry 2005; 2007; 2009) might be used to indicate the presence of human agents; the same holds for the even smaller Ergadia series.

**Ecclesiastic sites**
Identifying early medieval monastic sites, high-medieval churches, chapels and religious houses (Table 2.3 for definitions) is facilitated by a unique convergence of burial, excavated, textual, morphological, toponymic, and sculptural evidence. From this relatively strong starting point, it is often possible to work backwards to identify early medieval phases at later sites; in some instances, it is also possible to identify further sites that fell out of use before the high medieval period. Locating them is aided by continuity of ritual and/or burial practice at many sites to present. Even for those sites no longer present in the landscape, many were partially extant or removed within the living memory of the informants of the ordnance surveyors, the *Statistical Account* (Ireland: Shaw Mason 1814; 1816; Scotland: Sinclair 1794 Vol. XII), *New Statistical Account* (NSA V, VII), or of Reeves (1847) and Innes (1851; 1854).

This comes with a series of caveats. Churches and cemeteries are in many cases more recent foundations, either due to the post-Reformation realignment of Christian communities or in response to demographic shifts. The presence of burials alone cannot be used to identify an ecclesiastic site, even if the burials date to the EMP, as they may be related to community cemeteries or cemetery-settlements, as discussed in the previous section. Furthermore, abandoned secular and ecclesiastic enclosures were used in Ireland as *cillini*, anglicised ‘killeens’, as burial places for unbaptised infants, suicides, etc. up until the twentieth century (Donnelly and Murphy 2018). This might account for some of the sites reported to nineteenth-century scholars, but without other associations, they cannot be taken as evidence of medieval activity.

**Textual evidence for ecclesiastic sites**
Due to their strong association with textual production, ecclesiastic sites figure much more prominently in the documentary record than any other form of settlement in medieval Ireland and Scotland. Beyond the major centres of textual production, the coverage of the textual evidence is far from total; however, even a single reference to a minor site helps extend the
date-range of known activity there, and by collating information from several media, e.g. annals, martyrlogies and hagiographies, it is possible to identify further figures from ecclesiastic sites in instances where a name is given in the annals but no location. Furthermore, each reference represents a point on a timeline, which, when represented graphically, can focus dating evidence from alternative sources. Selected summaries of this information are found in the relevant site entries in A.3.11 and A.4.16

With this in mind, it was decided to work from the most reliable dataset: the distribution of high-medieval ecclesiastic sites. Using fieldwork, charters, episcopal letters and later income evaluations unavailable elsewhere, Reeves (1847) augments his edition of the rolls for the dioceses of Down, Connor and Dromore of the *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* (AKA the 1306 Taxation), which evaluated the income of each church in the territory ruled by Edward I of England to compensate him for a series of earlier taxes aimed at funding Crusader activity in the Levant. Reeves’s book forms the basis for any study of the medieval Church in northern Ireland. Combining this material with high-medieval ecclesiastic (Table 2.5) and secular (Tables 2.6–2.8) administrative documentation enabled the construction of an extensive dataset of churches and religious houses for the thirteenth century in Ulidia (listed by site in A.4). The Diocese of Argyll lay outside the remit of the *Taxatio*, and while the diocese does appear in Bagimond’s Roll (Theiner 1864, 109–117; Dunlop 1939, 53; cf. Watt 2001), an evaluation of the incomes of churches in Scotland dating to the AD1270s, it is only treated as a single unit, rather than being broken down by parish. The overall figure at least allows for comparison, though. The Hebrides were located in the medieval Diocese of Sodor at the time, subject to Trondheim-Nidaros (Beuermann 2002; Thomas 2010; Woolf 2015); therefore, they do not appear. While both dioceses feature rarely in papal and episcopal registers, and secular administrative documents (Tables 2.5–2.8), they feature enough to be able to reconstruct the basic ecclesiastic geography of the case study (A.3).

Having built a high-medieval dataset, it was then possible to use other, earlier forms of documentation to push activity at ecclesiastic sites further back in time. The most useful in this respect are the references to ecclesiastic sites and figures in the various sets of annals and chronicles (discussed in 2.7).

Also extremely important are the martyrlogies (Table 2.9). These are calendars of saints’ feast days, often with later glosses providing further information such as the churches associated with the figure being commemorated, if not already given in the main text, or their familial associations (Hennig 1970; Ó Riain 2006).

The early hagiographies of Patrick and Colum Cille (Table 2.10) are also particularly
important sources of information (de Paor 1971; Swift 1994; Ó Cróinin 1995, 154–68; Charles-Edwards 2000, 8–67, 416–40). Occasionally, later texts contain useful incidental information, e.g., two high-medieval lives of Comgall of Bangor (Plummer 1910b, 3–21; Heist 1965, 332–3). Information might also be gleaned from devotional poetry and hymns (e.g., Reeves 1853b; Todd 1855; Stokes 1883; Clancy and Markús 1995), later breviaries (Macquarrie 2001, 114) or in high-medieval genealogical compilations (Ó Riain 1985; 2011). The appearance of an ecclesiastic site, figure, or population group in these texts at least indicates that it was in existence at the time the text was composed, which can be used to better interpret other forms of evidence. Beyond that, the reliability of the narrative details of hagiographies is often suspect (Ó Riain 1982; 2018; McCone 1984; Picard 1985; Clancy 2001, 1; Fraser 2005, 115). As discussed by Jenkins (1991), texts are produced by someone for someone; however, these texts can at least provide a point of entry into the mentalities of contemporaries (Darnton 1984; 1986; Chartier 1985; La Capra 1988; Ó Ríagáin 2008) and how they interpreted/imagined their past. Furthermore, incidental references in this material to daily life and economic activity (Doherty 1982) provide invaluable information not available elsewhere.
Table 2.5. Principal high-medieval ecclesiastic documentation used to form dataset of high-medieval churches in both case-studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Coverage (AD)</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxatio Ecclesiastica</em>, AKA 1306 Taxation (income of churches in territories held by Edward I)</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>no exemptions listed,</td>
<td>Reeves 1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vetera moumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum</em> (Papal letters related to Ireland and Scotland from the Vatican archive)</td>
<td>1216–1547</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Theiner 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagimond’s Roll</td>
<td>c.1275</td>
<td>Argyll treated as single unit; Sodor not covered</td>
<td>Theiner 1864, 109–117; Dunlop 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pontificia Hibernica: Medieval Papal Chancery Documents Concerning Ireland</em></td>
<td>640–1261</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheehy 1962; 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calendars of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland</em></td>
<td>1198–1404</td>
<td>heavily abridged; translation issues, names not standardised</td>
<td>Bliss 1893; 1895; Bliss and Johnson 1897; Bliss and Twemlow 1902; 1904; Twemlow 1907; 1915; 1933; British History Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Innocent III to Ireland (supplement to Bliss)</td>
<td>1198–1216</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunning 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Patrologia Latina</em> (reprinted editions of entire canon of patristic works, plus Papal registers from Gregory I to Innocent III)</td>
<td>230–1216</td>
<td>misprints and transcription errors</td>
<td>Migne 1841–1855, 217 volumes; Migne 1862–1865, four volumes of indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Regesta Honorii Papae</em> (registers of Pope Honorius)</td>
<td>1216–1227</td>
<td>old edition</td>
<td>Pressutti 1888; 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annates (records of payments by the holder of a benefice to their ordaining authority)</td>
<td>1400–1535</td>
<td>old edition</td>
<td>Coleman and Flood 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cartae Dunensis</em> (collection of charters involving Downpatrick)</td>
<td>1176–1302</td>
<td></td>
<td>MacNicoaill 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal and royal letters related to diocese of Sodor</td>
<td>1203–1380</td>
<td>old edition</td>
<td>Munch 1860, 152–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartularies and registers of the major religious houses in</td>
<td>c.1100–1600</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Morton 1832; Innes 1832; 1837a; 1837b; 1842; 1843a; 1846a;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6. Principal high-medieval secular administrative documentation used to form dataset of high-medieval churches in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Coverage (AD)</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of Medieval Scotland project (PoMS) (summary of each surviving charter, with details of individuals and places involved)</td>
<td>1093–1314</td>
<td></td>
<td>PMoS website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Scottish Charters</td>
<td>565–1153</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regesta Regum Scottorum (charters of the medieval kings of Scotland)</td>
<td>pre-1153–1603</td>
<td>(eventually)</td>
<td>Barrow and Scott 1971; Webster 1982; Duncan 1988; Barrow 1999; Neville and Simpson 2012; cf. Hodge 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum, Register of the Great Seal of Scotland</td>
<td>1306–1546</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Thomson 1912[1814]; Balfour Paul and Thomson 1882; 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnatial chartularies and registers (charters involving earls and lords)</td>
<td>c.1100–1600</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Innes 1853a; 1853b; 1859; Shaw and Innes 1848; McInnes 1940; Fraser 1883; 1888; 1889; 1892; Ramsay 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burghal charters (charters involving burghs)</td>
<td>c.1100–1600</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Anderson 1890; Cooper 1883; Marwick 1894a; 1894b; Metcalfe 1902; Renwick 1884; 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections of charters and letters</td>
<td>c.1100–1600</td>
<td>old editions</td>
<td>Archibald 1905; Angus 1926; Swinton 1905; Macphail 1914; 1916; 1920; 1934; Lamont 1914; McKechnie 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendars of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty’s Public Record Office, London</td>
<td>1108–1516</td>
<td>translation, abridgement and transcription issues</td>
<td>Bain 1881; 1884; 1887; 1888; Simpson and Galbraith 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innes 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of the Parliaments of Scotland (online database)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RPS website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rotuli Scotiae in Turri Londensi (Scottish rolls of royal administrative documents in the Tower of London)  

Instrumenta Publica Sive Processus Super Fidelitatibus Et Homagiis Scotorum Domino Regi Angliae Factis (list of acts of homage in Scotland to Edward I of England)

Table 2.7. Principal high-medieval secular administrative documentation from Irish sources used to form dataset of high-medieval churches in Ulidia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Coverage (AD)</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of Irish Chancery Letters (online database of surviving information from the medieval Irish chancery)</td>
<td>c.1244–1509</td>
<td>translated, poor consideration of semantic ranges of terms, poorly organised and cross-referenced</td>
<td>CIRCLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogues of Accounts in the Pipe Rolls of the Irish Exchequer (PRIE)</td>
<td>1171–1337</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dougherty 1903; 1905; 1907; 1912a; 1912b; 1913; MacDonnell 1904; Cullinan 1906; O’Farrell 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish justiciary rolls</td>
<td>1270–1326</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mills 1905, 1914; Wood et al. 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes and Ordinances, and Acts of the Parliament of Ireland</td>
<td>1199–1422</td>
<td>old edition</td>
<td>Berry 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1333 Inquisition post mortem into holdings of Earl of Ulster</td>
<td>1260×1333</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orpen1913a; 1913b; 1915; 1920; 1921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.8. Principal high-medieval secular administrative documentation from English sources used to form dataset of high-medieval churches and secular settlements in Ulidia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Coverage (AD)</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, London</td>
<td>1171–1307</td>
<td>abridged translated calendars, translation and transcription issues</td>
<td>Sweetman 1875; 1877; 1879; 1881; Sweetman and Handcock 1886; cf. Hand 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls of royal letters patent in Tower of London (RLPTL, letters not closed by a seal, often intended for wider public proclamation)</td>
<td>1201–1385 (and beyond)</td>
<td>often abridged, earlier calendars in Latin, switched later to English translations</td>
<td>in Latin: Hardy 1831; Maxwell Lyte et al. 1901; 1903a; in translation: Maxwell Lyte et al. 1891; 1893; 1895; 1903b; 1903c; 1906; 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls of royal letters close (RLCTL, letters closed by a seal, often intended for private reading)</td>
<td>1205–1385 (and beyond)</td>
<td>often abridged, earlier calendars in Latin, switched later to English</td>
<td>in Latin: Hardy 1833; 1844; Maxwell Lyte et al. 1902; 1905; 1908; 1916; in translation: Maxwell Lyte et al. 1892; 1893; 1895; 1898; 1901; 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls of royal charters (RCTL, records of grants made)</td>
<td>1199–1417 (and beyond)</td>
<td>often abridged, earlier calendars in Latin, switched later to English</td>
<td>Ayloffe and Morant 1774; Maxwell Lyte and Stamp 1908; Maxwell Lyte et al. 1908; 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitions post mortem (IPMTL, lists of properties and incomes held at death of holder)</td>
<td>1222–1377</td>
<td>often abridged, earlier calendars in Latin, switched later to English</td>
<td>Maxwell Lyte et al. 1904; 1906; 1910; 1912; 1913; Kirby and White 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early modern collection of transcribed royal letters by William Prynne</td>
<td>1199–1307</td>
<td>transcription issues, idiosyncratic ordering of material</td>
<td>Prynne (1665)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foedera (early modern collection of earlier documents related to the Crown)</td>
<td>1066–1654</td>
<td>transcription issues, idiosyncratic ordering of material</td>
<td>Rymer and Sanderson 1745; 1739; 1740; 1741; supplemented Hardy 1869; 1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal and Other Historical Letters Illustrative of the Reign of Henry III</td>
<td>1216–1272</td>
<td>older edition</td>
<td>Waddington Shirley 1862; 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotuli de liberate, ac de misis, et praestitis, regnante Johanne (miscellaneous documents related to the reign of King John)</td>
<td>1199–1216</td>
<td>older edition</td>
<td>Hardy 1844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.9. Martyrologies used in this dissertation, date of composition approximate and open to dispute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composed</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology of Tallaght</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>?Óengus mac Óengobann</td>
<td>AD790–860</td>
<td>Tallaght</td>
<td>Lebor Laignech partial; Brussels MS. 5100–4</td>
<td>12th C; 17th C</td>
<td>Kelly 1857; Best and Lawlor 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology of Óengus</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Óengus mac Óengobann</td>
<td>9th C (later glosses)</td>
<td>Tallaght</td>
<td>Rawlinson B505; Leabhar Breac; Franciscan MS;</td>
<td>14–15th C; 15th C; c.AD1470</td>
<td>Stokes 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology of Gorman</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>Marianus Gorman</td>
<td>AD1156–1173</td>
<td>Knock Abbey</td>
<td>Brussels BR MS 5100–4</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology of Donegal</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Micheál Ó Cléirigh</td>
<td>c.AD1630</td>
<td>Louvain, Bundrowse</td>
<td>Brussels BR MS 5095–5096</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Todd and Reeves 1864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.10. The principal hagiographies used in this dissertation, others will be introduced in the relevant chapters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Composed</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectanea de Sancto Patricio</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tirechán</td>
<td>Late 7th C</td>
<td>?Armagh</td>
<td>TCD MS 52 (Book of Armagh)</td>
<td>9th C</td>
<td>Bieler 1979, 122–62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Sancti Patricii</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Muirchú</td>
<td>Late 7th C</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>TCD MS 52 (Book of Armagh)</td>
<td>9th C</td>
<td>Bieler 1979, 62–122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Tripartita Sancti Patricii</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9th–10th C</td>
<td>?Armagh</td>
<td>BL MS Egerton 93; Rawlinson B.512</td>
<td>15th C; 15–16th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1887; Mulchrone 1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber de Uirtutibus Sancti Colombae</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Cumméne Find</td>
<td>7th C</td>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>Schaffhausen G. 1</td>
<td>8th C</td>
<td>Anderson and Anderson 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Initials</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Manuscript Details</td>
<td>Editions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Sancti Columbae</td>
<td>VSC</td>
<td>Adomnán</td>
<td>Early 8th C</td>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>Schaffhausen G. 1; BL MS Add. 35110</td>
<td>Reeves 1857; Reeves and Skene 1874; Orr Anderson and Ogilvie Anderson 1961; Sharpe 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita Sancti Blaitmaici</td>
<td>VSB</td>
<td>Walafrid Strabo</td>
<td>Mid 9th C</td>
<td>Reichenau</td>
<td>St Gallen MS 869; St Gallen MS 899</td>
<td>Migne 1855, 1043–6; Pörnbacher 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Toponymic evidence for ecclesiastic sites

Many early Insular monasteries and churches have no explicitly ecclesiastic generic in their names, which is especially the case with most major sites (e.g. Bangor, Clonmacnoise, Lorrha). However, certain forms of toponym (Table 2.1) might be used in combination with other evidence to push back the timeframe of use/occupation at certain ecclesiastic sites with high-medieval documentary and physical evidence, especially in Ireland. According to Flanagan (1984, 25), the Latin term *dominicum*, used in the sense of ‘church’ or ‘church building’, reflected popular rather than official usage and was confined to the fourth and fifth centuries AD in Continental manuscripts, with Ireland an exception in the continued use of the term as *SG domnach* beyond this point. *Domnach* was not used by Muirchú, writing in the seventh century, who used the term *ecclesia* (§I.5; or *aeclessia* (§I.24; §§II.11–2) to refer to churches or church buildings. *Domnach* was also used sparingly by Muirchú’s contemporary Tírechán (§27, §46), but in many instances his *aeclessia* + specific names appeared as *domnach* + specific names in the tenth-century VT (Flanagan 1984, 26). This is a reflection of Armagh’s growing tendency to claim all *domnach* sites as related to Patrick and thus under Armagh’s jurisdiction (Flanagan 1984, 26–7; Charles-Edwards 2000, 240). The divergence arguably reflects the official–popular divide in usage found in earlier Continental contexts; however, it could indicate that the use of *domnach* in new coinages had declined by Muirchú and Tírechán’s time (Flanagan 1984, 28–31).

*Lann*, cognate with Welsh *llan*, is much rarer in Ireland when used to refer to a church rather than its—probably earlier—sense of ‘land’ or ‘house’ (Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, 104–5), and it is difficult to separate coinages directly relating to church buildings from churches built at sites with pre-existing *lann* names. Early examples include Lann Eala, Lynally, Co. Offaly (AU778.6; founded before c.AD610, see Ó Riain 2018, 50–4) and Lann Léire, Dunleer, Co. Louth (AU721.5).

The frequently occurring element *Cill/Cell*—from Latin *cella* ‘cell’ or *cellula* ‘little cell’—was used metonymically to refer to a church or monastery in Ireland and northern Britain at least as early as the seventh century (e.g. Muirchú §I.27; Tírechán §16, §20, §30; VSC §I.20, §I.30; see Flanagan 1984, 31–4). However, it had a long usage in literary usage and toponym coinages, and many of the examples in Scotland are high medieval, and sometimes even later (MacDonald 1979; Butter 2007, 5–6; Macniven 2006, 176–8; 2015, 67–9; contra Nicolaisen 2001, 183–6). The term is normally anglicised as Kill- or Keel-, which are also normally the ways in which Gaelic/Irish *coill* (wood or woodland) is represented in English—
a potential source of confusion.

*Disert*, from Latin *desertum*, names might in some instances refer to an early medieval hermitage or monastic site. However, the evidence as it stands indicates that sites with this toponymic specific date to the period after c.AD800 (Flanagan 1984, 35–6).

*Annat* names in Scotland might indicate the presence of early medieval ecclesiastic activity (MacDonald 1973; Clancy 1995). However, this warrants further investigation, as it might refer to the perceived presence of a cemetery or church, and could have been coined at any point between the high medieval period and early modern period. Furthermore, it is rare in Ergadia.

**Table 2.11. Potentially early ecclesiastic toponymic elements, as argued by in ‘References’ column; translations based on eDIL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponym</th>
<th>Survives as</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>General Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domnach</td>
<td>Donny-, Donagh-</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>c.AD500–800</td>
<td>Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, 70–4; Charles-Edwards 2000, 184–5, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lann</td>
<td>Lan(n)-, Lin(n)-</td>
<td>church (but also ‘land’, ‘house’, ‘building’)</td>
<td>c.AD500–800</td>
<td>Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, 104–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cill or Cell</td>
<td>Kil(l)-</td>
<td>cell (monastic cell or a church)</td>
<td>c.AD500–1300 (or later)</td>
<td>Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, 49–54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseart</td>
<td>Dysert-</td>
<td>desert (i.e. a hermitage)</td>
<td>(c.AD500– or) cAD800–?</td>
<td>Flanagan and Flanagan 1994, 69–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andóit, annáid</td>
<td>Annat, Annet</td>
<td>church, church containing relics</td>
<td>preAD1000? (doubtful)</td>
<td>Watson 1926, 250–4; MacDonald 1973; Clancy 1995b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morphological evidence for ecclesiastic sites

Architecture

Both case-study regions participated in wider high-medieval architectural fashions: the Romanesque and Gothic styles (Pevsner 1943, 56–172; Stalley 1999; for Ireland: Henry 1970, 148–89; O’Keeffe 2003; Stalley 2005; 2011; Moss 2014, 46–53). Romanesque features began to appear in buildings in Ireland from the early twelfth century, probably with the construction of Cormac’s Chapel in Cashel (Henry 1970, 149–50). The Irish and Scottish variants of the Romanesque style, which arguably continued in both case-studies longer than in England or lowland Scotland, are referred to here as ‘Hiberno-Romanesque’ and ‘Northern Romanesque’ respectively. Local adaptations of the Early English Gothic style of the thirteenth century are referred to as ‘Hiberno-Gothic’ and ‘Northern Gothic’ in each of the case-studies. Similar to the Hiberno- and Northern Romanesque, these localised styles continued in use later than the shift to Decorative Gothic in England.

Previously constructed of wood, Bede’s mores Scottorum (HGA III.25), the use of stone and mortar for the construction of ecclesiastic buildings became more common in Ireland in the ninth–tenth centuries (Manning 2000). This might also be tentatively applied to the evidence in Ergadia. Initially, this occurred at ecclesiastic central places, with a further escalation/democratisation in the use of stone for ecclesiastic buildings in the twelfth century (Ó Carragáin 2010; 2015). Therefore, the presence of pre-Romanesque stone churches (dámliac) or bell towers either on the ground or referred to textually might be used to indicate early activity.

Valla

Large, often bi- or trivallate, curvilinear enclosures with large areas between the banks referred to as ‘valla’ enclose the majority of known sites dating to c.AD500–1150, based on archaeological and textual evidence (Swan 1983; 1985; Edwards 1990, 104–12; Hamlin 2008). Such enclosures accord well with a sketch appearing in the eighth–ninth-century Book of Mulling, if it is not a liturgical motif (Yvard 2010; cf. Lawlor 1895; 1897; Nees 1983; see 2 Corinthians 12:2–4; Ezekiel 40–48; Revelations 21 for biblical models). However, Campbell and Maldonado (2020, 2–4, 26–31, 41–5) draw attention to the operation of a non-curvilinear layout common across northern Britain, potentially based on Adomnán’s description of the earthly Jerusalem.

If it is accepted that Ireland and Scotland were affected by the wider fall-off in new
ecclesiastic foundations c.AD900–1100 (Ó Carragáin 2009, 357), then the earliest phases of activity at ecclesiastic sites with valla might date to c.AD500–900, if not AD500–800. Aerial photographs (where available), satellite imagery (Google Maps; Bing Maps) and the first edition OS maps around every known church, chapel or cemetery of any date in both case study were examined to determine the presence of valla. Considering that Neolithic, Bronze Age and Iron Age multivallate settlement and ritual enclosures are morphologically similar, only examples with other evidence indicating use for Christian practice can be included in the analysis.

Sculpture
Simple crosses carved into stones or slabs, or stones carved into a cross-shape might have been produced at any time from the introduction of Christianity down to the eighteenth century (Mallory and McNeill 1991, 214). Only a small percentage of the corpus of cross-inscribed stones, cross-slabs, high crosses and other ecclesiastic sculpture can be narrowly dated, due to the use of long-lived simple motifs on the majority of examples. Some are datable by their use of Old or Middle Irish, by the names of individuals mentioned, by the use of runes for inscriptions in Old Norse, or by artistic parallels in other media (Fisher 2001). Others might be datable through the use of the Christogram (†) and Staurogram (‡), rivals to the cross in the early centuries of Christianity (Carrington 1957, 205–6; Black 1970; Brown 2000, 84; Hurtado 2006). However, later deliberate archaism cannot be ruled out in these cases, as occurs at Durham (Looijenga 1997, 171–2). A series of graveslabs with floreated crosses in coastal areas of Counties Down and Antrim Co. Down is dateable to the thirteenth century (George and Davies 1946; Cordner et al. 1947). In Ergadia, the series of figurative ‘West Highland’ slabs are datable as a series to AD1300–1550 (Steer and Bannerman 1977).

Freestanding high crosses in Ireland and Scotland fall into two chronological groups centred on the eighth–tenth and twelfth centuries respectively (Harbison 1992; Edwards 1990, 164; Moss 2014, 143–58). Both series are quite similar, if internally diverse, and rather than interpret them in terms of a simple–complex evolutionary scheme, they are best interpreted in terms of regional treatments of a common theme (Edwards 1990, 161–71; Mallory and McNeill 1991, 213–7; contra Henry 1954; 1965; 1967). A small number in Ireland are dateable by inscribed references to known persons (Harbison 1999), but beyond that, precise dating is difficult and Harbison (1992) is reluctant to date any high-cross in Ulidia. Several examples in Ergadia can be dated to either AD750–850 or to AD1350–1500 (Fisher 2001; RCAHMS 1992).
Sculpture and inscriptions in non-ecclesiastic settings (listed Hamlin 2008; Fisher 2001), including freestanding Ogham-inscribed stones have to be omitted, due to a lack of association with ecclesiastic settlement activity.

**Crannogs and stone islets**

Crannogs and other forms of islet/island settlements are relatively under-represented in the survey volumes produced by the RCAHMS (Cavers 2010, 136). Morrison (1985, 76–7), Harding (2000, 301–2) and Henderson (1998) point to a tendency to overgeneralise in terms of morphology and chronology. Cavers (2010, 58–9) states “there has yet to be a crannog site investigated that was not likely to have been occupied and rebuilt over a considerable period of time,” including the refurbishment of several sites in the high or late medieval periods (Crone 1993, 246; Cavers 2010, 157). Considering that the main difference between crannogs and stone islets is related to the use of wood and brush in the former, it can be difficult to distinguish between them without survey or excavation. This is exacerbated by the complex taphonomic processes at work related to their location in lakes, marshes and marine tidal ranges, such as erosion, decay, collapse and horizontal movement of organic and inorganic deposits, not least due to the horizontal (waves, currents) and vertical (rising and falling surface levels) movement of water, including drainage. This often leads to stratigraphic inversion or the mixing of strata, making it difficult to work out detailed site-chronologies (Cavers and Henderson 2005, 296–7; Jacobsson 2015, 50–1).

Therefore, the two forms are largely treated together here. It is likely that contemporary sites served similar functions and were occupied by similar groups over a period of time stretching from the late Bronze Age to at least the late Middle Ages, with the Irish series possibly slightly later than those in Scotland (Munro 1882; 1892–3; Barry 1987, 18–20; Edwards 1990; 2005; Crone 1993; 2012; O’Conor 1998, 79–84; Brady and O’Conor 2005; Henderson 1998; O’Sullivan 1998; 2000; Harding 2000; Holley 2000; Hale 2000; 2004; Fredengren 2002, 2004, 2007, Cavers 2010; Lenfert 2013). Biggar (1859, 188) goes so far as to state that “some crannogs in the north of Ireland are known to have been occupied so lately as 150 years ago”, which might mean that c.AD1700 might represent a final cut-off point.

**Island settlements**

Island settlements represent a distinct category, they are basically hamlets located on small islands and they seem to mainly belong to the late medieval and early modern periods (see
RCAHMS volumes), but they may have been reused in many cases, with earlier phases potentially dating as early as the Neolithic. They consist of groups of buildings on an island, usually lacustrine and close to the shore, surrounded by either an enclosure or a kerbed revetment running around the edge of the island (RCAHMS 1992, 23; Shelley 2009; Lenfert 2011, 39–40).

Several settlement enclosures are located on natural islands. Considering that none of them take up an entire islet or island, they are regarded here as a variant on the location of settlement enclosures on rock stacks and outcrops, rather than representing a separate settlement class.

Hilltop enclosures
Very few enclosed promontories and hilltop enclosures/enclosed hilltops have been excavated, and some have been found to date to the Bronze Age, earlier than the temporal remit of this dissertation (Raftery 1994; Waddell 2000). However, as discussed in Chapter 4, in several instances they have been found to (also) date to the EMP and thus must be considered here as a group.

Enclosed promontories
The classification ‘enclosed promontory’ (preferred here to the misleading term ‘promontory fort’) most likely overlaps in function, if not form, with several of the other categories of enclosed settlement employed in this dissertation. Here, it is defined as any enclosed site whose enclosing elements consist of >66% natural topography, usually cliffs or very steep ground. Erosion and weathering might mean that some enclosed promontories, especially those on coastal shelves, were previously fully enclosed by artificial means, but in most cases, the use of a bank and/or ditch to cut off a headland from the mainland is clearly visible. The end of an inland ridge might also be cut off in similar fashion. A large proportion of the area cut off—ranging from 204–86,000m² in the current study—is often very rough ground, and only a small proportion might have been used for settlement. Therefore, there is little point in comparing areas with other enclosed sites. While activity at these sites might date to as early as the Neolithic, the limited archaeological evidence from enclosed promontories points to an Iron Age usage (Henderson 2007, 131–3), continuing into the EMP and perhaps beyond in Ireland and Scotland (O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 62–4, 337–8).
2.2.2.b Ergadia

The categories employed to classify enclosed settlements during the RCAHMS’s field were originally intended as a procedural shorthand (Maxwell 1969; RCAHMS 1971, 15–9; cf. Harding 1997, 123). However, the categories have since then become reified, leading to calls to move beyond them (Gilmour 2000, 117; contra Nieke 1984; 1990). Several of the RCAHMS’s classifications mask both internal differences within categories and similarities between sites across different categories. Therefore, the series of sites known as ‘duns’, ‘brochs’ and ‘forts’ have been reclassified here, while keeping in mind Armit’s (1991, 200) caveat regarding the Scottish corpus of evidence’s resistance to rigid classificatory schema.

The classificatory divisions, while based on physical differences, are used primarily to break down a large dataset into more manageable portions and to attempt to gain some understanding of morphological change over time and its relationship to social structure and historical processes. The principal divisions are based on size (Tables 2.12–2.14) and the presence of macromorphological features. To enable an examination of geographical, morphological and chronological variability within these classificatory divisions, each site in Ergadia was assigned a code based on shape (1–4, Table 2.12) and internal area (A–J, Table 2.13). Sites with two or more visible ‘complex’ intramural features were assigned a /C/ prefix, with /pC/ used for denuded sites with walls thick enough to contain ‘possibly complex’ features (Table 2.14). To take an example, Dùn Mòr Bhalla (Vaul) on Tiree would then be a CASR-B1, rather than a ‘broch’.

Table 2.12. Basic distinctions made in terms of shape in classifying enclosed settlements in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>Length of axes &lt;5% difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-circular</td>
<td>Length of axes &lt;10% difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ovoid</td>
<td>Length of axes &gt;10% difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D-shaped</td>
<td>Curvilinear with one straight side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-rectilinear</td>
<td>Curvilinear with two or more straight sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-triangular</td>
<td>three (rounded or pointed) corners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Polygonal mixture of curved and straight sides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.13. Sub-categories of enclosed settlements based on area enclosed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Area enclosed</th>
<th>Basic classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt;50m²</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50–99m²</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100–149m²</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>150–199m²</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>200–299m²</td>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300–499m²</td>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>500–999m²</td>
<td>MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1000–1999m²</td>
<td>MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2000–2999m²</td>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3000–9999m²</td>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.14. Mural features, when taken together might indicate ‘complexity’ in ASR and settlement enclosure construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intramural cell</td>
<td>Small room contained within wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural gallery</td>
<td>Long passage contained within wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard cell</td>
<td>Intramural cell located off main entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double walling</td>
<td>Two distinct walls either abutting or separated by void or filling in single construction event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple walling</td>
<td>Three distinct walls either abutting or separated by void or filling in single construction event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revetment</td>
<td>Distinct internal or external wall added to original wall, either abutting or separated by void or filling, in separate construction event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural stairs</td>
<td>Set of stairs located within wall itself leading to an upper gallery or cell, or to an open walkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural stairs</td>
<td>Set of stairs located on internal wallface leading to an upper gallery or cell, or to an open walkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarcement</td>
<td>Lip along internal face of wall to support roof timbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal batter</td>
<td>Flaring outwards of external wall face towards base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Atlantic stone roundhouses (ASRs)**

Atlantic stone roundhouses might best be treated as representing a spectrum of complexity (Armit 1991; Harding 1984; 1997; 2004; Henderson 2007), ranging from ASRs with low drystone walls c.1–2m thick, to sites with thick and/or high walls containing a variety of
intramural features. This is preferred here to a simple opposition between simple ‘duns’ and complex ‘brochs’. While Harding (2017, 308–9) sees ASRs as being “of a different order altogether” to lowland wooden roundhouses, they are more likely part of a wider tradition of contemporary roundhouse construction (Haselgrove 1999, 116–7). An upper limit of 200m² in internal area is employed here as a working division between ASRs and settlement enclosures. It broadly accords with the limit of a 16m internal diameter proposed due to roof-weight and the availability of timber (Alcock and Alcock 1987; Harding 1997, 128–9). The limit of 375m² proposed by the RCAHMS (1971, 18) is much larger than wooden roundhouses elsewhere in Britain in the Bronze and Iron Ages (Cunliffe 1991, 242–6, 251; cf. the large palloza in northern Spain, Ménendez 2008, 219–56), and larger than the average present-day house size in the United Kingdom (Hudson 2015).

Any proposed date-range for the construction and primary occupation of ASRs must reckon with shallow stratigraphy and the potential removal of earlier layers during episodes of secondary occupation (Henderson 2007, 122–8). A general date range of c.300BC–AD900 for the entire series would side-step the tendency for prehistorians and early medievalists to claim the majority of sites for their own period of interest (Harding 1997, 122–33). An exception to this might be a sub-group of (near-)circular CASRs, conventionally referred to as ‘brochs’ in contradistinction to non-complex ‘duns’ and dated to c.200BC–AD200 (Martlew 1982; Gilmour 2000; MacKie 2003; 2007; Romankiewicz 2011). This sub-group’s distribution is densest in the Orkneys, Shetlands and Outer Hebrides, with far fewer examples in Ergadia and no evidence there for complex settlement clusters centred on CASRs prevalent further north (Armit 2003).

Most ASRs have no evidence for being set within an outer enclosure. While some ASRs are located within a settlement enclosure, in no instance are they demonstrably contemporary with that enclosure. Some have morphologically distinct annexes or outworks in the form of short arcs cutting off the easiest approaches, if located on an outcrop or rock stack, as is most common. However, proving a chronological relationship is difficult, especially for the annexes. Therefore, they might best be seen as occupying an intermediate category between unenclosed and enclosed settlement.
Settlement enclosures

Table 2.15. Set of classificatory categories used for secular enclosed settlements in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic stone roundhouse</td>
<td>Curvilinear stone-built structures, most likely roofed, &lt;200m² in total internal area</td>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>broch, dùn, dun-house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small settlement enclosure</td>
<td>Enclosed settlements approximately 200–500m² in total internal area</td>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>dùn, dun-enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium settlement enclosure</td>
<td>Enclosed settlements approximately 500–2000m² in total internal area</td>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>dùn, dun-enclosure, fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large settlement enclosure</td>
<td>Enclosed settlements approximately 2000–10,000m² in total internal area</td>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large settlement enclosures</td>
<td>Total internal enclosed area greater internal area than 1ha/10,000m²</td>
<td>VLSE</td>
<td>fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced enclosed settlement</td>
<td>Outcrop or ridge with central enclosed area surrounded by enclosed terraces on lower slopes</td>
<td>TES</td>
<td>dùn, fort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with ASRs, settlement enclosure classes include a wide variety of forms; some sites might be enclosed by fairly thin walls or banks 1–2m thick, others by more massive enclosing elements, some of which might have intramural features or elaborate entrances. Some sites might be located on relatively open land and be fairly regular in plan across the range of shapes in Table 2.12, others might be located on outcrops, rock stacks, islets or hilltops. Furthermore, some sites might be univallate, others multivallate or annexed, or have their easiest approaches defended by a short arc of walling. Furthermore, some sites might be fully enclosed, others might employ natural features, such as cliffs or steep slopes, in combination with banks/walls.

In terms of their dating, SSEs and MSEs are generally dated as a group in Scottish contexts to the Iron Age and EMP. The larger sites (LSEs and VLSEs), resembling Lock and Ralston’s size- and location-based amorphous definition of hillforts (2017), are poorly dated. Some are morphologically similar to Iron Age hillforts in southern Britain, others to Bronze Age hilltop enclosures/hillforts in Ireland (O’Brien 2017), others still to Neolithic enclosed hilltops on both islands (Waddell 2000, 38–9; Bradley 2007, 69–77).

Multivallate enclosures raise questions in relation to classification and relationship between the various elements in time, especially when each enclosing arc is demonstrably morphologically dissimilar or the reuse of material between valla is evident. Unlike in Ulidia, the valla are almost exclusively widely spaced, making them more similar to hilltop enclosures or ecclesiastic enclosures than multivallate raths. There is no demonstrable general diachronic...
progression from simple to complex, small to large, or vice versa (Harding 1997, 120–2). Therefore, individual cases must be examined on their own merits.

In instances where a central area on the summit of a rock outcrop is surrounded by several, lower (partially) enclosed terraces, then these particular examples are classified here as ‘terraced enclosed settlements’ (TESs), referred to elsewhere more dramatically as ‘nuclear forts’ (Stevenson 1949; Alcock 1988; Harding 2004). Similar to enclosed promontories (EPs), broken ground can make up significant proportions of their overall enclosed area, rendering basic morphological comparison with other forms of enclosed settlement difficult. In terms of dating, most TESs have multiple phases of activity, usually beginning with a smaller central enclosure and expanding outwards, usually in the EMP, as at Dunadd and Little Dunagoil.

2.2.2.e Ulidia

Far less re-classification was necessary for the Ulidia case study (Table 2.16). The nebulous term ‘ringfort’ is avoided (NISMR; FitzPatrick 2009, 271; O’Sullivan et al. 2013), even if used by the Archaeological Survey of Ireland (ASI) and in most scholarly and professional discourse in the Republic of Ireland (Proudfoot 1961; 1970; Ó Riordáin 1979; Edwards 1990, 2005; Mytum 1992; Limbert 1996; Stout 1997; O’Conor 1998; Kerr 2007; Comber 2008). The term is a misnomer, masking morphological, if not functional, variability when collectively referring to what were primarily enclosed farmsteads—or, occasionally, corrals or production sites—of relatively low defensibility.

As an alternative abstract designation, variants of the less-chronologically and morphologically deterministic ‘settlement enclosure’ is favoured here over ‘early medieval (settlement) enclosure’ (O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 1) to refer to the wider series. Island-wide, settlement enclosures are the most prevalent settlement form associated with the EMP, and the remains of these sites retain a very visible presence in the landscape, with perhaps as many as c.45,000 or even c.60,000 extant examples (cf. Stout 1997, 53; Stout and Stout 2011, 44; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 49).

Most known settlement enclosures are circular or sub-circular, although evidence from recent large-scale excavations has further broadened the known variety of shapes and forms of enclosures proven to be similar to raths and cashels in terms of their function and chronology (Kinsella 2010). There has been some debate regarding the dating of settlement enclosures. Some scholars favour a narrow chronological horizon, the ‘orthodox view’ (Lynn 1975a; 1975b; 1983) for their construction, based mainly on outdated artefactual chronologies. Others,
such as McNeill (1975), FitzPatrick (2009), and Comber and Hull (2010) draw attention to evidence for a longer potential floruit in different parts of the island.

While the number of settlement enclosures with associated absolute dates increased from 47 to 147 between 1997 and 2013 (Stout 1997; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 65; cf. Kerr and McCormick 2014; Kerr 2007), that is only about 0.245% of the postulated island-wide figure of c.60,000. The majority of dated samples fall within the period c.AD600–900, but a significant amount of evidence indicates use, if not construction until at least AD1200, and further work might indicate an even wider chronology extending to c.AD1400–1600.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univallate rath</td>
<td>Earthen enclosure, usually (sub-) circular bank with external ditch, bank may have had palisade or stone revetment, normally c.30m internal diameter with evidence of internal buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified enclosure</td>
<td>Rath-sized cropmarks or partially surviving earthworks—could also be ring-barrows, henges, ornamental tree-rings, or recent livestock corrals; penannular cropmarks have been excluded as barrows. Cropmarks &lt;16m have been excluded as undated hut-sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous enclosure</td>
<td>Small enclosed settlement not taking the form of a rath or a cashel, or an enclosure similar to raths and cashels, but not primarily used for domestic occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashel</td>
<td>Drystone enclosure, occasionally with external ditch, usually univallate, c.30m internal diameter with evidence of internal buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjoined raths</td>
<td>Two or more settlement enclosures directly in association with overlapping or joining valla, with each element capable of being classed as a form of rath were it to appear alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform rath</td>
<td>Earthen enclosure formed by cutting a ditch into a natural knoll, often only distinguishable from raised rath through excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised rath</td>
<td>Enclosed sites formed either by the introduction of material to form a mound, or by the accretion of occupation layers, usually preceded by a flat stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivallate rath</td>
<td>Enclosed site with two closely spaced enclosing banks, either with one or two ditches, some examples can have larger internal area than univallate raths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivallate rath</td>
<td>Enclosed site with three or more closely spaced enclosing banks, usually with corresponding ditches, some examples can have a larger internal area than univallate raths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Identifying colonial activity

Considering the aim of the current study, the forms of settlement and proxies for settlement taken as indicating colonial activity warrant discussion in a discrete section, broken down by colonial episode, even if the approach to the material is similar to Section 2.2.

2.3.1 Dál Riata

Considering that the people involved in the purported colonial episode in LIA–EMP Ergadia originated in the Ulidia case study, it might be postulated that any potentially diagnostic colonial monuments could be similar to those from Ulidia. While such a proposition can justifiably be criticised as essentialist and culture-historical, it was decided not to dismiss it a priori, rather that the evidence itself should provide the basis for its interpretation. Therefore, any settlement monuments common to both areas, including those in 2.2.2 and Table 2.3 were treated as potentially diagnostic of colonial activity, even if they can mostly be dismissed as such a posteriori (see Chapter 5).

2.3.2 Scandinavian diaspora

2.3.2.a Longphorts and camps

Downham (2014, 4; cf. 2010; Maas 2008) points out that about a third of the references in Irish sources c.AD830–950 to camps and bases associated with colonists from Scandinavia or the Scandinavian diaspora employ the term longphort. Further references to camps or bases use the terms dún and dúnad(h) [both ‘enclosure’], which implies that ‘longphort’ was used by annalists in the same general and unspecific terms. The format “the gentiles of X did Y” was also used in many cases where a base or settlement of unspecified form, permanence, function and population had been established. The physical, textual and toponymic evidence for longphorts—the Anglicised plural will be used here—has been well-discussed for Ireland, less so for Scotland (Joyce 1875, 300–1; Meyer 1913, 951–2; Watson 1926, 493–5; Sheehan 2008; Gibbons and Gibbons 2008; Kelly 2009; 2015). However, the term continued to be used to at least the late Middle Ages to refer to campaign fortifications and even palaces (O’Conor 1998, 84–87), which probably accounts for most—if not all—of the surviving toponyms containing ‘longphort’ as a specific qualifying a generic, e.g. Athlunkard, or Áth an Longphort (the Ford of the Longphort) in Fairyhill townland, Co. Clare (argued as associated with the Scandinavian diaspora by Kelly and O’Donovan 1998, 16; Hodkinson 2002, 1; disputed Gibbons 2005; see Ó Riagáin 2010c, 45–9).
The camps and bases did not adhere to a single standard form. Some may have been purpose-built D-shaped enclosures close to river estuaries as at the only two identified in Ireland through excavation: Woodstown, Co. Waterford (Russell and Hurley 2014) and Anagassan/Linns, Co. Louth (Clinton 2014). Whether these D-shaped enclosures represented the original form of the campaign fortification or an expanded subsequent enclosed riverside settlement is difficult to be determined. However, several Insular and Continental camps repurposed pre-existing secular and ecclesiastic settlements (Biddle and Kjolbye-Biddle 1992; Ó Floinn 1998, 164) or made opportunistic use of islands, marshes, knolls and outcrops with little visible artificial enclosure (Raffield 2013). Considering the shifting semantics of the term over time (Table 2.17) and variability in morphology and function, only camps/bases/proto-urban centres with two or more forms of evidence linking them to Scandinavian(-diasporic) settlement activity will be referred to by the somewhat unsatisfactory catch-all term ‘longphort’.

Table 2.17. Etymology of longphort. SG definitions from eDIL, Latin from LatDict, NG from Ó Dónaill (1977). See Maas (2008) on the shifting semantics of the term in Irish sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long</td>
<td>ship, boat, container</td>
<td>SG to NG</td>
<td>nalis longa</td>
<td>longship, galley</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>port</td>
<td>shore, bank, landing place</td>
<td>SG to NG</td>
<td>portus</td>
<td>port, harbour</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>port</td>
<td>restricted area, mound, fortified place, abode</td>
<td>MG to NG</td>
<td>portus</td>
<td>place of refuge</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longphort, pl. longphuirt</td>
<td>ship fortress, camp</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>long + port</td>
<td>ship + port, refuge</td>
<td>SG, MG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longphort</td>
<td>camp, campaign fortification, palace</td>
<td>MG</td>
<td>longphort</td>
<td>(borrowed as ossified unit)</td>
<td>MG, GC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.b Furnished burials

Perhaps the most important archaeological proxy for present purposes is the series of furnished burials in both case studies dated to c.AD850–1000 on mainly artefactual, but occasionally radiocarbon, dating (Graham-Campbell and Batey 1998, 152–4; Griffiths 2010, 72; Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014; Harrison 2015; Ó Riagáin 2016). This series of furnished burials represents examples of burial traditions breaking with the local norms, employing a set of practices more commonly associated with Scandinavia. In many respects, their disappearance is as instructive as their appearance, and it is in this respect that the transcultural concepts discussed in 1.2 are
most helpful (Chapter 6). The parameters for data collection are outlined in A.2. Sexing the associated human remains is normally difficult due to the poor level of survival of skeletal material. Where it was impossible, the burials were categorised morphologically, as well as in terms of the presence of material culture gendered male, female, and burials to which no gendered objects were present (see Ó Ríagáin 2016).

2.3.2.c Old Norse toponyms

A working list of Old Norse (ON) toponymic generics related to settlement in both case studies (Table 2.18) was drawn up after consulting exemplary studies such as MacBain and Watson (1922[1892], 67–118; contra Gillies 1906), Watson (1926), Johnson (1991), Gammeltoft (1998; 2001; 2006; 2007), Mac Giolla Easpaig (2002; 2009), Kruse (2004; 2005), Stahl (2005); Taylor (2005; 2011), Jennings and Kruse (2009), Márkus (2012a; 2012b), Whyte (2014), Holliday (2016), and most especially, Macniven (2006; 2013a; 2013b; 2015). Recourse was also made to the online Northern Ireland Placename Database (NIPD). Use was made of a variety of dictionaries available online and in print (Table 2.19).

Certain topographic names related to natural features that have been demonstrated as commonly used habitatively in naming settlements have also been included (Table 2.18; Crawford 1987; 1995; contra Nicolaison 1982; 1992; 2001). In relation to ON generics that were adopted as loanwords in Gaelic or Irish or false cognates (Table 2.20), only those easily identifiable as containing ON specific + generic elements and employing ON syntax have been included. This comes with the caveat that some might have been employed at a later date by English speakers (Tables 2.21 and 2.22).

Following Nicolaison’s (2001) methodology, toponyms were collected primarily from cartographic sources in order to gain an awareness of the location of the toponyms within the landscape. Mapping valleys and rivers provides a challenge, as they are linear features rather than merely points on maps. Therefore, the point where a settlement using the name habitatively would be most likely to occur has been estimated, usually at the mouth of the associated valley or river. Where several associated features are named with respect to one original feature, they are taken as a single toponym. For example, Glen Scaddle, the River Scaddle, Inbhir Scaddail, and Inverscaddle Bay in Ardgour all refer to ON *skáðr* (askew, oblique) + ON *dalr* (valley), which would seem to refer to the valley’s meeting of Cona Glen obliquely. It is hoped that further investigation into the historic forms of the names involved and the morphological, phonological and orthographic shifts will greatly add to the preliminary
dataset used here as a proxy for settlement.

The principal maps used to identify surviving Old Norse toponyms in Ergadia were the georeferenced scans of the Ordnance Survey (OS) first and second edition one-inch (OS 1856–1891; 1885–1900) and six-inch (OS 1843–82; 1888–1913) maps available via the National Library of Scotland’s (NLS) website. These were supplemented with the NLS’s collection of historic maps, especially Mercator (1595), Blaeu (1654), Roy (1747–1755) and Langlands (1801). For Ulidia, the georeferenced scans of the OS first (1832–46), second (1846–62) and third (1900–07) edition maps are available via the Public Records Office of Northern Ireland’s online historic maps viewer. The 1651 Down Survey of Ireland is available via Trinity College Dublin.

Table 2.18. Potential Old Norse (ON) habitative toponymic elements found in Ergadia and/or Ulidia placenames, including topographic names used habitatively; definitions derived from Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874). See also Crawford (1987; 1995) and Macniven (2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ON</th>
<th>Survives as</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bólf, bøl (n)</td>
<td>-bol, -pol(l), -pool, -bul(l)</td>
<td>lit. ‘built’, i.e. reclaimed and cultivated land, farm or settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bólstaðr (m)</td>
<td>-bol(l), -pol(l), -pool, -bister, -bolster</td>
<td>farm, homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setr, (n)</td>
<td>-ster</td>
<td>place, residence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sætr, sætr (n)</td>
<td>-ster</td>
<td>mountain pasture, dairy-lands, shieling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staðr, staðir (m)</td>
<td>-ster, -stadh, -staid</td>
<td>place, stead, abode, stop, usually plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>býr, bær, bær (m)</td>
<td>-by</td>
<td>farm, settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tún (n)</td>
<td>-ton, -tunn, -tùn</td>
<td>farm, place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tupt, topt (f)</td>
<td>tot-, -tot, töt-, tòt-</td>
<td>a homestead, piece of ground, or ruins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borg (f)</td>
<td>borg, burg, -bridge</td>
<td>fortification, rock outcrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haugr (m)</td>
<td>-hough, haugh, -hog, -how</td>
<td>mound, heap, cairn (often used in relation to settlements and burials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalr (m)</td>
<td>-dale, -dal, dail, -ddle, -dle</td>
<td>valley (topographic term used habitatively, for potential problems, cf. tables below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vik</td>
<td>-aig</td>
<td>bay, inlet (often used habitatively)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.19. Principal dictionaries used for this dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td><em>Latin Dictionary and Grammar Resources</em></td>
<td>LatDict</td>
<td>LatDict</td>
<td>LatDict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages</em></td>
<td>de Vaan 2008</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Irish</td>
<td><em>electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language</em></td>
<td>eDIL 2013</td>
<td>eDIL</td>
<td>eDIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td><em>An Icelandic-English Dictionary</em></td>
<td>Cleasby and Vigfusson 1874</td>
<td>Germanic Lexicon Project</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dictionary of Old Norse Prose</em></td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
<td>DONP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English</td>
<td><em>An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary</em></td>
<td>Bosworth and Toller 1898; 1921</td>
<td>Germanic Lexicon Project</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old French</td>
<td><em>Anglo-Norman Dictionary Online</em></td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Anglo Norman Dictionary</td>
<td>AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic</td>
<td><em>An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language</em></td>
<td>MacBain 1911</td>
<td>Sabhal Mòr Ostaig</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Am faclair mòr Gàidhlig – Beurla; Am Faclair Beag</em></td>
<td>Dwelly 1901–9</td>
<td>Sabhal Mòr Ostaig</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td><em>Foclóir Gaeilge-Béarla</em></td>
<td>Ó Dónaill 1977</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots (Lallans)</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of the Scots Language</em></td>
<td>Grant, Murison and Robinson 2004</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
<td>DSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue</em></td>
<td>Craigie, Aitken, Stevenson, Dareau 1931–2002</td>
<td>University of Dundee</td>
<td>DOST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.20. Old Norse loanwords in Scottish Gaelic or Irish frequently potentially occurring in toponyms, derived from MacBain (1911).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaelic</th>
<th>Old Norse</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sgarbh (m)</td>
<td>skarfr (m)</td>
<td>cormorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sgeir (f)</td>
<td>sker (n)</td>
<td>small island, sea rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geodha (m)</td>
<td>gjá (f)</td>
<td>stream, chasm, cove surrounded by rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acarsaid (f)</td>
<td>akkeris-sæti (n)</td>
<td>anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dail (f); dàil (f)</td>
<td>dalr (m)</td>
<td>dale, valley; valley meadow, meadow by stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ùig (f)</td>
<td>vik (f)</td>
<td>bay, inlet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.21. Gaelic/Irish words potentially mis-identifiable as Old Norse topographic elements, using MacBain (1911), Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874), Flanagan and Flanagan (2001), Ó Dónaill (1977), the eDIL and the NIPD for reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toponymic Element</th>
<th>Potential Gaelic Interpretation</th>
<th>Meaning(s) of Gaelic Terms</th>
<th>Potential ON (mis) Interp.</th>
<th>Meaning(s) of ON Term(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-dale, dail, -dail, -dle, -del</td>
<td>dàil or dàil (f); dál or dàil (m); dail (m)</td>
<td>assembly; share/portion; blind(person)</td>
<td>dalr (m)</td>
<td>valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ster, -stadh, -staid</td>
<td>stad (m); gen. staid</td>
<td>stop, act of stopping; location of stopping</td>
<td>staðr (m)</td>
<td>place, stead, abode, stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tolm, -home, -holme</td>
<td>tuaim (f); tuama (m)</td>
<td>mound or tumulus; tomb</td>
<td>hólmr (m)</td>
<td>islet, mound, coastal field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ford, -phort, -art</td>
<td>port (m) (Latin portus), Ir. gen. poirt, an phoirt G. gen. puirt, a’ phuirt</td>
<td>port, landing place, or platform or bank</td>
<td>fjörðr (m)</td>
<td>fjord, bay, inlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fell, -mhil, -mhaul</td>
<td>meall (m), gen. mill, an mhil</td>
<td>lump, also mountain, hill or prominence</td>
<td>fjall (n)</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ness, -nish</td>
<td>inis or innis (f)</td>
<td>island, but also promontory or headland</td>
<td>nes (n)</td>
<td>headland, promontory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y, -oy, -ay, -ey</td>
<td>-igh, -idh, -i/-i</td>
<td>common word endings</td>
<td>øy, ey (f)</td>
<td>island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aig</td>
<td>-aig (noun ending), -ag (gen. -aig)</td>
<td>Gaelic noun ending, Gaelic diminutive</td>
<td>vik (f)</td>
<td>bay, inlet, creek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.22. Potentially cognate terms in Old Norse and Old English, using Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874) and Bosworth and Toller (1898; 1921) for reference. English terms could potentially have been applied much later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Old Norse</th>
<th>Old English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ey, -ay</td>
<td>island</td>
<td>øy, ey (f)</td>
<td>eg, ieg, íg (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-dale</td>
<td>valley</td>
<td>dalr (m)</td>
<td>dæl (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirk</td>
<td>church</td>
<td>kirkja, kirke (f)</td>
<td>kirk (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-land</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>land (n)</td>
<td>land (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-holm</td>
<td>island, islet, hill, coastal field</td>
<td>hólmr, holmr (m)</td>
<td>holm, holme, hulm (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-haven, -hafen</td>
<td>port, harbour</td>
<td>havn, hafen, hafn, höfn (f)</td>
<td>hæfen (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-heim, -ham</td>
<td>home, settlement</td>
<td>heimr (m)</td>
<td>hám, hém (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burg, borg, burgh, borough, brough</td>
<td>fortification, town, city</td>
<td>borg (f)</td>
<td>burh, burg, beorh, burgh (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ster, stadh</td>
<td>location, place, abode</td>
<td>staðr (m)</td>
<td>stæð, stœð, stede (m); later stead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ness</td>
<td>headland</td>
<td>nes (n)</td>
<td>ness (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ton, -tun, tunn</td>
<td>farm, settlement, enclosed yard</td>
<td>tún (n)</td>
<td>tún (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-haugh, -howe, -hog, -haug</td>
<td>hill, lump, mound, cairn</td>
<td>haugr (m), from hár (adj., ‘high’)</td>
<td>heah (adj., high), cf. Middle and Mod. English loanword from haugr, how/howe and homonym haugh (‘low-lying river meadow’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3 Anglo-Norman evidence

2.3.3.a Castles

Defined here as heavily fortified elite residences (O’Conor and de Meulemeester 2007, 10–2; Allen Brown 1970, 14), castles originated in their various European forms in northern and western Frankia and the Rhineland in the era of feudalisation that followed the fragmentation of the Carolingian political system (Elias 2000; Bloch 1961). Ringworks, mottes and masonry castles (Table 2.23) all played an important role in the establishment and maintenance of one group based in this region, the Normans, in a dominant position in the social structure in England and Wales from the late eleventh century (Allen Brown 1970; 1985; Platt 1978; Cathcart King 1988; Pounds 1990; Johnson 2002; Prior 2006). Castles were similarly employed in Ireland from the first arrival of Anglo-(Cambro-)Norman knights and soldiers to intervene in a dynastic dispute in the late 1160s and in the subsequent centuries of the colony in Ireland (Leask 1941; Barry 1987; O’Conor 1997; McNeill 1997; Sweetman 1999; O’Keeffe 2000; Ó Riagáin 2010c), including in Ulidia (McNeill 1980). The point at which castles were adopted by elites in Ireland not identifying themselves as Anglo-Norman/English has been debated (O’Conor 2005; contra O’Keeffe 1998; 2000, 22–9, 43–4, 56), but it does not seem to have occurred until the late thirteenth or fourteenth century for masonry castles (Chapter 7). The confusion is caused by the Irish term caistel used in AU1129.5, and AU1139.5 is derived from the Latin castellum. However, Orderic Vitalis used the terms castellum, castrum and oppidum interchangeably to refer to castles, fortifications or walled cities (Chibnall 1980, 104), all of which had been in use for several centuries prior to this. Therefore, without physical confirmation, such references are treated here as potentially referring to other forms of enclosure unless there is other evidence indicating the presence of a castle.
Table 2.23. Basic castle forms in the Insular Zone; dating is AD and applies to the Insular Zone. The term “hall-keep” is preferred to the RCAHMS’s ‘hall-house’ as hall-houses elsewhere (e.g. in England) are non-defensive structures: all dates AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>Dating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earth and Timber Castles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwork</td>
<td>Large (sub)circular earthen bank with external ditch and usually palisaded</td>
<td>Expansionary activity, campaign fortification, quickly constructed</td>
<td>1150–1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motte</td>
<td>Large mounds consisting of layers of earth and gravel, usually topped with some form of structure, often within or adjacent to enclosure (bailey)</td>
<td>Consolidation, not quickly constructed</td>
<td>1150–1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moated site</td>
<td>Fortified settlement enclosed by a ditch with upcast internal bank and palisade; less elaborate than ringworks and mottes</td>
<td>Consolidated land-holdings; occasionally manorial centres, more often farming centres</td>
<td>1200–1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masonry Castles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep-centred castle</td>
<td>Large stone structure in the form of a large keep (donjon) within space enclosed by strongly defended stone walls</td>
<td>Domination, very high status, usually in securely held territory</td>
<td>1150–1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall-keep</td>
<td>Defensive, two-storey keep containing a hall, low emphasis on enclosing walls</td>
<td>Domination, held by local lords in securely held territory still potentially open to warfare</td>
<td>1150–1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle-of-enclosure</td>
<td>Heavily defended curtain wall, usually with corner towers, flanking towers, and gatehouse, principal residence within enclosing walls, non-defensive internal structures</td>
<td>Domination, royal, ducal and/or baronial associations, occasionally occupied by local lords</td>
<td>1200–1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell-keeps</td>
<td>Usually circular with small open courtyard at centre, usually on former motte; rare</td>
<td>Domination, royal, ducal and/or baronial associations, occasionally occupied by local lords</td>
<td>1150–1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Castles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform castle</td>
<td>A group of uncastellated buildings located on rock outcrop or scarped glacial mound inside a reasonably massive bank, mortared or unmortared stone wall</td>
<td>Occupied by local lords or possibly very high-level farmers in areas of regular low- and high-level military activity</td>
<td>1300–1700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Towerhouse**
Smaller, later, less-defensible version of masonry castle, usually within stone-enclosed bawn

Occupied by local lords or possibly very high-level farmers in areas of regular low- and high-level military activity

1300–1700

Masonry castles can usually be identified and dated by a combination of morphological and architectural analysis with textual and excavated evidence. In some instances, later towerhouses have been found on excavation to have high-medieval origins (4.2.14). Similar to moated sites (Glasscock 1970; Barry 1977; 1987; 2000; O’Conor 1998), ringworks are quite rare in Ulidia and Ergadia (McNeill 1980; RCAHMS 1992), but several possibilities will be discussed. Glasscock and McNeill (1972) have catalogued the motes in Ulidia, and various excavations have indicated that many platform and raised raths have later phases as motes.

The situation is more complex in Scotland, and even more so in Ergadia. There was no wave of Anglo-Norman colonists leaving a trail of physical remains and documentary references behind them. Mottes and masonry castles were erected across the Kingdom of Scotland under the sponsorship of the Canmore dynasty from the twelfth century, after which it followed the general trends in castle building seen in England and Wales (Talbot 1974; Lindsay 1986, 17–37). Ergadia was not a constituent part of this kingdom at the outset and was only integrated slowly into it from the mid-thirteenth century onward. Therefore, the distribution of castles in space and time—not to mention socially—varies (RCAHMS 1992, 19–23). Castle-building on the west coast of Scotland and in the Hebrides does seem to predate construction by Gaelic-Irish elites. It is related to a complex mix of the region’s incorporation into the Scottish state, of local emulative practice, and of competition between regional elites (discussed Chapter 7).

### 2.3.3.b Rural nucleated settlement

Rural nucleated settlement seems to have been almost completely lacking in Ireland prior to the Anglo-Norman era. These are represented in the landscape today by the monuments classed as deserted medieval settlements, although some modern villages may occupy the sites of medieval villages (Buchanan 1970; Glasscock 1970; Barry 1977; 1987; 2000; O’Conor 1998; O’Keeffe 2000), which has been proven to be the case in many instances in England (Lewis 2007). O’Conor notes that a large number of villages in Ireland may be undiscovered, especially those abandoned earliest (1998, 46) or those in intensively used farmland. The
substantial remains uncovered at sites such as Mullaghmast, Co. Kildare (Bolger 2017) would seem to support this. Some might have been located where a medieval church/chapel and a castle occur in close proximity, perhaps where a more modern village is located, and preferably where medieval documentary references to a manorial or farm centre are known. No such settlements have been identified in the Ergadia case study.

2.3.3.e Towns

Urbanism in high–late medieval Ireland is discussed by Graham (1985; 1993; 2000), Wallace (1985b), Bradley (1985; 1995), Mac Niocaill (1985), Barry (1987), and O’Keeffe (2000). From documentary and archaeological evidence, several towns are readily identifiable in Ulidia, and several less definite examples are proposed in Chapters 4 and 7. No medieval towns are known from Ergadia.
2.4 Dating methods

2.4.1 Absolute dating

In addition to the collections of radiocarbon-dates in Table 2.1 the original sources of all absolute dates obtained by radiocarbon-dating have been consulted and every date used in the current project has been recalibrated using the OxCal 4.2 program, according to the IntCal13 radiocarbon calibration curve. The potential problems with some of those dates must be acknowledged. The contamination of samples by old or new carbon has been known to occur (MacKie 1997, 178), as has the underestimation of error ranges (Ashmore 1997, 239; 1999; 2000). Prior to the use of accelerator mass spectrometry as standard, radiocarbon dates could only be obtained from large samples, which meant that the samples often contained mixed materials of different ages or large pieces of long-lived species subject to the Old Wood Effect (Warner 1990). Radiocarbon dates obtained from humic acid might also be problematic, as its percolation and mixing within soils might be a source of inaccuracy. The potential effects of marine reservoirs must also be taken into consideration, especially seeing as coastal communities play an important role in the present study. The potential presence of carbon derived from marine sources in human and animal bone used for radiocarbon dating might lead to those dates being skewed (Jarman et al. 2018). Marine carbon might thus be responsible for some of the early dates proposed for burials in Dublin by Simpson (2005; 2010), for example. Taphonomic and stratigraphic considerations are also often under-appreciated. A sample from a ditch does not date the original cutting of that ditch, rather it represents a point in time during the life of a feature possibly recut on multiple occasions (Kerr 2007, 87). Potentially re-used several times, a hearth or furnace pit might contain a great deal of mixed material.

The corpus of available relevant dendrochronological material is quite small (Baillie 1985; Crone 1994; 2012). It should also be noted that the year in which a tree was felled might not represent the year that it was used in construction activity. The length of time a piece of timber might be seasoned as well as the possibility of reuse must also be considered, as must the position of the sample in the overall cross-section of the tree from which it came. Therefore, dates might not be as precise as radiocarbon calibration implies.

2.4.2 Artefactual dating

Systems of relative artefact chronology built on the selective equation of archaeological horizons with historical events have proven hugely problematic for both textual and archaeological reasons (Lynn 1985–6; Warner 1985–6; Edwards 1990, 130–7; Newman 1997;
2002; Campbell 2007, 46; contra Hencken 1950, 15; 1935–7; 1938; 1941–2). Even though they have been heavily criticised, Cahill Wilson (2012, 16–7) demonstrates that the outdated artefact chronologies have continued to feed into archaeological studies down to the present day, either directly, or indirectly via other typologies (e.g., Guido 1978 on glass or Fowler 1960; 1963 on brooches). Even when constructed by comparison to radiocarbon-dated evidence, relative artefact chronologies are subject to constant change as radiocarbon results are re-evaluated and new data are added. Therefore, the date-ranges proposed here based on the most recent scholarship must remain provisional.

2.4.2.a Imported pottery
Several forms of imported pottery (Tables 2.24–2.25) represent some of the most reliable means of dating Insular archaeological strata artefactually, often to a higher resolution than radiocarbon-dating. However, there can occasionally be grounds for misidentification, especially when distinguishing between various forms of slipped pottery of differing shades of red/orange, often (mis-)referred to as *terra cotta sigillata* (Dragendorff 1895; Pollitt 1993, 276–7; cf. King 1983; 1984 Webster 1996, 1). Sherds identified by the catch-all term ‘Samian pottery’ might in some cases actually be Arretine ware (Bateson 1973, 66), or later forms such as African or Phocaean red-slipped ware (ARSW and PRSW). The potential for redeposition is also an important consideration, as is the curation of vessels, or of sherds post-breakage—possibly as pilgrims’ tokens (Collins 1955, 59; Warner 1976; cf. Bateson 1973, 26–7; Belier 1981–2, 193).

Imported pottery also plays an important role in dating HMP sites (Table 2.24). While much of the output of the 200+ high-medieval kilns in England (Musty 1974, 41), and their locally produced copies from Dublin, Downpatrick or Carrickfergus (McNeill 1981–2), appearing in Irish and Scottish contexts might look similar in form, it has the benefit of being broadly similar in date. Examples of Scottish Redware or Whiteware (Table 2.25) might also be occasionally confused for English or French pottery on first glance. Furthermore, the designation of pottery as ‘Saintonge’ is often shorthand, masking a whole range of French imports (Haggarty 2006). As with the English pottery, the similarity in general date between the forms mitigates the problems associated with exact identification, especially where green-glazing is mentioned by excavators without any further comment. Therefore, a general date of c.AD1200–1400 is applied to all forms of green-glazed pottery found in both case-studies, unless strong evidence indicates a particular, more narrowly-datable form.
Table 2.24. Imported pottery appearing in LIA and EMP contexts in one or both case studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Dating (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samian pottery</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><em>Terra sigillata</em></td>
<td>Mass-produced fine red-slipped tableware, decorated or undecorated</td>
<td>Asia Minor, southern France, Rhine-Mosel region</td>
<td>Insular: 100–400 (General: 100–400)</td>
<td>Ó Ríordáin 1945–8; Bateson 1973, 26–7, 87; 1976; King 1983; 1984; Pollitt 1993, 276–7; Webster 1996; Campbell 2007, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arretine ware</td>
<td><em>Terra sigillata</em></td>
<td>Mass-produced fine red-slipped tableware, decorated or undecorated</td>
<td>Arezzo, Tuscany</td>
<td>Insular: 1st–3rd C (General: 1st–3rd C)</td>
<td>Ó Ríordáin 1945–8; Bateson 1973; 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocaean red slipware</td>
<td>PRSW</td>
<td>A-ware</td>
<td>Orange well-slipped fine tableware</td>
<td>Western Anatolia</td>
<td>Insular: 450–700 (General: 100–700)</td>
<td>Campbell 2007, 26; Duggan 2018, 45–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Roman amphorae 1</td>
<td>LRA1</td>
<td>Bi-ware</td>
<td>Sub-cylindrical, broad bottom</td>
<td>Cypro-Syrian catchment area</td>
<td>Insular: 400–700 (General: 300–700)</td>
<td>Campbell 2007, 19; Duggan 2018, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Roman amphorae 2</td>
<td>LRA2</td>
<td>Bi-ware</td>
<td>Sub-globular, wide, broad bottom</td>
<td>Peloponnese and Aegean</td>
<td>Insular: 400–700 (General: 300–700)</td>
<td>Campbell 2007, 19; Duggan 2018, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Roman amphorae 3</td>
<td>LRA3</td>
<td>Bi-ware</td>
<td>Sub-conular, pointed bottom</td>
<td>Western Anatolia</td>
<td>Insular: 400–700 (General: 300–700)</td>
<td>Campbell 2007, 19; Duggan 2018, 32–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Roman amphorae 4</td>
<td>LRA4</td>
<td>Bv-ware</td>
<td>Elongate sub-cylindrical, narrow bottom</td>
<td>Gaza/Palestine</td>
<td>Insular: 300–700 (General: 300–700)</td>
<td>Campbell 2007, 19; Duggan 2018, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Abb.</td>
<td>AKA</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Dating (AD)</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Green ware</td>
<td>HGW</td>
<td></td>
<td>green-glazed</td>
<td>Bristol area</td>
<td>c.1120–1275</td>
<td>Barton 1963a; Sweetman 1978, 156; McNeill 1981–2; Barry 1987, 96–100; Ponsford 1991, 1998; Vince 1987, 1988; Sandes 1993; Forward 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td>glazed</td>
<td>Cheshire area</td>
<td>1100–1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webster and Dunning 1960; Barry 1987, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>green- or yellow- glazed</td>
<td>Scarborough area</td>
<td>1200–1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laing and Robertson 1969–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saintonge pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td>green-glazed or polychrome</td>
<td>Loire–Garonne regions</td>
<td>1150–1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barton 1963b; Barry 1987, 96–100; Deroeux and Dufournier 1991; Haggarty 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen-type ware</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green-glazed whiteware</td>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>1150–1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deroeux and Dufournier 1991; Haggarty 2006; Barry 1987, 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2.b Non-imported pottery

A series of low-fired, occasionally organic-tempered locally produced ceramic forms are found along the western seaboard of Scotland from the EIA onward, with each form named for the site at which it was first identified (Table 2.26). Initially decorated with surface incisions/impression, decoration came to be confined to applied cordons in the early–mid first millennium AD, with a subsequent transition away from decoration occurring by the eighth century AD (Lane 1990, 123; 2014; Armit 1998, 9; Laing 2006, 89–90). Apart from these defining features, body sherds can only be assigned a date-range corresponding to the entire chronology of all forms except for Dunagoil ware.

Locally produced low-fired coarse pottery across the North Channel is a much later tradition. Where both appear on the same site, souterrain ware (SW) is always stratified above imported E-ware (O'Sullivan et al. 2013, 241). Any early radiocarbon-dates associated with SW have so far been due to the use of mixed charcoal samples (e.g., Harper 1970; McNeill 1991–2, 100; contra McSparron and Williams 2009, 132). The possibility that timber felled in AD782 (Baillie 1986, 106) was seasoned prior to use means that the SW found underlying it might be later in date. Vessels with applied cordons (CSW) or decorated rims (DSW) came into use later than plain vessels (PSW), probably in the tenth–eleventh centuries and continue to appear as late as the thirteenth–fourteenth century, associated with imported English and French pottery and their local copies (McSparron and Williams 2009, 137–8). The coarse pottery known as “everted rim ware” (ERW) seems to have been an adaptation of local tradition to the introduction of new forms from southwest England after AD1180–1200 (McNeill (1980, 109–10).
### Table 2.26. Locally produced coarse pottery from western Scotland and northeast Ireland.

#### Ergadia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Dating</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunagoil ware</td>
<td>Very Coarse Pottery (VCHP)</td>
<td>coarse with gravel inclusions, incised decoration but often plain, footed base; barrel-shaped urns, small vases</td>
<td>c.1000BC–AD800</td>
<td>MacKie 1974; 1997; Lane 1983; 1990; 2014; Topping 1987; Armit 1991; 2001; 2008; Laing 2006, 89–90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaul ware</td>
<td>coarse, triangular incised, often with triangular patterns, footed base; barrel-shaped urns; small vases</td>
<td>c.800BC–AD500</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clettraval ware</td>
<td>Hebridean Everted Rim Ware (HERW)</td>
<td>everted rim, incised incisions, curved parallel lines, no footed base, waist cordons; jars</td>
<td>c.400BC–AD500</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebridean undecorated coarse pottery</td>
<td>HUCP</td>
<td>plain coarse pottery</td>
<td>undecorated, similar fabric to Vaul or Clettraval</td>
<td>AD500–1200</td>
<td>Lane 1983; 1990; 2007; 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeterminate Hebridean undecorated coarse pottery</td>
<td>iHUP</td>
<td>undecorated indeterminate body sherds similar to all other forms except Dunagoil ware</td>
<td>800BC–AD1800</td>
<td>(this thesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creggan pottery</td>
<td>Crog(g)an or Craggan pottery; Barvas ware</td>
<td>very similar to other forms, sometimes decorated with incised lines</td>
<td>AD1200–1800</td>
<td>Webster 1999; Lane 2007; Cheape 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ulidia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Dating (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cordoned souterrain ware</td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td>Cordon applied to sides of bucket-shaped pot</td>
<td>1000–1400</td>
<td>McSparron and Williams 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorated souterrain ware</td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td>Bucket-shaped pot with/out cordon and incised decoration</td>
<td>1000–1400</td>
<td>McNeill 1980, 107–10; McSparron and Williams 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.27. Wheel-thrown pottery found in Ulidia and Ergadia produced at multiple kilns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Dating (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish medieval Redware pottery</td>
<td>SMRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straight-sided or globular cooking pots; often with light-green, brown-green, brown or reddish glaze</td>
<td>1200–1600</td>
<td>Hall 1996; 1998; Haggarty, Hall and Chenery 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish medieval white Gritty pottery</td>
<td>SMWGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Straight-sided or globular cooking pots; often with light-green, brown-green, brown or reddish glaze</td>
<td>1200–1600</td>
<td>Hall 1996; 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>AKA</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Dating (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick pottery</td>
<td>WTCP, GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>wheel-thrown cooking pottery or green-glazed jugs</td>
<td>1200–1400</td>
<td>Pollock and Waterman 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus pottery</td>
<td>WTCP, GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td>wheel-thrown cooking pottery or green-glazed jugs</td>
<td>1200–1400</td>
<td>Simpson and Dickson 1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2.c Glass

The system of classification applied to imported glass vessels by Campbell (2007, 54–73) is adhered to here (Table 2.28). While a high-definition chronology for glass beads might never be available, several forms can be dated to an accuracy of c.100–200 years, and where not, they are a useful indicator of general date, extending perhaps to a period as broad as c.AD500–c.AD1200 in an Irish context (Table 2.29; Mannion 2013, 182; 2015; cf. Guido 1978). The chronology of beads in western Scotland is similar, although might be pushed further back into the LIA, but this might be related to the nature of the evidence (Table 2.29).

Table 2.28. Expected date ranges for non-imported glass beads in Ireland, adapted from Mannion (2015, 20–30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected date (AD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>segmented</td>
<td>6th–10th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>cable</td>
<td>7th–late 9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2A</td>
<td>cable, from single twisted rod</td>
<td>7th–late 9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>toggle beads</td>
<td>late 6th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>interlace decoration</td>
<td>late 6th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>embellished tripartite</td>
<td>late 6th–10th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>lattice decoration</td>
<td>7th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7</td>
<td>spiral marvered (yellow)</td>
<td>6th–8th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 8</td>
<td>spiral marvered (dark)</td>
<td>7th–early 10th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 9</td>
<td>spiral unmarvered</td>
<td>7th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 10</td>
<td>herringbone decoration</td>
<td>late 6th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 10A</td>
<td>marvered thread inlaid herringbone decoration</td>
<td>late 6th–9th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 11</td>
<td>ribbed</td>
<td>late 5th–early 7th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 12</td>
<td>raised segments on surface</td>
<td>8th–12th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 13</td>
<td>spiralling coil</td>
<td>late 6th–early 8th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 14</td>
<td>mixed colour</td>
<td>mid-7th–late 8th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 15</td>
<td>globular plain</td>
<td>late fifth–early 10th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 15A</td>
<td>globular plain (miniature)</td>
<td>5th–10th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 16</td>
<td>annular plain</td>
<td>late 6th–early 8th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 17</td>
<td>annular translucent</td>
<td>late 6th–early 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 18</td>
<td>spherical plain</td>
<td>7th–9th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.29. Imported glass appearing in the Atlantic Insular Zone (after Campbell 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Dating (AD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>Late-Roman/Mediterranean tradition</td>
<td>5th–6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon/Germanic tradition</td>
<td>6th–8th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>Atlantic tradition, decorated</td>
<td>6th–7th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class D</td>
<td>Atlantic tradition, undecorated</td>
<td>6th–7th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class E</td>
<td>Whithorn tradition</td>
<td>6th–7th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2.d Metalwork

Personal adornment

The problems outlined in relation to relative artefactual chronologies mainly apply to metalwork, including Fowler’s (1960; 1963) and Kilbride-Jones’s (1935–6; 1935–7) systems of brooch-classification and dating, and potentially several of their later revisions (Graham-Campbell 1976, Kilbride-Jones; 1980, Dickinson 1982; cf. Edwards 1990; Lane and Campbell 2000, 106–114). The series bossed penannular brooches of the ninth–tenth centuries might be an exception to this, as they are dated by association with wealth-deposits containing coins (Graham-Campbell 1975). Recent research has demonstrated that the chronology of some penannular brooches in Ireland, if not Scotland, should be pushed back by 100–200 years in some cases (Newman and Gavin 2007; Gavin 2013a; 2013b; Cahill Wilson 2012, 16–7). The use of evolutionist models masks the complexities involved in these changes and is misleading in terms of its proposed march from simple to complex (Booth 2015, 39). Therefore, while the chronologies are still under revision, brooches can only be used to date sites/strata in general terms with the broadest possible date for each form applied without stark divisions between the use of each form.

Table 2.30. Brooches in the Insular Zone; all dates AD; see Section 2.4.2.d for references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Date (Brit.)</th>
<th>Date (Irl.)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>3rd C BC–4th C AD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Small, thickened heavy loop, lumped pins, rounded bulbous terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Aa</td>
<td>3rd C BC–5th C AD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Blunt or slightly expanded terminals, grooves behind terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>3rd C BC–5th C AD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Spiral terminals coiled in the same plane as the hoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>1st–4th C AD–7th AD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Terminals coiled at a right-angle to the hoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Subtype</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>1st C BC–6th C AD</td>
<td>7th–8th C AD</td>
<td>Terminals bent back, transverse grooving, straight pins, slight zoomorphic resemblance in some sub-types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type E</td>
<td>3rd–8th C AD</td>
<td>? 4th–8th C AD</td>
<td>Small, with recognisable zoomorphic features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type F</td>
<td>4th–8th C AD</td>
<td>4th–8th C AD</td>
<td>Larger, with fully zoomorphic terminals, barrel pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type G</td>
<td>5th–9th C AD</td>
<td>7th–9th C AD</td>
<td>Faceted terminals, lozenge ornament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type H</td>
<td>4th–5th C AD</td>
<td>4th–5th C AD</td>
<td>Flattened expanded terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird-headed penannular</td>
<td>7th–9th C AD</td>
<td>7th–9th C AD</td>
<td>Bird-headed terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-penannular</td>
<td>late 7th–8th C AD</td>
<td>late 7th–8th C AD</td>
<td>Large, flattened joined terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossed penannular</td>
<td>8th–10th C AD</td>
<td>late 9th–10th C AD</td>
<td>Cylindrical pin-head, flat triangular terminals ornamented with dome-headed bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle brooch</td>
<td>10th C AD</td>
<td>10th C AD</td>
<td>Solid globular brambled terminals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At present, Fanning’s (1983; 1994; cf. Graham-Campbell 1983; Ó Floinn 1987a, 179; Edwards 1990, 141–5; Laing 2006, 162–4) evolutionary model is the dominant paradigm in relation to ring-headed pins (RHPs; Table 2.31). However, their chronology may need revision in the light of recent research due to his reliance on dating the Dublin deposits, for example, by outdated interpretations of the textual evidence for Dublin. The stick pin has been studied even less, but it seems to have eclipsed the RHP in the eleventh–twelfth centuries (Edwards 1990, 142).

Similar issues exist in relation to oval brooches associated with Scandinavia. While an AD750–900 date might be applied to single-shell and AD900–1000 to double (Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 132–3, Kershaw 2013, 96–7), a general AD800–1000 is applied here, unless stated otherwise. In terms of weapons, Petersen’s (1919; cf. Grieg 1940; Martens 2004; Pedersen 2014, 73–101; Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 75–131) classifications are adhered to throughout.
Table 2.31. Chronology of pins in Ireland and Scotland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Dating (N. Brit)</th>
<th>Dating (Irl.)</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish ring-headed pin</td>
<td>2nd–8th C AD</td>
<td>2nd–8th C AD</td>
<td>wire loop inserted through head with simple ornamentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looped-headed ring-</td>
<td>5th–6th C AD</td>
<td>5th–6th C AD</td>
<td>wire loop inserted through looped head with simple ornamentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headed pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluster-headed ring-</td>
<td>5th–6th C AD</td>
<td>5th–6th C AD</td>
<td>wire loop inserted through baluster head with simple ornamentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headed pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain ring-headed pin</td>
<td>7th–10th C AD</td>
<td>7th–10th C AD</td>
<td>ring inserted through baluster, polyhedral or looped head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyhedral-headed ring-</td>
<td>9th–10th C AD</td>
<td>9th–10th C AD</td>
<td>polyhedral head with simple ornamentation on head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headed pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney-capped ring-</td>
<td>10th–11th C AD</td>
<td>10th–11th C AD</td>
<td>close-fitting, kidney-shaped ring, large head often with bramble decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headed pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring-brooch</td>
<td>8th–9th C AD</td>
<td>8th–9th C AD</td>
<td>pin with pseudo-penannular head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite-brooch</td>
<td>9th–10th C AD</td>
<td>9th–10th C AD</td>
<td>long pin with kite-shaped head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick pin</td>
<td>11th–12th C AD</td>
<td>11th–12th C AD</td>
<td>long pin with decorated or plain head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coins and bullion**

In the majority of instances, coins found in archaeological deposits in both case studies can be dated to the floruit of either the minter or the figure under whose authority it was minted, and in some instances to a phase within that floruit. Therefore, while keeping in mind that the minting–deposition cycle is longer than often assumed and also the potential for curation, coins can often be used to date archaeological deposits to sub-centennial resolution.

This is more difficult for the coins minted in Dublin c.AD1000–1150, where the coins struck by Sigtryggr Óláfsson in imitation of elements of the English coinage of Æthelred and Knútr were themselves imitated in diminishing quality following the beginning of the decline of Dublin in the AD1030s (O’Sullivan 1949, 193; Dolley 1965; 1966; 1987, 818; Woods 2013a; 2013b). This cycle of coinage continued sporadically until c. AD1150, with the introduction of a series of bracteates minted at Dublin, Clonmacnoise and Ferns (O’Sullivan 1949, 196), which became obsolete in the 1170s following the establishment of the Anglo-Norman colony.

Only a minority of the coins found in the Insular Zone come from archaeological deposits, however. The majority come from stray finds or from wealth deposits and hoards either unassociated with settlement remains or found during works prior to the advent of professional archaeology. This material cannot be taken as direct evidence of settlement, but it at least indicates that the depositors of the material took part in wider networks of exchange.

**Weaponry and tools**

In certain instances, weapons found in archaeological contexts might be dated to an accuracy of <200 years, if not <100. This is particularly important for dating the assemblages from Viking Age furnished burials discovered prior to the advent of professional archaeology. Weapons from this period are discussed by Oakeshott (1960, 132–63), Martens (2004) and Siddorn (2005). Peirce, Oakshott and Jones (2002) provide an overview of the dominant systems of Viking-Age sword classification, the most dominant of which is Petersen (1919), who also classifies axes and spearheads. Swords are further discussed by Andersen (2004) and Żabiński (2007). High–late weapons are discussed by Oakeshott (1960, 181–340), who also (1997) discusses swords from the same period.

Beyond this, the presence of iron knives and tools of indeterminate form at settlement sites can be used to date those sites to after the introduction of ironworking. The same holds for the presence of iron slag, ore and bloom.

**2.4.2.e Querns**

A transition in small-scale grain processing technology occurred in the Insular Zone in the mid Iron Age, with saddle querns replaced by rotary querns (Coles 1979; Heslop 1988; Caulfield 1977; 1981). Waddell (2000, 320–1; cf. Armit 1991, 192) suggests, though, that saddle querns may still have continued in use for other grinding tasks, which means that the presence of saddle querns cannot always be taken as an indicator of activity prior to the introduction of rotary querns. Poorly dated, the beehive rotary quern—with a dome-shaped upper portion—is
seen as the earliest form of rotary quern (Hayes et al. 1980, 306; cf. Hamilton, Haselgrove and Gosden 2015). Waddell (2000, 323) notes that no beehive quern in Ireland has been found in a datable context, with some examples dated via the appearance of certain La-Tène-style motifs. On the current evidence, a date of c.200BC might be plausible for the introduction of rotary querns with a flat upper portion in both case-studies (Armit 1991, 190–2; Waddell 2000), but it continued in use until the modern era (Fenton 1976). In the absence of other evidence, their appearance on settlement sites can be taken as indicating activity dating to c.200BC–AD1800.
2.5 Combining the evidence

As noted in the introduction, Chapters 3–4 are based on a series of diagrams that overlay the dating evidence on the morphological categories. The diagrams are sorted by classification and geographical location. As demonstrated in Figure 2.1, the diagrams combine the $2\sigma$ for each radiocarbon date in curve form with the current consensus on the dating of the material evidence (abbreviations: 0.2) in the form of a bar, with striped sections indicating uncertainty. Where only uncertain evidence is available, the site was omitted from the diagrams. For multiperiod sites, each phase (as identified by the excavator, or in A.3–4) has been presented sequentially on the same diagram. Documentary references are assigned a point on the timeline represented by a star if the reference has a reliable date. In the case of references appearing in hagiographies, martyrologies, sagas or histories, a date-range based on the date of composition is applied and represented as a grey bar; thus, a reference to Patrick being somewhere in the fifth century but only appearing in the VT is treated as reference to that location contemporary to the composition of the VT, rather than a reliable fifth-century reference. A timeline runs horizontally across the bottom of each diagram, with three vertical lines representing the textually attested beginning of each colonial episode, at AD500 (green) for the Dál Riata episode, AD793 (blue) for the Scandinavian diaspora episode and AD1170 (purple) for the Anglo-Norman episode to represent the beginning of each colonial episode. This enables the reader to keep each of the episodes in mind when working through the diagrams.

Presenting the information in this way enables the identification of continuities and discontinuities both spatially and temporally in ways that would not otherwise be possible. It also provides a test for the artefact chronologies, but a full re-evaluation of these chronologies will have to await a further publication. This visual approach was favoured over a more quantitative approach to better suit the uncertainties surrounding much of the material evidence and the deficiencies in the programme of radiocarbon-dating on many excavations (see Kerr and McCormick 2014). Combining the radiocarbon-dates as a whole or using Bayesian statistics to combine radiocarbon curves and artefact chronologies would lead to much distortion, due to the lack of a normal distribution of dating evidence both in terms of stratigraphy within sites and the variance in evidence between sites excavated under different conditions at different times using different approaches. An intermediate solution has been applied in the conclusions of Chapters 3–4, where a series of cumulative frequency diagrams for non-ecclesiastic settlement and furnished burials are used to combine radiocarbon, material culture and documentary evidence, with a value of 1 applied to each piece of evidence whose
dating range falls within each century to provide a summary visualisation of the chronological diagrams. Ecclesiastic sites were omitted from the cumulative frequency diagrams due to their more widespread appearance in the documentary record; due to the nature of recording and transmission, textual evidence for sites does not provide a normal distribution, which would further skew cumulative frequency plots. In lieu of these, a graphic representation of the better recorded sites has been included in the conclusion to Chapters 3–4.

Figure 2.1. Example of the form of chronological diagram used in Chapters 3 and 4. See preface for abbreviations.
2.6 Mapping
An approach based on spatial analysis in relation to settlement patterns around the North Channel has already successfully identified that visibility and steep terrain were important factors in siting enclosed settlements (Werner 2007). While maps are principally used throughout for qualitative visualisations of the process at work, in several instances, heatmaps of particular forms of enclosed settlement were used to demonstrate the relationship between certain features, e.g. castles and earlier farming settlements (Chapter 7). QGIS was used exclusively. The digital elevation models (DEMs) underlying the maps were processed from the ASTER GDEM, which is freely available online from Japan Space Systems/NASA. Maps of both the bedrock and superficial onshore geology are available from the British Geological Survey (BGS), and hydrology from NUI Galway and OSUK. The shore outlines, county, townland and baronial boundaries were downloaded and adapted from OpenStreetMap, as were the parish boundaries for Scotland. The parish boundaries for Ulidia were rasterised from the Memorial Atlas of Ireland and adjusted using Reeves (1847), from which the medieval rural deaneries and diocesan boundaries were then drawn, while keeping the warnings regarding projecting townlands too far back in time by Reeves (1857–1861). These were the basis for the proposed early medieval political maps used in Chapters 5–7 (cf. MacCotter 2008 for alternative maps with slightly different boundaries).

2.7 Events, processes, and textual evidence
Chapters 5–7 combine the insights gained in relation to (dis-)continuity by overlaying the sum of associated dating evidence onto the morphological categories of settlement with the sequence of events and the actors involved with them drawn from primary documentary material. Rather than rely on collections such as Stevenson (1870a; 1870b) and Anderson (1922a; 1922b), as criticised by Woolf (2007, 77 contra, e.g., Duncan and Brown 1956–7), all primary documentation (Table 2.32) has been assessed where possible both in translation and in the original language, consulting relevant literature regarding source criticism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
<th>Area covered</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annals and chronicles</strong></td>
<td>Short descriptions of events</td>
<td>Pre/proto/pseudo-history to early modern period</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Man, Iceland, Frankia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only a selection of events included, Irish only reliable from mid-6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hagiographies</strong></td>
<td>Biographies of saints</td>
<td>Entire Christian period</td>
<td>Europe, North Africa and Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biased, largely allegorical or proprietal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martyrologies</strong></td>
<td>Calendars of commemorations of saints</td>
<td>Continental: c.AD450– Insular: c.AD800–</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biased, occasionally confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genealogies</strong></td>
<td>Regnal lists and lists of descendants of major ecclesiastic and secular figures, occasionally embedded in other genres</td>
<td>Pre/proto/pseudo-history to early modern period</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Man, Iceland, Frankia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often later constructions back-projected for political reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthetic histories</strong></td>
<td>Histories of events</td>
<td>Pre/proto/pseudo-history to early modern period</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Man, Iceland, Frankia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often heavily biased or even propaganda pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal texts</strong></td>
<td>Codes of legal practices</td>
<td>Insular c.AD700–</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Frankia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idealised view of society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poetry</strong></td>
<td>Verse literature</td>
<td>Pre/proto/pseudo-history to early modern period</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Frankia, Scandinavia, Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature, but might occasionally contain useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sagas</strong></td>
<td>Prose literature</td>
<td>Pre/proto/pseudo-history to early modern period</td>
<td>Ireland, Scandinavia, Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature, but might occasionally contain useful information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys</strong></td>
<td>Evaluations or listing of properties and payments due</td>
<td>c.AD900–</td>
<td>Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Frankia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rare, coverage not total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Taxations
- Evaluations or listing of properties and payments due
- c.AD1200–
- Ireland, Scotland, England
- Rare, coverage not total, only gives amounts liable for taxation, exemptions not mentioned

### Charters
- Records of grants, or inspections of previous grants
- c.AD800–
- Ireland, Scotland, England, Wales, Frankia, Scandinavia, Iceland
- Huge number after c.AD1150

### Inquisitions (IPM)
- Extents of individual property and income, usually post mortem
- c.AD1200–
- Ireland, England, Scotland, Wales
- Not all completely published

### Pipe Rolls (PR)
- Summary or transactions involving royal exchequer(s)
- c.AD1200–
- Ireland, England
- Irish series destroyed, only summaries available

### Patent Rolls
- c.AD1200–
- Ireland, England
- Irish series destroyed, only summaries available

### Closed Rolls
- c.AD1200–
- Ireland, England
- Irish series destroyed, only summaries available

Consisting of a mixture of Latin, Old Irish and Middle Irish, the corpus of Irish annals is preserved in manuscripts dating to the twelfth century onward (Table 2.33; see Mac Niocaill 1975: Mc Carthy 2008). In most instances, the surviving annals are compilations of earlier sources. A proposed *Chronicle of Ireland* exemplar has been most recently reconstructed by Charles-Edwards (2006; named by Hughes 1972, 99–159; named *Ulster Chronicle* by O’Rahilly 1946, 253; Anderson 1980, 1–42; critiqued Mc Carthy 2009). This in turn was based on several exemplars, the most visible of which is the proposed *Iona Chronicle*, recorded c.AD670–740, but containing entries on earlier material of various origins, from notes on Easter tables, lists of abbots, to dynastic genealogies and king-lists, some of which may have been oral (Mac Neill 1914; Henderson 1967, 165–8; Bannerman 2016[1974]: 9–26). This
exemplar was potentially partial towards Iona at the expense of its rivals (Fraser 2005), and it may have been subject to editing for political or scholarly reasons between the exemplar leaving Iona and the production of the *Chronicle of Ireland (Kelleher (1963; 1968; 1971; Charles-Edwards 2000, 501–7; Úrdail 2007).

According to the current consensus, the *Chronicle of Ireland was used as the main source for the surviving annals up until the annalistic year 911 (O’Rahilly 1946, 258; Charles-Edwards 2006), after which an Ulster, Munster and Clonmacnoise group emerged, underlying the AU, AI and the annals based on the *Clonmacnoise Chronicle (AT, AClon, CS; see Grabowski and Dumville 1984; Dumville 1993). Of these, the AU probably preserves its exemplar material most accurately in content, if not chronological apparatus, despite being produced in the late fifteenth century (Anderson 1980, 1–2, 40–2; cf. Mc Carthy 2002 for important caveats). Much material was omitted from the AI due to its Munster focus, while material from an *Irish World Chronicle was added to the AI and Clonmacnoise series, best exemplified by the AT (Anderson 1980, 4–5; see Mc Carthy 2001; 2008a; who in 2002 argues that this material more properly belongs to the AU). In many instances the AT omits entries where the agent is uncertain and in others adds entries or extra information to pre-existing entries based on later source material, ranging from genealogies, king-lists, martyrologies and hagiographies (Anderson 1980, 40–41). Many of these may have originated as marginalia in the Clonmacnoise copy/continuation of the *Chronicle of Ireland. Therefore, the AU is given precedence throughout, but in cases where additional information is given by another set of otherwise co-dependent annals, those annals are also cited after the AU and separated by comma, with a semi-colon indicating a different reference to a different event. Due to the nature of the transmission of the texts, annalistic years often do not accord to calendar years (Anderson 1980, 30–1; Mc Carthy 1998; 2001 who favours the dating in the AT as most accurate); therefore, all years are preceded by the abbreviation of the source annal when employed here.

English, Welsh, Manx, Icelandic and Frankish annals and chronicles (Table 2.33) have all been used to provide supplemental information otherwise lacking related to both case studies and associated historical events. The same principles apply to the various recensions of the ASC, AC and Icelandic annals, in that each set derives from a common exemplar or set of exemplars, and in cases of additional information, that information may have been inserted from other categories of evidence of varying reliability.

Literary texts (Table 2.34) are treated as literature rather than factual historical record; at best, sagas give an indication of the socio-political milieu in which they were written and how the past was interpreted at the time of writing. This applies to Irish sagas (Mallory and McNeill

Slightly more reliable, if still problematic due to their divergence from one another and from the chronicles in relation to certain details are the Song of Dermot and the Earl and the Expugnatio Hibernica, narrative accounts related to the early years of Anglo-Norman activity in Ireland (Table 2.34). A related text, the Topographia Hibernica, seeks to describe Gaelic Ireland as it stood in the twelfth century, with the subtext of providing a justification for its colonisation. The high level of bias is extremely important for understanding the mindset of the colonists (cf. Bartlett 1993, 96–102; Davies 1990, 32; O’Conor 2003, 29–31).

The Book of Rights, or Lebor na Cert (Dillon 1962) is an eleventh-century text outlining the mutual obligations between overkings, local kings, and the sub-regal political units in Ireland at the time. While it presents an idealised and schematised view of Irish society, it mentions several sub-kingdoms that rarely appear in other textual sources or in the names of later administrative units.

Lastly, a large amount of genealogical information is compiled in high–late-medieval manuscripts (Tables 2.35–2.36; MacNeill 1921, 43–63; Hughes 1972, 160–2; Anderson 1980; Ó Muraíle 2010). It can at least be used to identify relationships between names appearing in the annals without a dynastic affiliation. Charles-Edwards (2000, 483–6) differentiates between three principal groups (Table 2.35), and it is only the first group that were composed in the EMP. They can also be broken up geographically and it is important to note that the principal collections are from East Connacht and Laigin (Dobbs 1921; 1923; 1940; O’Brien 1962) rather than Scotland or northeast Ireland (Table 2.36). The compilations contain a mixture of son–father lists extending back in time, as well as a variety of poems and prose texts of different dates moving forward in time. All of the compilations have extensive material related to Ulidia, with a much smaller amount of material relevant to Ergadia surviving (Table 2.36).

While it would be tempting to see these collections as exercises in copying and compilation rather than composition, several intertextual factors must be considered. Firstly, the earliest genealogies are political documents related to the reconfiguration of the political system in the northern half of Ireland, inventing familial relations between dynasties to support alliances or legitimate asymmetric power relations between groups (Kelleher 1968; Charles-Edwards 2000, 483–6; 2005; Bhreathnach 2005; and Murray 2005). This material might have
influenced the compilation of the earliest contemporary annals, and vice versa (Kelleher 1963; 1971; Ó Corráin 1998b; Charles-Edwards 2000, 505).

Secondly, scholars c.AD900–1150 produced a set of synchronisms that sought to combine saga, hagiography (particularly the texts produced in Armagh on St Patrick), origin legends, genealogies and annalistic evidence into a series of didactic synthetic chronological narratives (see MacNeill 1912; Carey 1994, 17–20; Ó Cróinín 2005a, 182–7; Carney 2005). Examples are Lebor Bretnach (Todd 1848; van Hamel 1932; Thanisch 2015, 128), the Irish Synchronisms (Anderson 1949; Thanisch 2015) and Lebor Gabála (Macalister 1938–1956).

This material informed much subsequent textual production in Ireland, including the annals, which would account for some of the unique material in the Clonmacnoise annals (AT, CS, AClon), for example, which must date to after the mid-tenth-century divergence of the *Clonmacnoise Chronicle exemplar (Anderson 1980, 35–42; Grabowski and Dumville 1984; Dumville 1993, 187) from the *Chronicle of Ireland exemplar. This is the context within which the prose passage opening with Miniugud Senchasa Fher n-Alban (MSFA, Skene 1867, 308–14; Anderson 1922, cl–cli; Bannerman 1974; Dumville 2002) must be understood. It is a complex/corrupted compilation of at least two separate genealogical tracts and what seems to be a survey of Dál Riata for the purposes of determining military service owed. Bannerman (1974, 68) argues that it is a tenth-century translation into MG of an earlier Latin original of uncertain date. This might only be true for a portion of the text, however, and based on that it only survives in late-medieval East Connacht manuscripts, it is difficult to look beyond Dumville’s (2007, 52–3, 66–71) proposition that it was part of a dossier of loosely connected material related to northern Britain compiled in East Connacht or nearby at Clonmacnoise. Therefore, the importance of the MSFA, its accuracy and reliability might have been overstated.

The material related to all of the named individuals in both case-study regions outside of the genealogies was collected in a series of Word documents, with selections of this material appearing in a series of prosopographical tables in A.5 and A.6. This is supplemented by further tables relating to the named members of the Scandinavian diaspora in Britain and Ireland (A.6).
Table 2.33. Annals and chronicles, with information on main recording centres, source manuscripts, and published editions and translations; *italics* = title of published book form, non-italics = working title of text, or published as part of a larger work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish Annals</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Lacunae</th>
<th>Contemp.</th>
<th>Manuascripts</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>MS Composed</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Annals of Ulster</em></td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>AD431–1588</td>
<td>AD1131–1155; poor edition post 1155; sparse post 1511</td>
<td>late 7th C</td>
<td>TCD MS.1282; Rawlinson B.489</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>Belle Isle, Lough Erne</td>
<td>Mac Airt and Mac Niocaill 1983; Hennessey 1887; Mac Carthy 1893; 1895; 1901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annals of Inisfallen</em></td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>AD433–1092 (original), to 1390 (cont.)</td>
<td>AD1130–59, 1214–6, 1285–95; sparse post 1295</td>
<td>late 7th C</td>
<td>Rawlinson B.503</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Emly, Lismore, Inisfallen</td>
<td>Mac Airt 1944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annals of Tigernach</em></td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>AD489–1178</td>
<td>AD767–973; 1004–1017</td>
<td>late 7th C</td>
<td>Rawlinson B.502; Rawlinson B.488</td>
<td>12th C; 14th C</td>
<td>Clonmacnoise, Lackan</td>
<td>Stokes 1895; 1896a; 1896b; 1896c; 1897a; 1897b; Mac Niocaill 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chronicon Scottorum</em></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>AD353–1150</td>
<td>AD723–804</td>
<td>late 7th C</td>
<td>TCD MS.1292</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td><em>Clonmacnoise</em></td>
<td>Hennessy 1866; Mac Niocaill 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annals of Clonmacnoise</em></td>
<td>AClon</td>
<td>Adam–AD1408</td>
<td></td>
<td>late 7th C</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td><em>Clonmacnoise, Lemanaghan</em></td>
<td>Murphy 1896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmentary Annals of Ireland</td>
<td>FA</td>
<td>AD573–628; 662–704; 716–35; 851–73; 906–14</td>
<td>late 7th C (+ 11th C saga material)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliothèque Royale 5301–5320</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td><em>Clonenagh</em></td>
<td>O’Donovan 1860; Radner 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annals of Loch Cé</em></td>
<td>ALC</td>
<td>AD1014–1590</td>
<td>AD1139–1169, 1316–1384</td>
<td>11th C</td>
<td>TCD MS.1293; BL Add. 4792</td>
<td>16th C</td>
<td><em>Boyle</em></td>
<td>Hennessy 1871a, 1871b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Connaught</td>
<td>ACon</td>
<td>AD1224–1455</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>RIA MS.1219; TCD MS.1278</td>
<td>*Boyle</td>
<td>Freeman 1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Hiberniae or Grace’s Annals</td>
<td>AHG</td>
<td>AD1074–1370</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>TCD E.3.20</td>
<td>16th C</td>
<td>Kilkenny</td>
<td>Butler 1842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Hibernie, or Pembridge’s Annals</td>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>AD1162–1370</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>TCD 583; Laud Misc.; BL Add. 4792</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Gilbert 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annalium Hiberniae Chronicon</td>
<td>AClyn</td>
<td>AD1–1349</td>
<td>sparse to AD1170</td>
<td>TCD olim E.3.20; BL Add. 4789; Rawlinson B.496</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Kilkenny</td>
<td>Butler 1849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of the Four Masters</td>
<td>AFM</td>
<td>2952BC–AD1616</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>RIA MS.1220; TCD MS.1300 TCD MS.1301</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Co. Donegal</td>
<td>O’Donovan ed. 1856a, 1856b, 1856c, 1856d, 1856e, 1856f, 1856g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**English Annals and Chronicles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Contemp.</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>MS Composed</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>ASC/D</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ed.</td>
<td>Trans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia Regem Symeonis Dunelmensis</td>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>AD732–802</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Parker Library MS 139</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>ed. Hodgeson Hinde 1868; trans. Stevenson 1855; see Blair Hunter 1963; Gransdn 1997, 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronica Magistri (Roger of Howden)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD732–1201</td>
<td>AD1192</td>
<td>BL Royal MS 14.C.2; Laud MS 582</td>
<td>12th C; 13th C</td>
<td>Howden</td>
<td>ed. Stubbbs 1868; 1869; 1870; 1871; trans. Riley 1853a; 1853b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesta Regis (Roger of Howden)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>AD1169–1192</td>
<td>AD1169</td>
<td>BL Cotton Julius A. xi; BL Cotton Vitellius E. xvii</td>
<td>12th C; 13th C</td>
<td>Howden</td>
<td>ed. Stubbbs 1867a; 1867b; cf. Barlow 1950; Corner 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia Rerum Anglicarum</td>
<td>HRegA</td>
<td>AD1066–1198</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Bodleian Digby 101</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>ed. Howlett 1885; 1885; trans. Stevenson 1856b, 395–672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Welsh and Manx Annals and Chronicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Lacunae</th>
<th>Contemp.</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>MS Composed</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annales Cambriae A</td>
<td>AC/A</td>
<td>AD445–954</td>
<td>few dates given</td>
<td>mid 10th C</td>
<td>Harleian 3859</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>ed. Phillimore 1888; Gough-Cooper 2010 2012; 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Cambriae B</td>
<td>AC/B</td>
<td>(Adam–) AD457–1286</td>
<td>chronology off occasionally</td>
<td>mid 10th C</td>
<td>National Archives MS E.164/1</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>Neath</td>
<td>ed. Gough-Cooper 2010; 2015a; 2016; 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Cambriae C</td>
<td>AC/C</td>
<td>(Adam–) AD641–1288</td>
<td>chronology off occasionally</td>
<td>mid 10th C</td>
<td>BL MS Cotton Domitian</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>St David’s</td>
<td>ed. Gough-Cooper 2010; 2015b; 2016; 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brut y Tywysogion</td>
<td>Brut</td>
<td>AD662–1332</td>
<td></td>
<td>14th C?</td>
<td>Peniarth MS 20</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Williams ab Ithel 1860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Northern British Annals and Chronicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Contemp.</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>MS Composed</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronicle of Melrose</td>
<td>CMel</td>
<td>AD735–1270</td>
<td>original 1140–1270</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>BL Cotton Faustina B.ix</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>Melrose</td>
<td>ed. Stevenson 1835; trans. Stevenson 1856a, 77–242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalacronica</td>
<td>Scal</td>
<td>AD1066–1363</td>
<td>Lay-composed</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Corpus Christi MS 133</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Edinburgh and Heaton</td>
<td>ed. Stevenson 1836; trans. Maxwell 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Abb.</td>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Contemp.</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
<td>MS Date</td>
<td>MS Composed</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitoma Chronicon (AKA Prosper’s Chronicle)</td>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>AD379–455</td>
<td>5th C AD</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>ed. Mommsen 1892; 1894; cf. Valentin 1900, 411–41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Regni Francorum C</td>
<td>ARF.C</td>
<td>AD741–829</td>
<td>Late 8th C</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10th C</td>
<td>Carolingian court</td>
<td>ed. Anon. (undated); Pertz and Kurze (1895)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Reseniani</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD230–1578</td>
<td>many early lacunae</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>AM 424 4°</td>
<td>18th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 1–30; see Pires Boulhosa 2010, 177–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrik Høyers Annaler</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD1000–1310</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>AM 22 fol°</td>
<td>17th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 55–75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annales Regii C</td>
<td></td>
<td>46BC–AD1341</td>
<td>many lacunae, unique details AD1200–1341</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>GKS MS 2087 4°</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 77–155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skáholts Annaler</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD140–1356</td>
<td>many early lacunae</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>AM 420 a 1°</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 157–215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottskalks Annaler</td>
<td></td>
<td>AD1–1578</td>
<td>many early lacunae</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>Holm perg 5 8°</td>
<td>16–17th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 297–378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oddveria Annall</td>
<td></td>
<td>49BC–1427</td>
<td>many lacunae</td>
<td>13th C</td>
<td>AM 417 4°</td>
<td>16th C</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>ed. Storm 1888, 427–491</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.34. Literary texts potentially containing historical information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airgíalla Charter Poem</td>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>7th–8th C</td>
<td>Legendary history of the Airgíalla and a justification of their relationship with the Uí Néill</td>
<td>ed. and trans. Bhreathnach 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dindsenchas</em></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8th–12th C</td>
<td>Topographic lore</td>
<td>ed. and trans. Gwynn 1903; 1906; 1913; 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lebor Gabála Érann</em></td>
<td>LGE</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Legendary accounts of successive mythical colonisation events in Ireland, contains synchronisms based on genealogies, hagiographies and annals</td>
<td>ed. and trans. Macalister 1938; 1939; 1940; 1956a; 1956b; see Carey 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caithréim Cellacháin Chaisil</em></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Propaganda text outlining the deeds a king of Cashel and his relationship to the Scandinavian diaspora in Ireland</td>
<td>ed. and trans. Bugge 1905; see Ó Corráin 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buile Suibhne</em></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1190×1500</td>
<td>Fictional account set in the aftermath of the battle of Mag Rath, c.630, mentioning several Irish and Scottish placenames</td>
<td>ed. and trans. O’Keeffe 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Song of Dermot and the Earl</em></td>
<td>SDE</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>Old French narrative of events surrounding the arrival of the Anglo-Normans in Ireland and its aftermath</td>
<td>Lambeth Palace MS Carew 596; ed. and trans. Orpen 1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Topographia Hibernica**  –  late 12th C  
Latin description of Ireland in late 12th C through eyes of the coloniser  
(Author: Giraldus Cambrensis, AKA Gerald de Barri)  
ed. Dimock 1867; trans. O’Meara 1982

**Orkneyinga Saga**  –  c.1230  
Pseudo-history of the early of Orkney c.AD850–1200; chronology and detail both suspect  
(Author: Sturla þórðarson)  

---

### Norwegian and Icelandic synthetic histories and sagas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>Subject matter</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwagiensium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historia Norwegie</td>
<td>HN</td>
<td>1210–1250</td>
<td>Norwegian history and pseudo-history; genealogy of Earls of Orkney and prosopography of kings of Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Böglungasaga</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1210–1230</td>
<td>Norwegian royal history covering 1202–1209, earlier short and later long version both almost contemporary</td>
<td>ed. Jónsson 1957; trans. (Norwegian) Storm and Bugge 1914, 1–56; (English) Michaelsson 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hákonar saga Hákonarsonar</td>
<td>HSH</td>
<td>1264–1265</td>
<td>Contemporary account of Hákon Hákonarson’s reign, including his campaign in the Insular Zone in 1263 (Sturla þórðarson)</td>
<td>ed. Vigfússon 1887; trans. Dasent 1894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.35. Medieval Irish royal and ecclesiastic genealogical texts used in this thesis; Charles-Edwards’s (2000, 483–6) Group 1: Middle Irish King Lists; Group 2: Baile Chuinn and associated texts; Group 3: Eleventh-century independent genealogies; I have added a fourth group containing independent information. Early-modern genealogies have been omitted from the present study due to spatial constraints. All dates AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Content Date</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MS Date</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book of Ballymote</td>
<td>BBM</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>East Connacht</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Book of Ballymote</td>
<td>c.1390</td>
<td>ed. O’Brien 1962 (partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Book of Lecan</td>
<td>LML</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>East Connacht</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Book of Lecan</td>
<td>1390×1418</td>
<td>ed. O’Brien 1962 (partial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Uí Maine</td>
<td>LUM</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>East Connacht</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Book of Uí Maine</td>
<td>1392×1394</td>
<td>ed. Macalister 1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laud 610</td>
<td>L610</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Laigin</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Laud 610 (Book of the White Earl)</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>ed. Meyer 1912; 1913; cf. MacNeill 1912; 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicon (Marianus Scottus)</td>
<td>MScot</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Northeast?</td>
<td>11th C</td>
<td>Codex Palatino- Vaticanus no. 830</td>
<td>11th C</td>
<td>ed. Mac Carthy 1892, 93–6; Pertz 1844, 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawlinson B503</td>
<td>B503</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Laigin</td>
<td>11th C</td>
<td>Rawlinson B503</td>
<td>14th C</td>
<td>ed. Best and MacNeill 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.7</td>
<td>H.2.7</td>
<td>Group 4, comp.</td>
<td>East Connacht</td>
<td>700×1400</td>
<td>TCD H.2.7</td>
<td>15th C</td>
<td>ed. Dobbs 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Abb.</td>
<td>Direct Translation</td>
<td>Content Date</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS Date</td>
<td>Published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genelach Rig n Alben</td>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>Genealogy of the kings of Alba</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Rawlinson B502; Lebor Laignech</td>
<td>12th C; 12th C</td>
<td>O’Brien 1962, 328–9; cf. Hughes 1972, 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceithre primchenéla Dáil Riata</td>
<td>CPDR</td>
<td>Four main kindreds of Dál Riata</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>Lebor Laignech; Book of Ballymote; Book of Lecan</td>
<td>12th C; c.1390; 1390×1418</td>
<td>O’Brien 1962, 426; cf. Dumville 2000; Fraser 2009, 146–7; Broun 2014; 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniugud Senchasa Fher n-Alban</td>
<td>MSFA</td>
<td>Statement of the pedigree of the men of Alba</td>
<td>10th C or later</td>
<td>TCD H.2.7; Book of Ballymote; Book of Lecan</td>
<td>c.1350; c.1390; 1390×1418; 1650</td>
<td>Bannerman 2016[1974]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genelaig Albanensisim</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Genealogy of the people of Alba</td>
<td>12th C</td>
<td>TCD H.2.7; Book of Ballymote; Book of Lecan</td>
<td>c.1350; 1390; 1390×1418</td>
<td>Bannerman 2016, 65–8; Anderson 1922a, cliii–clvii; Skene 1867, 308–17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3. Iron Age and Medieval Settlement in Ergadia: Chronology, Distribution, Function and Status

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to use morphological and chronological evidence to identify the continuities and discontinuities in the forms of settlement used in Ergadia from the Early Iron Age right through to the late medieval period, i.e., c.800BC–AD1400. At the outset, it must be restated that the morphological classifications employed here (discussed in 2.2.2, summarised in Table 3.1) themselves are not absolute, nor are any social relationships implied from their form and distribution. Rather, the divisions employed here are largely for the purpose of structuring the large dataset, and there is much scope for potential overlap between them.

The sum of available evidence will be used to investigate the potential function and relative status of the various settlements. In an attempt to build social structure from the bottom up, the secular settlement forms are in general presented in Sections 3.2 to 3.10 from the lowest to highest potential status, beginning with unenclosed settlements. This is followed by a discussion of ecclesiastic sites and cemetery-settlements (3.11 and 3.12). Following this, the possible indicators of colonial activity are discussed (3.13–3.15). The chapter will close with a set of conclusions framed by cumulative frequency plots for the forms of secular settlement and a sum of references to ecclesiastic sites.

Space precludes a full discussion of the large amount of information associated with each site; this takes place instead in A.3, where a full list is also found of each site in each class of monument, together with some associated basic geolocation data. As stated in 2.5, the chronological evidence for each site within each category is portrayed in a series of diagrams. The abbreviations used in the diagrams are available in Section 0.2. When comparing between diagrams, please note that the timescale at the bottom of the diagrams differs between that used for Sections 3.3–3.10 (unenclosed to terraced enclosed settlements; timescale A: 2000BC–AD2000) and that used for ecclesiastic sites and furnished burials (timescale B, 400BC–AD1600). This makes it easier to portray the associated evidence, which has a much narrower chronology in the second group of sites. It also facilitates comparing between the case-study regions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unenclosed settlement</td>
<td>settlement with no obvious enclosing features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic stone roundhouse</td>
<td>curvilinear stone-built structures, most likely roofed, &lt;200m² in total internal area</td>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small settlement enclosure</td>
<td>enclosed settlements approximately 200–500m² in total internal area</td>
<td>SSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium settlement enclosure</td>
<td>enclosed settlements approximately 500–2000m² in total internal area</td>
<td>MSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crannog</td>
<td>enclosed sites on artificial or augmented natural islands with a core of radially arranged timbers and packverk brush, often interspersed with layers of stone, clay, gravel or sand; occasionally with timber piles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large settlement enclosure</td>
<td>enclosed settlements approximately 2000–10,000m² in total internal area</td>
<td>LSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large settlement enclosures</td>
<td>total internal enclosed area greater internal area than 1ha/10,000m²</td>
<td>vLSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed promontory</td>
<td>natural topography used to form &gt;66% of enclosing element</td>
<td>EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced enclosed settlement</td>
<td>outcrop or ridge with central enclosed area surrounded by enclosed terraces on lower slopes</td>
<td>TES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery-settlement</td>
<td>large settlement enclosures containing both domestic structures and burials, with no church/chapel building identifiable</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early monastic site</td>
<td>monastic institution pre-dating high-medieval standardisation of monasticism, may have had pastoral roles in the secular community, others did not, some sites potential foci for secular settlement, some sites part of wider federations, or paruchia, headed by high-status institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious house</td>
<td>monastic institution tied to one of the several Continental religious orders introduced into the Insular Zone in the high medieval period and subsequently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Christian ritual centre with resident ritual specialist(s), with pastoral role associated with a territorial parish especially post-c.AD1100, pre-c.AD1100 catchment area less well-definable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>sub-parochial dependant ritual centre, mainly post-dating c.AD1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>seat of a bishop, main ritual centre of a diocese, i.e. territorial unit consisting of several parishes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motte (motte and bailey)</td>
<td>large mounds consisting of layers of earth and gravel, usually topped with some form of structure, often within or adjacent to enclosure (bailey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hall-keep</strong></td>
<td>defensive, two-storey keep containing a hall, low emphasis on enclosing walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Castle-of-enclosure</strong></td>
<td>heavily defended curtain wall, usually with corner towers, flanking towers, and gatehouse, principal residence within enclosing walls, non-defensive internal structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform castle</strong></td>
<td>a group of uncastellated buildings located on rock outcrop or scarped glacial mound inside a reasonably massive bank, mortared or unmortared stone wall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towerhouse</strong></td>
<td>smaller, later, less-defensible version of masonry castle, usually within stone-enclosed bawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2. Numbers of each of the monument forms discussed in this chapter, and their state of research; multiple morphologically distinct phases counted as separate sites; * = doubtful reference; (parentheses = surface finds or antiquarian evidence from site with later excavations):
arch. fabric = closely datable architectural material only (e.g. windows with semi-pointed arches); more general morphological dating covered by Freq. column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unenclosed settlement</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9 (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crannog</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 (+1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine crannog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone islet</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island enclosure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed early monastic site</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (+3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early ecclesiastic site</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(indeterminate function)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery-settlements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(153)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious house</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longphort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwork</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motte</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall-keep</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle-of-enclosure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep-centred castle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform castle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Unenclosed Settlement

Morphology
The identification and dating of unenclosed settlements rely on evidence obtained from excavation or surface finds. The nine souterrains not associated with an enclosed settlement can be assigned to the MIA–LIA on morphological grounds, supported by the available excavated evidence. While two wooden round-houses appear with souterrains, Glen Cloy on Arran and Mote Hill in Kintyre, dating curvilinear structures by morphological analogy is almost impossible due to their long usage from the Neolithic to the early modern period. The same holds for rectilinear forms dating from the late first millennium AD to the modern era. Therefore, the group of 42 sites presented here might only represent the tip of the proverbial iceberg (a series of more tenuous examples are discussed in A.4). They at least indicate that the distribution of enclosed settlements only tells part of the story. There is much variation within this group of 42 sites, from clusters of small curvilinear structures at Ardachuple, to sand-dune structures at Machrins, to caves at Ellary and Keil, to the single large Iron Age roundhouse at Glenshellach, to dispersed settlements located close to ecclesiastic sites such as Inchmarnock 5 and 8 and Glebe Field, Iona.

Distribution
The chronological diagrams are broken into the principal sub-regions of the Ergadia case-study. Map 3.1 represents the total distribution of unenclosed settlement from all periods, with Maps 3.2–3.4 representing the three main chronological groupings. It should be noted that many of the denser areas are due to higher amounts of developer-funded archaeology, e.g. mid-Lorn or higher levels of field work, e.g. Coll and Tiree (Beveridge 1903).
Map 3.1. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ergadia dating to the Late Iron Age (LIA).
Map 3.2. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ergadia dating to the early medieval period (EMP).
Map 3.3. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ergadia dating to the Viking Age (VA).
Map 3.4. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ergadia dating to the high medieval period (HMP).
**Chronology**

With so few radiocarbon dates, it is difficult to say anything beyond that unenclosed settlements were in use right across all of the periods being studied. Breaking it down by region, the majority of evidence from Cowal and Bute (Figure 3.1) belongs to the high–late medieval period(s), but all of the sites except Barmore Wood were multiperiod with evidence from the MIA, LIA, EMP and/or VA. Future research on the cluster of house platforms at Barmore Wood might also indicate use across several periods. The single site from Arran dates to the MIA, whereas the only example in Kintyre to had evidence for several periods of use (Figure 3.2). For Mid Argyll (Figure 3.3), beyond the multiperiod use of several caves it is difficult to state anything on two quoted radiocarbon dates from open settlements, but there is a similar spread apparent, with one site in the VA and one in the HMP. For Lorn and Northern Argyll (Figure 3.4), the evidence is spread across several periods, but there is a noticeable fall-off after c.AD1000 in the Lorn sites, bar Oban Bay, with continuity into the HMP apparent at the two Ardnamurchan sites. There is a noticeable cluster in the Viking Age apparent in the Hebridean sites (Figure 3.5), with earlier phases also apparent at Crossapol and the published excavations at Ardnave and Kilellan. The significance of this will be discussed in Chapter 6.
Figure 3.1. Chronological diagrams for unenclosed settlements in Cowal and Bute using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.2. Chronological diagrams for unenclosed settlements in Arran with timescale A. No unenclosed settlements dating to the period in question are known from Kintyre. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
### Ellary Farm 1, Knapdale [cave]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GU-2660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunagoil ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow globular bead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GU-2659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU-2658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone needles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone beads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA hand-pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oval-headed pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucible (Type C or D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4a</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA ring brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4b</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMWGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inveraray Coop, Mid Argyll

- SUERC-59057

### Killinochonoch Hill, Kilmartin, Mid Argyll

- SUERC-34968

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 3.3. Chronological diagrams for Mid Argyll with timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
### Ardentrive, Kerrera

**IHCP**
- Bone animal-headed pin

### Dunstaffnage and Dunbeg, Lorn

**Phase 1**
- SUERC-44889

**Phase 2**
- SUERC-44900
- SUERC-44890
- SUERC-44896
- SUERC-44897
- SUERC-44880
- SUERC-44895
- SUERC-44898

**Phase 3**
- SUERC-44884
- SUERC-44886
- SUERC-44885
- SUERC-44894
- SUERC-44899
- SUERC-44887
- SUERC-44888

### Kilmore, Lorn

- OxA-8534
- OxA-8437

---

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 3.4. Chronological diagrams for unenclosed settlements in Lorn and Northern Argyll using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
### Iona (Glebe Field)

- HUCP
- CA-RHP
- Steatite bowl
- Whetstone of Norwegian schist

### Kilellan, Islay

**Phase 3**
- GU-3518
- GU-3519
- Dunagoil ware

**Phase 4b**
- Dunagoil ware

**Phase 4b**
- GU-3516
- GU-3515
- Dunagoil ware
- Black bone pin copy of Roman jet pin

**Phase 5**
- HUCP
- Glass bead (Class 15)
- CA loop-headed pin
- Single-sided tanged iron knife
- Single-sided tanged iron knife
- Bone mounts
- Bone gaming pieces

### Kilkenneth, Tiree [S]

### Killunaig, Coll

- CA-RHP
- CA loop-headed pin
- Bone pin with round head

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 3.5. Chronological diagrams for unenclosed settlements in the Hebrides with timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

While the majority of the unenclosed settlements would seem to be related to agricultural activity, some may have fulfilled specialist roles in relation to, for example, iron production, as would seem to have been the case at St Columba’s Cave (Tolan-Smith 2001, 25–72) and Big Cave (Ritchie 1966–7). This might account for the presence of personal adornments and imported material such as Samian and imitation Samian at these sites. While both of these sites were located in caves, a large amount of slag is also known from the MIA roundhouse/souterrain pairing at Glen Cloy on Arran, which also engaged in agricultural activity (Mudie 2007). The HMP sites at Loch Doilean, Ardnamurchan (Ellis 2016b) and Ardachuple, Cowal (Rennie 1997) seem to have specialised in charcoal production, but again the inhabitants may also have engaged in agricultural activity. Therefore, in the main,
unenclosed settlements are taken here as primarily farming settlements.

Considering the number of farm-names (see 3.14 for ON examples) that appear in areas of relatively low density in terms of ASRs and settlement enclosures, it would seem as though there are many unenclosed settlements still to be discovered. Such settlements may well have been associated with several social strata as yet invisible in the landscape existing right through this project’s chronological sweep. Their occupants’ existence might be hinted at by texts such as the MSFA (see Nieke 1984 II, 134–40 for speculation on Islay in this regard) and the accounts of battles in the annals. Were future research on settlement in the region to focus on targeted excavation and dating of such settlements, including at the locations of more modern unenclosed settlements, there might be a chance of better understanding the lives and habits of what might have been the majority of the population, which would lead to a complete re-evaluation of the socio-political system in the wider region.
3.3 Atlantic stone roundhouses (ASRs)

Morphology

ASRs represent both the most numerous and variegated group of pre-modern secular settlement sites in Ergadia. As discussed in 2.2.2, there is much variance in terms of shape and the presence of complex intramural features. As can be seen in Table 3.3, only 1/31 CASRs and 1/38 pCASRs have an irregular shape. The corresponding figures for circular examples are 14/31 and 21/38. There might be grounds then for treating CASR-B1, CASR-C1, pCASR-B1 and pCASR-C1 sites as a separate sub-category, one which would correspond to, and expand on, the group of sites referred to as ‘brochs’ elsewhere (MacKie 1997; 2007). The four CASR-D3 structures might be another subgroup, possibly more related to the series of small SSEs, especially seeing as one of them, Kildonan Bay, has excavated evidence indicating that it was an enclosure rather than a roundhouse (A.3 entry). Some of these clusters might be socially significant, not least due to the small percentage of the overall number of ASRs. This will be discussed further below in the section dealing with function and status.
Table 3.3. Basic morphological groups and sub-groups of ASRs in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>ASR</th>
<th>pCASR</th>
<th>CASR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Circular or sub-circular, &lt;50m² internally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Ovoid, &lt;50m² internally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular, &lt;50m² internally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Irregular &gt;50m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group A</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Circular or sub-circular, 50–99m²</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Ovoid, 50–99m²</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular, 50–99m²</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Irregular, 50–99m²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group B</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Circular or sub-circular, 100–149m²</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Ovoid, 100–149m²</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular, 100–149m²</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Irregular 100–149m²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group C</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Circular or sub-circular, 150–199m²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Ovoid, 150–199m²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular, 150–199m²</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Irregular 150–199m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group D</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution

As can be seen from their general distribution (Maps 3.5–3.6), ASRs tend to be located in coastal areas. When found inland, they are located in valleys, even if they themselves might occupy rock outcrops or rock-stacks. They are located in or close to the areas of cultivated land on the Roy Map, and while the LCA is not a very good indicator of Iron Age or medieval farming, there is at least some general correlation visible between better farmland and ASRs.

Turning to the regions, as Figure 3.6 and Map 3.5 demonstrate, there is a distinct lack of ASRs in the southeast of the case study in Cowal and Bute (6 ASRs). In comparison, Colonsay alone has 13. Clearly, there were different choices of settlement form being made across the different sub-regions of the case-study. Another clear regional difference visible in Maps 3.7–3.8 is the combination of complex features and circularity with location. All of the CASR-B1s (Figure 3.7) are located on Mull and Tiree except for an outlier at Inverglen near Strachur in northern Cowal. Of the five CASR-C1s, only Dùn Rostan in Knapdale is located on the mainland. All of the CASR-D4s are located outside the Hebrides region.

Figure 3.6. ASRs by sub-region of the Ergadia case study.
Figure 3.7. CASRs and pCASRs of all shapes and sizes by sub-region.
Map 3.5. Sum distribution of ASRs of all forms in Ergadia.
Map 3.6. Sum distribution of CASRs and pCASRs of all forms in Ergadia.
Map 3.7. Sum distribution of round (in plan) ASRs, CASRs and pCASRs in Ergadia.
Map 3.8. Distribution of confirmed CASRs in Ergadia by shape.
Map 3.9. Sum distribution of ovoid (in plan) ASRs, CASRs and pCASRs in Ergadia.
Map 3.10. Sum distribution of D-shaped, rectilinear or triangular (in plan) ASRs, CASRs and pCASRs in Ergadia.
Map 3.11. Sum distribution of irregular-shaped (in plan) ASRs, CASRs and pCASRs in Ergadia.
Chronology

Unfortunately, the dataset from excavated ASRs is not large enough to fully test the system of morphology-based sub-classifications. Therefore, all of the evidence from all of the sites is presented below in the series of chronological diagrams, broken down by region in the same way as the unenclosed settlements above. Two things are apparent. One is that almost all of the excavated ASRs (as opposed to those with associated surface finds) have evidence for multiple periods of occupation, from the MIA to the HMP and beyond. The CASR-C1 at Tirefour and the pCASR-C1 at Rahoy (Figure 3.10) are exceptions to this, which might be significant.

This brings us to the second apparent pattern: that CASR-B1 and CASR-C1 sites, or circular ASRs with complex mural features 50–150m² in internal area are a phenomenon of the MIA and LIA with little evidence for occupation after this, even where multiple phases are apparent, as at Dùn Mòr Bhalla and Dùn Mòr a’ Chaolais on Tiree (Figure 3.11). Material from the pCASR-B1 at Kingscross Point, Arran (Figure 3.8) was reused in the mound for a furnished burial coin dated to after c.AD850, which would seem to indicate that the ASR was out of use prior to this.

A third point might be made in terms of regionality: that sites in Mull, Coll, Tiree and Northern Argyll (Figures 3.10–3.11) tend to have little or no evidence for occupation after AD500, whereas sites in Kintyre and Mid Argyll (Figures 3.8–3.9) have a significant amount of evidence for occupation c.AD500–1000 and again in the period c.AD1200–1500. Furthermore, while the latter group of sites have evidence of occupation in the LIA, there is very little evidence for occupation in the MIA. The immanent publication of the radiocarbon dates from various excavations in Mid Argyll and Knapdale as part of the ‘Dalriada Project’ (Regan 2007) might help prove or disprove this third point.

What all of this indicates is that, on the present evidence, there were different processes at work in different parts of the case-study region at different times. Different choices were being made in terms of shape and mural features in the MIA and LIA. This might be coupled with the lack of Vaul and Clettraval ware at ‘mainland’ ASRs, which seems to be both chronologically and socially significant. It would seem as though the northwest portion of the case study took part in the same fashions in relation to buildings and pottery as the rest of the Hebrides, whereas Kintyre, Arran, Knapdale and Mid Argyll did not. Targeted research in Bute, Cowal and Lorn, as well as Islay, Jura and Colonsay would help us to better understand this potential morphological and chronological regionality.
Figure 3.8. Chronological diagrams for ASRs in Kintyre and Arran using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.9. Chronological diagrams for ASRs in Knapdale and Mid Argyll using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.10. Chronology diagrams for ASRs in Lorn and Northern Argyll with timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
An Caisteal, Mull [pCASR-B1]

iHCP

Rotary quern

An Dùnan, Sàlum Bay, Tiree [ASR-C2]

iHCP

An Dùn, Balephetrish, Tiree [ASR-B1]

iHCP

Vaul ware

An Dùn, Rockside, Islay [ASR-D2]

Vaul ware

Udal ‘Late Norse’ pottery

Dùnan nan Nighean, Colonsay [ASR-A3]

iHCP

Dùn Beannaig, Tiree [ASR-C2]

DHCP

Dùn Beic, Coll [ASR-D3]

DHCP

Vaul ware

Dùn Boraige Bige, Tiree [ASR-B1]

Vaul ware

Dùn Boraige Mòire, Tiree [CASR-B2]

Vaul ware

Dùn Hynish, Tiree [ASR-D2]

Dunagoil ware

Clettraval ware

HUCP

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 3.11. Chronological diagrams for ASRs in the Hebrides using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Function and status

In terms of their function, one debate has been whether CASRs were group refuges, elite residences or farmhouses (MacKie 1974; 1997). There is nothing to preclude all three, similar to the way various forms of castles combined all three. At Dùn Mòr Bhalla (Vaul), the rotary querns and burnt grain point towards grain processing and consumption, and the bone assemblages indicate the animal consumption patterns across the various periods, initially dominated by sheep/goat, before cattle came to gain equal footing in the CASR phases (Noddle in MacKie 1974, 187–98). This might be significant, and indicate either feasting or surplus consumption, or it might be that a small number of cows were eaten continually over a long period of time.

Both crucible and mould fragments related to the production of copper-alloy items were found in the two main phases at Dùn Mòr Bhalla (Figure 3.11; MacKie 1974, 150–3). When combined with the glass, pottery and copper-alloy items originating within the Roman Empire, and the elaborate architecture of the settlement itself, it would seem that Dùn Mòr functioned as a high-status settlement during at least part of the period c.200BC–AD400. This may be revised in light of future investigations at other sites on Tiree, which would provide important grounds for comparison. It might also account for the later insertion of burials into the site, possibly as a means of building a connection with the past in the EMP. The presence of a brooch of the La Tène 1c style at Tòrr an Fhamhair in Rahoy (Figure 3.10) might indicate similar social status.

The presence of Samian pottery at Dùn Fhinn (Figure 3.8) indicates that the occupants of ASRs without complex features could also have access to long-range networks of exchange. The presence of two penannular brooches in Phase 2 at the site would further seem to underline that the occupants of the site might have been of comparatively high social status. The same would seem to be the case for the occupants of two further Kintyre sites, Kildalloig and Kildonan. The relationship of glass beads and ring-headed pins to relative social status in western Scotland has not been fully explored, but the presence of one or both of these items of personal adornment may well have had a social function, e.g., at Eilean Rìgh or Balure (Figure 3.9).
3.4 Small settlement enclosures (SSEs)

Morphology

The presence of intramural features is so rare in SSEs (Table 3.4) that it does not warrant being treated separately. Only Ardifuir 1 definitely has an intramural cell or gallery. Tràigh Machir on Islay was noted by Piggott and Piggott (Piggott and Piggott 1945–6, 102) as having a possible gallery, but it is no longer visible (RCAHMS 1984, 123). A possible cell or mural stairs is noted at Ballygroggan 1 (RCAHMS 1971, 77–8), but this may be due to later disturbance. 25 sites have walls >4m thick, and future research might find intramural features in these. However, considering that only 1/111 SSEs in Ergadia definitely has intramural features, the 25 sites have not been included here as having possible complex features, in contrast to those in the ASR series.

No SSE can be said to be truly bivallate, i.e. enclosed by two complete enclosures. 40 sites have outworks, 24 sites have annexes, but all of the annexes seem to be later than the core SSE. 33 SSEs are incompletely artificially enclosed, with topographical features such as cliffs making up the remainder of the enclosing element. The shape of all five of the incomplete ovoid SSEs would seem to have been due to erosion. Beyond this, it is difficult to state how many were planned as incomplete and how many are incomplete due to erosion and robbing-out. Finally, due to the fact that many of the enclosing elements survive as grassy banks, it is difficult to definitively state what proportion of sites were enclosed in drystone walls, earthen banks, and earthen banks with stone revetments, respectively. The presence of vitrified material in the walls/banks might indicate the presence of timber-lacing, which might be chronologically significant. However, such evidence is rare, as it requires an event of intense burning and its subsequent identification. It has been identified at six SSEs, four via excavation. One caveat is that such material could potentially be redeposited in wall core, rather than formed in-situ, which limits its utility as a chronological marker. Another is that timber-lacing could have been added to a pre-existing enclosure at a much later date, which would seem to have been the case at Macewan’s Castle, for example.
Table 3.4. Basic morphological subdivisions of SSEs in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Internal area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>Vitr.</th>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Outworks</th>
<th>Annexe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSE-E1</td>
<td>circular or sub-circular</td>
<td>200–299 m²</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-E2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>200–299 m²</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-E3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular</td>
<td>200–299 m²</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 possible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-E4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>200–299 m²</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group SSE-E</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 (I)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-F1</td>
<td>circular or sub-circular</td>
<td>300–500 m²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-F2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>300–500 m²</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-F3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear or sub-triangular</td>
<td>300–500 m²</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 possible</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE-F4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>300–500 m²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group SSE-F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>(I)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution

As can be seen in Figure 3.12 and Map 3.12, Northern Argyll excepted, there is a reasonably normal spread of SSEs across the wider region, with a pronounced distribution on the west mainland coast, Bute and southeast Islay. They are largely coastal, but that could be said of most settlement distributions in the region.

![Bar chart showing distribution of SSEs by sub-region.]

Figure 3.12. Distribution of SSEs by sub-region.
Map 3.12. Distribution of SSEs in Ergadia.
Chronology

While radiocarbon dates are available for only one site, Loch Glashan, and two quoted dates available for another, Cnoc an Ràith, the dating evidence from the SSEs in Ergadha indicates a similar spread across the MIA, LIA, EMP, VA and HMP as seen with the ASRs. 3/12 SSEs are definitely multiperiod, and excavation might indicate that several more are also. Only two of the datable SSEs are in the Hebridean zone (Figure 3.17), both of which are irregular SSE-E4s of similar date to the CASRs and ASRs in that sub-region of the case study (Figure 3.5). Only two sites seem to have evidence after AD900, Dùn an Fheurain and the HMP phase at Ugadale (Figures 3.14, 3.16).

One of the more striking differences is between Ardifuir and Loch Glashan, which are arguably very similar sites located in the same general area, SSE-E1s, both almost perfect circles with internal diameters of 19m (Figure 3.15). As discussed in its appendix entry, only a small portion of Loch Glashan was excavated with the aim of dating its construction, rather than occupation, so it may well have had phases of activity corresponding to the artefactual evidence at Ardifuir. Conversely, Ardifuir was explored by antiquarians, and modern excavation might demonstrate that it had an earlier, MIA phase. The evidence from Cnoc an Ràith (Figure 3.13), one of a small group of earthen enclosures similar to Irish raths would seem to place it exactly contemporary to the use of raths in Ireland.

![Figure 3.13. Chronological diagrams for SSEs in Bute using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.](modified from OxCal v4.3.2, Bronk Ramsey (2017); r5 IntCal13 atmospheric curve (Reimer et al. 2013))
Figure 3.14. Chronological diagrams for SSEs in Kintyre using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.15. Chronological diagrams for SSEs in Mid Argyll and Knapdale using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate
beginning of the HMP.

**Figure 3.16.** Chronological diagrams for SSEs in Lorn using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Figure 3.17.** Chronological diagrams for SSEs in the Hebrides using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Function and status

The prevalence of artefacts such as rotary querns, and the presence of plant and animal foodstuff remains in associated deposits (A.3) would seem to indicate that SSEs were primarily domestic structures, perhaps for a nuclear family. The presence of annexes might be related to farming. The presence of spindle-whorls might also be an indication of domestic activity, but whether such activity was confined to occupants of certain settlement forms cannot be said on the present evidence. Similar to ASRs, the location of the majority of sites in locations not easily accessible might be related to defensive considerations, especially in relation to those sites with outworks cutting-off their easiest approaches. However, it is unlikely that a single explanation suits all sites—there may have been other considerations at work. For example, it may have been to avoid losing a portion of potentially cultivatable land to settlement, to avoid wild animals, or to utilise the prevailing wind to keep midges away during the summer. They may well have only been seasonably occupied, with a less-exposed domicile utilised during the winter.

Considering that so few sites have been excavated, any discussions of the relationship between the distribution of material culture, morphology and status must be provisional. Within the group of SSEs, Ardifuir 1 does stand out, due to its intramural features and its occupants’ involvement in non-ferrous metalworking indicated by the crucible fragments and ingot mould. Furthermore, the presence of both red-slipped pottery (be it Samian, ARSW or PRSW) and E-ware can be taken as an indication that the occupants were connected to the networks within which objects, people and ideas moved on the Atlantic Arc and beyond. The presence of a curated polished stone axe might also be an indication that the occupants’ position in social space might have been elevated in comparison to the occupants of surrounding settlements. The evidence points to at least one phase of Ardifuir 1 being contemporary to Dunadd (3.9), seemingly one of the regional ideological-military-economic-political (IMEP) foci, which might have been the source of some of the non-local items.

Dùn an Fheurain also indicates connections to similar networks, via the presence of red-slipped pottery and an antler pottery stamp, and perhaps some of the CA items, such as the possible lyre fragments. CA rings and pins represent something of an unknown quantity in relation to status. They may be visible symbols of power, or fashion accessories (not that the two can ever be separated); it is argued here that they might part of a package of indicators of status, a package that also included living in an enclosed settlement.
3.5 Medium settlement enclosures (MSEs)

Morphology

Despite including a much larger range of enclosed areas, 500–1999m$^2$ (Table 3.5), there is another decrease in overall number in comparison to smaller classes. A total of 85 sites of various sizes and topographical locations are encompassed by the medium settlement enclosure (MSE) classification. Only one site has intramural features, Dùn na Maraig (Christison 1903–4, 234–6; Campbell and Sandeman 1961–2, 53; RCAHMS 1988, 164), in the form of a possible guard cell leading off the entrance. Another, Dùn Mhuirich, has a gatehouse feature outside the entrance to the inner of its two enclosures. Future research might find similar features elsewhere, but it cannot be used to sub-divide the sites here. 7/9 bivallate MSEs have their valla immediately outside one another, similar to bivallate raths in Ireland (in that respect, if not any others). At Dùn Eibhinn, Colonsay, the outer enclosure is 10m downslope on the outcrop on which the site is located, and most likely dates to the undated major alterations of the internal enclosure on the summit (Grieve 1923, 208–12; Piggott and Piggott 1945–6, 88–9; RCAHMS 1984, 89–90). The same might be the case at Dùn Mhuirich, Knapdale (RCAHMS 1988, 189–90). Both trivallate MSEs also have closely spaced valla. All sites with more than one vallum/wall are found in sub-group H, whereas 5/6 MSEs with evidence of vitrification fall within sub-group G. In some respects, it is a more homogenous group of sites than the SSEs; only one site, Barr Mains (H1), is located in open ground, and Kilkeddan (G3), another Kintyre site is located on a low knoll. Six further sites are located on shelves or hills summits accessible from more than 180°. Every other site is located on a ridge crest, outcrop, knoll or hill summit, island, or in one case, on a rock stack.
Table 3.5. basic morphological subdivisions of MSEs in Ergadia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Internal area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>BiV</th>
<th>MuV</th>
<th>Vitr.</th>
<th>Out-works</th>
<th>Annexe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSE-G1</td>
<td>(sub-) circular</td>
<td>500–999m²</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-G2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>500–999m²</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-G3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear/</td>
<td>500–999m²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-G4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>500–999m²</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group MSE-G</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-H1</td>
<td>(sub-) circular</td>
<td>1000–1999m²</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-H2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>1000–1999m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-H3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear/</td>
<td>1000–1999m²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE-H4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>1000–1999m²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Sub-group MSE-H</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution**

Figure 3.18 demonstrates a reasonably even spread between regions, but Map 3.13 indicates pronounced densities around the Laggan in Kintyre, northern Knapdale/southern Lorn, western Mull, Arran and Colonsay. This might indicate the operation of local traditions, although SSEs are located in the same general areas, except for on Colonsay, where there are none.
Figure 3.18. MSEs by sub-region.
Map 3.13. Distribution of medium settlement enclosures (MSEs) in Ergadia.
Chronology

Radiocarbon dates have been obtained from a single MSE. Furthermore, unlike those classes already encountered, very few have produced narrowly dateable artefacts, or indeed any artefacts at all. As it stands, the evidence points towards MSEs being in use in all phases of the Iron Age, with a cluster in MIA, with potential reuse in later periods (Figures 3.19–21).

The geographical spread of datable sites is less than ideal. There is no MSE from Lorn, Northern Argyll or Islay with dating evidence. The radiocarbon dates from Eilean an Dùin (Figure 3.20) are far from conclusive; GU-1815 is evidently from mixed carbon and both date-ranges are subject to the Hallstatt Plateau. Furthermore, both samples were taken from deposits overlain by the enclosure bank (Nieke and Boyd 1987, 55–6), which means that the burning event that created the charcoal might at best have been immediately prior to construction. The burning may even have preceded construction by several centuries and have been related to natural processes.

No other MSEs have associated radiocarbon dates, but, hopefully, the recent excavations at Dùn Mhuirich might help redress this imbalance. Ritchie and Lane (1978–80, 209, 215, 217) are most likely correct in their suggestion that the homogeneity of the pottery from Dùn Cùl Bhuirg indicates one main phase of occupation c.100BC–AD300 (Figure 3.21). However, the mould and glazed jug sherds demonstrate that there may have been two subsequent reoccupations of the site. Two other sites also had activity in the HM P, Dùn Eiphinn and Dùn Mhuirich. The only evidence from Dùn Eiphinn is from the HMP (Figure 3.21). The bulk of the evidence from Dunagoil on Bute would seem to be MIA and possibly LIA, but there is a possibility that the site was reoccupied in some way in the EMP, based on the glass bead and the HUCP (Figure 3.19).
Figure 3.19. Chronological diagrams for MSEs on Bute using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.20. Chronological diagrams for MSEs in Mid Argyll using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.21. Chronological diagrams for MSEs in the Hebrides using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

MSEs may or may not have been for communal defence, or some other communal activity. Altogether, 22 sites have some form of settlement evidence in the form of house, hut or cell platforms. However, without excavation it is impossible to say whether or not they are contemporary, post-dating or even pre-dating the construction of the artificial defences.

In contrast to the SSE series, there is no material evidence for the occupants of any MSEs participating in networks of exchange involving items from outside Atlantic Scotland, at least not until the apparent re-use of certain sites in the high–late Middle Ages. This might be both chronologically and socially significant, with the caveat that information is limited.

Rotary querns seem to only appear in the assemblage from one MSE, which might indicate that grain was not processed on site in most instances. Animal bone is known from Dùn Cùl Bhuirc (Noddle in Ritchie and Lane 1978–80, 225–9). However, the minimum number of individual animals (MNI) across all species numbers only 42, cf. 285 from Dùn Mòr Vaul, but within this, cattle, pig, deer and sheep appear in that order. A large amount of fish and
shellfish remains appear in the Dùn Mhuirich assemblage (A.3; Regan 2013), which indicates exploitation of adjacent marine resources. However, it is not completely clear to which phase of activity these belong. It may be that some of the sites, especially those more inaccessible and exposed, but in strategic locations may either have been used for defensive purposes, or perhaps were occupied by individuals whose primary occupation was not subsistence farming. They might also have been used for group activities such as feasting or were garrisoned in times of uncertainty. Or all of these.

3.6 Crannogs, stone islets and island enclosures

Morphology
The morphological subdivisions in Table 3.6 are employed here in an attempt to identify patterns in the evidence. The divisions are not absolute. Crannogs and stone islets have been separated here, but they were most likely contemporary and functioned in similar ways, as discussed in 2.2.2. Furthermore, several sites have more than one phase of activity and there may have been movement from one form to another. An example of this is the islet in Loch Seil, which seems to have originally been a stone islet, with wooden piles added later (Cavers 2010, 60, 189–90). The morphological division might have been due to the lower availability of wood, necessitating a greater use of stone. Future research might indicate that the division is related to that between wooden and stone roundhouses. Three crannogs are located in seawater, in areas of sheltered mud-flats close to the coast. These might be treated as a separate sub-group, and were one to be properly excavated, they might compare to the group of such sites in Clyde and Beauly Firths (Hale 2000) in terms of both morphology and chronology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mod. exc.</th>
<th>Antiq. exc.</th>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Surface finds</th>
<th>C14</th>
<th>Doc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>crannog</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marine crannog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stone islet</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>island settlement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution
The main difference in terms of distribution would seem to be that crannogs are more likely to be found in ‘mainland’ Argyll and stone islets on the islands (Map 3.14). The largest cluster of crannogs is on and near Loch Awe. Figure 3.22 demonstrates that crannogs are rare in the Hebridean zone, whereas Figure 3.23 demonstrates that stone islets are rare on the ‘mainland’, although not as rare as crannogs on the Hebrides. This may have been down to cultural or individual choices being made, but the availability of wood may also have been a factor, as already noted.

![Figure 3.22. Crannogs by sub-region.](image1)

![Figure 3.23. Number of stone islets by sub-region.](image2)
Map 3.14. Distribution of crannogs (including marine crannogs) and stone islets in Ergadia.
Map 3.15. Sum distribution of medieval island settlements in Ergadia.

**Chronology**

Without excavation, all that can be said of a crannog or stone islet in Ergadia is that it is likely to date to anytime between the EIA and HMP. Crannogs and stone islets are very well represented in terms of absolute dating evidence. However, in line with the rest of Scotland,
most of these dates have come from samples taken from structural timbers lacking stratigraphic context during survey work (Ashmore 2004, 159–60; Cavers 2010, 187–91; Crone 2012, 147). This makes it difficult to state when in the settlement’s life cycle sampled material might come from. The same problems occur in relation to surface finds and even to finds from excavations—due to the complex taphonomic processes at work, it is often the case that later material has ended up in a stratigraphically lower position, e.g., the late-first-millennium AD axe at Loch Glashan (Crone and Campbell 2005, 65–8). This can render any discussion of phasing very difficult, and the simplest option might be to treat the assemblages as one long phase, in the diagrams at least. As can be seen in Figures 3.24–3.27, the radiocarbon dates and artefactual evidence indicate the long period of potential use, if not construction, of crannogs in the Ergadia case study, extending from the Bronze Age–Iron Age transition to the seventeenth century AD (see Henderson 1998; Harding 2000; Cavers 2010; Crone 2012).

Stone islets are much more poorly dated, it is difficult to generalise from two sites with radiocarbon dates spread across such a wide date-range (Figure 3.28), and the artefacts from Eilean na Chomhairle are most likely related to the (ill-fated) construction of a stone hall there in the HMP (Caldwell 2010).

Figure 3.24. Chronological diagrams for crannogs in Cowal using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.25. Chronological diagrams for crannogs in Kintyre using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.26. Chronological diagrams for crannogs in Mid Argyll using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line
(AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.27. Chronological diagrams for crannogs in Lorn using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.28. Chronological diagrams for stone islets in Ergadia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
**Figure 3.29.** Chronological diagrams for island settlements in Ergadia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

Cavers (2010, 161–2) builds upon Morrison’s (1985) connection between crannogs and relatively good farmland by superimposing crannog distributions on the *Land Capability for Agriculture in Scotland Map* (LCA; see Birnie et al. 2010). Cavers (2010, 159–60) also examines Morrison’s (1985, 76–8) suggestion that crannogs (and stone-islets) and ASRs and SSEs were settlements with similarities in distribution, size and function, noting that:

> As basic geographical analyses show, crannogs and duns may adhere to similar locational principals [*sic*], but there is nothing unique about these principals [*sic*] that tells us more about these sites than that they were probably farmsteads.

Cavers (2010, 163) further notes that:

> A view of crannogs as superior to duns, which were constructed as second choice settlements when suitable loch conditions are not available cannot be sustained (cf. Nieke 1983, 305), and on the available evidence the contrast between duns and crannogs must have had significance beyond simple geographical circumstances.

Cavers (2010, 160) draws attention to his spatial analyses comparing the actual and expected distances of ‘dun-houses’ and ‘dun-enclosures’ (ASRs and SSEs) from crannogs, noting that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA-33136</td>
<td>iHCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-33137</td>
<td>SMRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-33138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle quern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
there is little difference between the two. His main conclusion from this is that “terrestrial sites of all classes were strongly influenced by the availability of agricultural land”. Cavers (2010, 160) also counters Warner’s (1994) assertion that crannogs served as ‘bolt-holes’ for the occupants of nearby high-status settlements, noting that very few crannogs are in close proximity to such sites. Even when located in close proximity, it would be difficult to prove such a suggestion without a large sample of similar sites to compare against.

Both Loch Glashan and Ederline Boathouse (Figure 3.26) demonstrate that the occupants had connections to networks of movement of material culture, and it may be that their occupants were of comparatively elevated social status in relation to the occupants of other nearby sites. Naturally, this has to be balanced against the caveats provided by Fredengren (2002) in relation to Irish crannogs, in that not all crannogs can be associated with the upper strata of society. The social role played by certain crannogs might have more to do with the identity of the occupants themselves than the nature of the settlement they occupied, similar to crannogs in Ireland and similar to the other forms of enclosed settlement discussed before. For all we know, this might also have been demonstrated in the use of different buildings on the crannog surface.

3.7 Large settlement enclosures (LSEs)

Morphology
While the group of LSEs is relatively small, it is quite diverse, and some insights might be gained by dividing it up into several sub-groupings to try and squeeze evidence for chronological or geographical variation from the scant evidence. Shape might continue to be significant, both in itself and in relation to topographic constraints. Considering that the group of sites is much smaller, and covers a much wider range of enclosed areas, it would be preferable to employ a different system in subdividing LSEs and vLSEs in Ergadia. Only four LSEs enclose areas larger than 5000m², with eight in total over 4000m², compared to thirteen in the 2000–2999m² range, which is in line with the general fall-off in numbers with increased size illustrated in Table 3.7. Only two sites are bivallate, and one is trivallate.
### Table 3.7. Basic morphological subdivisions of LSEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Internal area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Incomplete</th>
<th>BiV</th>
<th>MuV</th>
<th>Vitr.</th>
<th>Outworks</th>
<th>Annexe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSE-I1</td>
<td>(sub-) circular</td>
<td>2000–2999m²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-I2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>2000–2999m²</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-I3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear/</td>
<td>2000–2999m²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-I4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>2000–2999m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Sub-group LSE-I</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-J1</td>
<td>(sub-) circular</td>
<td>3000–9999m²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-J2</td>
<td>ovoid</td>
<td>3000–9999m²</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-J3</td>
<td>D-shaped, sub-rectilinear/</td>
<td>3000–9999m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>triangular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSE-J4</td>
<td>irregular</td>
<td>3000–9999m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Sub-group LSE-J</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution**

Perhaps the most important aspect of the distribution of LSEs in Ergadia is that there are no LSEs in the Hebrides sub-region except for on Islay, nor are there any in Northern Argyll (Figure 3.30; Map 3.16). There are also almost as many LSEs in Cowal and Bute as there are ASRs (Figure 3.6). Some sites, such as Barmore and Balloch Hill are certainly strategically located, overlooking important valley routeways, or overlooking important inlets, as at Eilean Dearg, Cnoc Breac and Dùn Skeig, or a combination of the two, as at Dùn Mac Sniachain (Map 3.16). There would also seem to be a correlation between reasonably good land on the LCA (values 4.2 and under) and LSEs, but this is no different than any other form of enclosed settlement.
Figure 3.30. LSEs and vLSEs by sub-region. Note that all examples in the Hebrides sub-region are on Islay.
Map 3.16. Distribution of large settlement enclosures (LSEs) in Ergadia.

**Chronology**

Only three LSE sites have associated datable material culture, one of which has radiocarbon dates (Figure 3.31). The evidence as it stands points to a potential period of use extending from the 800BC to about AD200. There is no firm evidence for occupation after this, but it should
be noted that the series as a whole is poorly dated. It may well be that the later, smaller phases at Largiemore, Dùn Skeig, Duntroon and Dùn Mac Sniachain date to as late as the EMP. It is important to note that the earlier phases of Dùn Skeig, Duntroon and Dùn Mac Sniachain had extensive evidence for vitrification, indicating the probable use of timber-interlacing and that the sites were deliberately burned to such an extent that the stone vitrified (A.3 entries).

Figure 3.31. Chronological diagrams for LSEs in Kintyre using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line
(AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.32. Chronological diagrams for LSEs in Lorn using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

The rarity of these sites in the landscape of Ergadia might be an indication of their association with high-status settlement. The metalwork from Dùn Mac Sniachàin (Figure 3.32) might be an indication of high-status occupants, as might its reoccupation and remodelling at least twice. It occupies a very strategic position, overlooking the sea at Ledaig at a point where rough upland comes almost to the sea itself, with only a narrow passage along the coast, overlooked by the LSE. It overlooks Ardmucknish Bay, the Linn of Lorn and the entrance to Loch Etive. Balloch Hill overlooks both the Laggan depression and Conie Glen, both of which are heavily cultivated in the Roy Map and have some of the best agricultural land in the region according to the LCA. Barmore occupies a similar position in relation to Glendaruel, and it is worth noting that a coin of the third-century Roman Emperor Gallienus (Robertson 1949–50, 142), was found nearby on the valley floor near Ormidale House.
3.8 Very large settlement enclosures (vLSEs)

Morphology

While one of the smallest working classifications employed in this thesis, the eight enclosed sites with enclosed areas >10,000m² and with >66% of their defences artificial contain much variety (Table 3.8); therefore, they might be classified with the same system employed for LSEs. Each site is discussed more fully in A.3.

Table 3.8. Basic morphological subdivisions of vLSEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Vallation</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-A1</td>
<td>Tòrr Dubh Beag</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>trivallate (widely spaced)</td>
<td>open hilltop</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-A2</td>
<td>Bridgend</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>bivallate (closely spaced)</td>
<td>low open hill</td>
<td>RCAHMS 1984, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-A3</td>
<td>Cnoc Ballygowan</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>univallate</td>
<td>open hilltop, one steep side</td>
<td>unpublished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-B1</td>
<td>Cnoc Araich</td>
<td>Kintyre</td>
<td>trivallate (closely spaced)</td>
<td>flat-topped hill, steep sides</td>
<td>RCAHMS 1971, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-B2</td>
<td>Dùn Ormidale</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>univallate</td>
<td>flat-topped hill, steep sides</td>
<td>Christison 1888–9, 388–9; RCAHMS 1975, 16; Harding 1997, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-C2</td>
<td>Drumadoon</td>
<td>Arran</td>
<td>univallate incomplete</td>
<td>flat-topped hill, steep sides</td>
<td>Balfour 1910, 188–91; Harding 1997, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-D</td>
<td>Dùn na Ban-Óige</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>incomplete, several arcs</td>
<td>outcrop hill</td>
<td>Campbell and Sandeman 1961–2, 52; RCAHMS 1988, 162–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vLSE-D</td>
<td>Creag a’ Chapuill</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>incomplete, several arcs</td>
<td>outcrop hill</td>
<td>Christison 1903–4, 211–3; Campbell and Sandeman 1961–2, 43; RCAHMS 1988, 147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tòrr Dubh Beag might be either Bronze Age or Iron Age, based on comparenda in Ireland and Britain with widely spaced valla (see O’Brien 2017). The closely spaced ramparts at Cnoc Araich might have parallels in Iron Age England and lowland Scotland (Cunliffe 1991, 312–70). While the evidence is incomplete, Bridgend might be related to either of these. Dùn
Ormidale and Drumadoon might also belong to the same general group as Cnoc Araich, even though their defences are far slighter; even then, Drumadoon’s use of the local topography might place it in its own class. Ballygowan might belong to any of these three groups. Although they lack the terracing employed in TESs, the two Mid Argyll sites have more in common with TESs than with most LSEs and vLSEs, both in terms of morphology and their general location. While this might have as much to do with the local topography as cultural choice, it might give a broad indication of the date of these two vLSEs.

**Distribution**

What can be noticed very quickly from Map 3.17 is a continuation of the pattern seen in the group of LSEs, i.e. that southern and mainland Ergadia is more strongly represented. However, little can be said for such a small group of undated sites beyond this.

**Chronology**

In terms of their dating, at present none of the sites has any sort of dating evidence. This limits any discussion of the morphological evidence and the function of the sites. As noted above, some sites might have morphological parallels elsewhere, but this cannot be confirmed in the absence of dating evidence.

**Function and status**

While the size of each of these sites might indicate a high social status, there is very little evidence for settlement, and even then, settlement could postdate initial usage. It may be that the sites were used for assembly or ceremony, rather than for military or residential purposes, although each of these can never be untangled from one another. Without associated material culture or radiocarbon dates, all that can be said is that each occupies a locally strategic/highly visible position.
Map 3.17. Distribution of very large settlement enclosures (vLSEs) in Ergadia.
3.9 Enclosed promontories

Morphology
As stated in 2.2.2.a, enclosed promontories are those sites where the natural topography makes up >66% of the enclosing element. In practice, it is often as high as 90%, with the enclosure located on a narrow neck of land, e.g., Eilean nan Damh, Sloc a’ Bhodaich, or the very large Sloc a’ Mhuil, all on Mull (RCAHMS 1980, 83, 87). Some sites have multiple enclosing arcs, as a Dùn na Muirgeidh, Mull, where a consecutive series of terraces are cut off on a coastal promontory (RCAHMS 1980, 80–1), possibly due to a similar mode of thought as with TESs (3.9). In most instances, much of the area enclosed is too rough to be used for settlement. For example, Eilean na Ba on the coast of Tiree covers some 8.6 hectares and is cut off from the mainland by a long bank and a series of walls cutting off gullies and terraces, but only about a hectare of the area cut off would have been habitable (RCAHMS 1980, 83; cf. Bing Maps imagery). Even then, it would still be one of the largest enclosed settlements in the case study, and surely worthy of further research.

Distribution
As can be seen in Figure 3.33 and Map 3.18, the vast majority of EPs are in the Hebrides sub-region, with half of Islay alone having more EPs than all of the other sub-regions put together. This might reflect a cultural choice or might also demonstrate that there was a greater number of suitable locations on Islay. In reality, it was probably a mixture of both. Almost all of the EPs are coastal, Tòrr a’ Chlaonaidh and Colagin in Lorn are exceptions to this.

![Bar chart showing the number of enclosed promontories by sub-region.](image-url)
Figure 3.34. Enclosed promontories by district or island.
Map 3.18. Distribution of enclosed promontories (EPs) in Ergadia.

Chronology
Radiocarbon dates are only available for Dunollie (Figure 3.36), but it is imagined that the imminent publication of Dùn Mhuirchaidh, Ardnamurchan will provide radiocarbon dates for the bowl furnace and the settlement there (Cobb et al. 2011; 2012; 2015). The excavators’
proposed EIA date for the furnace is unlikely, considering that there are several furnaces in EMP contexts at Dunadd. Dunaverty (AU731.4) and Tarbert (AU712.5) are both only datable by a single documentary reference (Figure 3.35) and castles were constructed at both of these strategic locations in the thirteenth century (see A.3), potentially obliterating any earlier evidence. A late (fifteenth–sixteenth century) castle was also constructed at Dunollie, but small-scale excavations there demonstrated that the site was occupied c.AD500–1000 (Figure 3.36; Alcock 1987). Further research might extend this chronology, but it is difficult to generalise from so little evidence, especially seeing as only 1/30 EPs in the Hebridean sub-region has any material evidence, and that is only indeterminate Hebridean coarse pottery (iHCP, but probably DHCP; Figure 3.37; Mackie 1963, 21). On this scant evidence, it may be that the Hebridean sites are earlier than those on the mainland, which would be in line with the evidence from the other forms of enclosed settlement encountered so far. It would certainly not be good archaeological practice to generalise for the 30 Hebridean sites from the excavated evidence at Dunollie; future research might indicate occupation being separated by several centuries.

Figure 3.35. Chronological diagrams for enclosed promontories in Kintyre using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.36. Chronological diagrams for enclosed promontories in Lorn using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.37. Chronological diagrams for enclosed promontories in the Hebrides zone using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status
Considering that Dunollie, Dunaverty and Tarbert appear in the documentary record and all
were chosen as locations for later castles, their occupants probably held an elevated position in social space (Figures 3.35–3.36). Dunollie, the secular site in the case-study with the most pre-AD1000 references, is also the enclosed promontory with the largest assemblage, containing evidence for the production of potentially socially significant items of material culture, evidence of connections to wider transregional networks of exchange, as well as more prosaic items (Figure 3.36; A.3 entry). The fact that Dunollie also appears in an Irish saga, Táin Bó Fraích, c.AD700×750 (Meid 1967, line 378, dating on p. xxv; trans. Gantz 1981, 126), although it may be later in date, illustrates that the site was an important point of reference for contemporaries. It is highly debatable whether or not the site is the Caput Regionis mentioned by Adomnán in association with the appearance of Frankish sailors (VSC I.28). Sharpe (1995, 132, 291) discusses the various translations for the term, preferring ‘regional capital’, but what regional capital is unknowable (Anderson and Anderson 1961, 264 suggest Dunadd). The term might actually refer to a person rather than a place, or even be a direct translation of Cenn Tire, Kintyre (disputed by Anderson and Anderson 1961, 264; contra Buchanan 1762[1582], 14; Reeves 1857, 57).

This is not to say that all enclosed promontories were central places—it is likely that they were utilised for a wide variety of purposes, and many might not have been permanent settlements. Several others might have been part of wider landscapes of settlement, such as the complex made up of Beinn Sholaraidh, Beinn a’ Chaisteil, and Allt nan Bà in northwest Islay, consisting of two enclosed promontories and at least two areas of cliff-foot settlement covering several hectares in total (RCAHMS 1984, 77–81). Dùn Uragaig (Piggott and Piggott 1945–6, 88; RCAHMS 1984, 95–7) and Meall Lamalum (RCAHMS 1984, 98–9) on Colonsay both seem to have been the focal points of clustered settlement at some point after their initial construction, as does Dùn na Muirgheidh, Mull (RCAHMS 1980, 80–1; Pennyghael in the Past 2011, 38).
3.10 Terraced enclosed settlements (TESs)

Morphology
The small series of TES sites is characterised by a central elevated area surrounded by a series of lower enclosed terraces, usually located on outcrops, rocky hill summits or the ends of ridges. There might be some overlap with enclosed promontories or certain other sites with annexes, enclosed terraces or other outworks. It is argued here, however, that the sites form a small standalone group due to the complexity of their outworks.

Distribution
It is hard to say anything about the distribution of just eight sites (Map 3.19), but there may be some correspondence between the distribution of other forms of settlement and the distribution of TESs. The coastal TESs on Coll, Tiree and Jura and perhaps A’ Chrannag in Knapdale are located in very similar locations as EPs and might be regarded then as more elaborate versions of a similar tradition. This might also be kept in mind for Dunadd if the arguments that it might have been a coastal promontory as late as AD460–770 are accepted (see Lathe and Smith 2015).
Map 3.19. Distribution of terraced enclosed settlements (TESs) in Ergadia.

**Chronology**

As can be seen in Figures 3.38–3.40, the majority of the evidence is from the three excavations at Dunadd (Christison 1905; Craw 1930; Lane and Campbell 2000), with a significant amount of evidence also coming from the amateur excavations at Little Dunagoil (Ross 1880, 79;
Apart from what seems to have been a brief high-medieval reuse of the site for feasting/ritual, occupation of Dunadd seems to have come to an end by AD900 (Figure 3.39). Proposing an exact end-date for the occupation of Dunadd is difficult though, as all bar one of the radiocarbon dates were from samples charcoal derived from mixed species (A.3 entry for full list). It may well be that all of the dates are at least 100 years too old, if not more. The $2\sigma$ ranges of only two Phase 2 samples extend beyond AD800, and even then, they could equally be from prior to that, even if the presence of old wood is factored in. The (re)occupation of Little Dunagoil (Figure 3.38) continued to AD1000 (Phase 4), and possibly beyond, depending on how the rectilinear ‘longhouse’ structures are interpreted. As it stands, it would seem as though TESs expanded downslope in the EMP from a core area on the summit dating to the MIA–LIA, although this is only based on the evidence from Dunadd and Little Dunagoil; future research might indicate otherwise.

Figure 3.38. Chronological diagrams for terraced enclosed settlements (TESs) in Bute using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.39. Chronological diagrams for TESs in Mid Argyll using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Function and status
Considering the range of artefacts indicating links to transregional networks of exchange, it is likely that both Dunadd and Little Dunagoil were socio-political central places. At Dunadd, there is evidence for the concentration and consumption of resources, the production of potentially socially significant items of material culture, the presence of a possible inauguration site, and monumental architecture, not to mention its central location within Ergadia (Figure 3.39; Map 3.19). One wonders if similar evidence would be uncovered were Dùn Chonallaich to be excavated, to take a morphologically similar and geographically proximate example. Whether Skene’s (1876, 229) proposition that Dunadd “was the capital of Dalriada” is correct must await the further excavation of other central places in the region; in the meantime, Lane and Campbell’s (2000) designation of the site as “an early Dalriadic capital” remains a more accurate description.

Little Dunagoil, as part of the Dunagoil complex, was certainly a central place, but again, any statement regarding it being the central place of any dynasty might be premature, and sites like Barmore would have to be excavated to better understand the distribution of social power in the area. Dùn na Cleite is the largest enclosed settlement—aside from EPs—on Coll and Tiree (Beveridge 1903, 91), which might be significant. Its temporal relation to the series of CASRs on the island would have to be better understood before making any statement on comparative status, though. The same holds for Dùn Dubh and Dùn Morbhaidh. The RCAHMS suggest that An Dunàn, Ardmenish, a TES on Jura, located close to an anchorage may have

Figure 3.40. Chronological diagrams for TESs in the Hebrides with timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
“been of some strategic importance in the later prehistoric and Early Historic periods” (1984, 22, 72–5), but without dating evidence it is difficult to determine its socio-political role in relation to other sites.

3.11 Ecclesiastic Settlement

Morphology

Table 3.9 outlines the various forms of ecclesiastic sites that were introduced in 2.2.2. Table 3.9 draws a distinction between definite early monastic sites and later churches and chapels that also had early evidence. For practical purposes, they might be treated together, though, with the caveat that non-monastic churches administering to a secular congregation may have been a feature of the landscape prior to the twelfth century. The adoption of a clear diocese–deanery–parish model in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries—paralleled across all other regions of western Christendom—resulted in a visible hierarchy of ecclesiastic settlement: cathedral–church–chapel. Religious houses adhering to Continental monastic rules and standardised layouts came to replace the more heterogenous earlier monastic sites in the same period.

Large monastic valla are known from Iona, Lismore and Kingarth, but several smaller sites were located on small islands such as Eilean Mór and Eileach an Naoimh, with further probably monastic sites such as Inchmarnock, Kirkapol, Holy Island and Keills located within smaller enclosures similar in size to the inner enclosure at Kingarth. Few of the buildings at these sites survive in their original form, with most rebuilt in the HMP in either Romanesque or Gothic style, or both. For example, the nave at Kingarth was executed in large regular stone blocks with chevrioned Romanesque arches, with the chancel rebuilt using rubble masonry following the Northern Gothic style (Image 3.1; A.3)
Image 3.1. Kingarth: Romanesque chancel arch with later Northern Gothic rebuilt chancel in background. Note the difference in the shape of the arches and the form of masonry used.

Image 3.2. Western range of the vallum at Iona, looking north towards Dùn Î.
Table 3.9. Main classifications of ecclesiastic sites used in the present study (some sites appear in more than one column); note that several parishes were amalgamated in the period AD1400–1700, resulting in several churches being demoted to chapel status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>No. in Ergadia</th>
<th>Modern Exc.</th>
<th>Antiquarian Exc.</th>
<th>C14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13 (+ 2 geophys)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious house</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmed early monastic site</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early ecclesiastic site of indeterminate function (later became churches or chapels)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery-settlements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early cemeteries with no settlement evidence (later became churches or chapels)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late cemeteries (post AD1200) with no settlement evidence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(1 geophys)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesiastic toponym with no other evidence</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution

As already stated, the distribution of early medieval monastic sites is difficult to disentangle from the distribution of community cemeteries that later became churches and chapels. Iona, Lismore and especially Kingarth are located in areas of comparatively locally good farmland according to the LCA and the Roy Map. This also is the case with Inchmarnock, but not at potentially eremitic sites such as Eileach an Naoimh in the Garvellachs, Eilean Mòr in Knapdale and Holy Island off Arran.

However, it is also important to note that all of the definite early monastic sites are located either on small coastal islands or close to the shore (Map 3.20). This might have been related to choices made by the founders in relation to retreating from society, but it might also reflect the marginal role of the early church (discussed in Mytum 1992, 63–7 in relation to Ireland). That said, coastal locations would provide direct linkages by sea to other ecclesiastic sites (see VSC for several examples of such interaction), not to mention trade routes (Doherty 1980). The group of later churches and chapels with evidence for early phases might belong to a
subsequent generation of ecclesiastic settlement following a more normal distribution over the landscape (Maps 3.21–3.22).

The association with good land is also evident in the distribution of parish churches, in all instances, they are located within 1km of patches of land with locally low LCA numbers (Map 3.23). While it might not have been the case that such land was held directly by these churches, the tithes from areas such as these would at least have sustained the parish church and associated clergy. This association is not as strong with chapels, which might be expected if a plebania model was in operation, with a central mother church and outlying chapels serving the spiritual needs of a dispersed set of communities. Such chapels would probably not have had a full-time occupant, but were at least set within wider settlement landscapes, the evidence for which is invisible without archaeological fieldwork.
Map 3.20. Early monastic sites and high-medieval churches and chapels with evidence for earlier phases in Ergadia (i.e., early ecclesiastic sites).
Map 3.21. High and late medieval churches and chapels in Ergadia.
Map 3.22. High and late medieval religious houses in Ergadia.
Map 3.23. Sum distribution of ecclesiastic sites in Ergadia overlain on the Land Capability for Agriculture index (see preface for codes; lower number = better land).

Chronology

Figures 3.41–3.46 cover several pages and contain the sum of all dating evidence from all ecclesiastic sites in the case study. Sites with a vallum are marked with [V]. In most instances,
this evidence is confined to two categories, but in some cases more. The evidence from Iona (Figure 3.45) is extensive enough to take up several pages. Only the more closely datable items of sculpture have been included, there are over 100 items of early medieval sculpture in total from Iona alone. Several phases are evident at Iona. The archaeological and documentary evidence indicates what seems to be a direct line of continuity from the late sixth century AD right through to the fifteenth century at Iona. Figure 3.45 also indicates the potential expansion of the ecclesiastic area of the island in the HMP with the foundation of Teampull Rónáin and the Nunnery, while also indicating that the cemetery at Martyrs’ Bay is broadly contemporary to the main ecclesiastic site, even if the relationship between the two is poorly understood.

Lower resolution evidence hints at similar continuity at Kingarth (Figure 3.41) and Lismore (Figure 3.44), corresponding to the evidence from second rank ecclesiastic sites in Ireland in general. It is evident from Figures 3.41–3.46 that many of the high-medieval parish churches have earlier evidence, either sculpture or a vallum, indicating some form of early activity. In all, 45 of 230 ecclesiastic sites have two or more pieces of early medieval evidence, 21 of which later became parish churches. Most other high-medieval parish churches and chapels seem to be on ‘greenfield’ sites, such as Kilchousland, Kilmichael and Kilcalmonell in Kintyre (Figure 3.42). This brings us to an important point: that a significant proportion of Kil(l)- names do not have any early medieval evidence, which would be in line with Macniven’s (2015, 67–9) discussion of the use of such names. Only two (Keills and Eilean Mòr) of the ten early monastic sites employ Kil(l), but only as alternative names that might be late coinages. It is argued here that most, if not all such names date to the high-medieval reorganisation of the ecclesiastic landscape into dioceses, deaneries and parishes, similar to in Ireland.
Figure 3.41. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in Cowal and Bute using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.42. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in Kintyre and Arran using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the...
approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.43. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in Mid Argyll and Knapdale using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.44. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in Lorn using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
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Figure 3.45. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in Iona using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate
beginning of the HMP.
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Figure 3.46. Chronological diagrams for ecclesiastic sites in the Hebrides using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

The majority of visible remains are high–late-medieval parish churches and chapels, that functioned as the foci of Christian ritual practice of defined communities, with chapels normally subservient to a central parish church. Residential spiritual communities confined to small number of religious houses, all of which, except Iona, were new foundations associated with local elites. All of these churches were subject to episcopal oversight in this period, which came to be focussed on Lismore and (briefly) Iona (A.3).

For the high-medieval churches/chapels with earlier evidence, it cannot be determined whether they were previously monastic sites, cemeteries, cemetery-settlements or perhaps even some form of community church or chapel, hence the designation early ecclesiastic site. Monastic and/or episcopal sites with early documentary references (Iona, Lismore, Kingarth)
seem to have continued to be regarded as high-status centres in subsequent centuries. The pastoral role of the early Insular Church has been the source of much debate (Hughes 1966; Ó Corráin 1981; Sharpe 1984; Etchingham 1991; 1999). It may be that some of the non-funerary sculpture was used in pastoral activity, but there is no way of knowing this for certain.

3.12 Cemetery-settlements

Morphology

With the documentary evidence for early ecclesiastic activity in Ergadia limited to a very small group of sites, as stated in Chapter 2.2.2, it is difficult to disentangle cemetery-settlements occupied by secular communities from early monastic sites and other early ecclesiastic sites. It can be especially in cases where the Church later appropriated familial and community cemeteries for use as monastic sites in the EMP–VA and for the placement of parish churches or chapels (potentially at the behest of the occupants) in the HMP. Furthermore, the occupants of both cemetery-settlements and ecclesiastic sites ‘lived with the dead’ with burials and domestic structures occupying the same enclosed space, even if they might have been located in different areas within that enclosed space. In some instances, later domestic structures might have overlain graves, as was the case at Baliscate, for example.

Based on the excavated evidence from a series of sites, it is possible to propose the existence of at least five cemetery-settlements in Ergadia, the dating evidence from which is outlined in the chronology section. Morphologically, it might be possible to propose that Quien on Bute and Teampull Phadruig on Tiree might also have been cemetery-settlements. Further research might demonstrate that many of the parish churches and chapels with earlier sculptural evidence were also originally either cemetery-settlements or community cemeteries without any settlement.

The enclosure of such sites might have taken the form of a bank and ditch, or a wooden palisade, as opposed to the more massively enclosed SSE, MSE and LSE sites discussed above. This might lead to some sites being mis-classified as unenclosed settlements, but in all instances, including Bruach an Druimein, some sort of element setting the site apart from the outside world is evident.

Distribution

For the moment, their distribution must be regarded as somewhat random, albeit related to farmable land (Map 3.24). Considering the evidence outlined above for the unenclosed
settlement(s) at Ardachemple (3.2; A.3 entry), Ardnadam was located in a wider landscape of contemporary settlement. While Baliscate is located in upland, it would seem to be farmable at the very least. Innellan is located close to the coast on reasonably good land and it would be interesting to investigate whether there were unenclosed settlements nearby as occurs at Ardnadam. Loch Finlaggan is located within a landscape of wider settlement, with two crannogs/stone islets also in the lake, not to mention the location of a very high-status high–late medieval site on the same island (Caldwell 2010). Bruach an Druimein is located in the Kilmartin Valley in land marked as cultivated in the Roy Map (1745).
Map 3.24. Distribution of cemetery-settlements, cemeteries dating to c.AD300–1000 with no settlement evidence, and undated Christian cemeteries with no settlement evidence in Ergadia.
Chronology
As can be seen from Figures 3.47–3.49, each of the proposed cemetery-settlements is a multiphase site, Innellan excepted. It would seem in most instances, though, that it was a case of episodic rather than continuous reoccupation. Loch Finlaggan, Innellan and Baliscate were certainly used for burial and most likely also for settlement from c.AD600–700, with burial activity continuing beyond AD1000 with the last two. The long-cists at Bruach an Druimèin would also seem to place settlement and burial activity on the site broadly contemporarily. The settlement and burial activity at Ardnadam clusters quite late, apart from the very early evidence at the site.

Figure 3.47. Chronological diagrams for cemetery-settlements in Cowal and Bute using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.48. Chronological diagrams for cemetery-settlements in Mid Argyll using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.49. Chronological diagrams for cemetery-settlements in the Hebrides using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

Based on the excavated evidence, Bruach an Druimein (Figure 3.48) would seem to be a site with occupants of potentially high status, with its grain-drying kilns, metalworking, slate motif pieces, and items of material culture derived from long-distance networks (the E-ware and possibly the copper-alloy pin). Considering its location close to Dunadd and Dùn Chonallaich, it might have been related to either of these sites in some way. The location of the central place of the Meic Dhomhnaill kings/lords of the Isles on the same island c.AD1170–1500 as the earlier cemetery-settlement in Loch Finlaggan might have been intentional, and the cemetery-settlement would have been occupied at the same time as the stone islet phase of Eilean na Chomhairle nearby. That is not to say that all cemetery-settlements would have had high-status associations; it is likely that sites such as Ardnadam, Innellan and Baliscate would have been integral parts of their local communities, even if metalworking and the processing of agricultural produce do seem to have taken place at most of these sites. Grain production or processing may have a particularly important consideration, as seems to be the case at Bruach
an Druimein, but further research would be necessary to explore this at more than a handful of sites. Considering the number of unenclosed settlements near Ardnadam, it may have functioned as a burial centre, settlement and possibly a chapel of ease for the dispersed community, over time.

Without further archaeological work it is difficult to determine whether it was one or several families, or perhaps a kin-group that were based at these sites. At the moment, it would seem to be a small number of houses that were directly associated, which might mean that they functioned similar to the various forms of non-ecclesiastic enclosed settlements discussed in this chapter, with an additional role in relation to burial.
Colonial evidence

3.13 Longphorts, camps and bases

There is no textual or archaeological evidence for longphorts or any other form of camp or campaign fortification in Ergadia. However, there are at least four toponyms containing the term ‘longphort’ (Table 3.10; Map 3.25). They are discussed separately here, as they are not derived from Old Norse, unlike the placenames discussed in 3.14. Dalinlongart in Cowal and Baranlongart in Knapdale are particularly promising, being located at the heads of Holy Loch and Loch Caolisport giving access to the mid-points Firth of Clyde and Sound of Jura respectively and close to overland routes. While there is no visible enclosure in either location, each could have functioned as longphorts in the Viking Age, but an association with later campaign fortifications cannot be ruled out. The use of definite articles and the use of longphort as a specific to qualify a generic in all four might point to their being late coinages. The location of the four longphort names in areas of low numbers of ON toponyms could support their use as longphorts; that their possible ON name did not survive might be an indication that the expansion into these areas was not successful. However, this is unlikely. Culinlongart, Kintyre is located too far inland, and would seem to be named for a nearby ASR (Martin 2013, 209). While it overlooks Loch Fyne, Bàrr an Longairt in Cowal is immediately overlooked by higher ground and there is very little space on the water’s edge. It may have served as a landing point during a military campaign in any historical era for a force campaigning in the general area, rather than as any sort of bridgehead. This point also applies to the other two locations. Therefore, it is unlikely that any of these four toponyms refers to activity in the Viking Age, even if the possibility cannot be completely ruled out.

Table 3.10. Possible longphort toponyms in Ergadia; definitions based on Dwell (2009[1901–9]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS name</th>
<th>Gaelic form</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Specific Location</th>
<th>VA Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baranlongart</td>
<td>Bàrr an Longphoirt</td>
<td>crest or summit of the longphort</td>
<td>Knapdale</td>
<td>Clachbreck</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr an Longaig</td>
<td>Bàrr an Longphoirt</td>
<td>crest or summit of the longphort</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>north of Kilfinan</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalinlongart</td>
<td>Dail an Longphoirt</td>
<td>meadow or field of the longphort</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>near Ardnadam and Kilmun</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinlongart</td>
<td>Cúl an Longphoirt</td>
<td>back-land or hinterland of the longphort</td>
<td>Kintyre</td>
<td>Glen Breaclerie</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 3.25. Longphort toponyms in Ergadia, with later parish boundaries.
3.14 Burials as a proxy for settlement

Morphology

In seeking to use the presence of burials as a proxy for the presence of humans living within a particular landscape, burials at ecclesiastic sites have been excluded. They have already been discussed above, where relevant. This section examines the evidence for furnished burials, unfurnished cremation burials and unfurnished inhumation burials not at ecclesiastic sites (Tables 3.10–3.16). Unfurnished burials are outlined in Table 3.17. The level of information available from the series of furnished burials varies greatly, seeing as the majority of them were excavated by antiquarians or were encountered during construction or farm work. Therefore, the level of information is incomplete; however, the amount of information available still allows for an extensive discussion (see A.3).

The furnished burials can be divided up in a number of ways. For example, they might be divided into male, female or gender-neutral graves groups based on the material culture included in the funerary drama. Some of the burials can also be sexed by physical remains. The graves might also be divided along morphological lines: into those with and without stone-lining, mounds, boats, or animals, or into single and multiple burials, or into cemetery and isolated burials. All of these might be meaningful distinctions, especially seeing as only a fraction of their contemporary population might have been afforded a burial at all (see Price 2008). Tables 3.12–3.14, broken into male, female and gender-neutral (M, F, N; see Ó Ríagáin 2016) respectively attempt to portray as much of this information as possible. The variety of morphologies and funerary rites employed is significant; it will be argued in Chapters 6 and 8 that this represents a colonial funnel in operation, where traditions from various homelands are renegotiated and combined as settlers transculturate in their new social and physical environment.
Table 3.11. Principal morphological characteristics furnished burials and possible furnished burials in four of the sub-regions; no burials have been identified in Cowal and Bute; for the Hebridean burials, see the next table. Con. = confidence, M/F/N = male/female/gender neutral (bold = sexed physically, non-bold = gendered artefactually), MA = middle-aged, MA+= late middle-aged or old-aged, orientation bold = location of head, L = left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>M/F/N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Prox. burials</th>
<th>Mound lined</th>
<th>Stone-setting</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Boat</th>
<th>Animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingscross, Arran</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>coastal ridge</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millhill, Arran</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>coastal ridge</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?cremated</td>
<td>?cremated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbert Bay, Gigha</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danna, Knapdale</td>
<td>Mid Argyll and Knapdale</td>
<td>coastal knoll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>NE–SW</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrera</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>coastal knoll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oban Train Station</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>coastal knoll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortenfern, Ardnamurchan</td>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swordle Bay, Ardnamurchan</td>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>coastal valley</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>cairns</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>WSW–ENE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.12. Principal morphological characteristics furnished burials and possible furnished burials in the Hebrides sub-region of the case study. Con. = confidence, M/F/N = male/female/gender neutral (bold = sexed physically, non-bold = gendered artefactually), YA = young adult or late adolescent, MA = middle-aged, MA+= late middle-aged or old-aged, orientation bold = location of head, L = left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Island</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>M/F/N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Prox. burials</th>
<th>Mound</th>
<th>Stone-lined</th>
<th>Stone-setting</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Boat</th>
<th>Animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 1</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>machair</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 2a</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>machair</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>F MA+</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 2b</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>machair</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M MA+</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>E-W</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 3</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M MA+</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>WSW–ENE</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 5</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>machair</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruach Mhòr</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>valley floor</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>barrows</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a Bharraich a</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>F MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>NNW–SSE</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a Bharraich b</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>NNW–SSE</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a Bharraich c</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>F MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSE–NNW</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a Bharraich d</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>cremated</td>
<td>cremated</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druim Arstail</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>coastal knoll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochan Chille Mhòr</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>coastal knoll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>poss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>Riding</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>Shield</td>
<td>Axe</td>
<td>Spear</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Adornment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millhill</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swordle Bay</td>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>horn-terminal, iron ladle</td>
<td>hammer &amp; tongs, sickle, whetstone,</td>
<td>CA RHP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13. Selected grave-goods from of furnished burials sexed (rare) or gendered (often, with caveats) as male in Ergadia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>context</th>
<th>Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 2b</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>x 2</td>
<td>horn-terminal, iron cauldron or ladle, hammer &amp; tongs, adze, ferrule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 3</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 5</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a’ Bharraich b</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tràigh nam Bàrc</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machrins 1</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>yes broken poss. iron pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machrins 2a</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiloran Bay</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no iron pot or ladle sickle balance, weights, coins, chest silver pin; 2 × CA RHPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grishipoll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornaig Beg</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>several</td>
<td>several</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.14. Selected grave-goods from female furnished burials in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Brooches</th>
<th>Other adornments</th>
<th>Glass, stone, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 1</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>silver pin, silver wire chain, silver-plated CA mount</td>
<td>2 × Frankish beads, 1 × Scandinavian bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinaby 2a</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>CA ladle</td>
<td>needle case, needle, glass linen smoother</td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>CA buckle</td>
<td>blue glass bead, 2 × jet beads, pumice, amber bead, vessel glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruach Mhòr</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td>shears, sickle or weaving batten, spindle-whorl</td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>CA buckle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>iron pins (undescribed)</td>
<td>amber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a’ Bharrach a</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × repurposed shrine strap terminals; CA PPA ring-brooch</td>
<td>CA RHP, CA ring</td>
<td>pierced serpentine pebble, amber, bone or ivory object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Càrn a’ Bharrach c</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>shears, bone needle case</td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>CA RHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machrins 3</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
<td>knife or sickle</td>
<td></td>
<td>CA RHP, CA mount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiree</td>
<td>Tiree</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × oval</td>
<td>trapezoidal-headed stick pin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15. Selected grave-goods from gender-neutral furnished burials in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Adornments</th>
<th>Glass, stone, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingscross</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td>whalebone plaque</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>wooden chest with lock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbert</td>
<td>Kintyre and Arran</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>spindle-whorl</td>
<td>balance, weights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oban</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>(details not given)</td>
<td>(poss. boat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortafern</td>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>?knives</td>
<td>?CA PA brooch</td>
<td>four glass beads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carn a’ Bharraich d</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druim Arstail</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × CA nails, CA fragments</td>
<td>CA RHP</td>
<td>blue bead, jet bead or armlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lochan Cille Mhòr</td>
<td>Oronsay</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>iron strips, chisels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Lobb</td>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(poss. boat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.16. Unfurnished cremation burials in Ergadia dating to the EMP and/or VA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>M/F/N</th>
<th>Insertion into</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardnave, Islay</td>
<td>Hebrides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>pyre site on beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baliscate, Mull</td>
<td>Hebrides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>stone row</td>
<td>upland near coast</td>
<td>token deposit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleigh, Kilmore</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neolithic cairn</td>
<td>upland near coast</td>
<td>token deposit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machrins 2c,</td>
<td>Hebrides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>abutting two other graves (2a and 2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.17. Unfurnished single inhumation burials in Ergadia dating to the EMP and/or VA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>M/F/N</th>
<th>Insertion into</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kintra, Islay</td>
<td>Hebrides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>extended inhumation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machrins 2b,</td>
<td>Hebrides</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>juvenile, abutting two other graves (2a and 2c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution

As can be seen on Map 3.26, the furnished burials in Ergadia are located mainly in the Hebrides sub-region, although there are several possibilities in the other sub-regions. 3/4 unfurnished cremation burials are also found in this sub-region, with the fourth dating to the EMP and possibly related to a different social phenomenon. Including the more tenuous examples, at the moment Islay (7) and Colonsay (12, including 6 on Oronsay) dominate the discussion, with Coll (2, including a possible cemetery), Mull (1) and Tiree (1) further behind. This might have as much to do with the pattern of research than the original distribution of such burials, especially considering that the clusters at Ballinaby (5), Oronsay (6) and Machrins (4) make up such a large portion of the overall figure. Considering the high number of Old Norse toponyms on Coll and Tiree (3.14), further research may well identify more furnished burials. Removing the doubtful examples from the other sub-regions leaves us with a figure of Arran (2) and Ardnamurchan (1), but future research might help redress this. The uncertainty associated with the evidence from Kintyre, Mid Argyll and Lorn is in line with the other categories of evidence discussed in 3.14.
Map 3.26. Furnished burials and dispersed cremations and inhumations dating to the Viking Age in Ergadia.

**Chronology**
Only three sites have been excavated under modern conditions: Swordle Bay, Ardnamurchan (Batey 2016; Harris et al. 2017), and two adjacent sites on Colonsay: Machrins 2/Cnoc nan
Gall (Becket and Batey 2013) and Machrins 3 (Ritchie 1981). Radiocarbon dates have been obtained and made available for Machrins 3 and Cnoc nan Gall, and it is imagined that dates for the recent excavations at Swordle Bay will become available soon. A re-examination of the material from Kiloran Bay, Colonsay, has also produced a radiocarbon date. The quality of recording and excavation practice varies greatly between sites. It ranges from notes of items uncovered during construction, as at Millhill and Oban, to drawings and reports made by individuals who had never actually visited the excavations, as at Kiloran Bay, Colonsay, to excavations lacking site-plans but otherwise well-conducted, as at Ballinaby on Islay (Anderson 1880).

As can be seen in the series of chronological diagrams (Figures 3.50–3.54), the series of furnished burials would all seem to fall within the period AD800–1000, as expected. The three radiocarbon dates from the furnished burials and the radiocarbon dates from the cremations at Ardnave, Baliscate, and possibly Cleigh (Figure 3.55) are all consistent with this. Graham-Campbell and Batey’s (1998, 142–4) suggestion that they date to a period extending “from the late ninth to the second half of the tenth century” would seem to be generally sound, even if there might be certain examples with slightly earlier dates possible for some of the items of material culture.

![Figure 3.50. Chronological diagrams for furnished burials in Arran and Kintyre using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.](image-url)
Figure 3.51. Chronological diagrams for furnished burials in Northern Argyll using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.52. Chronological diagrams for furnished burials on Colonsay and Oronsay using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata
episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.53. Chronological diagrams for furnished burials on Islay using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.54. Chronological diagrams for the furnished burials on Coll, Tiree and Mull using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.55. Chronological diagrams for unfurnished burials in Ergadia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

The social function of the graves will be discussed in full in Chapter 6. For now, it is enough to note that beyond their use for disposing of the dead, they served as stages in funerary dramatas, involving the relegation of social relations by the living through the medium of the funeral rites and the grave-goods (see Parker Pearson 1999; Harrison 2015; Ó Riagáin 2016). Considering the number of burials involving individuals of advanced years and of women, it would seem as though the burials were carried out by a settled community. As can be seen in Tables 3.10–3.11 (see also A.3 entries), the low number of individuals young enough to be active warriors is striking; the burial at Grishipoll on Coll might be the only definitely identifiable grave of
such an individual. Such individuals may have been buried in a different way, or they may have
died and been buried on campaign outside the case-study region. Their absence might indicate
that the burials belong to the aged first generation of settlers or perhaps even subsequent settlers
in some cases. It would seem as though differentiations can be made in terms of the status of
those involved in the funerary drama; Kiloran, Machrins 1, and Ballinaby 2a and 2b stand out
among the series, this might be due to their being slightly earlier or it might be related to the
high social status of those involved (Figures 3.52–3.53). Swordle Bay might perhaps be related
to a lower social tier, a warrior/free-farmer, or it might be that the second and third generation
practiced slightly less elaborate funeral rites (Figure 3.51). It is also worth noting that
weapons do not always make a warrior in a funerary setting, rather they represent the ideal
portrayal of personhood while at the same time demonstrating the ability of those carrying out
the funeral to remove valuable items of material culture from the sphere of the living. All of
this will be discussed further in Chapter 6.
3.15 Toponyms as a proxy for settlement

This section is concerned with the usage of placename evidence as means for identifying presence in the landscape of Ergadia of people speaking a Scandinavian language, if not members of the wider Scandinavian diaspora or people of Scandinavian origin. It assumes that Old Norse (ON) was not used for toponymic purposes before c.AD800, and that it ceased to be used for new naming events by c.AD1200, if not before (cf. Macniven 2006; 2015; Nicolaison 2001), with some possible exceptions on islands with non-resident high–late-medieval elites such as Tiree (Holliday 2016, 207). The methodology has already been outlined in 2.3.2, along with the general problems associated with the dataset. A comparison with studies such as Johnson (1991), Macniven (2006; 2015), Markús (2012) and Holliday (2016) demonstrates that many more ON placenames survive in the toponymic record than are discussed here. A full list of all toponyms included in the maps is to be found in A.3.15.

As already noted in 2.3.2, the ON toponymic evidence might be divided into habitative and topographic names, as well as divided along the lines of the diagnostic potentiality of the elements. Here, each habitative element will be introduced in sequence, followed by the topographic elements probably referring to habitations. This group mainly consists of dalr and vík names, which, while topographic at face value, have been proven in other contexts in Norway and Iceland to refer to settlements (Crawford 1995).

In some cases, toponyms in their current form have passed through two or more languages since each original naming event leading to potentially dropped syllables or vowel shifts. Therefore, farm-names containing bólstáðr/ból/bœl are treated together here (Map 3.27), with the caveat that further study might be able to separate them chronologically and socially (see Gammeltoft 2001, 234). The small groups of staðr/staðir/setr names are similarly treated (Map 3.28). The byr/bær names and tín names (Map 3.29) are difficult to disentangle from late coinages in English, especially those taking the form X-ton. Borg names (Map 3.29) are difficult to assign to active settlements, in almost all instances the term is used to refer to the visible remains of earlier enclosed settlements and it was often used as a specific to qualify another generic, e.g. Borgadel in Kintyre, Glen Borrodale in Ardnamurchan. It is important to differentiate sætr [shieling or outlying farm] from setr [place, residence, farm] if possible, considering their very different social roles.
Table 3.18. Potential Old Norse habitative toponymic elements found in Ergadia placenames; definitions derived from Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874). See also Crawford (1987; 1995) and Macniven (2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ON</th>
<th>Survives as</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bólstadar (m), bó, beð (n)</td>
<td>-bol, -pol(l), -pool, -bul(l), -bolster, -bost, -bister</td>
<td>lit. ‘built’, i.e. reclaimed and cultivated land, farm, homestead or settlement</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staðr, staðir (m)</td>
<td>-ster, -stadh, -staid</td>
<td>place, stead, abode, stop, usually plural</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>býr, bær, bær (m)</td>
<td>-by</td>
<td>farm, settlement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tún (n)</td>
<td>-ton, -tunn, -tùn</td>
<td>farm, place</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>setr, set (n)</td>
<td>-ster</td>
<td>place, residence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sætr, sætr (n)</td>
<td>-ster</td>
<td>outlying farm, upland pasture, dairy-lands, shieling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skáli (m)</td>
<td>-sgeall</td>
<td>outlying farm, upland pasture, dairy-lands, shieling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>œrgi (m), erg (n)</td>
<td>-ari, -argi</td>
<td>outlying farm, upland pasture, dairy-lands, shieling (loan from Gaelic)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borg (f)</td>
<td>borg, burg, -bridge</td>
<td>fortification, rock outcrop</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalr (m)</td>
<td>-dale, -dal, dail, -ddle, -dle</td>
<td>valley (topographic term used habitatively, for potential problems, cf. tables below)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vík (f)</td>
<td>-aig</td>
<td>bay, inlet (often used habitatively)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 63 bóll/bólstadar names appear in Map 3.27, and there are probably many more examples (listed A.5). Macniven (2015, 73) draws attention to the much higher prevalence of toponyms derived from bólstadar in Scotland, c.240, in comparison to Norway (c.108) and Iceland (“20 or so”), suggesting to him “that the name type was used as a convenient label in the apportionment of larger estates”. This would accord with its early usage in Norway (Gammeltoft 2001, 186). Conversely, Nicolaisen (2001, 120) points out that, as with many cases in Norway, bólstadar in a colonial context name “may be regarded as independent creations without linguistic or economic links with other farm-names”. Even if this might be criticised in the light of Gammeltoft’s (2001) in-depth study of the name, it is likely that Ergadia saw a mixture of both primary and secondary usage.

The distribution of 93 unique dalr farm-names might be instructive in this respect (Map
3.30 and Table 3.18), with the caveat that some *dalr* names might not have been farm-names. Their visible presence in the ‘mainland’ and ‘island’ portions of the case-study, in contrast to the ‘pure’ habitative names, is worth noting. However, they are not seen as examples of coinages by people passing through (Nicolaisen 2001), rather they are seen as potential farming settlements. They are more dispersed and are named in relation to the principal topographic feature—the valley in which they were located. In areas where farms occurred closer together, terms such as *bólstaðr* names might have been necessary as primary names, due to a topographically derived name not being specific enough in the early phases of settlement. Some of the *dalr* names might also be related to secondary expansions into areas outside the core areas of the colony/colonies.

The other habitative names occur in very small numbers, but it would be tempting to link the -by names to high-status primary farms, especially seeing as Ballinaby is located so close to a series of well-furnished burials. The group of 60 *vik* names might also contain a number of primary farms, e.g. Cornaig, Tiree (Map 3.31 and Table 3.18, from *Kornvik*, Holliday 2016, 314–5, 452–3), which has the highest income of all of the farms/townships listed in an AD1541 rental of the island. Future research will no doubt identify many more such examples. It should be noted that a primary farm name does not necessarily indicate a high-status or high-value farm. Holliday (2016, 93) demonstrates that three secondary farms on Tiree became more valuable than the primary estates from which they came.

Although rare, the preservation of *staðir* names, indicates the grouping together of smaller farm units (Macniven 2015, 74–5). The names of these are unknown, but perhaps they might be preserved in unrecorded fieldnames. They may well have had Gaelic, or a mixture of ON and Gaelic, names. This may have been one of the reasons for their being grouped together, as might their small size and low status. However, they were most likely held in a fashion similar to later examples of subinfeudation, i.e., a single unit was divided up by its holder and divided between tenants paying to that holder. The latter might also hold for names derived from *tupt/topt*, particularly where they cluster on Coll (see Johnston 1991, 127), which might be why the term survives in a Gaelic word order, e.g., Totranald and Totamore on Coll.

The lack of *sætr* [shieling, upland pasture or outlying farm, not to be confused with *setr*] names might be significant; therefore, it is worth going into the issue in detail. Only one *sætr* name has been identified in Ergadia, on Islay (Macniven 2015, 75–6). Macniven (2015, 76) sees this gap as filled by ON *ærgi*, also *erg* (MacBain s.v. ‘áirdh’; Cleasby and Vigfusson s.v. ‘erg’), a loanword of SG *áirge*, a term that shifted semantically from ‘place for milking cows, byre, cowshed’ to ‘summer pasture’ (eDIL s.v. ‘áirghí’; Macbain s.v. ‘áirdh’). Macniven (2015, 279
75) and Taylor (2005, 8) translate the Gaelic àirigh by using another ON-derived English term, ‘shieling’ (from ON skáli, see Cleasby and Vigfusson). The modern Irish term àiri very much keeps to the sense of the SG/MG term and it is difficult to say when the semantic and morphological departure between the Irish and Gaelic terms took place. The àirigh names might have been coined before the use of ON in the landscape (Nicolaisen 1969) or adopted by ON speakers when moving into upland areas (Macniven 2015, 76). They might in many cases be much later, related to one of the number of reorganisations of farming in Argyll and the Hebrides in the sixteenth, eighteenth or twentieth centuries.

Table 3.19. Outlying farm-names in selected areas of Ergadia. (parentheses = unit preserved ex nomine in an àirigh name).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Àirigh</th>
<th>Òrgi</th>
<th>Skáli</th>
<th>Sœtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islay</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jura</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mull</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintyre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapdale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.19 and Map 3.32 depict the sum of this group of toponyms. It is highly likely that the àirigh names are fairly recent, possibly related to the reorganisation of grazing land after the Highland Clearances, especially in areas where they cluster. Some may well be older, or recoinages of older names. Two names on Islay contain semantically equivalent ex nomine units. Arihalloch contains both àirigh and skáli (Macniven 2015, 70, 289–90); the ex nomine usage of skáli paired with its semantic equivalent àirigh indicates a coinage after skáli lost its meaning for the name’s user group. The same might hold for Eresaid, probably àirigh + sætr, rather than Ari/Arni + sætr (contra Macniven 2015, 305–6). Johnston (1991, 294) suggests that
the use of ærgi names might have referred to “a heimsetter, a low lying sheiling close to the main farm”, adopted to fill a toponymic gap in the vocabulary of settlers.

It is argued here that the relative rarity of such names is related to their loss during the various landscape changes of the past few centuries. Without a detailed knowledge of the names of outlying farms to go with the bólf, setr, staðir, and topographic farm names, it cannot be said whether or not outlying and minor farms also had ON names at the same time. This will be discussed further in Chapter 6. For now, it is enough to note that the coverage of ON toponyms was not total, but it was extensive in the Hebrides sub-region in relation to the naming of central farms and farms located close to one another. The distribution of dispersed farms with ON-toponyms, usually dálr names is also significant.
Maps of toponyms

Map 3.27. Toponyms in Ergadia containing böll, bólstæðr or bæl.
Map 3.28. Toponyms in Ergadia containing *setr*, *land*, *staðr* or *staðir*, and *tupt* or *topt*.
Map 3.29. Toponyms in Ergadia containing býr or bœr, tún, and borg.
Map 3.30. Toponyms in Ergadia containing *dalr*. 
Map 3.31. Toponyms in Ergadia containing *vík*, *haugr* and *nes*, all of which are topographical names, but might have been used habitatively.
Map 3.32. Toponyms referring to upland pastures in Ergadia.
3.16 Earth and timber castles

Morphology
Of the small group of fourteen potential mottes in Ergadia listed by the RCAHMS (Canmore), only four might be accepted as possibilities (Map 3.33). Even then, all four potential mottes are modified natural mounds, and in the absence of excavation, documentary references or any other dating evidence, they may actually represent a different class of monument. The summit area of Achenelid and Cnoc mhic Eoghainn make very large mottes, and they may be earthen equivalents of SSEs and MSEs located on rock stacks. Furthermore, several of the RCAHMS’s fourteen potential mottes have been reclassed in this dissertation as platform castles, and an argument might be made for 2/4 of the ‘mottes’ here. The remaining two, Macharioch and Achadunan are as small as the smallest mottes Ulidia, even if erosion cannot be ruled out. Therefore, they might not be mottes either.

Distribution
In terms of their distribution (Map 3.33), three of the four possible mottes are in Cowal, with the other site in Kintyre. No ringworks have been found, which is significant, as it would seem to indicate the lack of need for campaign fortifications by an incoming and expanding elite, which would agree with the documentary record.

Chronology
If the sites are indeed mottes, then they could be assigned a date of c.AD1150–1300, but no narrower than that, as no dating evidence is currently available.

Function and status
The mottes, if they are mottes, would most likely have been occupied by either the local nobility or reasonably wealthy local farmers—the two groups were not exclusive. It is possible that their distribution was related to the redistribution of land by either the crown or its agents, which might also be indicated by the distribution of new parish churches and chapels in the period c.AD1150–1350, discussed in 3.11.
3.17 Masonry castles

Morphology
The principal morphological division in Ergadia is between hall-keeps (preferred to the RCAHMS’s “hall-house” considering the use of the term for a widespread undefended settlement in England and lowland Scotland) and castles-of-enclosure. None of the castles might be regarded as keep-centred castles. The distribution of hall-keeps might be masked by the much larger group of later towerhouses, but it is possible to identify eight hall-keeps, all of which are broadly rectilinear and two storeys in height, with datable arrowslits and aperture dressings.

Seventeen masonry castles-of-enclosure have been identified, although two of those, paired on two adjacent islands, Càrn na Burgh Mòr and Càrn na Burgh Beag in the Treshnish Islands, might be regarded as a single unit, Cairnburgh. The other masonry castles range from elaborate examples such as Rothesay and Dunstaffnage to smaller sites such as Castle Sween and Castle Lachlan, both of which were small enough to have their courtyards roofed, even if they were not in either case. The island fortifications at Cairnburgh, Dùn Chonaill and Eilean Dearg might form a separate sub-category, with larger areas being only partially enclosed by artificial means.

Ongoing excavations at Dunyvaig on Islay might demonstrate that it was originally a castle-of-enclosure, but no evidence exists for this so far. The Loch Finlaggan complex might have been occupied in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, but it cannot be classed as a castle due to the nature of its defences.

Distribution
Masonry castles in Ergadia are in all instances in defensive, strategic locations. Some of the coastal castles were sites for control over sea-routes rather than within high-yield agricultural land (by local standards), but the most important managed both, e.g. Rothesay, Brodick, Dunstaffnage, and Dunaverty. The most notable aspect of their distribution is their absence from Islay, Jura, Colonsay, Coll, and Tiree (Map 3.33).
Map 3.33. Distribution of hall-keeps, masonry castles-of-enclosure, and possible mottes in Ergadia dating to c.AD1200–1350.
Map 3.34. Distribution of fifteenth- to seventeenth-century towerhouses and undated platform castles in Ergadia.
Chronology

Based on textual and morphological evidence, the towerhouses in Ergadia can be dated to after AD1400, and are thus excluded from the analysis. The earliest surviving references are always to operating castles, rather than to their construction. Figures 3.56–61 outline the dating evidence for hall-keeps and castles-of-enclosure. It is doubtful that any castle in Ergadia predates c.AD1200; arguments for Castle Sween as the first masonry castle in Scotland are unfounded. There are no features that would place it exclusively before AD1200, and the dating of the site by attempting to work back from the Meic Suibhne family to their eponym is unsound (A3.17; RCAHMS 1992, 245–59; contra Simpson 1959, 6; 1960, 9; Dunbar 1981; Arneil Walker 200, 48).

Figure 3.56. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Arran and Kintyre, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.57. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Cowal and Bute, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.58. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Knapdale and Mid Argyll, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.59 Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Lorn, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 3.60. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Northern Argyll, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 3.61. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in the Hebrides, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

**Function and status**

All of the pre-AD1350 castles on Map 3.33 were elite settlements. However, there was a status differential between the occupants, materialised in the form of the castle. Each of the hall-keeps functioned as the centre of a landholding, either a *villa terrae* or a manor. For example, Fincharn on Loch Awe was held by Gille Easpaig Mac Gille Christ as part of a knight’s fee holding from Alexander II (Macphail 1916, 121–4). The same holds for the smaller castles-of-enclosure. A manor centred on Achanduin on Lismore is mentioned in 1304, held by Eógan Mac Dubgaill (preserved in 20 James IV, in Balfour Paul 1882, 670–1 no. 3136.6). The castles on small marine islands, Cairnburgh and Dùn Chonaill, were probably not farming centres, located as they were on small rocky islands far from farmland. However, even then they might have been involved in the extraction of surplus from fishing and trade on behalf of their owners, in addition to being part of a network of military installations focused on the Firths of Lorn and Clyde.
3.18 Conclusion

Based on the preceding outline of the form, distribution, dating and function of the sum of settlement in Ergadia c.800BC–1400, summarised in Figures 3.62–67, it is possible to identify some general trends. A fall off in the use of most forms of enclosed settlement by is visible in all cases, but the contrast is striking between the mainland, bar Northern Argyll (Figures 3.62–3.65), where this seems to have occurred c.AD750–850, and the Hebrides (3.67), where it occurred c.AD500–550. The high/late-medieval reoccupation of ASRs in Kintyre and Arran (Figure 3.62) and the EP spike in Lorn (3.65) brought about by the evidence from Dunollie might also be an outlier. However, both might be indicative of real processes at work in Viking Age Lorn and HMP Kintyre. The evidence for TES (from Little Dunagoil) use in Cowal and Bute (3.63) contemporary to the Lorn EP spike would seem to confirm this. Almost invisible, but significant, is the pattern of crannog use, with rises in the EIA–MIA and the later EMP and VA visible in Lorn, contrasting with a constant level in Cowal and Bute and a steady rise to the c.AD750 in Mid Argyll; however, Loch Glashan probably skews the Mid Argyll range. These continuities and discontinuities will be taken up again in Chapters 5 and 6.

The general decline in evidence for enclosed settlement corresponds to a rise in the evidence from unenclosed settlements in Cowal and Bute (3.63) and Lorn (3.65), but the Kintyre and Arran (3.62) and Mid Argyll (3.64) sub-regions see no such rise. This general decline corresponds most strikingly with the rise in the use of furnished burials and cremation in the Hebrides (3.67), where a rise in evidence for unenclosed settlement is also visible. This corresponds to the spike in furnished burials and unenclosed settlement visible in Northern Argyll (3.66).

Ecclesiastic settlement is perhaps a less clear guide. Figure 3.63 outlines the number of discrete references to Iona, but it might be related to the transmission of textual information as much as Iona’s being subject to historical events and processes. A clearer idea of the chronology of ecclesiastic settlement is demonstrated in 3.46 and A.3.11, with the introduction of new parish churches and chapels in the HMP visible against a backdrop of continuity at early ecclesiastic sites and cemetery-settlements involving their repurposing for use in the new system of parishes and dioceses of that period. It would be difficult to argue for any major decline in the VA, but there may have been short interruptions to the pattern of continuity as will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Finally, the distribution of greenfield parish churches is arguably higher in the mainland portion of the case study and might be related to the adoption of castles and potentially
settlement patterns more in line with the rest of Scotland in the HMP. Castles are notable in their absence from most of the Hebrides zone, with the exception of around Mull and the Firth of Lorn. This difference forms the basis for the short discussion of high-medieval Ergadia in Chapter 7.

What might we draw from this? It would seem as though the regional divisions hinted at in historical sources, be it into the Cenél a Comgaill, nGabráin, Loairn and nÓengussa, into Gaill and Goidil or into the Meic Ruaidhri, Dubgaill and Domnaill are set against a long tradition of regional variability within the case study. Furthermore, despite being notoriously difficult to date, there are some forms of settlement, such as round CASRs and TESs that have a narrow chronology, as demonstrated in 3.3 and 3.10.

**Cumulative frequency plots based on sum of artefactual and textual evidence.**

![Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in Kintyre and Arran based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10.](image)
Figure 3.63. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in Cowal and Bute based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10. The spike in ASR evidence in comparison to the decline in other enclosed settlements is due to several ASRs seemingly being reoccupied in the HMP.

Figure 3.64. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in Knapdale and Mid Argyll based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10. The large TES spike is due to the amount of evidence from Dunadd. However, note the contemporary spike in crannog evidence also. The other forms decline after c.AD500, but not massively.
Figure 3.65. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in Lorn based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10. The spike in EP evidence is due to Dunollie. However, note that there is not the same general fall-off found in Northern Argyll and the Hebrides.

Figure 3.66. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in Northern Argyll based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10. Note the spike in furnished burials and unenclosed settlement in the Viking Age.
Figure 3.67. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlements in the Hebrides zone based on the data represented in the chronological diagrams presented in 3.2–3.10. Note the decline in enclosed settlement after c.AD550 and spike in both unenclosed settlement in the Viking Age.
Figure 3.68. Sum of annalistic references to Iona per 25 years, c.AD550–1100. No other sites in the case-study region have sufficient documentary evidence prior to AD1100 to be plotted.
Chapter 4. Settlement in Ulidia: Morphology, Chronology, Basic Distribution and Function

4.1 Introduction
Just as Chapter 3 did for Ergadia, this chapter discusses the morphology, chronology, basic spatial distributions and function of each of the categories of settlement evidence in the Ulidia case study c.800BC–AD1400, drawing on textual, sculptural, architectural and excavated evidence. The same general structure applies, with the categories listed in order of their potential social status, so that an idea of social structure might be built from the bottom up. The proxies used for settlement in the absence of evidence, namely burial and toponymic evidence, will also be discussed. Including undated/unclassified enclosures, c.4500 potential settlements in the Ulidia case study might be assigned to the period under examination. Considering the size of the dataset, and that it contains settlement forms well-dated across Ireland, it was decided to generally adhere to the pre-existing system of classification, with some alterations, in contrast to the large-scale reclassification of the evidence from Ergadia. The chapter will close with a set of conclusions framed by cumulative frequency plots for the forms of secular settlement and a sum of references to ecclesiastic sites.
Table 4.1. Numbers of each of the monument forms discussed in this chapter, and their state of research; multiple morphologically distinct phases counted as separate sites; * = doubtful reference; (parentheses = surface finds or antiquarian evidence from site with later excavations): arch. fabric = closely datable architectural material only (e.g. windows with semi-pointed arches); more general morphological dating covered by Freq. column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unenclosed settlement</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souterrain (no enclosure)</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univallate raths</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified enclosure</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous enclosure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashel</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjoined raths</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform rath</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised rath</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised/platform rath</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed outcrop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivallate/counterscarp rath</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivallate rath</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island enclosure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crannog</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop enclosure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed promontory</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early ecclesiastic site</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 (+5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early ecclesiastic site (poss.)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12 (+9)</td>
<td>27 (+13)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapels</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (+3)</td>
<td>3 (+4)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious house</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (+12)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longphort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwork</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moated site</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motte</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep-centred castle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle-of-enclosure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall-keeps</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform castle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Unenclosed settlement

Morphology

As discussed in 2.2.2.a, there might be a whole social stratum in both case studies only being hinted at by the evidence uncovered so far due to the difficulties inherent in identifying unenclosed settlements in the landscape. Furthermore, even when physically identified, dating domestic structures by morphological analogy is not appropriate, due to the lengthy associated chronologies of all forms of unenclosed settlement, which means only sites dated by radiocarbon or artefactual associations can be included in the dataset. The exception to this would be the CASR-B1 on Divis Mountain (Gillespie 2010), which might be dated by comparison with the Ergadia series. As with Ergadia, the dataset would then represent only a small fraction of the overall number of unenclosed settlements. This is occasionally hinted at in accounts of battles or the dues owed to members of the extractive elites in both case studies in the EMP, VA and especially the HMP.

Most of the unenclosed settlements of all phases were identified by the radiocarbon-dating of the features found during large open-plan excavations, with targeted excavation of visible remains much rarer. Several others were dating artefactually, usually through the presence of pottery or personal adornment. In some cases, unenclosed settlements might underlie later settlement enclosures. However, several of the LIA instances where this has been proposed (e.g. Becker et al. 2008; Becker 2009) are rejected here on archaeological grounds (Table 4.2, see site entries in A.4 for full discussion).

Table 4.2. Iron Age settlement evidence rejected in this thesis on archaeological grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Morph.</th>
<th>Dating Evidence</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiville</td>
<td>Univallate rath</td>
<td>C14 (mixed charcoal)</td>
<td>LIA</td>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Mixed sample dated very early (1957), second sample from same context firmly in EMP–VA, material culture and morphology agree with later date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galboly</td>
<td>field wall</td>
<td>C14 (humic acid)</td>
<td>LBA–EIA</td>
<td>LBA</td>
<td>from peat over field wall, does not date wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodland</td>
<td>Pit in unenclosed settlement</td>
<td>C14 (humic acid)</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Downward filtration of humic acid; later rectified date places feature in Neolithic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to souterrains being taken as representing unenclosed settlement when not directly associated with enclosed settlement, they dominate the group of unenclosed settlements. Beyond that, they would mainly seem to consist of curvilinear houses up until c.AD800 and a mixture of curvilinear and rectilinear houses after this point, with the series of cave settlements possibly an exception to this pattern.

**Distribution**
The group of unenclosed settlements dating to the Iron Age (Map 4.1) is probably too small to say anything about their distribution, bar that they are often located in areas chosen for house-construction and road-building projects. The same holds for unenclosed settlements dating to the EMP, VA and HMP identified by excavation alone (Maps 4.2–4.4). Nearly 10% of all of the known souterrains in Ireland are located in Co. Antrim. Rather than indicating ‘tribal groupings’ (Buckley 1986), their non-even distribution across similar landforms might indicate different approaches taken to the practical uses of souterrains in different areas (Map 4.3). This holds for both souterrains associated and not associated with enclosed settlements. Their avoidance of upland and bogland areas is related to their relationship with farming; in this respect, they are similar to several of the forms of settlement enclosure discussed in 4.3–4.11. The general distribution of unenclosed settlement would seem to have been related to the distribution of contemporary enclosed settlements. Swift (1998, 118–9) discusses the textual evidence for landscapes of settlement involving secular and ecclesiastic enclosed settlements and a myriad of other non-enclosed forms. It is argued here that the archaeological evidence is beginning to indicate that Swift’s text-based proposition is reflected in the archaeology. This should be taken as a warning against the fixation of the internal area of enclosed settlements in the planning phases of construction projects.
Map 4.1. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ulidia dating to the Mid and Late Iron Age (MIA–LIA).
Map 4.2. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ulidia dating to the early medieval period (EMP).
Map 4.3. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ulidia dating to the Viking Age (VA).
Map 4.4. Total distribution of unenclosed settlements in Ulidia dating to the high medieval period (HMP).
Chronology

As can be seen in Figure 4.1 and Map 4.1, the number of unenclosed settlements dating to the Iron Age in its entirety is fairly low. This is in line with a general trend found across Ireland (Raftery 1994; Dolan 2014) and is related to the low archaeological visibility of unenclosed settlement. That said, the number of known Iron Age unenclosed settlements is still higher than any subsequent period in Ulidia, and of similar order to the number known from Ergadia. As noted in 2.2.2.a, a wider use of radiocarbon-dating has led to a much higher level of detection of Iron Age unenclosed settlement activity, just as it will for subsequent periods (Figure 4.1; Maps 4.2–4.4).

Figure 4.2 outlines the radiocarbon-dating evidence from excavated souterrains in Ulidia. While each of these souterrains was associated with enclosed settlement, they might be used for the purposes of comparison, few of the souterrains in Figure 4.1 have associated radiocarbon dates. One problem with dating the fills of souterrains is that the fill material is redeposited and usually contains carbonised material older than the process of in-filling of the souterrain. This is most likely behind each of the date-ranges that fall before AD800 (see A.4 site entries), but targeted excavation might eventually extend the use of souterrains back in time.

The visibility of souterrains might skew the dataset, making it seem as though there was an upsurge in unenclosed settlement after c.AD800, as might artefactual evidence dating to the same period, such as souterrain ware. The reliance on souterrain ware to date so many unenclosed settlements might obscure the number dating to the EMP. Furthermore, were the dating of CSW and DSW, and indeed PSW, to be strictly applied, every unenclosed settlement with any of these forms could potentially date to the HMP, even if the period AD800–1100 is more likely in most instances. This might help account for the apparent drop in the number of HMP unenclosed settlements. On the current evidence, it would be best to see unenclosed settlement as in constant use throughout the period under research, while noting that there is an apparent rise in visibility, if not overall use, in the period AD800–1100.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aird [S]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyaghagan [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, CSW, DSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyboley [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyhackett [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spearhead (Type C or E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyhenry 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB-943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyhornan [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, ERW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyloran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta-22387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta-223870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballymartin [S]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, GGP, ERW, DSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballynacraig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUERC-5084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ballyutoag/Aughnabrack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB-2594, UB-2637, UB-2636, UB-2596, UB-2595, UB-2638, CA-RHP, PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Cave [cave]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA stick pin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrreeghy Site 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-343951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrstown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB-6242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hill [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft Road, Holywood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-RHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross, Kilcoo [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossreagh East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-195009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossreagh West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB-4917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegere [S]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumadonnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-138989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-138988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumlea Hill, Inch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB-4603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(modified from OxCal v4.3.2 Bronk Ramsey (2017); r5 IntCal13 atmospheric curve (Reimer et al 2013))
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drumnakill, Bighouse [S]</td>
<td>PSW, DSW, CSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseverick [cave]</td>
<td>E-ware, PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsilly</td>
<td>UB-967, UB-2001, UB-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunturk</td>
<td>Beta-347442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galgorm [S]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortnamaddy</td>
<td>no lab no.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groomsport</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>UBA-12632, UBA-12633, UBA-12634, UBA-12631, UBA-12628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilbride [S]</td>
<td>PSW, DSW, CSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knockdhu [S]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisnalinchy</td>
<td>Beta-236973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Calibrated dates (calBC/calAD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magheramenagh</td>
<td>Beta-186550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta-186551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta-186549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malone Upper</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masked Rock Shelter [cave]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnis North</td>
<td>UB-3537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyadam [S]</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murlough Dunes</td>
<td>UB-548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Cave [cave]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portbraddan Cave [cave]</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite comb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3x Walrus ivory pins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1. Chronological diagram for unenclosed settlements in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [S] after the name of the site indicates souterrains, while the shape after the name of the site indicates whether circular or rectilinear domestic structures were found in association.
Function and status

Considering that the vast majority of settlement evidence from the Irish Iron Age is unenclosed (see Becker 2009; 2012; Becker et al. 2008), unenclosed settlements would seem to have been associated with a wider cross-section of contemporary society than in the Bronze Age or early medieval period. This contrasts with the construction of elaborate ritual sites such as Tara, Navan Fort and Knockaulin, and with the large amount of decorated metalwork and stonework deposited in watery locations across the northern half of the island (Raftery 1994; Waddell 2000, 319–72). It also comes with a caveat that the vast majority of hilltop enclosures and
enclosed promontories are unexcavated. Moreover, the large-scale dating of multiple strata in archaeological excavations is a phenomenon of the past two decades; further research using these techniques might greatly alter our knowledge of Iron Age settlement. For the moment, though, it would seem as though status was displayed and materially negotiated through very different means, means that have left little archaeological trace beyond the presence of largescale projects such as ritual centres and roads through bogs.

The association of unenclosed settlements and of souterrains unassociated with enclosed settlement gives a potential indicator of the presence of several categories of unfree tenants, labourers and slaves who provided labour, renders and agricultural productivity within their contemporary societies (Section 1.3.3; Table 1.2; Charles-Edwards 2000, 68–9; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 79–85).

It is argued here that souterrains functioned primarily for storage. They were ideal stores for dairy products and meat (Edwards 1990, 30). Barrel hoops have been found in Balrenny, Co. Meath, which may support this, as does the evidence for possible butter storage at Shaneen Park, Co. Antrim (Edwards 1990, 30). The presence of storage jars and grain in the souterrain at Drumadoon would certainly seem to indicate a storage function (McSparron and Williams 2009, 129). Storage as a primary function has been disputed by some. Warner (1979, 131; 1980, 92) dismisses the storage function of souterrains. McCormick claims that the construction of souterrains is a reaction to the commercialisation of slavery (2008, 221). Clinton (2001, 60) draws attention to the presence of a range of impedimental devices, such as trapdoors, pit-drop or shaft entrances, porthole slabs, protruding jamb-stones, and head obstructions. He sees these as defensive features, but he also draws attention to the presence of ramps and stepped entrances at other examples. They may have additionally provided a refuge during small-scale cattle raids (Clinton 2001, 60–1). However, as Edwards (1990, 30) points out, they would become death traps in the event of a sustained attack if the ventilation shafts were blocked and a fire started. This would seem to have been the case in ALC1135.2, when the king of Fir Li and his family were smothered in a cave by the Uí Tuirtre. The defensive features might also have been to deter thieves; tripping over a protruding jamb would certainly alert the dogs within a compound and thus the occupants. O’Conor (1998, 98–9) discusses the importance of flight and of the use of the landscape for defensive purposes in the HMP. This is referred to by Giraldus Cambrensis (*Topographia* III §37), but it might partially be colonial bias, as will be discussed in Chapter 7.

It is likely then, that souterrains served primarily for storage and secondarily as refuges in low-level skirmishes, whether they were associated with enclosed or unenclosed settlements. Our knowledge of unenclosed settlement in the high medieval period is still in its infancy. It
has proven just as difficult to identify archaeologically as in the Iron Age or EMP. This is despite the much higher level of documentary evidence for this period, which was characterised, perhaps to an even greater degree, by the extraction of agricultural surplus by the aristocracy from clients and tenants. This was paralleled by the extraction of income by the Church via its network of parishes, all of which had to come from someone living somewhere. The figures in the chronology section are a start, but it is imagined that a far greater number of unenclosed settlements will become known through the utilisation of wider programmes of radiocarbon-dating as standard on archaeological excavations.

4.3 Univallate raths

Morphology
In terms of the morphology of univallate raths in Ulidia, they for the most part nearly circular, with an internal diameter centring on 30m, with examples known to be as large as 45m or 60m. They may have had internal buildings or souterrains (A.4.3). The large open-plan infrastructural excavations south of the border have demonstrated that all forms of raths had annexes and outlying buildings, as postulated based on documentary sources (Swift 1998), but very few have been identified in Northern Ireland so far, where the focus of excavations until recently has been on the enclosure itself.

Distribution
In terms of their distribution, univallate raths tend to avoid upland areas (Map 4.5). Comparing Maps 4.5 and 4.6, the number of unclassified enclosures makes it difficult to determine their exact overall distribution, but taken together, they can be used to give a maximum and minimum view of the potential distribution of univallate raths in Ulidia. Notable densities are visible to the east of Lough Neagh and in western Co. Down—the core areas of the early medieval Cruithin kingdoms of the Uí Chóelbad (Dál n'Araide) and Uí Echach Cobo. Their lower density in eastern Co. Down might indicate that other settlement forms were in use in the territory ruled by the Dál Fiatach and Uí Echach Airde, and the Church may have held large amounts of territory here, as it did in the HMP (see Reeves 1847).
Map 4.5. Distribution of univallate raths in Ulidia.
Chronology

Figure 4.3 represents the sum of the dating evidence available from univallate raths in Ulidia, including the univallate phases of later raised raths. The information derived from all the sources taken together is complementary, although it would seem as though the traditional cut-off point of c.AD900 should be extended for the occupation, if not foundation-events, of univallate raths, to AD1200, if not AD1400 (contra Lynn 1975). Many of the radiocarbon dates were obtained during projects more concerned with questions of origins rather than continuity, which shaped decisions regarding from which contexts material should be dated. This might mean that the selection of samples for radiocarbon-dating might need to be rethought, as the material culture indicates that the late phases of activity at univallate raths are under-represented in absolute-dating strategies. It is also evident from the diagrams that very few sites have evidence of activity prior to AD600, although the various aceramic phases indicated in Figure 4.3 might demonstrate otherwise, were they to have associated radiocarbon dates. As noted in 4.2, the use of souterrain ware for dating purposes might be misleading; it is likely that many more univallate raths had settlement activity prior to c.AD800 that is currently archaeologically invisible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site &amp; Phase</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnmeen, Site 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong></td>
<td>UB-14193, UB-14196, UB-14191, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4</strong></td>
<td>UB-14195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryduff 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, CSW, GGP, Coin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Skreen 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong></td>
<td>CA-escutcheon, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass bead (Class 15A), Glass bead (Class 15), Bone pins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Skreen 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong></td>
<td>Glass bead (Class 15A), Glass bead (Class 15), Bone pins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clontonakelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB-663, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrstown, Portrush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB-6237, UB-6232, UB-16613, UB-6377, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumbroneth 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumlea Hill, Inch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UB-4602, SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunsilly</td>
<td></td>
<td>UB-968,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faranfad, Piper’s Fort</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>PSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finkiltagh</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough Fort</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killyglen (Fairy Cave)</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killarn</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langford Lodge, Gartree</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>E-ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisduff/Carnmeen</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>CA-RHP,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DSW,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>ERW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismahon</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>CA-RHP,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisnacreevy</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRA2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 4.3. Chronological diagram for univallate raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
**Function and status**

It has been argued elsewhere (e.g. Stout 1997) that, rather than their being high-status monuments, univallate raths might be best associated with the classes of free farmers mentioned in various EMP legal texts (Table 1.2; Charles-Edwards 2000, 130–1). That is not to say that the lower grades of nobility did not also occupy such sites. Also, some sites might have served specialist functions, such as ironworking; there were furnaces at Lissue, Dunsilly, and Deer Park Farms, but the small amounts of slag at four other raths probably indicate small-scale ironworking (Figure 4.3). Slate motif pieces were also present at Lissue (Figure 4.3; A.4.3 entry). The grain-kilns at Rathbeg, Carnmeen 3 and Corrstown (where a grain-pit was also found), and the millstone from Deer Park Farms indicate largescale grain processing in the vicinity of the sites (Figure 4.3). It may be that such sites were associated with comparatively higher-status occupants than the general group of raths, or it might be down to them being excavated using modern methodologies—Carnmeen 3 and Corrstown were both large, open-plan excavations, rather than targeted excavations solely focussed on the enclosures.

The LRA1 from Lisnacreevy represents something of an outlier, being found in a ploughed field near an unexcavated rath. All of the univallate raths associated with E-ware were later rebuilt as raised raths (Figures 4.3, 4.8). This connection to the long-distance movement and redistribution of material culture might indicate that the occupants may have been from among the lower levels of the aristocracy, or from the highest levels of free farmers with direct clientship links to the upper aristocracy. Both Lismahon and Deer Park Farms would also be similarly refurbished, which might indicate a connection between ring-headed pins and status, although Ballykennedy, Lisduff and Seacash were not, but the last two were also occupied as late as the HMP (Figure 4.3). This might demonstrate a connection between longevity of use and relative status. The presence of glass beads might be similar to the presence of ring-headed pins in relation to status, but this would need more work, building on the start made by Mannion (2015) in this respect. It should also be noted that material culture might indicate relative differences in terms of wealth within groups of otherwise similar social status, or choices by agents to adorn themselves in certain ways unrelated to social stratification.
4.4 Miscellaneous enclosures

Morphology
A small group of sites do not fit well into the classifications; therefore, they must be placed into Kinsella’s (2010) ‘miscellaneous’ group. Some sites consist of a series of ditches with associated EMP material, with no further information available, e.g., Lissue/Knockmore and Ballyvally. They are treated here together, in lieu of a better option. Also treated here is the group of sites classed by the NISMR as ‘enclosure’ (Map 4.6), having ruled out as many tree-rings, barrows and henges as possible. In most instances, the classification has come about due to only part of the enclosure surviving, with many visible only as cropmarks or short arcs of bank and ditch.

Distribution
Miscellaneous enclosures are argued here as randomly distributed (Map 4.6). The series of unclassified enclosures follow a similar distribution to univallate raths. In some instances, the unclassified enclosures ‘fill in’ areas of lower densities of univallate raths, such as in western Antrim, which might be due to the destruction of sites due to modern farming practices, possibly combined with classificatory differences between NISMR surveyors. Again upland (e.g., the Antrim massif) and wetland areas (the Montiaghs) are avoided.
Map 4.6. Distribution of unclassified and miscellaneous (i.e., non rath/cashel-form enclosures, but contemporary to them) in Ulidia; caveat: some of these enclosures or portions of enclosures may be henges, tree-rings or barrows.
Chronology

As can be seen in Figure 4.4, miscellaneous enclosures might have been in use across the period AD600–1400, based on the artefactual evidence and the one associated radiocarbon date.

Figure 4.4. Chronological diagram for miscellaneous enclosures in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

It is likely that these sites served specialists functions, ranging from metalworking sites such as Ballyvollen to what may have been sites with agricultural functions: Ballyaghagan (Cave Hill), Ballynoe, Ballyhamage and Killylane (A.4.4). They may well be part of a wider set of related features in their landscapes—this is one of the main problems with solely focussing on the internal area during excavations.
4.5 Cashels

Morphology
In general, the cashels in Co. Down tend to be near circular, if slightly irregular in many cases. A number of the north-eastern examples are quite small and oval-shaped, and similar to Werner (2007) and McSparron and Williams (2011a; 2011b), those examples located on outcrops have been classified as outcrop enclosures and discussed in their own section. In almost all instances, cashels in Ulidia tend to be univallate with no ditch, but the second phase of activity at Deerfin involved the digging of a ditch and construction of an upcast counterscarp bank. Several sites have been mis-identified as cashels when they were actually univallate raths with a stone revetment or stone paving laid on the earthen bank (A.4.3). The sites where this occurs have been classified as univallate raths.

Distribution
As can be seen from Map 4.7, there are two main groups: one in south Co. Down and another smaller group in northeast Antrim. While it might be argued that they are located in areas where a ditch cannot be dug into the earth to form an upcast bank, thus necessitating the use of a stone wall, in many instances it seems to have been down to the preference of the builders.
Map 4.7. Distribution of cashels in Ulidia.
Chronology
Unfortunately, very little excavation has taken place at cashel sites in Ulidia, with four sites in total, with no radiocarbon dates available. This might skew the dating evidence represented in Figure 4.5, as it is reliant on artefact chronologies that might not tell the whole story.

Figure 4.5. Chronological diagram for cashels in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status
Similar to univallate raths, cashels might also be regarded as having been farming settlements associated with a class of free farmers or the lower nobility. They may in some instances have
been something to aspire to by occupants of other forms of enclosed settlement—the series of stone-revetted univallate raths might be an indication of this, e.g. Craigs, Co. Antrim. Deerfin represents something of an exception to this, as extensive evidence for metalworking was uncovered there, including the production of iron ring-headed pins, knives and tools, as were possible crucible stands and “five industrial hearths” (Bratt 1975). Considering that Deerfin had a ditch and earthen counterscarp bank added to it, it may be that the alterations were associated with the occupants of the site having a particular social status. This might be hinted at in the discussions of smiths and other craftworkers in the eighth-century legal texts (see 1.3.3).

4.6 Conjoined raths

Morphology

It is difficult to state where the dividing line between a rath with an annexe and conjoined raths lies. As stated in Table 2.16, conjoined raths are classified as such when each element would be capable of being classed as a rath were it to appear alone. It would seem as though they might be part of a wider cluster of features, e.g., at Brokerstown, where evidence was found for a nearby souterrain, two possible medieval houses and a field system (Dunlop 2007; 2009). The pairings often consist of morphologically distinct elements, e.g., the univallate rath and multivallate rath pairing at Ballypalady.

Distribution

For such a small group of sites (66), their distribution might not be significant. Most of them occur in areas of high concentrations of raths in general (Map 4.8), which might indicate a specialist function in a local division of labour.
Chronology
As can be seen in Figure 4.6, the majority of evidence from conjoined raths lies in the AD600–1000 range. However, the stick pins from Ballypalady 2 and Ballywee and the latest radiocarbon date from Brokerstown (UB-9256) indicate that conjoined raths may have been in use as late as the twelfth or even fourteenth century AD.

Figure 4.6. Chronological diagram for conjoined raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Function and status

It may be that one of the conjoined pair in each case served a specialist function, or that these sites were associated with specialisation, be it grain production or the production of metalwork and glass, albeit not to the exclusion of other forms of enclosed settlement. The presence of houses in all four excavated sites indicates domesticity. The presence of iron ingots, ore, bloom and slag, of copper-alloy slag, crucibles and glass slag would all indicate that Ballykennedy (Lawlor 1917) was a significant production site. The presence of a sword pommel and an iron cast bird at Ballykennedy, which have not been possible to date from their descriptions, might indicate either the production of high-level ironwork or the relatively elevated status of the occupants. The other half of the pair may have functioned as a ‘normal’ rath.

The byre, dry-store, drying-kiln and souterrains at Ballywee (Lynn 1974) all indicate that it was associated with both arable and pastoral agriculture; perhaps to a greater extent than most of the excavated univallate raths. The complex arrangement of fields, pits and gullies around the conjoined pair at Brokerstown (Dunlop 2007) would seem to indicate that it was part of an intensively farmed landscape extending across several periods. The same holds for Ballypalady (Waterman 1972). Dress pins were present at 3/4 excavated sites, which might be an indication of some sort of social differentiation in relation to the occupants of such sites, as might the presence of glass beads at 2/4 sites.
4.7 Platform raths

Morphology
Differentiating between raised raths and platform raths can be difficult in the field, but it is often possible to determine that the rath sits on the altered summit of a natural feature, either in the field or from the field notes. In cases where this is not possible, only excavation can determine if a mound is an artificially altered earthen topographic feature, and thus a platform rath. The waters are further muddied in cases where a platform rath has been converted to a raised rath (e.g., Gransha), or a motte (e.g., Ballyfounder), or both, by the introduction of further material. In fact, 6/13 platform raths were overlain by mottes, one was converted to a ringwork (Piper’s Fort) and one into the bailey for a masonry castle (Seafín). Therefore, an intermediate category of “Raised or Platform Rath” is employed in Maps 4.9–4.10 to cover uncertain cases.

Distribution
The distribution of platform raths differs little from univallate raths or cashels, avoiding both uplands and areas of wetlands (Map 4.9). One difference in comparison to multivallate raths is that platform raths are least dense along the external borders of the overkingdom, which might be significant, possibly due to an association with farming—or the collection and extraction of agricultural surplus—rather than military activity. There is also a notable concentration of platform raths in the lower Ards peninsula, possibly either due to emulative practice or the local topography.

Chronology
Normally, platform raths are seen as later than univallate or bivallate raths, but the presence of E-ware at Ballyfounder (Waterman 1958) and Gransha (Lynn 1985), and the radiocarbon dates from the latter, demonstrate that platform raths were in use as early as the seventh century. It may be that these early sites served as prototypes for the later examples in the series, or it might be that raised raths were an attempt to artificially replicate these early platform raths. However, only two platform raths have associated radiocarbon dates (Figure 4.7), and it may be that several more have earlier activity not visible in the artefactual dating.
Map 4.9. Distribution of platform raths in Ulidia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballyfounder</td>
<td>E-ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymurphy</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballynarry</td>
<td>PSW, CSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyroney</td>
<td>2x CA-stick pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clanrolla</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromore</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW, CSW, DSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 4.7. Chronological diagram for platform raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
**Function and status**

Considering that raised/platform raths consist of about 20% of the total number of raths, they might generally be associated with the upper strata of free farmers or lower aristocracy. There are some exceptions to this at platform raths that differ from the general series. The first (pre-motte and bailey) phase at Duneight 1 in Co. Down might be best described as a platform rath, albeit one of much larger proportions, with an enclosed summit area 60m by 30m on its axes and deep wide ditches (Waterman 1963; A.4 entry). Waterman (1963, 76) is probably correct in his suggestion that this rather than the nearby bivallate rath is the site mentioned in AU1003 and AU1010, references which indicate that it had royal associations and it is located overlooking the border between the territories associated with the Ulaid and the Dál nAraide. Its evidence for ironworking and consumption of meat, while paralleled at many sites, might in this instance be an indication of the presence of the warrior-aristocracy. Evidence for external buildings was also found outside the enclosure, indicating that the site was a focal point for further settlement (A.4.7).

The presence of a Type F3 brooch and E-ware in the earliest phase at Gransha and brooch moulds (Figure 4.7), forty motif pieces and a series of iron weapons in the second phase (Lynn 1985) might indicate that the site was associated with wider networks of exchange and with the production and redistribution of potentially high-status material culture from the sixth to the ninth centuries. It was probably not a royal site, but it might have been associated with the upper strata of the nobility, which might account for its early use of the platform style. The early use of the platform rath form at Ballyfounder and its association with E-ware might indicate the elevated status of its occupants, especially seeing as it is in such a strategic hilltop location.

In these three cases, Duneight was distinguished from other platform raths by its size and Gransha and Ballyfounder by their height in comparison to contemporary sites. This might have set the sites and their occupants apart from the occupants of contemporary settlements. The other excavated platform raths fit better into contemporary norms, but even then, their height difference might have been socially significant. Their continued use might indicate the relative stability of their occupants, something interrupted by the conversion of many sites to mottes in the Anglo-Norman era (discussed Chapter 7).

In general, platform raths seem to have been associated with a mixed arable and pastoral economy (Kerr 2007, 115; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 53). The large amount of oat and barley remains, and the cattle, sheep, horse and pig bones from Drumadoon would seem to confirm an agricultural function (A.4.7 entry; McSparron and Williams 2009, 124–30). It might also represent the concentration and consumption of agricultural resources, so any conclusion would
have to await further research. The presence of a spearhead at Drumadoon might indicate the participation of the occupants in military activity, or it might have been related purely to defence. Ironworking (seemingly for general purposes) also seems to have taken place at Ballynarry, Ballyroney, Drumadoon, Duneight and Gransha (A.4.7 entries), a similar spread to that which occurs across the entire range of enclosed settlements.

4.8 Raised Raths

Morphology
As noted in Table 2.16, the difference between raised raths and platform raths is that raised raths are artificially constructed platforms, usually overlying early univallate or bivallate raths. This platform might have formed naturally through successive occupations or it might have been formed using introduced material. Most of the mounds seemed to have been without revetments. However, the second phase of Lismahon was formed using a timber revetment, which subsequently collapsed (Waterman 1959, 143) and there were drystone revetments at Deer Park Farms and Sallagh.

Distribution
The distribution or raised raths differs little from platform raths, including a lower density along the external borders of the overkingdom, which again might be significant. The excavated examples tend to be found in areas of fairly dense presence of univallate raths, and O’Sullivan et al. (2013, 53; also Kerr 2007, 115, O’Sullivan and Downey 2007, 34) state that there is a “statistically significant association with good quality agricultural land”. This was based on the northwest of Ireland, but it might be applicable also to Ulidia.
Map 4.10. Distribution of raised raths in Ulidia.
Chronology
On the evidence outlined in Figure 4.8, it would seem as though the proposition that raised raths are a phenomenon dating to c.AD800 onwards (Kerr 2007, 99) is most certainly correct. Considering that, by definition, they represent later phases of other forms of enclosed settlement, their later date might be expected. The section outlining the dating evidence from Meadowbank represents an outlier with its early dates. This is because too little information is available from the site to separate the reported six phases there from one another (see Halpin and Crothers 1995), with the dates obtained through secondary sources (Kerr 2007, 93, Chapple 2013).

Several raised raths have evidence dating to after c.AD1180. This might be due to the conversion of many such sites into mottes, but in the cases of Ballynarry, Deer Park Farms, Poleglass and Rathmullan, it is difficult to determine whether the late phases were mottes or remained as raised raths. This is due to the lack of evidence for an ‘upgrade’ of the defences at these sites four in their late phases. The late phases of Deer Park Farms did not receive the same archaeological attention as the earlier phases; for example, no samples were radiocarbon dated from the upper strata, despite the presence of high medieval pottery.
Figure 4.8. Chronological diagram for raised raths in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status
Considering that raised raths are built over several sites from which E-ware, penannular brooches and other potential indicators of elevated status were obtained (A.4.8), it may be that
some raised raths were associated with members of the warrior- or political-aristocracy. This might be evidenced by the presence of a spearhead at Meadowbank (A.4.8). Their construction may have been connected to a re-ordering of the aristocracy in the ninth–tenth centuries, in line with the process of political centralisation ongoing in Ireland and in Ulidia at the time (discussed in Ó Corráin 1978; Doherty 1998). They may have been intended as copies of the small group of early platform raths, but this is speculative.

Beyond that, like the vast majority of other settlement enclosures in Ulidia, they probably functioned as farms (see the grain evidence from Haw Hill and Deer Park Farms in A.4.8), but also possibly the concentration of agricultural resources, if only for renders to be passed up the social pyramid. The souterrains at several sites might be an indicator of this. Metalworking was carried out at Ballyrickard, Deer Park Farms, Haw Hill, Meadowbank and Rathmullan, and potentially at several other sites (Figure 4.8; see A.4.8 entries). This metalworking may have been functional, rather than related to the production of high-status items of material culture.

4.9 Enclosed outcrops

Morphology

It is argued here that the series of enclosed settlements on rock stacks/outcrops in northern Antrim (Werner 2007; McSparron and Williams 2011) represent a variant of the platform rath tradition using rock platforms rather than earth/clay mounds. However, they differ enough from platform raths to warrant discussing them in a separate section. There might be something of a fine line between classing a site as an enclosed outcrop and as a hilltop enclosure, or between a cashel and an enclosed outcrop, and future research might identify further examples.

Distribution

As can be seen in Map 4.11, the majority of enclosed outcrops are located in northern Antrim. The topography in this region contains many rock outcrops, much more so that in Co. Down; therefore, the distribution might be related to the availability of outcrops to enclose. Considering that the series strongly resembles similarly located SSEs and MSEs in Ergadia, they may be regarded as part of a cross-North Channel distribution of such sites.
Map 4.11. Distribution of enclosed outcrops in Ulidia.
**Chronology**

Despite having some morphological similarities with sites located on outcrops in western Scotland, there is little evidence at the two sites excavated so far (Figure 4.9) to see them as contemporary to the SSEs and MSEs located on outcrops discussed in Chapter 3. Unfortunately, the evidence is also possibly too weak to state whether or not they are successive to the SSEs and MSEs in Scotland. This will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

![Figure 4.9. Chronological diagram for enclosed outcrops in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.](modified from OxCal v4.3.2 Bronk Ramsey (2017); r5 intCal13 atmospheric curve (Reimer et al 2013))

**Function and status**

Childe (1938, 127–8) sees the presence of lignite cores in the outer ward at Doonmore as evidence for the manufacture of lignite objects. The presence of iron bloom at the site indicates iron production or iron working also took place at the site (A.4.9). The presence of three copper-alloy ring-headed pins at Doonbought (Figure 4.9) might indicate that its occupants were of
potentially elevated comparative social status. That both sites later became castles of enclosure would indicate that they were in strategic locations, which might also indicate that the occupants of the sites in the EMP–VA were part of the military aristocracy. Little can be said beyond that without further information from contemporary sites in this part of Antrim—the portion of the Ulidia case study that has received the least amount of survey and excavation.

4.10 Bivallate Raths

Morphology
The main division within the group of bivallate raths is sites with two banks and two ditches (bivallate raths) and sites with two banks and one ditch (counterscarp raths). This may or may not have been a significant distinction to contemporaries, and it comes with the caveat that a second ditch might have been present at many of the unexcavated counterscarp raths. Some raised and platform raths are also bivallate or counterscarped, which represents something of a classificatory challenge. Considering that all raised raths are multiperiod, their separate phases can be treated separately in the analysis here. Bivallate platform raths are treated like bivallate raths here, to avoid over-complicating the analysis.

Distribution
The distribution of bivallate raths resembles that of all other types of raths (Map 4.12). Where univallate, raised/platform raths are densest, so too are bivallate raths; upland and marshland areas are avoided. This might indicate some sort of social relationship between the occupants of bivallate raths and the other forms discussed so far.
Chronology
The early dates from Carnmeen 23 (Dunlop 2015; Figure 4.10, phases 1–2) are most likely from residual hazel charcoal in the fill of two grain-drying kilns and a souterrain. Charred grain from the other kilns gave much later dates, and it is proposed here that these dates are more reliable. The dates are discussed in full in the appendix entry for Carnmeen 23 (A.4.10). The earliest date from the ditch at Ballywillwill 1 (Waterman and Collins 1952) might be carbonised material older than the ditch itself, but comment must await the full publication of the recent archaeological activity at the site. The evidence from Ballyhenry 2 (Lynn 1983) and Crossnacreevy (Harper 1973–4) would seem to indicate that bivallate raths might date to as early as the sixth–seventh centuries in their early phases.

From the small number of excavated sites, it is evident that bivallate raths were in use as a class to possibly as late as the fourteenth century AD. Whether or not this was continuous must await further research, as might discussions of the form settlement at bivallate raths took in the HMP. At Carnmeen 23, the HMP phases consisted of the construction of a stone house and a stone revetment against the inner bank, perhaps to give the illusion of a castle. The HMP phases at the other sites might have been less elaborate.
Figure 4.10. Chronological diagram for bivallate raths in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

The problems with the early Irish legal texts have already been discussed, but the general conclusion that bivallate raths were associated with occupants of comparatively elevated status might still be drawn from schematic legal texts such as Crith Gablach, c.AD690–740 (Binchy 1941). The exact nature of this status no doubt changed over time, due to the high dynamism in Irish society AD700–1100 (see Ó Corráin 1972; 1978; Byrne 1973; Doherty 1998 for accounts of this centrifugal dynamic). A statement that bivallate raths might have been occupied by the lower aristocracy, perhaps with some sort of military role, might not be too wide of the mark. The presence of items of personal adornment might indicate the ways in which this status was bodily portrayed, possibly in combination with the wearing of weapons. The cluster of imported objects (LRA1, the stone lamp and possibly the glass bead) all possibly dating to AD400–600
at Crossnacreevy might indicate that the occupants of bivallate raths were (indirectly) associated with long-range networks of exchange at an early date (Figure 4.10). These would seem to be the only imports known so far from bivallate raths, though. The association of bivallate raths might also be indicated by their longevity. The unpublished excavations at Antrim Civic Offices and Ballylacky (A.4.10) excluded, all of the bivallate raths have clear evidence for (re)occupation in the HMP. That is not to say that the occupants remained the same over this huge sweep of time.

Rotary querns are rare at bivallate raths, but the grain-drying kilns and grain deposits in the souterrains at Carnmeen 23 indicate that the concentration and processing of agricultural produce might have been an important activity at bivallate raths (A.4.10). It might even be tempting to see them as local centres of surplus concentration within the system of the baile biataig system that developed after AD1000 (see MacCotter 2008, 23–4, 58–87). This might explain their continued use in the Anglo-Norman period after AD1180 (Figure 4.10). Slag was found at Carnmeen 23 and Ballymacash, with crucibles also found at the former. Therefore, metalworking also seems to have occurred at or near bivallate raths, but it does not seem as though they were specialist metalworking centres in general.

One bivallate rath, Rathmore, has strong royal associations, being the site of a major battle against invading Britons (AU682.2; AT682.3) and being remembered in the high-medieval life of Comgall of Bangor as the main royal site of the Dál nAraide (Plummer 1910b, 19 §52). Similar to Dunseverick, its appearance in the *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (AD1150×1200; Macalister 1956, 329–31) demonstrates that it was a major point of reference as late as the twelfth century.
4.11 Multivallate raths

Morphology
As noted in 2.2.2, multivallate raths are characterised by three or more very closely spaced banks with intervening ditches. There might occasionally be confusion in their recognition, as some sites with two ditches might have had three banks yet be misidentified as bivallate.

Distribution
As can be seen from Map 4.13, known multivallate raths are much rarer in the landscape. This is paralleled elsewhere in Ireland (O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 50). They are so rare that their distribution is statistically random. Mallory and McNeill (1991, 204, 222–4) see them as associated with the warrior-aristocracy, with their inhabitants possibly more reliant on renders than direct agricultural production, and that this might be testified by their lack of direct association with good farmland. This might have been true in some instances, but in others it was not. The few multivallate raths fall into two categories: those located at the core of kingdoms and those located on the frontiers between them. As can be seen in Map 4.13, five are located at the core of Mag Line and one at the core of Mag Cobo. Conversely, eight are located around the borders of Mag Cobo with surrounding territories and seven close to the outer borders of the overkingdom of Ulaid itself.
Chronology
Unfortunately, very few multivallate raths have been excavated (Figure 4.11), and radiocarbon
dates are only available for the rescue excavations at Tully (Harper 1970), where the upper
levels were not recorded, and the results were never published beyond a short summary. Tully’s
relatively early date is paralleled at other multivallate enclosures in Ireland (O’Sullivan et al.
2013, 65), with the caveat that the Old Wood Effect might have pushed all of the dates back
c.100 years (2.4.1). From the available evidence, it would seem as though Tully was occupied
from as early as the fifth–sixth century up until at least after AD1000, and it may have been
occupied immediately prior to its conversion to a motte in the late twelfth–early thirteenth
centuries. Other than that, the artefactual evidence from the other three sites is consistent with
all of the other forms of rath chronologically. An exception to this might be the possible Bronze
Age sword from Lisnavarragh, a site which is essentially undated beyond a report of works in
1832 (Proudfoot 1961, 121).
Figure 4.11. Chronological diagram for multivallate raths in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status
The complex of sites in Lisnagade townland, Co. Down represents something of a lost archaeological opportunity. The presence of a cluster of sites involving two multivallate raths (Lisnavarragh and Lisnagade 1) in proximity to one another, with a univallate rath joined to Lisnagade 1 by a series of earthwork (Jope 1966, 149–50) has no parallels in Ulidia. None of the excavations have been published and the notes from Lisnavarragh have been lost (NISMR). The location of the complex close to the external border of both the overkingdom of Ulaid and the kingdom of Uí Echach Cobo is probably significant and would be in line with the
proposition that multivallate raths were associated with the upper levels of the military aristocracy (see Mallory and McNeill 1991, 222, O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 61, 82–4). The assemblage and longevity of occupation at Tully would also seem to indicate elevated social status, but very little can be said of the other two excavated sites (Figure 4.11; A.4.11).

4.12 Island enclosures

Morphology and distribution

This category contains just one site, the enclosure on the larger of the two Dunnyneil Islands in Strangford Lough (Map 4.14). Several phases of activity have been identified, the three discussed here took the form of a series of indistinct enclosures and platforms followed by the construction of an enclosure resembling a platform rath and raised rath in its successive phases (Figure 4.12, phases 3 and 4). The site is located in Strangford Lough, and close to what seem to be core political areas within the overkingdom of Ulaid in the EMP, and it is likely that it was related to the dual royal and ecclesiastic settlements at Downpatrick, discussed in 4.16 and A.4.16.
Chronology

The large amount of data produced during the excavations at Dunnyneill has meant that the final publication of the site is still forthcoming; therefore, any discussion of the chronology is still preliminary. The three medieval phases proposed by the excavators certainly match the dating evidence (Phase 1 was probably in the Neolithic). It would seem as though Phases 2 and 3 were close together, but they may have been separated by several decades of abandonment. The same holds for Phases 3 and 4 (Figure 4.12).

![Chronological diagram for island enclosures in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.](modified from OxCal v4.3, 2 Bronk Ramsey (2017); r5 in Cal13 atmospheric curve (Reimer et al. 2013))
**Function and status**

No references exist to the island enclosure on Dunnyneill; therefore, we can only speculate based on parallels elsewhere. Dunnyneill has been proposed elsewhere as an emporium (Doyle 2009, 31; Campbell 2007, 51). This would seem to be an accurate description of its sixth–eighth-century phase, based on the range of non-local material culture found there (Figure 4.12). It may even be the focal point for the introduction of E-ware and other imports into the wider area, possibly under the sponsorship of the Dál Fiatach dynasty based in Downpatrick nearby (Map 4.14). The site may have continued to have specialist functions, perhaps metalworking, in the next two phases, but it would also seem to have functioned as an enclosed settlement in these periods (A.4.12 entry), perhaps similar in some ways to the role played by a crannog.

### 4.13 Crannogs

**Morphology**

Of the crannogs excavated in Ulidia, all of them except perhaps Lough Mourne 1 consisted of *packwerk* with radial timbers covered by stone, clay or peat, with several having evidence for piling and for the radial timbers being morticed to the piles. In this respect, they are very similar to many other crannogs in Ireland and Ergadia. Stone islets are rare, Lough na Cranagh near Fairhead in northeast Antrim might be the only example, perhaps due to a higher availability of timber in the region (A.4.13 entries). Marine crannogs are also very rare; perhaps Swan Island Little is the only example. Very little is known about surface structures, but Craigywarren, Kilknock and Lough Faughan all had associated wooden structure on their summits, and all excavated sites had midden material (A.4.13 entries).

**Distribution**

In terms of the distribution of crannogs, there seems to be the same preference for lakes with gently sloping shores (Fredengren 2002, 6; Henderson 2003, 862) as noted by Morrison (1985) for Highland Scotland (Map 4.15). This might be taken as indicating a link to relatively good farmland (see Cavers 2010). In Ulidia, however, at least 25% and as much as 50% of crannogs are located in areas of bogland, usually in drained lakes—gentle slopes do not always mean good farmland. This might be also seen in the associated placenames, especially those containing *móin*, Irish ‘bog(land)’. In such cases, inaccessibility might have played an important role in siting the crannogs. Some of these bog lakes seem to have had traditions of involving deliberate deposition of metalwork (Lisnacrogher, Lough Guile, Lough Ravel), and they may have been sited with reference to these traditions.
Map 4.15. Distribution of crannogs in Ulidia.
**Chronology**

It should be noted that all of the radiocarbon and dendrochronological dates in Figure 4.13 are from old wood, wood that might also have been seasoned prior to use, or possibly even re-used. A re-examination of the Samian pottery from Lough Faughan and Teeshan might indicate that the sherds are ARSW or PRSW. Frustratingly, Knowles (1904, 54–5) illustrates two sherds of “Samian ware” from “a County Antrim crannog”, but gives no further information, probably to avoid looting; he does the same with an iron sword. Future research might indicate what crannog he was referring to.

As the evidence stands, the majority of crannogs seem to have been occupied in the period c.AD500–1000, but there is also evidence for continued use into the LMP. At the other end of the scale, even when old wood is considered, Teeshan and Lough Tarmin were most likely occupied as early as the LIA.
Function and status

Reeves (1857) demonstrates that as late as the seventeenth century, some crannogs still functioned as the local central place—Teeshan/Lochmagarry, Lough Ravel, Loughtamin, and the Kilknoek. It may be that they were reoccupied, rather than it being a case of continuous use, but it might be an indication of their relatively high status. As O’Conor (2018, 162–4) points out, conspicuous demonstrations of deliberate archaisms played an important role in lordly display in late-medieval Ireland. In these cases, and others, it may be that earlier central places—real or imaginary, were being utilised to legitimate the distribution of social power possibly as early as AD1300. As O’Conor (2018) discusses, this may have been in reaction to a parallel system of lordly display in areas dominated by Anglo-Norman lords.

Social memory can be difficult to quantify, but evidence has been obtained from several crannogs for EMP–VA metalwork not found in the same quantity at other settlement monuments (Table 4.3). These include gold, silver and copper-alloy items of personal dress, iron weapons, riding equipment, as well as imported glass and pottery. It might be argued that once such an item is dropped in the wrong place at a crannog it is properly lost, whereas the same items might be more retrievable at terrestrial enclosed settlements.

Evidence for metalworking was also uncovered at four crannogs, including enamelling at
Craigywarren, and weights or scales from five sites (Table 4.3). Three sites had access to the networks along which Samian/PRS, glass vessels and E-ware travelled. While they might not be royal sites, the evidence indicates that at least some crannogs were occupied by individuals of high status—possibly the upper end of the warrior-nobility. That is not to say that they did not double as farming settlements—the plough from Lough Ravel and the bill-hooks from Craigywarren would indicate an association with arable agricultural activity, aside from the evidence for grain and animal consumption at the rest of the sites.

However, Fredengren's (2002) caveats in relation to linking all crannogs to high-status groups/individuals must be kept in mind when assessing the Ulidia series, even if 9/19 of the crannogs in A.4.13 have what might be termed indicators of the occupants’ comparatively elevated social status. The location of several of these either close to the core areas of the four main kingdoms, or at their boundaries would also seem to indicate the presence of the warrior-aristocracy—similar, perhaps, to the distribution of multivallate raths (Map 4.13). The death of two such figures at separate events at Loughbrickland would seem to support this (AU833.12; AU1005.6; A.4.13 entry). That the dating of the metalwork and imported material is spread across several centuries would seem to indicate that many of these sites had long-term associations with the upper end of the social pyramid in the periods under examination here.
Table 4.3. Material culture from crannogs in Ulidia potentially indicating the high status of occupants; for abbreviations, see Section 0.2; for evidence, see entries in A.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Personal adornment</th>
<th>Weapons, Riding</th>
<th>Metalworking</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Feasting, drinking</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballylough</td>
<td>silver chain with filigree beads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigywarren</td>
<td>silvered CA P-PA brooch; CA brooch pin, CA bracelet, CA stick pin, CA ring</td>
<td>sword, spear butt</td>
<td>crucibles, red enamel, CA cut-out of brooch centre, chisels</td>
<td>scale-pan</td>
<td>brown imported glass (Group B?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culramoney</td>
<td>CA stick pin</td>
<td>spear or pike, riding spurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA pot</td>
<td>slate motif piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisnacrogher</td>
<td>CA stick pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(major Iron Age mass wealth deposit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughbrickland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large lumps of iron slag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Faughan</td>
<td>silver brooch (undescribed), Type F/H CA brooch, CA brooch pins</td>
<td>shield boss; 2 cheek-pieces</td>
<td>crucibles, brooch mould, CA slag and dross</td>
<td>scale-pan</td>
<td>Samian, E-ware, Group B glass vessel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Mourne 1</td>
<td>Type E/F CA brooch, Type H CA brooch</td>
<td>axe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ravel</td>
<td>silver PA brooch, P-PA CA brooch, F2 CA brooch, CA RHP</td>
<td>axe, sword</td>
<td>anvil, tongs, crucibles, large iron lump</td>
<td>possible scale-pans</td>
<td>CA dishes</td>
<td>(Bronze Age wealth deposit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Tarmin</td>
<td>gold pins</td>
<td>spear</td>
<td>hammers</td>
<td>possible scale-pans</td>
<td>CA dishes, iron cauldron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moylarg</td>
<td>CA PA brooch, CA stick pin, CA ring</td>
<td>axe, spear butt, knives</td>
<td>chisels, hammers</td>
<td>weight</td>
<td>CA strainer</td>
<td>musical instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeshan</td>
<td>CA stick pins</td>
<td>sword, spear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.14 Hilltop enclosures

Morphology
There is a wide variety in hilltop enclosures in Ireland, ranging from the banked enclosures of the Neolithic (Donegore, Lyles Hill, Mount Sandel) to the large enclosures of the Bronze Age with their widely spaced banks. There is some evidence that Neolithic enclosures were reoccupied in the Iron Age, and it may be that they were also reused in the EMP or HMP. Most hilltop enclosures in Ulidia are Raftery’s (1972) Class 1, in that they are univallate, although some have a second vallum immediately outside (e.g., Carncroagh, see Mogey 1946, 135), rather than widely spaced like Class 2 sites. Class 1 sites might even be regarded as exemplars for the rath tradition in this respect—if they pre-date rath-building. However, some of them might be contemporary variants of that tradition in some instances—worth considering, seeing as the Ulidia sites are essentially undated. The pre-castle phase at Dundrum might be classed either as a hilltop enclosure or an enclosed outcrop, depending on how much of the summit was enclosed and where the dividing line between the two classifications should lie. If the lower slopes were also enclosed, as they were in the castle phases, then it might even have been a terraced enclosed settlement (TES) similar to sites such as Dunadd in Ergadia.

Distribution
Hilltop enclosures are more common in Co. Down, but it is worth noting that they avoid truly upland areas—they are in fact located overlooking areas dense in other forms of early medieval settlement.
Map 4.16. Distribution of hilltop enclosures in Ulidia.
Chronology

As can be seen from Figure 4.14, Neolithic hilltop enclosures were reused for Iron Age settlement activity in three instances, with Mount Sandel used again in the EMP. Considering the Iron Age date from an unenclosed settlement on its slopes, Scrabo might also have been occupied in the Iron Age, but the E-ware from the summit area would place at least one phase of activity there in the sixth–seventh centuries. It might also be referred to in Muirchú (I.23), but that is more likely a reference to Dromorebrague, as discussed at length in A.4.14. Dundrum and Dunbeg would both seem to have been in use in the EMP and VA, if not into the HMP, at which point a castle was constructed a Dundrum (A.4.21 entry).
Figure 4.14. Chronological diagram for hilltop enclosures in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [N] = Neolithic enclosure reused for later settlement activity.
**Function and status**

If the ‘unusualness principle’ (1.3.3) is applied in combination with the E-ware from Scrabo, it may well be that Scrabo was a central place in the EMP. It may have originally been at the centre of the territory of the Uí Echach Airde, rather than its periphery. The location of Movilla, a major ecclesiastic site in close proximity and the numerous house platforms on the lower slopes might be an indication of its importance. Alternatively, its location close to the division between the Dál Fiatach, and the Uí Echach Airde might be significant. Dunadd was located at a similar boundary. However, this boundary might be late, depending on how one interprets the early history of the Uí Dercco Céin in relation to their location (see Chapter 5).

Late traditions see the hilltop enclosure at Dunmull as a medieval inauguration site, complete with a ‘stone chair’ and carved footprint, but there is little to substantiate this claim (O’Laverty 1887, 261; NISMR). It is certainly well situated within the territory of Mag nÉilne (Map 4.16). Dunbeg may have guarded the border between Mag Cobo and the territory of the Dál Fiatach—while it might be reoccupied and be much older, its massive defences set it apart from all other sites in the case study. Dundrum would also seem to have been a strategically important site prior to the construction of a castle there, but very little is known of its early phases. The association with high-status settlement in late-medieval genealogical compilations (e.g. in Lecan, Dobbs 1921, 324; in Laud 610, Meyer 1912, 328–9) might preserve a memory of its social function, especially if it is accepted as the site referred to in Muirchú (§1.23; see A.4.14 entry). Downpatrick, whether it is interpreted as occupying the site of the cathedral or the Mound of Down, would seem to have served as the central place of the Dál Fiatach from the early EMP (AU496.3) to the arrival of John de Courcy (AU1177.1). The publication of the excavations from the Mound of Down should help clear this matter up. Therefore, while there is very little material evidence for the social status of the occupants of hilltop enclosures, documentary evidence at least hints at their importance.

**4.15 Enclosed promontories**

**Morphology and distribution**

The number of identified enclosed promontories (EPs) in Ulidia is low. They are mainly coastal (Map 4.17), using sea-cliffs and steep slopes to form the majority of the enclosing element. Knock Dhu and Mac Airt’s Fort are both inland, albeit within sight of the coast. A more intensive survey of coastal sites might result in many more being found—physically, there certainly are enough candidates in Antrim, for example. Morphologically, some sites are more
like coastal enclosed outcrops, e.g., Dunseverick, with others such as Larrybane slightly more accessible.

Map 4.17. Distribution of enclosed promontories in Ulidia.
Chronology
The inland EP at Knock Dhu proved on excavation to date to the Bronze Age (Macdonald 2016). The excavated evidence from Larrybane and the documentary evidence from Dunseverick can be taken as indicating that enclosed promontories could just as easily date to the EMP–VA (and perhaps beyond) as to the Bronze Age. The radiocarbon date (for which a ‘raw’ date is unavailable) from Doon Point on Rathlin indicates a potential MIA date for the construction of the rampart.

Figure 4.15. Chronological diagram for enclosed promontories (EPs) in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status
The two references to Dunseverick in the annals would seem to indicate that it was a politically important site of long standing, but they say nothing of the site’s occupants. The earliest reference is in Tírechán (§48) and from the context it might be deduced that Dunseverick was a royal site at Tírechán’s time of writing (late seventh–early eighth century). It is also mentioned in the VT, as having been blessed by Patrick when he visited Crích Dá[i]l Riata [the territory of Dál Riata] (Stokes 1887, 162–3 line 18). This territorial designation does not appear in Tírechán, which might be significant. Beyond this, there are several mythological and genealogical references to the site from the eleventh and twelfth centuries onward (A.4.15 entry). They might at least be taken as indicating the importance of the site, rather than preserving any sort of early tradition. There is no archaeological evidence to support these propositions at present, but the site’s morphological uniqueness might also demonstrate royal
or aristocratic associations. As a rock-stack on a promontory, it is very similar to Dunaverty in Kintyre, which might be significant as a possible indicator of similar types of sites being chosen for high-status occupation in the EMP (and beyond). Larrybane may have functioned as a site associated with the lower aristocracy, or it may have been a farm settlement, or both.

4.16 Ecclesiastic Settlement

About 280 sites in Ulidia might be designated as ecclesiastic sites whose period of use fell between AD400–1400. Not all of these sites appear in the documentary record, which serves as a warning against over-reliance on textual evidence, even if some of the sites may have previously been named otherwise. Similar to Ergadia in the Chapter 3, it is argued here that the appearance of ecclesiastic sites represents a significant change to the settlement pattern in Ulidia. However, unlike Ergadia, this change occurred contemporary to a major shift in secular settlement, as outlined above in 4.2–4.11.

The development of urban areas around sites such as Bangor, Movilla (in modern Newtownards), Coleraine, Antrim, Downpatrick and Dromore has meant that much material has probably been lost. This is further exacerbated by the abandonment, demolition or repurposing of many sites following the Reformation, the Plantation of Ulster and the imposition of Anglicanism as the Established Church in Ireland. Furthermore, there is much variation in the extent and quality of the excavations at ecclesiastic sites in Ulidia.

Morphology

In general, it is possible to physically identify the locations of almost all of the churches and religious houses referred to in high-medieval sources such as the 1306 Taxation and various Papal documents (Maps 4.19–4.20). Similar to the Ergadia case-study, many of the church buildings themselves have either been replaced or are in such a ruined state that dateable architectural features are no longer visible. For this reason, only a small number of ecclesiastic buildings with Romanesque or Gothic features are identifiable (Hamlin 2008; Mallory and McNeill 1991). This is mainly due to the impact of the Reformations and their aftermath.

Going back further, Ó Carragáin (2010, 110) draws attention to “a dearth of evidence in Ulster” for pre-Romanesque stone churches. A small group can be physically identified as either having such stone churches or references to such buildings, or with round bell-towers dating to between the tenth and twelfth centuries (Figure 4.16; Map 4.18). The group is further enlarged by including sites where early medieval sculpture and curvilinear valla are present.
As discussed in 2.2.2.a, inscribed stones bearing Christian motifs can only be used in tandem with other categories of evidence to indicate ecclesiastic activity. Therefore, the Tau-Rho inscription at Drumaquerrin, Co. Antrim (Hamlin 1972) has been omitted from the analysis, as it was probably a boundary or route marker. O’Sullivan et al. (2013, 356–360) list six excavated valla for the Ulidia case study. Using Hamlin (2008) and a further examination of the excavated evidence, it is possible to bring the number of valla up to 11 for Antrim and 19 for Down. Using the NISMR and satellite imagery, it has been possible to increase this to 26 sites with possible valla for Antrim and 33 for Down all with other evidence indicating ecclesiastic associations.

However, as with several sites in Ergadia, it may be that several sites with early burials, curvilinear enclosures and Christian sculpture functioned as cemetery settlements prior to their use by the Church. This will be discussed further in the ‘function and status’ section below.

Distribution

While the distribution of pre-AD1100 ecclesiastic sites (Map 4.18) is reasonably well spaced, there is the same avoidance of upland and wetland areas found in all forms of early medieval settlement enclosure. There is also a notable density of early ecclesiastic sites around Strangford Lough, which might explain the lower density of raths in this region. In western Down, early ecclesiastic sites form a loose ring around the edges of Mag Cobo, a pattern also identified by Mytum (1992, 67) in the territory of the Corco Mruad in modern Co. Clare.

A similarly high density of high-medieval religious houses is found around Strangford Lough, again another indication that the lower density of raths in this area might have been due to large amounts of land being in the hands of the Church from an early date. It is also the area with the highest density of parish churches and chapels, along with the area to the east of Lough Neagh, but this might have more to do with the nature of settlement in these areas in the thirteenth century AD, as discussed in Chapter 7.
Map 4.18. Distribution early monastic sites and high-medieval churches and chapels with evidence for earlier phases in Ulidia.
Map 4.19. Distribution high-medieval churches and chapels in Ulidia.
Map 4.20. Distribution of high-medieval religious houses in in Ulidia. See Table A.4.16-1 and the entries in A.4.16 for further information.
Chronology
The series of diagrams in Figure 4.16 present a summary of the dating evidence (see entries in A.4.16) from a selected series of ecclesiastic sites in the Ulidia case-study, taken to represent the larger series of about 280 sites with at least one category of evidence placing them in the period AD450–1500. What the series of diagrams indicates to the reader is that there is a general continuity visible at sites with early evidence, and that early evidence is usually from across several categories. The diagrams also indicate that several sites were newly founded in the HMP, e.g., certain parish churches and all of the religious houses associated with Continental orders (A.4.16 entries).
modified from OxCal v4.3.2 Bronk Ramsey (2017); r5 IntCal13 atmospheric curve (Reimer et al 2013)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Calibration Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newtownards</td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiberno-Gothic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x FCGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Gothic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portmuck</td>
<td>Long cists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaw harp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raholp</td>
<td>Long cists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x Glass bead (Class 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x CIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x CS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Romanesque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ram's Island</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 4.16. Chronological diagram for ecclesiastic settlement in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. [V] indicates the presence of an enclosing vallum.

**Function and status**

As stated in Chapter 2, ecclesiastic settlement might usefully be divided into several categories (Table 2.3), often with corresponding territorial units. The categories are not exclusive, and one site might function as several simultaneously. For example, a church might serve a secular community, parish, but also be located within a monastic institution, and could even be the seat of a bishop administering a diocese, a collection of parishes. Furthermore, over time a site
might move from one category to the other. This would seem to have occurred at sites such as Solar, Portmuck and Kilhorne, where later churches or chapels were seemingly inserted into pre-existing community or familial cemeteries, which might even have been cemetery settlements initially. Such sites tend not to appear in the martyrologies, and future research might be able to identify several more examples. The other early sites either appear in the annals, the martyrologies or hagiographies, and it is tempting to interpret the appearance of a particular figure in the sources as evidence of the presence of a monastic community. That is not to say that early familial cemeteries were not appropriated by the Church for use as monastic communities; this might have been the case at St John’s Point, Derry, Raholp, Saul, Bright, whose appearance in the MT, MO or Patrician documents might be an attempt to write their familial associations out of history (A.4.16).

That Bangor, Nendrum, Movilla and Downpatrick were major early sites with monastic and/or episcopal functions is without doubt. However, the pre-AD700 evidence from Downpatrick might be questionable, due to few ecclesiastic figures directly associated with the site are mentioned prior to AU753.6 (A.4.16). Connor, Armoy and possibly Antrim, Maghera, Muckamore, Rathlin and Saul can also be added to the list of early ecclesiastic sites. The lack of early evidence from Dromore is possibly due to the nature of the evidence. However, the possibility of a relatively late foundation (late eighth century) cannot be discounted either.

Turning to the high medieval period, many of the earlier sites were refounded as religious houses (Bangor, Downpatrick Inch, Movilla, Muckamore, Saul), were conferred with episcopal status within the re-organised Irish Church (Downpatrick, Dromore, Connor), or were repurposed as parish churches (e.g., Antrim, Armoy). To these might be added the series of newly founded religious houses (Table A.4.16-1) and newly founded parish churches such as Carrickfergus St Nicholas.
Colonial settlements and settlement proxies

4.17 Longphorts, bases and camps

Morphology
As it stands, there is no archaeological evidence for a longphort, base or camp in Ulidia associated with the Scandinavian diaspora. As discussed in 2.3.2.a, no example had been definitively identified archaeologically in Ireland until the excavations at Woodstown, Co. Waterford (Russell and Hurley 2014) and Annagassan (Clinton 2014). Several examples in Ulidia appear in the documentary record, either explicitly or implicitly (Table 4.4), but remain unlocated and of unknown morphology. These references are either explicit, in that the term ‘longphort’ is actually mentioned, or implicit, in that some sort of base of operations is implied, usually in the form of the X from/of Y, e.g. “the Gaill of Loch Cuan [Strangford Lough]” in AU926.1. These implicit references might indicate a settlement more substantial and permanent than a campaign fortification; therefore, the term ‘longphort’ is used here as shorthand for a potential campaign base, camp, or something more permanent.

Distribution
All of the documented longphorts, bases and camps in Ulidia are in strategic locations; Dundrum Bay and Belfast Lough are the only principal bodies of water without a reference to any form of camp. The earliest base in Ulidia was on Lough Neagh (Table 4.4), referred to only obliquely in the AU and CS, with no location is given, and it is only referred to as a longphort in AFM839.10 and in AClon836[AD839] as a “fforte”, both of which are much later texts with additions from non-annalistic sources. It is likely that the base was in a different location to the one mentioned the following century at Ruib Mena, where the River Main meets Lough Neagh, probably at Dunhin, the site of a later motte (Bourke 2010, 32). If the dúnad of the Gaill of Dublin at Cluan Andobuir (AU845.12) is taken as a reference to Cluan Dabhail, the meadow of the River Blackwater, rather being in the Midlands, then this might place the early longphort near the Blackwater’s entry into Lough Neagh (see AU754.3; AU933.3 A.4.17 for supporting evidence). This would help account for the large amount of deposited metalwork in this area (Bourke 2001; 2010), and provide a short overland route for attacking Armagh.

If Cáel (later ‘Caol’) Uisce is accepted as referring to the townland of Narrow Water northwest of Warrenpoint, then the longphort may have been in the vicinity of the high-medieval motte and/or the late-medieval towerhouse (A.4.17 entry). While an alternative might have been in the vicinity of Dún Ogalla (MCB1210.2), site of the high-medieval Carlingford
Castle in Co. Louth, Narrow Water’s estuarine location is preferred here over the castle’s location on the open bay.

Considering the large number of islands located in the sheltered portion of Strangford Lough, identifying a location for the base there is difficult, and it may be that different locations were in use at different times. The later towerhouse and village of Strangford are located on a spit of land separating Strangford Lough from the sheltered Strangford Bay would not accord with other known bases in terms of location. One option would be to identify Phase 3 at Dunnyneil as being a longphort or base (Figure 4.14). McCormick (2009, 106) suggests that a sub-rectilinear earthwork at Horse Island near Downpatrick might have been a longphort, but it is overlooked by higher ground and might have been a high-medieval moated site. Nendrum might be an option, but perhaps Chapel Island would be preferable, as it is located on the Ards side of the harbour and further from the central places and core territories of the Dál Fiatach. This would accord with Ó Floinn’s (1998, 164) statements regarding the opportunistic re-use of pre-existing sites. The peninsula of Ardkeen, site of a later castle, is also a promising location.

Beyond this, it is proposed here that two of the un-named longphorts in the territory of Dál nAraide mentioned in AU866.4 might be identified. The location of a furnished burial, the toponym Ballylumford and the historic ON-derived name (Tables 4.4–4.5) for Larne Lough all might indicate that there was probably some form of longphort or enclosed proto-urban settlement in the vicinity.

The evidence from Loughan Island near Coleraine is more circumstantial. There are several enclosures on the island itself, and it is in this general area that the gold ‘Dalriada Brooch’ (Anon. 1856; Warner 1974) and a Petersen Type H pommel (Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 722–3) were found separately (Table 4.4). It is located close to a major fording point on the Bann and to the early ecclesiastic site at Camus, and several earthworks were identified there during a LiDAR survey (Forsythe and McConkey 2012, 133). It was a major high-status centre in the 1160s (see A.4 entry), where an artefact known as the “Sword of the Jarl” was located (AU1165.10; MCB1165.2). It was attacked by Orcadians (AU1170.7) and was the site of a later manorial centre.

Chronology
There are two phases of longphort usage visible in Table 4.4: AD838–866 and AD926–945. Considering that it is the same locations involved (Map 4.21), the second phase might actually
be a continuation of the first, or it might represent a reoccupation. This is discussed further in Chapter 6.

Map 4.21. Distribution of proposed locations of longphorts in Ulidia (see Table 4.4).
Table 4.4. Longphorts, bases and camps in Ulidia associated with Scandinavian or Scandinavian diasporic activity (see Map 4.21); connected references (but containing unique information) separated by commas; references to separate events separated by semi-colons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Other evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh</td>
<td>AU839.7, AClon836; AU840.1; AU841.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>not specifically located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caol Uisce (Carlingford Lough)</td>
<td>AU842.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>could be on Loch Erne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlingford Lough</td>
<td>AU852.3, FIA§235; AU926.1</td>
<td>ON toponym, battle</td>
<td>Durgenniti based there in AU852.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangford Lough</td>
<td>CS877; AU926.5; AU942.2; AU942.4</td>
<td>ON toponym</td>
<td>not specifically located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruib Mena, Lough Neagh</td>
<td>?AU866.4; AU930.2; AU933.3; AU945.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>not specifically located, could be the same location as 9th C references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Larne (Ballylumford)</td>
<td>?AU866.4</td>
<td>ON toponym, longphort name, furnished burial, site of battle with Orcadians</td>
<td>Ballylumford might be a late toponym; later borough located in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inis Lachain (Loughan Island)</td>
<td>?AU866.4; AU1170.7</td>
<td>gold brooch, Type H pommel, reference to “Sword of the Jarl”, attacked by Orcadians</td>
<td>possible high-status settlement in 12th C; manorial centre in 13th C; see A.4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. References to ON-derived toponym for Larne Lough (year being referred to by the texts in parentheses, year of composition not). All dates AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (Form)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1210 Wulfrichford</td>
<td>15 James I Part 5 preserving RLPTL 12 John (Anon. 1800, 354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219 Wulvricheford</td>
<td>Sweetman 1875, 135 no. 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206-1230 (1018) Úlfreksfjörd</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga (Vigfusson 1887, 19 §17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1230 (1018) Úlfreksfjörd</td>
<td>Olafsf saga helga §98 (Hollander 1964, 330, 354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311 portus de Wolrikeford</td>
<td>Rolutulus Scotiae, §2, 4 Edward II (Ayloff and Morant 1744, 122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1375 (1315) Wokingis Firth</td>
<td>Brus XIV.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern Olderfleet Haven</td>
<td>contemporary toponym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern Olderfleet Haven</td>
<td>contemporary toponym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modern Aldfreck</td>
<td>contemporary townland name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Function and status

Primarily, the longphorts in Ulidia seem to have been raiding bases and overwintering camps. In relation to Lough Neagh, all the annals agree that captives and plunder were brought back there from Louth (AU840.1) and possibly Armagh (AFM839.14). However, might three successive years spent on the lake indicate (AD839–41) that there was an intention towards a more permanent settlement? AU866.4 mentions the presence of flocks and herds at the longphorts in Dál nAraide, indicating food production. Lough Neagh may well have been among those sites, and it would be tempting to see the winter campaign on Lough Neagh (AFM895.8) as potentially related to a longphort there. The evidence from Woodstown indicates that trade was also an important consideration at longphorts (Russell and Hurley 2014), and this would most likely have been the case at the Ulidia examples. The longphorts will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

4.18 Burials as a proxy for settlement

Morphology

While burials at ecclesiastic sites have been excluded from consideration for the use of burials as a proxy for human presence in a landscape, similar to 3.14, two exceptions must be made for furnished burials inserted into pre-existing cemeteries, both of which are tentatively gendered male by the presence of weapons. The furnished burial at St John’s Point (Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 642–8) was inserted into a pre-existing cist cemetery, which may or may not have had a church building at the time (A.4.16 entry). The burial at Skerry containing multiple weapons was found while constructing a new wall for the cemetery, would also seem to have been inserted into a pre-existing Christian cemetery (Day and McWilliams 1992, 115; Ó Ríagáin 2016, 151–5). The third burial containing weapons seems to have been a single burial near the coast at Larne (Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 642–8). Beyond this, it would seem as though the burial found in a mound at Ballyholme, near Bangor, might be gendered female due to the presence of oval brooches (Milligan 1906; Cochrane 1906). None of the other possible burials can be definitively identified as such (Tables 4.6–4.9; A.4.18), with the evidence from Church Bay b barely enough to warrant inclusion. Figure 4.18 outlines the evidence for non-furnished burials in non-ecclesiastic locations, currently at two sites, in order to set the furnished burials in context.
Table 4.6. Principal morphological characteristics furnished burials and possible furnished burials in Ulidia. Con. = confidence, M/F/N = male/female/gender neutral (bold = sexed physically, non-bold = gendered artefactually), MA = middle-aged, MA+= late middle-aged or old-aged, orientation bold = location of head, L = left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>M/F/N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Prox. burials</th>
<th>Mound</th>
<th>Stone-lined</th>
<th>Stone-setting</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Body position</th>
<th>Boat</th>
<th>Animal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larne</td>
<td>Latharna</td>
<td>coastal flat</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW–SE</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Point</td>
<td>Mag nNis</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?N–S</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerry</td>
<td>Bónraige</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>pos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyholme</td>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>raised beach</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay a</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>coastal plane</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>short cists;</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay b</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>coastal plane</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>short cists;</td>
<td>standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barrow</td>
<td>stone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay c</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>coastal plane</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>short cists;</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bay</td>
<td>Latharna</td>
<td>coastal cave</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BA cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>Mag nNis</td>
<td>sand-dunes</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrenpoint</td>
<td>Boirche</td>
<td>estuarine sand</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7. Selected grave-goods from of male furnished burials in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>Sword</th>
<th>Shield</th>
<th>Axe</th>
<th>Spear</th>
<th>Knife</th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Comb</th>
<th>Adornment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larne</td>
<td>Latharna</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type F1</td>
<td>CA-RHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s Point</td>
<td>Mag nlnis</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skerry</td>
<td>Bónraige</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay a</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrenpoint</td>
<td>Boirche</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8. Selected grave-goods from female furnished burials in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Brooches</th>
<th>Other adornments</th>
<th>Glass, stone, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballyholme</td>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td>CA bowl</td>
<td></td>
<td>2×oval brooches</td>
<td></td>
<td>poss. textile fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay c</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>CA ladle; iron cauldron</td>
<td>CA rings, iron knobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. Selected grave-goods from gender-neutral furnished burials in Ergadia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Adornments</th>
<th>Glass, stone, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Bay b</td>
<td>Rathlin</td>
<td>med.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>silver bossed penannular brooch with zoomorphic decoration</td>
<td>beads (prob. From brooch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballywillin</td>
<td>Eilne</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>glass beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>Mag nlnis</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bay</td>
<td>Latharna</td>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 × 9th A-S coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Distribution**

The presence of a furnished burial at Larne and St John’s Point might be related to activity on Lough Larne and Strangford Lough, respectively. Church Bay b and Ballyholme are both also coastal (Map 4.22). Skerry represents something of an outlier, but it should be remembered that the Scandinavian diaspora were active inland as well as in coastal regions, as will be discussed in Chapter 6. The examples rejected due to insufficient evidence are all also coastal.

**Chronology**

As can be seen from Figure 4.17, the artefactual evidence almost exclusively clusters in the Viking Age, in line with what would be expected from the form of burial practice employed. On the present evidence, it would seem as though all of the burials took place c.AD850–950, which would be in line with the historical evidence for activity in the region (see 4.17 on longphorts).
Map 4.22. Distribution of furnished burials and dispersed cremations and inhumations dating to the Viking Age in Ulidia.
Figure 4.17. Chronological diagram for furnished burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Figure 4.18. Chronological diagram for non-ecclesiastic burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 4.19. Chronological diagram for ecclesiastic burials in Ulidia using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
Figure 4.20. Chronological diagram for Iron Age burials in Ulidia using timescale A. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

The social function of these burials is discussed in Chapter 6.
4.19 Toponyms as a proxy for settlement

Old Norse-derived toponyms in Ulidia

The corpus of evidence for the coinage of toponyms by Old Norse speakers in Ulidia is far smaller than in Ergadia. This is consistent with the burial evidence, as will be discussed in Chapter 6. There is very little evidence for the habitative toponyms and for topographic toponyms used habitatively that feature so prominently across the North Channel. As already noted, the remit of this dissertation does not warrant an in-depth discussion of toponyms potentially containing elements outside of the primary list of potentially habitative elements (2.18). A fuller range of potentially ON-derived toponyms in Ulidia are discussed by Mac Giolla Easpaig (2002) and the NIPD.

The most obvious Old Norse coinages are marine-related (Table 4.10). Names containing the potential loanword *sceir*, from ON *sker*, i.e. reef, are excluded here, just as in Ergadia, even though their occurrence is much rarer in Ireland. Similar to elsewhere in Ireland, e.g., Waterford and Wexford, parallel Irish-language names exist for the three *fjörðr* names. It is important to note the ON versions informed the writers of English written sources, with Carlingford and Strangford also giving their names to Anglo-Norman/English settlements on their shores. Whether these settlements pre-dated Anglo-Norman activity cannot be stated at present, but their longevity might be indicative of more than just a topographic designation. The *Tabula Moderna* map of Britain and Ireland in Claudii Ptolemaei Geographicae (de Regio Monte 1525, 29f.) contains, in addition to Careforda [Carlingford], the names Eltanforda, Chenofrit and Verfordo marked as settlements, all appearing on the coast of Ulidia in succession moving south–north. The first is probably Strangford, but derived from Ulaid + *fjörðr*, the last might be from SG *Inbir* + *fjörðr*, and could then be Larne Lough (Inver being the name of the modern civil parish south of the town), and the other must be Belfast Lough. This material has not been included on the maps, but it might indicate that there were further ON toponyms, if not associated settlements, in Ulidia.

There is scant trace of the use of ON habitative elements in any Ulidia placenames, bar a small group of tenuous examples and some early examples of -tun(a) names (Table 4.10). Mac Giolla Easpaig (2002, 473–4) points to the placename Ballylumford, Irish *Baile an Longphoirt*, near Larne, first referred to in the seventeenth century (NIPD). Considering its proximity to a furnished burial and to a body of water with an ON name, the earlier use of the word might be favourable here. However, it might also relate to the landing of Edward Bruce’s forces here in 1315 (Barbour, *Brus* XIV.33) or some other event. Porg Hill may well indicate
the preservation of ON borg, but it has not proven possible to find any early forms for the name. Ballyholme is the site of the furnished burial gendered female discussed in 4.18. While this may be derived from Old Norse, Irish baile + ON holmr, which gives the Irish Baile Hóm (NIPD), however it might also have been from baile + tíaim (mound, burial-place, from Latin tumulus; eDIL). The definitive identification of any possible –dalr elements is difficult (Table 4.10), in all cases more plausible Irish or English explanations are apparent.

The Kaupmann-eyjar, mentioned in the thirteenth-century Hákonar saga gamla (§167) as the overwintering site of a Norwegian naval force in a 1230–1 campaign in the Irish Sea and Scotland (Vigfusson 1887, 148; Dascent 1894, 152; NIPD; Fellows-Jensen 2015, 275), might be the Copeland Islands off the Ards peninsula. The Cumbrian de Copeland family were prominent in the early years of the Anglo-Norman colony in Ulidia (Duffy 1995, 20), and they probably gave their name to the nearby Ballycopeland on the Ards peninsula. Therefore, these particular islands were more likely named for the family, rather than the name directly preserving Kaupland [bought land] or Kaupmanna [merchants]. The same holds for Copeland Water and Copeland Reservoir near Carrickfergus, Co. Antrim and a Copelands Hill in Ballinderry, Co. Antrim. The most sensible option is that the author of Hákonar saga rendered the family name back into its original Old Norse form for an Old Norse readership, rather than the islands actually having a directly ON-derived name.

Table 4.10. Toponyms in Ulidia potentially derived from Old Norse (cf. NIPD; Mac Giolla Easpaig 2002; Fellows-Jensen 2015, 278–82; final four fjörðr names identified by me).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Irish Alternatives</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlingford Lough</td>
<td>Kerlingfjörðr</td>
<td>Snám Aigneach;</td>
<td>ON: sea-inlet of the hag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loch Cairlinn</td>
<td>Ir.: swift sea-channel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(inlet of the hag-shaped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulbowline</td>
<td>aal-bolig</td>
<td>Carlingford</td>
<td>unavailable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lough</td>
<td>ON: residence or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>habituation of eels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangford Lough</td>
<td>Strangr fjörðr</td>
<td>Strangford</td>
<td>Loch Cuan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lough</td>
<td>ON: strong sea-inlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ir.: inlet of the harbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larne Harbour</td>
<td>Úlfreksfjörðr</td>
<td>Larne Harbour</td>
<td>Loch Ollarba;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loch Latharna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltanforda</td>
<td>*Ulaidsfjörðr</td>
<td>Dundrum?</td>
<td>ON: Ulaids’s sea-inlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Early examples of -tun/ton/tuna names in Ulidia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Later Alternatives</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chenofrit</td>
<td>??? + fjörðr</td>
<td>Belfast Lough?</td>
<td>ON: ??? + sea-inlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verfordo</td>
<td>*Verfjörðr</td>
<td>Lough Larne?</td>
<td>ON: man + sea inlet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slidery Ford</td>
<td>??? + fjörðr</td>
<td>Dundrum Bay</td>
<td>Slidhe Daire</td>
<td>Ir. ‘oaken road’ + ford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Possible -dalr surnames in Ulidia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Later Alternatives</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cushendall</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Antrim glens</td>
<td>Cois amhaimn dail</td>
<td>Shore of the river of the blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullaghsandall</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Antrim glens</td>
<td>Mullach Shandell</td>
<td>Hill of the de Sandel family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubbindall</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>near Ballymoney</td>
<td>Baile Gobain Dhaill</td>
<td>place/farm of the blind craftsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capeldale</td>
<td>kappella + dalr</td>
<td>Killinchy</td>
<td>Chapeldale (English)</td>
<td>chapel valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyndele</td>
<td>magn + dalr</td>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>mag(h) na dála/an dáil</td>
<td>plain of the meeting/share or population group, great/main valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Possible ON-derived habitative toponyms in Ulidia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>ON</th>
<th>Meaning (ON)</th>
<th>Irish Alternatives</th>
<th>Meaning (Irish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ushet</td>
<td>? + setr</td>
<td>? farm</td>
<td>Usaid, from oigséad (NIPD)</td>
<td>Hogshead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganaby</td>
<td>?gan + á + byr</td>
<td>?frenzied river farm</td>
<td>Gaineamhgh (NIPD); Gaineamh bui (RÓR)</td>
<td>sandy place; yellow sand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porg Hill</td>
<td>borg</td>
<td>enclosed settlement or hill/prominence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 4.23. Distribution of toponyms potentially derived from Old Norse in Ulidia.
4.20 Earth and timber castles

Morphology

Ringworks are difficult to identify in general, but in Ireland, where some 60,000 settlement enclosures survive in the landscape, such a task borders on the impossible without excavation or solid documentary evidence. Therefore, the number of ringworks is extremely low in Ulidia, especially those on greenfield sites (Map 4.24). Mottes, on the other hand, are much easier to identify, although the presence of raised/platform raths in the landscape can occasionally make matters difficult, especially when many mottes in northeast Ireland are the smaller end of the spectrum. Much work has been done on mottes in Ulidia (Glasscock and McNeill 1972; McNeill 1975; 1980; Lynn 1981–2, 1985), and the dataset in this dissertation is based on that. On excavation, many mottes were found to overlay either raised or platform raths, which is further discussed in Chapter 7.

Distribution

The distribution of mottes (Map 4.24) gives a very good indication of the maximum extent of the society in which mottes were built, i.e., of the extent of the political sphere linked ultimately to the king of England. They might also be found in higher numbers in marcher territories at the edges of the so-called ‘land of peace’, contrasted with a ‘land of war’ (both mentioned, e.g., in a petition of Robert Owen to Henry III (1270s, Royal Letters in the Tower of London no. 2473, tempora Henry III in Sweetman 1877, 160, no. 930). Their maintenance might have been less necessary in more heavily settled and pacified areas such as south Co. Wexford, for example (Ó Riagáin 2010c); therefore, areas in the core territories of lordships might have less mottes than expected, or territories held directly by the Church.

The distribution of ringworks is probably limited by the fact that ringworks might underlay several mottes and possibly even masonry castles. Therefore, the ringworks appearing in Map 4.24 represent those examples that were not later rebuilt. The number of moated sites is also limited—partly, possibly, due to social factors (see Chapter 7; also Ó Riagáin 2010c), but partly also due to their not being classified as such in the field.
Map 4.24. Distribution of ringworks, mottes and moated sites in Ulidia.
Chronology

The dating evidence outlined in Figures 4.21–4.22 demonstrates that the archaeological evidence is in line with the historical evidence for earth and timber castles in Ulidia. The continuity at the sites of former raths as such castles will be discussed in Chapter 7; for now, it should be noted that the majority of the sites in Figures 4.21–4.22 overlay or reworked pre-existing enclosed settlements.

Figure 4.21. Chronological diagram for ringworks in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Phase 3 (motte)</th>
<th>Phase 5 (motte or raised rath)</th>
<th>Phase 2 (motte and bailey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardkeen</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyfounder</td>
<td>Ladle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinarry</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coin of Edward III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyrooney</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymaghan</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clanrolla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumadoon</td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duneight</td>
<td>PSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calibrated date (calBC/calAD)
Figure 4.22. Chronological diagram for mottes in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP.

Function and status

Ringworks are seen here as campaign fortifications, while also being domiciles. This should not be forgotten, as a lord might be resident in a ringwork for a number of decades before moving elsewhere (e.g. Mount Sandel; Figure 4.21) or rebuilding the site as a motte or masonry castle. In many instances, they might have been associated with very high-status individuals. For examples, Trim Castle was originally a ringwork (Sweetman 1978), as was Dundrum in the Ulidia case study. They were very much capable of functioning as manorial and vill centres. Moving onto a consolidation phase would be impossible without ringworks and their occupants...
taking part in economic, social and political activity.

Normally, mottes are associated with the local aristocracy, but many later masonry castles associated with the upper levels of the aristocracy might originally have been ringworks or mottes before being modified (e.g., Norwich; see King 1988, 47). Therefore, there may have been a degree of emulative practice at work in their construction. Settlements with mottes were at once associated with the direct farming of demesne lands and with the concentration of surplus production from the surrounding area in the form of renders and taxation as part of the protection-system operated by a military aristocracy (O’Conor 2002, 173). As castles, they were also military centres to support the social position of the occupant, but also to ensure that the surrounding area was pacified, usually to the benefit of local farmers. They were not normally associated with the initial conquest of territory, more the consolidation and maintenance of power in such territories (Meulemeister and O’Conor 2007, 331; Higham and Barker 2000). They were also centres associated with the legal and political system, and often with craft production and the focal point for trade with the outside world. Manors and vills were often coterminous with parishes. Their centres may have been paired: castles (usually mottes) with churches, and occasionally there may have been settlement clusters in association. These settlements may have been within the bailey enclosure attached to the motte or outside the enclosure. Their location on/over previous forms of settlement, either by filling in ringworks (King 1988, 42) or over raised raths (Lynn 1981–2) might be related to both expediency and the desire to portray a continuity of presence, and thus of the exercise of power, within a landscape.
4.21 Masonry castles

Morphology

Somewhat surprisingly, masonry castles are a poorly understood category of settlement in Ulidia. The main cause of this confusion is the construction of a series of towerhouses in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, similar to elsewhere in Ireland, and again sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by both local Gaelic nobles and incoming planters (Jope 1966; McNeill 1983). These are two very different phenomena, but a combination of lack of research, Down excepted, and several instances of high-medieval sites being refitted and reused, e.g. Greencastle, Castle Carra and possibly Dunluce muddy the waters considerably. Three sites can be classed as keep-centred castles: Carrickfergus, Dundrum and Greencastle; we have no idea of the form taken by Coleraine Castle, but it may have been similar. No site in Ulidia can be classed as a castle-of-enclosure, although one phase of Dundrum might have been prior to the construction of the circular keep (A.4.21). Five sites can be classed as platform castles: Connor, Doonbought, Court MacMartin, Cross, and Dunshammer. The first four are mortared and more elaborate than platform castles in Ergadia, and the information from Dunshammer is insufficient to state whether it was mortared. Of the hall-keeps, Dunluce and Dunseverick are speculative inclusions, but they were manorial centres, and both may have been hall-keeps converted to towerhouses. Seafin is notable for having been set in a large earth-and-timber bailey. The masonry hall on the summit of the motte Clough Castle seems to have been a single storey and thatched; therefore, it cannot be classed as a hall-keep added to the motte.

Distribution

All masonry castles were located in strategic locations, be it the marcher castles at Seafin, Connor and Doonbought, or the major coastal castles at Carrickfergus and Greencastle, or located at major crossing points close to the coast Coleraine and Dundrum (Map 4.25). The significance of this will be discussed in Chapter 7.
Map 4.25. Distribution of high-medieval masonry castles in Ulidia.
Chronology

As already stated, it is difficult to disentangle high-medieval castles from the general series of castles made of stone. There is very little evidence for the construction of masonry castles in Ulidia prior to c.AD1200 (Figure 4.23). Dundrum might be an exception to this; initially a ringwork, it seems to have consisted of a stone curtain wall, a hall and other buildings before the construction of the circular keep, most likely by Hugh de Lacy, applying the latest in military technology (A.4.21). That Carrickfergus has a rectilinear keep might place it in the first two decades of the thirteenth century. As discussed in A.4.21, there is no evidence to place the castle before AD1200, and if construction started by de Courcy, it would seem to have mainly been built by either Hugh de Lacy or the Dublin government. Greencastle appears in the documentary record c.AD1252 and is similar in form to contemporary the thirteenth-century hall-keeps at Athenry, Co. Galway and Glanworth, Co. Cork (Sweetman 1999, 76).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardglass</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballylough</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce’s Castle</td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>UBA-19743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UBA-19744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WTCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Carra</td>
<td>GGP</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coin of Edward I</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caol Uisce</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunluce</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenarm</td>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.23. Chronological diagram for masonry castles in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. Asterisk = earlier phase at later medieval masonry castle.
Figure 4.24. Chronological diagram for platform castles in Ulidia, using timescale B. The green line (AD500) represents the historically attested beginning of the Dál Riata episode, the blue line (AD793) represents the Viking Age and the purple line (AD1170) represents the approximate beginning of the HMP. Asterisk = earlier phase at later medieval masonry castle.

**Function and status**

Masonry castles might be identified with the firmly established upper strata of the society within which they were built. Large, reasonably elaborate castles such as Carrickfergus, Coleraine (we assume), Dundrum and Greencastle were associated with the rule and administration of the lordship. Several others seem to have been manorial centres and those that cannot be associated with manorial centres most likely were the centres of vills, even if their primary function in some instances was as military installations. A further discussion of their function(s) is found in Chapter 7.
4.22 Clustered settlements: towns and villages

Villages

At the moment, there is no set morphology for identifying villages from the HMP or LMP in Ulidia. Identified dispersed settlements are quite rare in Ulidia in the HMP and the identification of villages has been difficult, as the factors that caused the abandonment of many so-called deserted medieval rural settlements (DMRS) might not have been a factor in Ulidia. Some may be located near medieval churches or castles, but it would take a large amount of fieldwork to confirm this. Many HMP settlements might fall under Lewis’s (2007) currently occupied rural settlement (CORS) category, as seems to be the case at Belfast, which urbanised quite late but has material evidence placing settlement there in c.AD1200–1500 (Brannon 1989–90; Ó Baoill 2006; see A.4.23). Killyglen is a promising option. It is centred on a motte–church pairing, with several earthworks visible and further identified through geophysics (Carver and McNeill 2004; Moore et al. 2004). Portmuck is another good option, it seems to be an EMP cemetery-settlement with a parish church and clustered rural settlement built over it (Reeves 1847, 58–9; O’Laverty 1884, 138–9; Gwynn and Hadcock 1970, 144; Hurl 2001; Anderson and Rees 2004). Beyond this, perhaps some of the non-urban boroughs might also have functioned as villages in the HMP.
**Towns**

As stands, Carrickfergus presents the strongest evidence for an HMP urban settlement in the Ulidia case-study. The various excavations around the town have been summarised by Simpson and Dickson (1981), McNeill (1980; 1981) and Ó Baoill (1993; 1998). This material is discussed in full in A.4. Carrickfergus may be the baile in Latharna burned in AU1199.3, but the first mention of burgesses is in 1221 (Maxwell Lyte 1901, 296 m. 3), after which references begin to appear regularly, including accounts of customs and the value of the income of the town (Ferguson 1855, 158; McNeill 1980). The inquisition made by Geoffrey de Mariscis in 1226 mentions only one villa, Carrickfergus and five bailiwicks, which might indicate that only Carrickfergus had acquired urban status at this point. The first reference to a borough at Coleraine would seem to be in 1261–2 (Curtis 1929, 10). Downpatrick had a mayor in 1260 (Sweetman 1877, 107 no. 661) and burgesses (Clyn1260.1), but it may well have had urban functions under John de Courcy. Both Newtownards and Antrim were also county seats (Dougherty 1912b, 35–6) and would probably also have been urban, rather than rural boroughs (A.4.22).

**4.23 Conclusion**

Based on the preceding outline of the form, distribution, dating and function of the sum of settlement in Ulidia c.800BC–1400, summarised in Figure 4.25, it is possible to identify some general trends. Unlike in Ergadia, Ulidia is treated here as a single region, seeing as it is not split into discrete sub-regions by sea, lakes and mountains. While unenclosed settlement remains at a constant level in Figure 4.25, it is possible to demonstrate a distinct continuity in evidence for occupation at all forms of enclosed settlement c.AD500–1400. The evidence from furnished burials clusters exactly where expected, but unlike in Ergadia, it does not correspond to a decline in evidence from enclosed settlement. As can be seen in Figure 4.26, these burials do seem to occur during a short decline in references to the major ecclesiastic sites in the region, something that will be taken up again in Chapter 6. The introduction of castles to the region (not in the diagram) in the period c.AD1180–1350 does not correspond to any decline in evidence from pre-existing traditions either. The implications of this will be taken up again in Chapter 7.
Figure 4.25. Cumulative frequency plots for non-ecclesiastic settlement in Ulidia, with all forms of castle omitted (due to better associated documentary evidence), but furnished burials included. Note that unenclosed settlement is more normally distributed, and that ‘native’ forms of enclosed settlement continue in use past AD1200.
Figure 4.26. Sum of annalistic references to major ecclesiastic sites in Ulidia, AD500–1100.
Chapter 5. The North Channel, c.AD300–800

5.1 Introduction
As discussed in 1.2.1, the Dál Riata have attracted historiographical controversy for over a thousand years in relation to both their own origin legend and that of Scotland. Whatever the problems surrounding the traditional narratives, that a group calling themselves the Dál Riata were located on either side of the North Channel during the EMP must be accounted for. This chapter will explore whether or not a colonial episode involving settlers moving between northeast Ireland to western Scotland c.AD500 actually occurred, and in what direction. To do so, the commonalities and differences in settlement and other material practices will be discussed. Following this will be a brief discussion of the historical-linguistic debates in relation to the LIA and EMP in the North Channel. An attempt will also be made to deconstruct the various successive layers of textual narrative that have distorted the history of the North Channel region at its entry into the documentary record in the LIA–EMP transition. The results of this process will then be recombined with the material evidence to attempt to (re)build a socio-political narrative of the wider region c.AD300–800.

5.2 Material evidence relating to colonialism
Campbell (2001) criticises the historicity of the colonialist explanation of the origins of the Dál Riata on linguistic, archaeological and historiographical grounds. His arguments have been influential, but his archaeological approach can be criticised in relation to both material culture and settlement chronology (Woolf 2012). Archaeological criticisms aside, the principal value of Campbell’s (2001) paper is that it seeks to bring the material evidence into the discussion—to then, a major deficiency in discussions of the Dál Riata—while also raising the issue of deeper commonalities in the North Channel and the Insular Zone in general. If the paper fails to address changes c.AD500, it certainly draws attention to material practices in subsequent centuries. Furthermore, the idea that the flow of material was two-directional is a hard one to shake. The aim of the next section is to build on Campbell’s initial suspicions and re-examine the commonalities and differences in the material evidence from the Ulidia and Ergadia case-study regions.
5.2.2 Commonalities

Settlement enclosures

Section 3.7 demonstrated that large settlement enclosures (LSEs) occurring on hilltops are almost exclusively found in ‘mainland’ Argyll, rather than in the Hebrides (Map 3.16), with the dating evidence indicating a usage in the EIA–MIA (Figure 3.31–3.32), similar to England (Cunliffe 1991) rather than to Ireland, where current consensus dates large hilltop enclosures to the late Bronze Age (O’Brien 2017). However, dates are available from only three sites in Ergadia; future research may alter this chronology. The small group of vLSEs (Section 3.8; Map 3.17) is completely undated (3.8). The small group of dated MSEs (Section 3.5), mostly located on outcrops, hilltops or islands, seems to be slightly later as a series, but almost exclusively MIA–LIA, with some evidence for re-use in the high–late medieval period. Possibly the most striking aspect of both groups is that there is very little evidence for their use after AD500, but that is being conservative with the date-ranges assigned to the artefacts—it may be that they went out of use as early as AD200–300.

In Ulidia (Chapter 4), the Neolithic large enclosed hilltop sites of Donegore, Lyles Hill and Mount Sandel were reused in the MIA for settlement purposes, with another phase at Mount Sandel dating to the EMP–VA. There would also seem to have been a similar Neolithic phase at Balloch Hill in Kintyre, which otherwise dated to the EIA–MIA. Houses from outside the main enclosure at Scrabo also date to the MIA, but the E-ware from the summit indicates potential activity there in the EMP, similar to the slightly later PSW and CSW from Dunbeg. The examples in the Ulidia series certainly seem to buck the trend of enclosed hilltops in Ireland dating to the Bronze Age; however, it should be noted that they are much smaller and might represent a separate class of monument (James O’Driscoll, pers. comm. 7 September 2019). Scrabo and Dunbeg seem to be of similar date to the expanded phases of the TESs in Ergadia, and indeed further afield at sites such as the Mote of Mark (Laing and Longley 2006) and Dumbarton (Alcock et al. 1993).

On the limited evidence from these sites, it would seem as though enclosed hilltops were being used/reused in both case-study regions for settlement purposes across the Iron Age, if not earlier. They also seem to indicate variant traditions at work in the mainland and on the islands in Ergadia (Maps 3.13 and 3.17). They would seem to have little to do with any c.AD500 colonial episode, but the use of similar enclosed settlements would indicate the existence of shared ideas, most likely as part of a wider Insular or even European trend (discussed Alcock 1988).
Campbell (2001, 287) states that “There is therefore no evidence of a change in the normal settlement type at any point in the 1st millennium AD and no basis for suggesting any significant population movement between Antrim and Argyll in the 1st millennium AD.” His use of raths and cashels to represent settlement in Ireland c.AD500 does not accord with the associated dating evidence (Sections 4.3–4.11), nor should they be taken as the representative form of settlement to the exclusion of unenclosed forms (Section 4.2). Furthermore, Chapter 3 has demonstrated the variety of forms in use and several regional, topographical and chronological differences across the Ergadia case-study region; therefore, taking hilltop ASRs and settlement enclosures, along with crannogs, as the region’s only characteristic settlement form “the early iron age through to the late 1st millennium AD” might also be questioned (cf. Campbell 2001, 287).

**Crannogs**

As demonstrated in Figures 3.24–3.28 and 4.13, the evidence at present indicates that crannogs and stone islets were in use in western Scotland several centuries before their use in the northeast of Ireland (Crone 1993; Campbell 2001, 287; Cavers 2010)—even allowing for old wood skewing the radiocarbon and dendrochronological evidence. In this respect, the Ergadia examples can be seen as part of a wider distribution extending into Perthshire and Ayrshire (Morrison 1985). Teeshan would seem to be the only site with dating evidence (from old wood) falling in the MIA, whereas the Ergadia crannogs Loch Avich and Loch Leathan have large timbers dating to the EIA, with Dubh Loch, Ederline and Eilean na Comhairle having phases falling within the MIA. In Ulidia, Loch Faughan, Lough Tarmin and Teeshan would each seem to have phases of activity falling within the LIA, with most of the datable crannogs in Ergadia also falling partially or wholly within this range. It should be noted, though, that far more absolute dates are available for the Ergadia series. It is unlikely that the appearance of crannogs had anything to do with any purported migration in the fifth–sixth centuries AD, considering that several examples on either side of the North Channel predate this. It might, though, indicate some sort of socio-cultural or political convergence in the LIA and/or EMP.

**Enclosed promontories**

Enclosed promontories occur in both case study regions, and beyond in the Forth–Tay region, Orkney and Shetland, the west coast of Ireland, Galloway, Man, southwest Wales, Cornwall and Brittany (Cunliffe 1991, 268; Henderson 2007, 128–42; O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 62–4, 337–
8). As a series, they are somewhat under-researched, but they do seem to be part of a shared Atlantic tradition, perhaps more a similar reaction to similar topography than anything to do with shared cultural traits. Chronologically, they can date to any time from the Neolithic to the high–late medieval period and might potentially have been used and reused by successive groups over the course of several thousand years.

Considering that only Dunollie (partially) and Larrybane have been excavated across the two case-study regions, it is difficult to state anything categorically. However, the radiocarbon-dates and artefacts do seem to indicate a period of use c.AD600–1200, and later, in the case of Larrybane. The documentary references to Dunseverick, Dunaverty and probably Tarbert (where excavations are now also underway) are in line with this, with the post-AD1200 activity in these cases taking the form of a masonry castle. The pottery evidence from Dùn nan Gall on Tiree is inconclusive. Even though the documentary (and artefactual, in the case of Dunollie) evidence indicates high-status associations, it should not be concluded that they were associated with any conquest of western Scotland by the Dál Riata. Rather, they seem to be part of a wider insular EMP tradition of high-status sites being located on partially inaccessible locations. Further research might indicate longer periods of use at these sites. In this respect, it is worth considering that settlement activity at Knock Dhu near Larne was found to date to the Bronze Age (Macdonald 2016) and there are other examples in Ireland and Scotland with Iron Age dates (Henderson 2007, 131–3).

Unenclosed settlements

Both case-studies seem to have employed similar techniques in relation to the various forms of wooden roundhouse, but as part of a wider Insular trend. Recent research has demonstrated a growing number of wooden roundhouses in Ergadia, as discussed in 3.2 and A.3.2, similar to elsewhere in Britain and Ireland. The major difference between the two regions is found in the series of ASRs, discussed in 3.3 A.3.3., and in 5.2.3 below. Unenclosed settlement cannot be used to positively identify colonial activity in the period AD400–600. The only main change visible in the record is the shift from rounded to rectilinear domestic structures in Ireland in the early ninth century (Lynn 1975), which might also be paralleled in Ergadia, but this has little to do with the Dál Riata episode and is more related to increased engagement with construction trends from beyond the Irish Sea zone.
**Flows of material culture**

There are small but significant assemblages of Roman material in both case-study regions. The most visible of these is perhaps the distribution of Samian pottery (Maps 5.1–5.2). Map 5.2 also demonstrates that a small number of Roman/Romano-British coins were found in Ergadia. However, the assemblage from Dùn Mòr Bhall demonstrates that items of personal adornment were also moving into western Scotland from Roman Britain, most likely through networks of exchange. Glass was also something that seems to have moved along these networks—the movement of Romano-British glass vessels provides an important parallel for the EMP movement of claw beakers and other glass vessels from Kent, Northumbria and Mercia into the region.

This contrasts with Ulidia, where coins dominate any discussion of the flow of material culture into the region from Britain in the LIA. Daffy (2013, 86–7) notes that Roman finds are known from almost every potential harbour from Dundrum, Co. Down to Dunfanaghy, Co. Donegal, with the presence of small finds in sand-dune areas possibly related to their use as beaching spots (Waddell 2000, 373–7). Several buried wealth deposits containing Roman/Romano-British material have been uncovered in the area around the Lower Bann and Bush and the North Antrim coast (Map 5.1; Bateson 1973). Several findspots of Roman material are located around Belfast Lough and the Samian pottery at two sites near Dundrum is also important to consider in this respect. As Daffy (2013, 83–4) discusses, while some of the single-finds in Belfast might be related to later importation by modern urban collectors, as in Dublin, they might be related to LIA social processes and to the higher level of works and excavations in these urban centres.

300 coins dating to between AD97×117 were found in 1827 at Flower Hill, a townland south of Bushmills and 500 coins with minting dates of AD69×175 were found in 1831 on Feigh Mountain, northwest of Dunseverick (Bateson 1971; 1973, 44–5). The contents of both deposits—if they were not in fact from the same hoard—were heavily decomposed; therefore, the minting range may have been wider. Their poor condition makes it difficult to say anything about use wear and the minting–deposition lag; it may have been several decades, or longer.

Possibly more significant for the present purposes are the two hoards at Ballinrees, Co. Londonderry, both found in 1854 (Bateson 1973, 42–3). The larger contained 1506 coins, half of which were clipped, silver ingots and cut plate, with a fourth–fifth-century bowl reconstructed by the British Museum (2017). The coins ranged from Constantius II to Honorius (AD324×424), with the latest coins in the group belonging to the period AD419×423. The second contained 195 coins of Gratian, Valens and Honorius (AD364×423). It might be
concluded, then, that the two hoards were contemporary. While they are not in the Ulidia case-study region, they are collectively referred to as the ‘Coleraine Hoard’ and located 6km west of the Bann and 1.8km east of the terraced enclosed settlement known as the Giant’s Sconce or Dún Ceithern.

No hoards of Roman coins are known from Ergadia, and only one from the Western Isles (Blackwell, Goldberg and Hunter 2017, 19–24). Single finds of coins are known though, and the number of sites with Samian pottery (if it has not been mis-identified) is higher in Ergadia compared to Ulidia (Maps 5.1–5.2).

What the evidence indicates is that both regions were connected to the wider Insular Zone and indeed beyond in the LIA and EMP. However, the larger amount of coins and hacksilver from northeast Ireland might indicate that the inhabitants of the region interacted with the areas of Britain under Roman control in a different way—either as mercenaries, *fæderati* or as raiders, or perhaps all three. Conversely, low amounts of Roman material would seem to have been more common at settlement sites in Ergadia, which might indicate a different relationship at work. That said, the possible presence of an experienced warrior group in the Lower Bann region in the fifth century might be worth exploring; it might even be a folk memory of such groups that was behind part of the later ‘Dál Riata myth’. Also, long-running interaction with Britain might have led to this group being referred to as the Cruithin [the Britons], swapping Brythonic /P/ for Goidelic /C/. This will be explored further in 5.5.
Map 5.1. Roman material from Ulidia (using same scale as Ergadia map to facilitate comparison).
Map 5.2. Selected Roman and Roman-British material from Ergadia; location of glass objects offset to allow for depiction of clusters of evidence.

In subsequent centuries, both Ergadia and Ulidia participated only slightly in the networks of exchange that brought LRA, ARSW and PRSW to the Insular Zone, something that contrasts with the AD550–700 movement of E-ware into and within the Irish Sea Zone.
(Maps 5.3–5.4), with Downpatrick, Dunadd and possibly Dunollie local centres of redistribution. This will be explored further under the heading ‘kingship and governance’ at the end of the current section.

Map 5.3. EMP imported pottery in Ulidia.
In terms of material culture, while this dissertation explores localised changes in material practices as brought about by the movement of people in colonial situations, it does not do so without qualifications. Considering the interplay between styles and fashions in penannular brooches in the Insular Zone (demonstrated by Lane and Campbell 2000 at Dunadd, for
example), brooches and pins can tell us very little about mass-migration in this instance. The potential movement of craftworkers (Alcock 1971, 265) and the interplay between various regional styles are discussed by Campbell (2009).

Therefore, the use of spiral-ringed ring-headed pins, Fowler Type F3 and G3 and penannular brooches in Campbell’s (2001) arguments might be questioned. Campbell (2001, 287) states that “The main form of brooch in 4th–6th-century Ireland is the zoomorphic penannular brooch” (Type F). Conversely, the Type G penannular brooch is much more common in western Britain, and Campbell proposes (based on two brooches) that it may have moved to Ireland from western Britain rather than the other way around, comparing the dates from Dunadd to those of Moynagh Lough (cf. Lane and Campbell 2000; Bradley 1991). However, Type F3 might be more a sixth–seventh century form in Ireland, for example (see Newman 1989, 13–4). Earlier, probably AD350–550 (cf. Graham-Campbell 1991, 228; Youngs 1995, 130), zoomorphic forms are very rare in the northeast of Ireland; one is known from the Bann at Toome and one from Navan Fort in Armagh (Kilbride-Jones 1980, 86, 93). Also, similar zoomorphic brooches were not unknown in northern Britain, even if their distribution is focussed on the Severn estuary (Ó Floinn 2001, 2–3). Therefore, their wide distribution was probably unrelated to any colonial episode, and more related to the flow of people and ideas between and within the two islands.

No Type G brooches are known from Ulidia, with the possible exception of a brooch from Solar (Hurl 2002, 55). Even then, it is difficult to determine a link between events c.AD500 and the G3 brooches in Northern Britain (e.g., Dunadd) that “date to the early and mid-7th century” and the Moynagh Lough example dated by dendrochronology to the early eighth century (cf. Campbell 2001, 287), whatever their relationship between one another. Furthermore, the dating of the Dunadd deposits is open to dispute in light of modern archaeological practice: all of the dates were from mixed charcoal potentially containing old wood from mixed redeposited material; therefore, the date-ranges are all probably too early.

The use of a series of spiral-ringed ring-headed pins dating to c.AD700–1000 to discuss events c.AD500 can certainly be questioned (cf. Campbell 2001, 287). Where they appear in the diagrams in Chapter 4, with the exception of Dundrum, they are from deposits/phases dated by radiocarbon or pottery to c.AD700–1000. Furthermore, the statement that “Both areas [Ergadia and Ulidia] were aceramic at this period” [presumably the fifth–sixth centuries] might be criticised, depending on how the chronologies of DHCP and CUHP in Ergadia are to be interpreted.
Burials
The evidence for Iron-Age funerary practices in both case studies is comparatively low, but it would seem as though both participated in wider trends in the treatment of the dead in the first millennium BC. No known burials dating to the late Bronze Age or Iron Age have been identified in Co. Antrim (McGarry 2010, 413). The figure of four burials from Co. Down (McGarry 2010, 413) has been greatly increased by the series of ring-ditches and cremation pits found during the excavations ahead of the Newry Bypass (Dunlop 2015), meaning there are now at least ten known burials from Co. Down, with a related series continuing into Co. Armagh. The use of ring-ditches represents the continuity of a tradition in Ulidia stretching back to at least the early Bronze Age, and the relationship between the ring-ditch and standing-stone at Ballybeen is paralleled at both Carrownacaw and Drumnahare, Co. Down (Mallory 1984, 4; cf. Collins 1957, 38; Raftery 1981). The use of short cists also represents continuity, and it may be that some of the many examples of single and clustered short cists noted by antiquarians (e.g., O’Laverty 1878; 1879; 1880; 1884; 1887) across Ulidia date to the Iron Age.

There seems to have been far fewer ring-barrows, ring-ditches and arrangements of small pits containing cremated remains in Ergadia, but short cists occur at least as often as they do in Ulidia (see Ritchie 1997; 84–9; Cowie 2004) and might have a similarly broad date-range. Iron Age inhumations are also known from the region (Armit 2004, 58).

An important convergence between the two regions is the adoption of clustered stone-lined (or ‘long-cist’) extended inhumation burials in the LIA, probably by about AD300 (Map 3.23). Recent research by Cahill Wilson (2012; 2014; Cahill Wilson and Standish 2016) and Maldonado Ramírez (2011a; 2011b; 2013) has demonstrated that this is related to Ireland and Scotland participating in wider changes related to burial practices in the Insular Zone and beyond in Roman Europe. This wider engagement saw the flow of certain forms of material culture into both areas, e.g., Samian pottery, LRA, and later ARSW and PRSW. It may well have been the vector by which Christianity and new ideas in relation to kingship, governance and private property were introduced into both regions.

Christianity
Ecclesiastic sites appear in both regions in the EMP. Christianisation might on occasion be linked to colonialism, e.g. the Teutonic knights in Livonia in the HMP (Bartlett 1993, 15–8) or the Spanish in the Americas (Cervantes 1995). Even then, this association was more complex than some sort of project of forced acculturation, even if the justification for the conquest of
territory might have been legitimated in Christian terms. More frequently, however, pre-modern Christianisation spread via other vectors, e.g. trade routes, missionary activity, transculturation, out-group intermarriage, or elite-led mass conversion. Thus, it is doubtful that there was any direct relationship between colonial activity and the appearance of Christian-associated settlement monuments in Ireland and western Scotland. Even if incoming colonists were to sponsor the foundation of ecclesiastic sites to bolster their authority, similar options were also open to local agents. In the absence of detailed documentary evidence, it is difficult to untangle such patterns of patronage.

With normally no other justification than the appearance of Colum Cille in the region in the AD570s, Christianity is traditionally portrayed as being introduced into western Scotland from northern Ireland (critiqued by Fraser 2009, 106). Far more likely is that Christianity arrived via interaction with the Roman world, similar to what was probably the case in Ireland. Taking Ireland first, the fifth-century chronicler/controversialist Prosper of Aquitaine notes that Palladius was sent as bishop to the Scotti believing in Christ in AD431 (Epitoma Chronicon, AD431, §1307 in Mommsen 1892, 473; discussion Valentin 1900, 411–41). This statement, the earliest secure contemporary reference to activity in Ireland (Ó Cróinin 1995, 14), indicates that there was a sufficient number of Christians in Ireland at the time to warrant assigning a bishop—and one with previous Insular experience, having accompanied Germanus of Auxerre to Britain in AD429. Prosper also refers elsewhere to the success of the mission in Ireland in Contra Collatorem (§363.2 in Migne 1861, 271). Whether Patrick is accepted as being in Ireland in the fourth or the fifth century, or Orosius accepted as describing Christian communities in southwest Ireland c.AD400 (Ó Corráin 2017), it would be difficult to demonstrate that Ireland was Christianised to such a high degree (see Ó Cróinin 1995; Charles-Edwards 2000 for in-depth discussion) that the sons of Erc would have brought Christianity to western Scotland c.AD500.

Turning to northern Britain, visitors to the region c.AD500 might have found western Scotland already partially Christianised. Fraser (2009, 88) draws attention to the ‘Latinus Stone’ from Whithorn and the ‘Cat Stane’ near Edinburgh as related to unambiguously Christian funerary practice and a possible indicator of the vectors by which Christianity spread in northern Britain. He also draws attention to the importance of Carlisle and the northern Irish Sea. Fraser (2009, 106) draws attention to the Gallo-Roman parallels of the double armed cross on the Kilmory Oib stone at the head of Loch Sween and the cave carvings at Eilean Mòr, implying that they could be connected to fifth century Gallo-Roman missionary activity. Fisher (2001, 14) states that the Kilmory Oib slab is one of the earlier slabs in the region, along with the geometric
slabs at Kilmory Knap and Kilmichael Inverlussa, both in fairly close proximity. Whether they are as early as Fraser proposes cannot be stated with any confidence, though. The hexafoil motif in the cave at Eilean Mòr and the Taurogram/compass cross motif both may well be early, but they are part of a wider fashion in Christianity—hexafoil slabs are known from San Pedro de Vilar, Pontedueme in Galicia (Museo Arqueolóxico e Histórico da Coruña, ground floor, site visit 29 July 2012) and in southern Portugal (Museu Nacional de Arqueologica, Lisbon, numbers 464, 295, 299, site visit 8 September 2017), for example. The western-British vector implied by the early material might also have been behind the origin of some of the early ecclesiastic sites and figures in the Strangford Lough area and beyond.

Another important piece of evidence is Patrick’s fourth–fifth-century Epistola ad miletes Corotici (‘Letter to the Soldiers of Coroticus, Bieler 1993, 91–102). The probably ninth–tenth-century heading applied to §I.29 of Muirchú’s Vita sancti Patricii in the Book of Armagh describe Patrick’s conflict against “Coirtech regem Aloo” (Coirtech, king of *Ail or *Aillenn). This might place him at Alt Clut/Dumbarton Rock (de Paor 1993, 113; Fraser 2009, 89; Charles-Edwards 2013, 35–6). Archaeological evidence indicates activity there in this period (Alcock and Alcock 1990), and a king named Ceredig appears as an apical figure in several northern British royal genealogies (Macquarrie 1993, 2–4). However, those genealogies may have inserted Ceredig from the Epistola or Book of Armagh, rather than representing independent evidence. That Coroticus/Ceredig—or his soldiers, at least—had apostate socii (‘allies’) from among the Scotti and Picti (§2, §15) would at least place him in northern Britain. The letter’s contents—including accusations of apostacy aimed directly at his allies and indirectly at the recipient—at least indicate that Christianity was reasonably widespread in northern Britain at the time, and that the northern Irish Sea/North Channel might have played an important role in the spread of Christianity. This may have continued with the sixth-century actions of Uinniau in the area around the northern Irish Sea (reconstructed by Clancy 2001) and may have led to the co-option of early Christianity in Co. Down and the Isle of Man into the Patrician legend.

Based on this evidence, if the sons of Erc did establish themselves in western Scotland c.AD500, then it cannot be stated that they were themselves Christian at this time, nor can the level of Christianity they encountered on arrival be determined. What can be said is that, both sides of the North Channel seem to have participated in similar fashions in relation to mortuary practice, Roman/Mediterranean pottery and ideas of kingship, shifting along with the rest of the Insular Zone.
Kingship and governance

As mentioned in the material culture section above, Downpatrick, Dunadd and Dunollie may well have been local centres for the redistribution of material culture acquired via long-distance trade networks. All three, and perhaps also Scrabo, Dundrum, Dunmull and Dunseverick in Ulidia and Dunaverty, Tarbert, Dun Nosebridge, and Dun Guaidhre in Ergadia would seem to be part of a wider Insular series of LIA–EMP central places located on hilltops, promontories and rock outcrops. Alcock (1988) explores the series in general. Where excavated, sites such as Tintagel in Cornwall (Barrowman et al. 2007), Dinas Powys in Wales (Alcock 1963; Seaman 2013; Seaman and Lane 2013), the Mote of Mark (Laing and Longley 2006) and Trusty’s Hill (Toolis and Bowles 2017) in Galloway, Dumbarton on the Clyde (Alcock and Alcock 1990; Alcock et al. 1992) and Dundurn in Strathearn (Driscoll 1989) demonstrate a similar grammar of governance in the post-Roman period. They also (mostly) demonstrate links to the movement of Mediterranean and/or western Continental ceramics and glass within the Insular Zone (Campbell 2007; Duggan 2018), as well as the production of items of probable-high-status associations, e.g., penannular brooches.

5.2.3 Differences

ASRs and SSEs

Atlantic stone roundhouses (ASRs) represent the principal difference between the two case-study regions. In this respect, Ergadia seems to be part of a wider tradition of building in stone in Atlantic Scotland. As discussed in 4.9, there might be an argument made that the small group of enclosed outcrops in northern Co. Antrim are part of the larger series of SSEs and MSEs with similar topographic associations in western Scotland. However, none of the Antrim sites have complex features and none so far have furnished any dating evidence prior to c.AD800 (Figure 4.9). Furthermore, the group is miniscule in comparison to the large number of ASRs across the North Channel. A series of test trenches/pits at the Antrim sites might help clear up the matter, or archaeologically test the proposition by McSparron and Williams (2011) that the Antrim sites are related to a migration stream established after the conquest of western Scotland by the Dál Riata.

There have been arguments made (e.g. Henderson 2007; to a lesser degree Werner 2007) that CASRs are related to the so-called ‘Western stone forts’ in Ireland. This might be stretching the evidence too far; the vast majority of intramural features in the Ergadia series are found in CASRs, whereas the Irish enclosures are much bigger, and while there might be similar ideas
at work, they are applied very differently (Henders 2007, 194–8). Functionally, they are
different forms of settlement, one is a house, the other an enclosure with massive stone walls.
Furthermore, it has been demonstrated in Chapter 4 that there has been very little solid evidence
dating the Irish enclosures to before the EMP (contra Henderson 2007, 201–4, whose
arguments in this respect are based on one iron object from Dún Aonghasa on Aran, misdated
imported ceramics and the problematic dates from Dunsilly discussed in Chapter 4 and A.4).

Ardifuir is the only SSE with definite intramural features; therefore, it has as much in
common with the Irish series as the CASRs in the Hebrides. However, it is best seen as part of
a series of SSEs that are morphologically similar to Irish cashels but are several hundred years
older in date in their early phases, e.g., Loch Glashan (Figure 3.15). This might be related to
the fact that Iron Age phases at Scottish sites are easier to recognise by artefactual means than
in Ireland.

Earthen enclosures are rarer in Ergadia, but Cnoc an Ràith on Bute would seem to be an
exact morphological and chronological parallel for the series of earthen settlement enclosures
in EMP Ireland. However, a handful of earthen-enclosed sites in Ergadia could hardly be seen
as evidence for the adoption of raths in the region following any sort of conquest. Their
distribution might be related to the distribution of soil deep enough for use in bank construction
to provide an alternative for stone. That said, their distribution in Ergadia might be due to the
existence of something of a North-Channel shared cultural milieu in the EMP, though, as
described in Section 5.2.2.

5.3 Language
Campbell’s (2001; 2009) suggestion that the north–south chain of high mountains running from
the central lowlands in the south to the north coast in Sutherland and Caithness represents more
of a cultural and linguistic barrier than the North Channel is certainly worth considering. He
uses the term Druim Alban, Adomnán’s Dorsum Britanniae, [both ‘back/spine of Britain’]. In
VSCII.46 (Anderson and Anderson 1961, 458–61), Adomnán states that the Pictish people and
the Scots of Britain were separated by the mountains of the spine of Britain. AU717.4 describes
the expulsion of the Iona community across/beyond [trans] this feature by Nechtan, described
elsewhere as regis Pictorum [(a) king of (the) Picts] (AT724.2; on Nechtan, see Clancy 2004).
The entry also appears in AT717.3, indicating that it was present in the *Chronicle of Ireland
exemplar, and possibly even in the pre-c.AD740 *Iona Chronicle exemplar, and thus written
from the perspective of Iona. Both Skene (1837a, 26–30) and Dunshea (2013) discuss the ways
in which the division of northern Britain and the extent of this area of mountains being referred
to might have been more complex than a simple east–west divide.

Clancy (2010, 381) discusses that the P and Q division of the Celtic language group was
originally an isogloss rather than representing a more fundamental division, suggesting instead
that the main differences developed in the first six centuries AD. This has major implications
for the discussion of the transmission of the names appearing around the North Channel on
Ptolemy’s second-century map, especially in terms of conflating named groups with certain
languages. Even by the EMP, Woolf (2012, 5–6) notes that there is no evidence for where the
interface between Goidelic and Brythonic speech communities lay, nor is there sufficient
understanding of mutual intelligibility or the existence of intermediate dialects. Somewhat
conversely, Clancy (2010, 382–3) points to the preservation of Brythonic features in eastern
Gaelic as evidence for the adoption of Gaelic by Brythonic speakers over several centuries
through several vectors, but not due to any convergence between the two languages. The
facility with which Brythonic/Pictish pett was adopted as a generic paired with Gaelic specifics
in toponyms in eastern Scotland c.AD800–1000 might be interpreted as an indicator of either
Woolf’s or Clancy’s propositions (see also Broun 1994). Both options indicate that the
misinterpretation of the use of this element have led to erroneous statements regarding the
distribution of ‘Pictish’ Brythonic speakers.

Bede (HGA.I.1) states that the five languages of Britain in his time were the languages
of the Angles, the Britons, the Scotti, the Picts, and the Latins. He describes the Britons from
Armorica as the primary inhabitants of the island in the south, followed by the Picts from
Seythia via Ireland in the north and then the Scotti from Ireland to the north of the Clyde among
the Picts. In HGA.I.12, Bede describes a place near Abercorn called “Peanfahel” in the
language of (the) Picts, which would certainly seem to be Brythonic in form. While potentially
intelligible to a Goidelic speaker by swapping /P/ for /C/, it is worth noting that the /P/ form
was preserved after a shift to Gaelic as the local language.

Texts emanating from Iona would seem to adhere to the widespread common academic
standard of SG centred on the northeast quadrant of Ireland, and Armagh in particular
(Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 177–9). It is difficult to state anything of the vernacular language of
the Dál Riata at the time, though. If it is accepted that the higher level of variation in written
Middle Irish/Gaelic (MG) had its origins in variations in the vernacular AD600–900
(Ó Muircheartaigh 2015, 187–96), then the dearth of written material from western Scotland
AD900–1200 leaves us with little idea of the vernacular form(s) in use. The content of the Book
of Deer demonstrates the influence of the twelfth-century dialect of eastern Scotland
(Ó Maolalaigh 2008) and Clancy (2010, 386–7) discusses the influence of MG on the Gaelic of the multilingual southwest Scotland, including the use of eclipsis. Neither of these would be completely appropriate to discuss the vernacular of the Dál Riata in the EMP. Furthermore, despite being later bastions of the language, Gaelic would seem to have been largely (re)introduced as the principal (but possibly not exclusive) language of western islands such as Islay (Macniven 2015) and Lewis (Kruse 2005) after several centuries of Old Norse being the dominant language (see Chapter 6). Clancy (2010, 389) points out that the processes behind this have barely been explored (cf. Cox 2002), but it might at least be said that the contemporary Gaelic of these islands might be of limited utility for discussing the similarities and differences between the languages of northern Britain in the LIA and EMP (Woolf 2007, 328–9).

When describing Colum Cille’s activities in Skye, Adomnán (VSC.I.33; Anderson and Anderson 1961, 274–5) has Colum Cille requiring an interpreter to speak to Artbranan, a chief of the ‘Geona’ cohort [Geonae primaries cohortis], who was brought by boat to meet Colum Cille, and was baptised by the saint before dying and being buried under a cairn. Colum Cille does not seem to have needed an interpreter to converse with Erc moccu Druidi, probably from Coll, rather than Colonsay (VSC.I.41). The Miathi of southern ‘Pictland’ are described as barbarians (VSC.I.8), as are the people encountered at Loch Ness (VSC.II.27). No interpreter is mentioned in the latter case, nor is one mentioned in relation to Colum Cille’s interactions with Bruide, king of the Picts, and the ‘mage’ Broichan (VSC.II.33–5). However, an interpreter was necessary to baptise a sick boy in the “province of the Picts” (VSC.II.32). It is argued here that the necessity of an interpreter for the baptisms of this boy and of Artbranan was related to the use of Latin in the ceremony, with no interpreter necessary for conversations in the vernacular. Whether this means that Colum Cille learned the language(s) of the region or could understand conversations by mentally applying conversion formulae (similar to speakers of Norwegian, Swedish and Danish today) cannot be determined on the current evidence. It might, though, point to the absence of hard linguistic boundaries at the time.

5.4 The textual narrative
As noted in 1.2.1, the traditional pseudo-historical narrative outlines how Loarn, Fergus (AKA Mac Nisse) and Óengus, sons of Erc, king of Dál Riata, came from northeast Ireland and took over a portion of western Scotland c.AD500. They subsequently divided it among themselves, giving rise to the three divisions of Dál Riata—as mapped by Bannerman (1974)—named after Loarn, Óengus and Fergus’s grandson Gabrán son of Domangart (see Map 1.2 for adapted
version). Bannerman’s division does not account for the Cenél Comgaill, named for another son of Domangart. Fraser (2010, 139–40) discusses how this visual synopsis and his conclusions on the historical material became enshrined in the scholarship on early medieval western Scotland for several decades. He also criticises the timelessness of the situation presented by Bannerman; once established, the traditional narrative allows for very little geopolitical change in subsequent centuries. Furthermore, Fraser (2010, 140–1) points out that the understanding of Dál Riata in ethnic, rather than political terms in models influenced by Bannerman are problematic, as is the implication that any Gaels in Atlantic Scotland were neither members of the main cenél (pl. of cenél, used in the sense of ‘group of descendants of X’) nor subject to one of them.

The archaeological evidence is at best inconclusive in relation to the purported conquest of western Scotland by a group from northeast Ireland (Sections 5.2.2–5.2.3). Moreover, it was demonstrated in Chapter 3 that much regional and chronological variation is visible in the Iron Age evidence from Ergadia—especially when comparing mainland Argyll with the southern Hebrides. In the following few pages, it will be demonstrated that the textual evidence does not support the historicity of a colonial episode involving the Dál Riata; rather, similar to the other categories of evidence, it points to a complex socio-political situation in the North Channel c.AD300–600.

The relevant textual material is discussed in detail in the prosopography in A.5, what follows here is a summary of the main points. As discussed in Section 2.7, the contemporary recording of the material that would later make up the various Irish annals began in the seventh century. It was also discussed in Section 2.7 that later hagiographical, saga, genealogical and synthetic historical material was worked into some of the annals to add to the material acquired from the proposed *Chronicle of Ireland* (Charles-Edwards 2006) exemplar from the mid-tenth century onwards. This was very much the case with the Clonmacnoise group of annals (Grabowski and Dumville 1984; Dumville 1993, 187; 2007). Therefore, any early entries related to the Dál Riata in the AT, CS and ACIon but not in the AU must be approached critically (see Anderson 1980, 40–1).

### 5.4.1 Dating Dál Riata

Of the earlier annals, it is only the AT that uses the term ‘Dál Riata’ at all, and only using the MG ‘Riada’ spelling, e.g. AT573.2, up until Conadd Cerr defeated the Cenél Demmáin branch of the Ulaid at Ard Corann, probably near Larne (AU627.1; AT628.1). The term is used again
to refer to the death of Conadd (AU629.1), and again in AU673.2 and AU691.3, compared to twelve times in the eighth century. Conadd was a member of the Cenél Comgaill, and the term might have been used to signify a new state of affairs. Considering the series of actions in northern Antrim mentioned here, and in previous decades in connection to the Cenél nGabráín, it is likely that northern Antrim was incorporated into their territory by the AD620s, possibly at the expense of the Cottraige based near Dunseverick, whose name is preserved in the barony of Cary (VT; Stokes 1887, 162; Mac Neill 1911–2, 61). This might be represented in the early ecclesiastic placename “Cúl Ectrann” in the VT (Stokes 1887, 162; modern Culfeightrin), if the etymology ‘corner of the stranger(s)’ (Reeves 1847, 79) is accepted.

The general use of Corcu and Dál as interchangeable equivalents to refer to population groups and lineages, with moccu used to refer to a single member of a lineage, continued to the eighth century AD, after which moccu fell out of use (Mac Neill 1911–2, 64). Anderson and Anderson (1961, 35–6) point out that Réti is an earlier genitive of Riata, and they draw attention to the obit of Dairchill moccu Retai, bishop of Glendalough (AU678.2; AT678.3) as an example of the use of a third form to refer to the group. Anderson and Anderson (1961, 55) note that the term ‘Dál Riata’ does not appear in the seventh-century legal text Cáin Adomnáin, with “Eochu Ua Domnaill ri” [Eochu, grandson of Domnall, king] (d.AU697.4) appearing without further details. Adomnán (VSC I.46) describes Goreus, son of Aedán as the strongest of all men from the populus Korkureti [people of Corcu Réti]. A name like Corcu/moccu Réti might have been the name of the group prior to AU627.1.

After AU792.4, a king of Dál Riata is not directly referred to as such until CS914, after which it is used very rarely, and usually as a geographical designator (see 6.3.5). It is argued here that this late usage, seemingly to refer to Dál Riata in northern Antrim, is a deliberate repurposing of an earlier term by another group to attain a veneer of antiquity, similar to the Cenél Lugdach appropriating the identity of the former Cenél Conaill (Lacey 2006, 321–2). Therefore, it would seem that the use of the term ‘Dál Riata’ and its equivalents to refer to a group or territory in western Scotland had a very short chronology extending from the AD620s to AD790s. Its subsequent usage is discussed further in Chapter 6.

5.4.2 Locating Dál Riata

‘Dál Riata’ might originally have been used in textual production to collectively refer to the Cenél nGabráín and Comgaill, but by the AD670s it would seem to have been expanded to incorporate the Cenél Loairn. The first appearance of the Cenél Loairn in the Irish annals
(AT678.3) in connection to their defeat on Tiree (“Tíriu” AU678.3) under Ferchar Fota by the Britons (AT678.4) is followed by an upsurge in references to the term ‘Dál Riata’ in *Iona Chronicle* entries (A.5). Dunollie is mentioned five times in the annals in this period, more than any other Insular secular site in this period (Table 5.1; A.3.10). It is in this period that the two documentary references to what seem to be the other major centres of the expanded polity occur, including Dunadd (Table 5.1). This also corresponds with the expansion of Dunadd into its ‘classic’ form, and to the high point of the region’s external connections, evinced in the distribution of E-ware and the profusion and blending of art motifs from across the Insular Zone seen in the brooch-mould assemblage from Dunadd (Figure 3.39 and A.3.9 entry). The evidence from Dunollie and Little Dunagoil (Figures 3.36 and 3.38) hints at similarities in this respect, and future research might demonstrate that this was also the case at Dunaverty.

Table 5.1. Documentary references to high-status sites associated with the Dál Riata; All years AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Human Agent(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>686</td>
<td>Tula Aman</td>
<td>AU686.1</td>
<td>Dunollie burned by Tula Aman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>AU698.3</td>
<td>Dunollie burned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Selbach</td>
<td>AU701.8</td>
<td>Dunollie destroyed by <em>(apud)</em> Selbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Selbach</td>
<td>AU714.2</td>
<td>Dunollie rebuilt by Selbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734</td>
<td><em>(presumably Onuist of Fortriu)</em></td>
<td>AU734.6</td>
<td>Talorgan son of Drostan captured near Dunollie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700×750</td>
<td><em>Táin Bó Fraích</em>, Meid 1974,15 line 378</td>
<td>mentioned in Irish saga as on the way from Pictland to Ards in Ulaid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Human Agent(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AU683.3</td>
<td>Dunadd besieged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onuist</td>
<td>AU736.1</td>
<td>Dunadd seized by Onuist, Dúngal and Feradach, sons of Selbach captured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Human Agent(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Selbach</td>
<td>AU712.5</td>
<td>Dunaverty besieged by Selbach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Human Agent(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Dúngal son of Selbach</td>
<td>AU731.4</td>
<td>burned by Dúngal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fraser (2010, 143–5) is critical of Bannerman’s (1974, 110) underplaying of the importance of the Cenél Loairn and its constituent cenél— and the rivalries between them— in this period. The evidence of the annals demonstrates that they were the pre-eminent group in western Scotland for several decades, before their obsolescence following a series of defeats by Onuist son of Uurgiust, king of Fortriu (AU734.7; AU736.1; AU734.6; AU736.2) culminating in “the smiting of Dál Riata” by Onuist (AU741.10). Following this, any references to the Dál Riata are to members of the Cenél nGabráin and possibly the Cenél Congaill, possibly an indication that the Cenél Loairn, if not all of Crích Dáil Riata had been incorporated into the wider territory ruled by Fortriu.

The existence of an overkingdom with several contesting dynasties may well have required a similar repurposing of the past in an effort to achieve some sort of harmony between the contending groups. Similar occurred with the incorporation of the Cenél nEógain and Cenél Conaill into the Úi Néill mythology and system of fictive kinship in Ireland in the seventh–eighth centuries (O’Brien 1939, 172–3; 1962, 147; Mac Niocaill 1972; Byrne 1973, 70–105; Ó Cróinin 1995; 2005; Charles-Edwards 2000, 441–68; Lacey 2006) and the relationships of the new Úi Néill to subject groups such as the Airgíalla formalised (see Mac Shamhráin 2000; Mac Shamhráin and Byrne 2005; Bhreathnach 2005b, 95–8; Macalister 1956, 344–5; Carey 1994, 22–3). This process may well have obscured other, earlier traditions, and the waters are further muddied by episodes of reshaping and repurposing, as will now be discussed.

5.4.3 Reconstructing Dál Riata

Fergus son of Erc

AT501.3, CAS499 and AClon501 all describe the conquest of a part of Britain by “Feargus Mor mac Earca” and the “gente Dal Riada” (see A.5), with no corresponding entry in the AU or AI. The AT and CS entries are in Latin with MG orthography used for the Irish terms (Anderson and Anderson 1961, 37; Dumville 1993, Campbell 2001, 288). The earliest appearance of Fergus Mór son of Erc as a member of the Dál Riata is in the VT (AD850×950, Stokes 1887, 162; Broun 2014), which also mentions that he was one of twelve sons of Erc and the grantor of Armoy to Patrick. However, the VT provides the unique detail that it was Fergus’s descendent, Aedán son of Gabrán “who took Alba by force” (Dumville 2007, 42).

“Fergus mor macc nise” appears in the ninth-century Notulae of the Book of Armagh (Gwynn 1913, 36), possibly in relation to the founding of Armoy. He also appears as the same, with the addition of di Dail Riatai [of Dál Riata] in the VT (Stokes 1887, 168) in an encounter
between Patrick and Fergus’s daughter Mogan, married to Cairthind son of Erc, of either the Uí Maccu Uais or Ind Airthir Uais (Walsh 1921–3; O’Brien 1962, 139–41; cf. ACP §43; Mac Shamhráin and Byrne 2005, 222), both of which were groups within the Airgiáalla located in central Ulster. Adomnán refers to two sons of Mac Erce, Domnall and Fergus, as being involved in the Battle of Móin Daire Lothair (VSC I.7; AU563.1; AT562.1). These figures are mentioned several times in the annals (e.g. AU543.2; AU547.1; AU550.1; AU561.1; AU563.1; AU566.1; repeated in AT). Domnall (d.AU566.2) is consistently portrayed in the genealogies as the ancestor of the main line of the Cenél nEógain (Charles-Edwards 2000, 606). This would confirm Broun’s (2014)¹ suggestion that Fergus son of Mac Ercae, a figure who effectively vanishes from the historical record after Adomnán, was repurposed in the ninth–tenth centuries in Patrician texts as the secular founder of Armoy and ancestor figure of the Dál Riata, and Aedán mac Gabráin. Broun (2014) suggests that the insertion of Fergus into the genealogy of Dál Riata might have occurred during the period when the church of Armagh had control over Iona, possibly during the dual abbacy of Armagh and Iona held by Máel Brígte (AU927.1).

There might be an even more likely instigator. A marginal addition to AU936.1, the obit of Joseph son of Fathach, abbot of Armagh and described as sapiens, states that he was of the Clann Gairbh Ghaela. The LL version of the MG Comarbada Pátraic adds that the “Clann […]b Gaelta” were of the Dál Riata (Lawlor and Best 1919–20, 327). This would seem to be the same group as the Garbraige branch of the Cenél Loairn (Rawlinson B.502 157 20–22 in O’Brien 1962, 278). He may well have come from northern Antrim, if not Lorn, and it is difficult to look past him for the expanded role of the Dál Riata in the VT, especially seeing as he was the direct successor of Máel Brígte, coarb of Patrick and Colum Cille. That he was described as sapiens probably indicates that he was involved in textual production.

Armagh seems to have made claims to primacy over the entire Scottish Church in subsequent centuries (e.g. AU1065.1; AT1148.7; AU1169.3; 1244, 12 Kalends June, 1 Innocent IV). It may well be that this claim to primacy dated to at least as early as the ninth century, or even earlier, building on claims in relation to Dunseverick and Olcán (of Armoy) established by Tírechán and strengthened by the association of the Dál Riata with the Patrician legend.

It is argued here that this material informs both the *Chronicle of Clonmacnoise* entries relating to Dál Riata that are evident in the AT. Strong arguments have been made in relation to the political context for the composition of the GA and CPDR, namely the contending claims

---

¹ I would like to thank Dauvit Broun for his permission to refer to the abstract to a conference paper given by him on this topic and for his discussion with me by email on the matter.
of overlordship over the territory of the Dál Riata by the kings of Alba, Moray, Cenél nEógain, Dál Cais and or Dublin (see Dumville 2002; 2007; 2011; and especially Wadden 2016). However, the scholarly motivations are equally important, and the VT material heavily influenced the synchronisms that in turn helped (re)shape the genealogical material appearing in the Laigin and East Connacht MG collections (Chapter 2; A.5), including the MSFA in its heavily corrupted fourteenth-century form, with the twelve sons in the opening passage an attempt to make sense of the material in the VT (Stokes 1887, 162; Broun 2014) and the confusion between Fergus and Mac Nise rooted in Fergus’s two appearances in the VT. High-medieval Clonmacnoise scholars might have taken an interest in the Dál Riata due to Conmach, abbot of Clonmacnoise being described in his obit as of the “Cenél Echach Gall” (CS868). Charles-Edwards (2006, 320) notes that this is probably a reference to a Cenél nEch(d)ach in an area controlled by the Gaill. However, it might also be a reference to “the foreign [i.e., not in Ireland] Cenél nEchdach”, a branch of the Cenél Loairn in the MSFA.

It is possible to identify the motif of three sons as the root of later dynasties or groups with the biblical model of the descent of all nations from Noah’s three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth (Vulgate, Genesis 9:18–9:19). The motif of twelve sons in the VT and MSFA would also seem to be based on the descent of the Twelve Tribes of Israel from Jacob (Vulgate, Genesis 29:32–29:35, 30:1–30:23, 35:18; 49:28). The twelve sons motif appears elsewhere in the VT, most notably for the present purposes in relation to Cóelub, ancestor figure of the Dál nAraide (Stokes 1887, 162–3). Clark (2015) draws attention to the widespread application of biblical and classical Graeco-Latin motifs in Irish, British and Frankish origin legends c.AD800–1100, and it would seem as though the Dál Riata material in this period and after is part of this wider trend of asserting—and tidying up—group identity by recourse to the bible and learned texts.

Going back further, the question cui bono? might be usefully posed in relation to seventh-century texts building dynastic relations between the Cenél Loairn, nGabráin and Comgaill, and even for the linkage of Armagh to these groups in the tenth century. However, an answer is harder to find for the material related to northern Britain found in the high–late-medieval manuscripts from Leinster and East Connacht beyond antiquarian interest. Firstly, it must be remembered that the synchronisms drawing together disparate (pseudo-)historical data into manageable portions were probably intended for use in Irish scriptoria as part of a scribe’s education. That such synthetic historiographical material might benefit Armagh’s pretensions to primacy is also an important consideration. Beyond that, the most obvious beneficiaries would be the kings of Alba, whose position was strengthened by their linkage to the Cenél nGabráin and Cenél Loairn king-lists, thus providing a justification of their rule by appeal to
great antiquity (see Broun 1999).

**Loarn and Óengus**

While both Óengus and Loarn appear in the later genealogies, synthetic material, and the MSFA, no attempt was made to project them back into the annals. Nothing can be found of Loarn, but something circumstantial might at least be said of Óengus. The death of Fergna, “nepotis Ibdaig [grandson of the Hebridean],” king of the Ulaid is recorded in AU557.1 (cf. AI557.1; corrupted in AT556.2), and he is elsewhere noted as the son of Óengus (AT552.5). While these entries are not contemporary, their relative consistency indicates that they were probably part of the *Iona Chronicle* exemplar of the *Chronicle of Ireland*; thus, they are eighth century at the latest, and probably earlier. This may well be the same Fergna listed in the MSFA as one of the sons of Óengus Mór son of Erc (Fraser 2009, 159–60). The twelfth-century LL recension of Senchas Dáil Fiatach (SDF.LL) has Óengus Ibtach as having a mother from the Hebrides, and states that he was the progenitor of the Úi Ibdaig branch of the Dál Fiatach (O’Brien 1962, 408). It also has him losing a battle to his second cousin once removed Demmán son of Cairell, the progenitor of the Dál Fiatach mainline (Charles-Edwards 2000, 624–5), as defeating and killing Fergna and his seven sons at the battle of Druim Clethe (O’Brien 1962, 409; cf. AT556.2; AFM551.3; Dobbs 1921, 338–9; Meyer 1912, 329–9;). MSFA lists seven sons of Fergna and no descendants for them. It may well be that the Cenél nÕengussa were then a branch of the Dál Fiatach side-lined by the Cenél Demmáin, who went on to become the dominant lineage among the Ulaid.

**Domangart**

Domangart is the last shared ancestor figure in the genealogies of the Cenéla Comgaill and nGabráin. His sons Gabrán and Comgall appear in the annals, but Comgall’s obit appears five times across three sets of annals (AU538.3; AU542.1; AU545.2; AI541.1; AT537.2), indicating that they are all late back projections potentially originating in different exemplars. Similar issues apply to the death of his son Gabrán (AU558.2; AU560.1; AI560.A; AT559.2). It is only with the careers of the sons of Gabrán and Comgall that the back-projections become more accurate, probably due to their relationships with Iona.

References to Domangart are inconsistent across the annals. He appears as Domangart Réti (AU507.1; AI541.1) and Domangart of Kintyre in AI503.1, but also has obits in AU466.1, AI503.1 and AT506.2. Beyond his appearances in the MSFA and the MG Dál Riata material, it
might be possible to identify him elsewhere. The SDF has Demmán son of Cairell fostered by “Domangart mac Predæ” (O’Brien 1962, 409; Dobbs 1921; Ó Cróinín 2005, 216) in the same passage that discusses the defeat of Fergna son of Óengus. The VT has Domangart son of the Dál Fiatach king Eocho blessed by the womb by Patrick (Stokes 1887, 224–5; cf. Gwynn 1913, 37). Could both of these figures be Domangart Réti of Kintyre, and the Eocho Munremar of the later genealogies his father? If it were the same Domangart, it would mean that the ancestral figures of three of the four main Cenél of the Dál Riata were side-lined by the Cenél Demmáin in relation to the kingship of the Ulaid. It would put a different spin on the series of battles recorded between the Ulaid and the Dál Riata in the seventh century.

5.5 Reconstructing the North Channel

So far, it has been established that, while there were several commonalities across the North Channel in terms of the settlement and burial evidence, there were also several divergences either morphologically or chronologically. If the Cenél Loairn are regarded as originating from a separate group entirely, then the Cenél nÓengussa, Corcu Réti and Dál Fiatach seem to have emerged from the LIA–EMP transition as related and competing elements in what might have been a shared socio-political or cultural sphere centred on the North Channel. What evidence there is points to their being in competition into the seventh century, with a split occurring sometime in the sixth century, with the Cenél Demmáin and Cenél nGabráin emerging as the dominant groups either side of the North Channel. The occurrence of this split might partly explain the divergences in settlement between Ergadia and Ulidia after the widespread adoption of raths and cashels in Ireland by AD600. However, it should be kept in mind that this earlier evidence overwritten by the textual co-option of the Cenél Loairn into the Dál Riata in the late seventh century, and by the Dál Riata origin legend from the tenth century onwards might itself be another invented tradition, aimed at normalising relations in the North Channel.

Mac Shamhráin and Byrne (2005, 160) propose that the realignment of power in the northern half of Ireland in the seventh–eighth centuries saw the series of small Cruithin kingships in mid-Ulster being recast in a dependent relationship with the Cenél nEógain and referred to as the Airgíalla. The ACP is an early witness of this, and it might be that the Ulaid had previously exercised power over the same groups prior to this. Lacey (2006) proposes that the identification of the Cenél nEógain as part of the Uí Néill most likely dates to the eighth-century reign of Áed Allán and that the Cenél Conaill’s link to the Uí Néill was also a confection.
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As noted in 5.2.2, Cruithin would seem to be cognate with the SG term corresponding to either ‘Briton’ or ‘Pict’, related to Brittonic *Pretāni*, cf. Latin Britannia and Greek Πρεττανική [Prettanikē] (Mac Neill 1911–2, 61). It has been the source of much controversy, not least due to the term’s potential political uses in relation to the seventeenth-century plantations in Northern Ireland and contemporary politics there (cf. Adamson 1978; 1982; 1991; Ó Cróinín 1995, 48–50; Howe 2000b, 97–8; Woolf 2012). There is a small chance that this term is related to proto-Celtic *k"ritu*- [magical transformation, shape] via SG *cruth* [shape, form] or SG *creth* [poem] or the Ogham inscription QRITTI (see Matasović 2009, 182; cf. Bruford 2000, 44–5). It might even be related to *cruithnecht* ‘wheat’ (eDIL), which would be an interesting parallel for the relationship between *ibdach*, probably ‘two-rowed barley’ and *Ibdach* ‘Hebridean’ (see Kelly 1997, 223; also Clancy 2018). However, the use of SG Cruithentiath (AU866.1) to refer to Fortriu and its surrounding area indicates that most likely ‘Briton’ or ‘Pict’ is the intended meaning of the Irish term. The name may have come about through interactions with Britain, as demonstrated in the hoards and Roman finds outlined above, or it might be as Woolf (2012) proposes, that there was a shared cultural milieu in the LIA–EMP centred on the North Channel.

It is argued here that the Battle of Móin Daire Lothair (Moneymore, Co. Londonderry; AU562.2; AU563.1; AT562.2) is important for understanding the realignment of northern Ireland and the North Channel, despite being one of the most confusing early accounts in the annals. The long poem attached to the entry and the entry’s opening clause, describing battle as between the Cruithin and the Uí Néill of the north, would seem to be later Uí Néill propaganda. Both the AU and AT mention Báetán son of Cenn/Conn, along with two branches of the Cruithin fought the battle against the Cruithin. The AT also states that seven kings of the Cruithin were killed including Aéd m-Brecc. The Cenél Eógain and Conaill collected the territories of Lee and Aird Eolargg to the west of the Bann for their part in the battle. The simplest explanation is that this was a battle between different elements of the Cruithin, swayed by the involvement of the Cenél Conaill and nEógain on one side. It would be tempting to see one or both of these Cenél as also part of the Cruithin at this point, ahead of rebranding themselves as Connachta/Uí Néill in later centuries, but this might be speculative.

This might shed light on the occasional sharing of the overkingship of the Ulaid between the Dál Fiatach and three different groups identified as Cruithin: the Uí Chóelbad and the Éilne, collectively referred to as the Dál nAraide from the seventh century, and the Uí Echach Cobo. Either via genealogical fiction or socio-political reality, the Latharna, Dál Sáilne and the Uí Dercco Céin were also incorporated into a Cruithin genealogy centred on the Dál nAraide Uí Chóelbad of Mag Line (Charles-Edwards 2000, 54–67). Information regarding further groups
is found in a variety of sources, all of it hinting at a more complex state of affairs (A.5; see Dobbs 1921; 1923; 1939; 1940; 1945; 1956). The alternating kingship between the Ulaid and Cruithin is very poorly understood; unlike the Uí Néill group, shared heritage is played down in the surviving sources, and on examining the evidence, it is obvious that Cruithin kings of Ulaid were very rare. While it might be due to one group being unable to supplant the other, it might also have its origins in an older polity ruled by a dynasty that fragmented with its principal elements renaming themselves or a central dynasty losing out to more local groups. Were that the case, it would explain the underlying relationship between the Airgialla, the Cruithin, Ulaid, Dál Riata, and the Cenél Conaill and Cenél nEógain. It would also put into context events such as a prominent member of the Cenél Conaill (Colum Cille) being granted an island in the Hebrides by a possible relative of the Dál Fiatach and early member of the Cenél Comgaill.

When the possible socio-political convergence in the North Channel came about is difficult to say. It may have been a fairly recent development, which would account for the differences in settlement practices in the EIA and MIA. It might also not have been a total convergence; areas highly connected politically might not necessarily be similar in settlement and other material practices, or even be similar in language. Furthermore, it may have only been part of western Scotland that took part in this shared sphere, or different areas might have taken part to different degrees. The differences in Islay, and especially Mull, Coll and Tiree from mainland Argyll might indicate that they looked north rather than south. Apart from Bute, Arran and Islay, there is no evidence that any of the Hebrides were connected to any of the groups associated with the Dál Riata. Skye might be an exception, but the connection of the Cenél nGartnait to the Dál Riata via a connection to the Cenél nGabráin might be late and most likely fictitious. Lorn and northern Argyll might have been something of a contact zone themselves, but the similarities in settlement and material practices in mainland Argyll with lowland Scotland, especially prior to the Roman period must also be kept in mind. However, the late entry of the Cenél Loairn into the sources in the late seventh century might indicate that they might not have been part of this North Channel political figuration prior to this.

The hardening of political divisions after AD700, not to mention the development of serious imbalances of power between the various groups involved might have led to the reshaping of each of their origin legends. This might have served to avoid any means of the more dominant groups (the Cenél nEógain and Dál Fiatach especially) from laying claim to any of the others. By manufacturing a shared homeland in northern Co. Antrim, the Dál Riata
could avoid any direct connection to the Dál nAraide, Dál Fiatach, Airgíalla or Cenél nEógain, buried so deep in the mythological past as to be almost irrelevant. This might have proven especially attractive to the later Clann Cináeda kings of Alba, and rival dynasties in Moray. Through it, they could have a connection to the Dál Riata and their territory, a toehold in Ireland and through it, a connection to various mythological high-kings, while also having an affinity distant enough to cement alliances with the Cenél nEógain, but not close enough to make them rivals. In all, reshaping history in this way would have been a very attractive proposition, and even if Armagh seems to have attempted to draw the kings of Alba into its orbit via a further rewriting of the Dál Riata’s past after they had ceased to be politically relevant in the ninth century.

5.6 Conclusion: colonialism?

Considering all of the above, do any aspects of the colonial model apply to the situation in the North Channel c.AD300–700? The case study discussed above provides a corrective against the potentially anachronistic designation of historical phenomena as colonialism. No movement of several social orders can be identified through the settlement evidence, which would rule out plantation colonialism. The establishment of settlements aimed at resource acquisition/extraction means that opportunistic colonialism can also be ruled out on the current evidence.

The dynastic interconnectedness hinted at in the documentary evidence demonstrates that both regions seem to have at least partly participated in a wider shared cultural milieu in this period. It is through this vector that transculturation in the form of Christianisation occurred. Beyond that, both regions participated in the fortification of elevated places in association by elements of their secular social elites, as did many other areas of contemporary Britain and Ireland. The same holds for the importation and redistribution of goods acquired by participation in long-range trading networks, such as ARSW and E-ware. This might actually render invisible the movement (in either direction) of an elite, if elites on both sides of the North Channel tended, for a time, to reside in similar settlements. This means that elite replacement colonialism cannot be identified, but it cannot be completely ruled out, even if it seen here as unlikely to have taken place. Future research in targeting elevated potential elite residences in Ulidia, e.g., Downpatrick, Dunseverick, Scrabo or Dromorebrague might shed further light on this and identify elite replacement colonialism.
Chapter 6. The Scandinavian Diaspora and the North Channel Zone

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will examine the extent, nature and outcome(s) of any potential Scandinavian colonial activity in the two case-study regions c.AD800–1100. While there are differences in the nature and amount of the evidence between the two, there are enough similarities to be able to structure the narrative in terms of the contact–expansion–consolidation–outcome phases introduced in 1.3.1. The contact phases for both regions are discussed together, due to the similar process at work, but the other phases are separated geographically to be able to better contrast them. Similar to Chapter 5, the available documentary evidence plays an important role in structuring the analysis, providing context and tying together the different categories of evidence outlined in Chapters 3–4. By way of a conclusion, the chapter will close with an examination of the transcultural processes at work during and after the colonial episode.

6.2 Contact

While the nature of contacts between the Insular Zone and Scandinavia prior to the late eighth century AD is debatable (cf. Myhre 1993), the AD790s saw a much higher level of recorded contact between Scandinavia and the Insular Zone, largely in the form of raiding (Table 6.1). This raiding activity escalated in subsequent decades.

Table 6.1. Early viking raids in Western Europe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Perpetrators</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>AD793-4</td>
<td>Northmen</td>
<td>Alcuin Epistolae §16–22; Dümmler 1895, 42–60; cf. HRA793; HRA794; ASC793/D–E; ASC794/D–E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>c.AD792</td>
<td>pagan pirates</td>
<td>Charter of Offa of Mercia, King’s College London Charter S 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex</td>
<td>AD786×802</td>
<td>Hörðar</td>
<td>ASC787/D–E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islands of Britain</td>
<td>c.AD794</td>
<td>un-named</td>
<td>AU794.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechru (Rathlin or Lambay, Ireland)</td>
<td>c.AD795</td>
<td>gentiles</td>
<td>AU795.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>c.AD795</td>
<td>un-named</td>
<td>AI795.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inishmurray, Inishboffin (Ireland)</td>
<td>c.AD795</td>
<td>un-named</td>
<td>AI795.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While normally leaving little evidence in terms of direct settlement, contact phases might be detectable through the movement of objects. An example of this would be the appearance in Scandinavia of ecclesiastic metalwork, and occasionally coinage, usually repurposed as items of personal adornment. Such items were often eventually deposited as grave-goods across Scandinavia, having arrived there directly, via gifts, or traded through markets such as Kaupang (Wamers 1983; 1985; 1998; for Kaupang 2011; for Trondelag, Heen-Pettersen 2013; 2014). The shrine of Comgall broken during the raids on Bangor (AU823.8; AU824; AI823.1) might have taken part in this cycle. The flow of this material would not be exclusive to the contact and expansion phases; however, it is argued as largely distinct from other, later flows of non-repurposed material such as pins and brooches, discussed in 6.8.1.

Another possible trace of the contact phase might be the evidence for burning at Iona (Reece 1981, 34, 108–9; AI795.3; AU802.9; AU806.8 AU825.17). However, this would require the use of high-precision dating methods from more secure contexts than redeposited midden material, while noting that intentional human agency might not be behind every fire.

Summaries of the various approaches and problems related to the causes of the Viking Age are found in Barrett (2008; 2010) and Ashby (2015). There is often a confusion between cause and effect, as Barrett (2008; 2010) points out, and what might be an outcome of one phase of activity, e.g. the contact phase, might be a causal factor in a subsequent phase of activity, e.g. expansion or consolidation. Catalysts such as technological advances in shipbuilding might also be conflated with actual causal factors.

Not all of those involved in raiding would have been subject to the same motivations, beyond a basic desire to acquire portable wealth. For some, a possible shortage of marriageable women due to female infanticide might have led to high bride prices (Barrett 2008). Woolf (2007, 52–5) discusses how groups in the Norwegian Vestland might have been excluded from a trade system where the Svear exchanged furs for Arab silver and then exchanged some of that silver in Danish and Frisian emporia for commodities such as wine, etc. The furs might have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Southern/mainland Ireland</th>
<th>AD795–6</th>
<th>gentiles</th>
<th>AC795–6/A; AI796.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Inis Pátraicc</em> (Peel, Isle of Man or Skerries, Co. Dublin); Ireland and Britain</td>
<td>AD798</td>
<td>gentiles</td>
<td>AU798.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquitaine</td>
<td>AD799</td>
<td>Northmen</td>
<td>Alcuin Epistolae §184; Dümmler 1895, 308–10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
been acquired directly or via trade with northern Scandinavia. The appearance of silver and emporia might have left elites reliant on agricultural surplus needing to acquire silver/gold to retain their relative social position. Randsborg (1980, 155–60) demonstrates that Danish groups might also have raided in Frankia and England in times when the flow of silver was cut off due to political events in Western and Central Asia. Northmen participated in some of this activity (ARF777; ARF782; ARF809). With little to trade, Vestland groups might have turned to raiding in the North Sea and Atlantic to keep up with areas better connected to the trade system such as Vestfold and Trøndelag (Woolf 2007, 53).
6.3 Expansion

6.3.1 Ireland and Ulidia

Determining where contact ends and expansion begins is difficult in cases of colonial activity involving an extractive contact phase based on the use of violence. The first of a twenty-year series of battles between local secular groups and raiders (Tables 6.2–6.3; Map 6.1) involved the Gennti [gentiles] being slaughtered by the Ulaid (AU811.6). The intensity of this activity and general raiding, intense enough to be reported in ARF812, is such that it might be seen as a prelude to the expansion phase.

It has been proposed that raiding activity moved inland in this period. Woolf (2007, 57–8) proposes that the raid on Ross Camm (AU807.8; CS807) relates to Roscommon, but it is more likely to have been Roscam on the northeast shore of Galway Bay (Ó Corráin 1972, 81; 1996b). The killing of Dúnchú, abbot of Tullylish (AU809.3), was avenged by Aéd Oirdnide of the Cenél nEógain invading Ulaid (AU809.7)—surely an indication that the Ulaid, rather than vikings, were the perpetrators. Therefore, neither example can be taken as evidence of inland raiding activity.

The attacks on Clonmacnoise (CS816) and Devenish (CS822; CS824) do indicate, though, that river systems were targeted from c.AD815 onwards. It may be that this increased range of activity was carried out from a base of operations in the Hebrides, Northern Isles or west of Ireland (Dolley 1966, 18–9; Sawyer 1971, 2, 211; Ó Corráin 1998a; Woolf 2007, 58–9). The evidence for this is far from clear (see critique by Etchingham 2007; 2010) and the raiding could still have been seasonal prior to the AD830s. No archaeological traces of any such bases have been identified.

Table 6.2. Raids, battles and murders at ecclesiastic sites in Ulidia, AD800–835 (Map 6.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tullylish</td>
<td>probably the Ulaid</td>
<td>killing of the abbot of Tullylish</td>
<td>AU809.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered, shrine of Comgall broken</td>
<td>AU823.8, A1823.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered, relics shaken from shrine</td>
<td>AU824.2, A1824.1, CS824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movilla</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU824.2, A1824.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movilla</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU825.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU825.9, CS825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor and Maghera</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU832.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 6.1. Raids on ecclesiastic sites and battles in Ulidia with raiders from Scandinavia, AD790–835. Approximate locations assigned to AD811 and AD828 battles, with marker placed secular central place of polity named.
Table 6.3. Battles with raiders from Scandinavia as prelude to expansion phase (Map 6.1 for Ulidia examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Perpetrator</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td>great slaughter of <em>gennti</em></td>
<td>AU811.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conmaicne and Umall</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>slaughtered (two events)</td>
<td>AU812.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Connacht)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumu</td>
<td>Cobthach of Loch Léin (Eóganachta)</td>
<td><em>Gennti</em> slaughtered</td>
<td>AU812.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Northmen</td>
<td>island of Ireland attacked</td>
<td>ARF812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umall (Mayo)</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>Umall slaughtered, king killed</td>
<td>AU813.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osraige</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>Osraige routed</td>
<td>CS824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag Inis (near Downpatrick)</td>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td><em>Gennti</em> heavily defeated</td>
<td>AU825.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dál nAraide</td>
<td>Lethlobar son of Loingsech, king of Dál nAraide</td>
<td><em>Gennti</em> defeated</td>
<td>AU828.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ard Ciannachta</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>king of Ciannachta killed, Lann Léire and Clonmore burned, porpoises slaughtered on coast</td>
<td>AU828.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brega)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mullins (south Laigin)</td>
<td>Úi Cennselaig, people of Tech Munnu</td>
<td><em>Gennti</em> defeated</td>
<td>AU828.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaille</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>king killed; brother captured</td>
<td>AU831.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derry</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td><em>Gaill</em> routed</td>
<td>AU833.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughbrickland</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>plundered, Congalach son of Eochaid (Ulaid) taken to ships and killed</td>
<td>AU833.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The events listed in Tables 6.2–6.3 correspond to the expansion of the range of ethonyms employed in the annals. AU828.3 introduces the term *Gaill* [sg. Gall, ‘(unfamiliar) foreigner(s)’ or ‘stranger(s)’], usually capitalised. It subsequently was used 200+ times in the annals. This expansion continued with the use of *Nordmanni* ‘Northmen’ in AU837.3 is the first of thirteen uses of the term Irish annals to c.AD1000. Up to this point, SG/MG *gennti* or Latin *gentiles* [“gentiles”] had been in exclusive use, used always in plural form c.80 times in the annals c.AD795–975, but rarely after CS856.

While the use of *Gaill* is still a case of othering in an episode of cross-cultural encounter, it is less dehumanising than the use of the biblical term *gentiles*, which expressed the fear and frustration on the part of contemporary writers at having to deal with a group playing by a very different set of social rules (Halsall 1992).

Military activity further intensified in the period AD835–855, with several references to
large battles, to large armies and fleets, to named individuals among the leadership, and, most importantly, to settlement (Ó Cróinín 1995, 234–8; Doherty 1998, 295–301; Griffiths 2010, 27). Large fleets are referred to on the Boyne, Liffey (CS837; AU837.3; AU837.4) and on the Shannon and Erne river systems that year (AU837.6; AU837.5). Griffiths (2010, 36) notes that the naming of one of the leaders killed during this activity, Saxolb, toisech na n-Gall [*Saxulf, chief of the foreigners] (AU837.9), indicates the growing familiarity of the annalists with what must at this stage be termed invaders. The same would apply to the naming of Agonn [Hákon] in a defeat by the Osraige (AU847.4; identified Downham 2007, 237; Etchingham 2015, 124).

Battles against the Gaill involving some of the island’s major dynasties, i.e., the Clann Colmáin (AU845.8; AU848.4), the Cenél Eógain (AU845.6), the Osraige (AU847.4), the Eóganachta (AU848.6; AU848.5) and the Laigin (AU848.5), are noted in the annals, with a high number of casualties, even allowing for potential exaggeration. This would seem to be part of a wider escalation of activities also involving larger fleets operating over a number of years in Frankia, Aquitaine and England (Brooks 1979; Coupland 1995, 194–5; ASB).

The earliest references to camps in Ireland also occur AD835–850 (Table 6.4), which would explain the raid on Clonmore, Co. Wexford on Christmas Eve (CS836; Hogan 1910). At least two early longphorts are known in Ulidia from this period, on Lough Neagh and Carlingford Lough (Table 6.4; see 4.17 and Map 4.21). While the other longphorts in Table 6.4 are slightly later in date, they may have originated in this period of expansion in Ulidia and Ireland in general, as colonists sought to gain a foothold in the landscape and engage in alliances and enmities with local dynasties.

The appearance of camps in Ireland is part of a wider mid-ninth-century phenomenon, where Scandinavian raiders and traders adapted to local conditions by innovating and adopting novel defended settlement forms. To take some slightly later examples, use was made of the natural topography at Torksey, Lincolnshire (Hadley and Richards 2016) and Oissel, near Rouen (ASB861). Opportunistic use was made of pre-existing sites at Clondalkin, Co. Dublin (AU867.8; Ó Floinn 1998, 164), or Repton, Derbyshire (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 1992). Other sites were purpose-built D-shaped enclosures close to bodies of water, as at Antwerp, Gent and Bruges (Loveluck 2013, 338–42; Ten Harkel 2013), and Hedeby (Jones 1984, 174–81; Roesdahl 1998, 120–3; Hilberg 2008, 101–11; Maixner 2012). Dublin (Wallace 2005) and Annagassan (Clinton 2014) took this last form, but the camps in Ulidia could have been similar to the others.
Table 6.4. Early references to camps and longphorts in Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Other evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inbir Dea = Linn Duachaill</td>
<td>AU836.5; AU841.4</td>
<td>excavated settlement</td>
<td>not Arklow, Linn Duachaill is near mouth of the Dee, contra Hogan (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>CS837; AU841.4</td>
<td>overlain by town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>CS845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>CS848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camps and longphorts in Ulidia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Other evidence</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh</td>
<td>AU839.7; AClon836; AU840.1; AU841.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>not specifically located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caol Uisce (Carlingford Lough)</td>
<td>AU842.11</td>
<td>site of two later castles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlingford Lough</td>
<td>AU852.3; FIA852; AU926.1</td>
<td>ON toponym, battle</td>
<td>Dubgennti based there in AU852.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangford Lough</td>
<td>CS877; AU926.5; AU942.2; AU942.4</td>
<td>ON toponym</td>
<td>not specifically located</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruib Mena, Lough Neagh</td>
<td>?AU866.4; AU930.2; AU933.3; AU945.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>not specifically located, could be the same location as 9th C references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Larne (Ballylumford)</td>
<td>?AU866.4</td>
<td>ON toponym, longphort name, furnished burial, late reference to battle with Orcadians c.AD1018</td>
<td>Ballylumford might be a late toponym; later borough located in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inis Lachain</td>
<td>?AU866.4; AU1170.7</td>
<td>gold brooch, Type H pommel, reference to the “Sword of the Jarl”, attacked by Orcadians</td>
<td>possible high-status settlement in 12th C; manorial centre in 13th C; see discussion in A.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Identifying the settlers

It is at this point in time that further evidence becomes available for the identity of the raid settlers. After Saxulf, one Tuirgéis was killed by Máel Sechnaill of the Clan Colmáin (AU845.8). Tomrair [Þórir], “tanise righ Laithlinne” [the deputy (to the) king of Laithlind, also spelled Laithlind] was killed fighting against the Laigin and Mumu (AU848.5). Subsequently, Amlaíb [Óláfr], “son of the king of Laithlind” arrived in Ireland (AU853.2). Between these
two events, 140 ships of “muinntir righ Gall” [the people/followers of the king of the foreigners] came to exact obedience from those already in Ireland (AU849.6; CS849). This might not have been the king of Laithlinn, though.

This might be taken as an early example of the settler–homeland tension, with the latter seeking to better control the actions of the former. It would also seem to indicate an increasingly centralised organisation of colonial activity in the Insular Zone. In these respects, it resembles the arrival of the English king, Henry II, in AD1170–1 to bring Anglo-Norman colonists in Ireland more directly under his control (Chapter 7). It would also indicate a scaling up of intention, with the slightly sporadic opportunism of the smaller-scale raiding activity giving way to an extractive colonial project (Barrett 2010, 296).

Several theories have been put forward as to the location of Laithlinn (Table 6.5). The only likely option is the suggestion by Wamers (1985; 1998, 66) and Etchingham (2007, 28; 2014, 33–4) that it is derived from ON Hlaðir [now ‘Lade’] + SG/MG linn (pool, lake, eDIL), with the initial /h/ dropped and the nominative ending /r/ removed, with the first /i/ hardening the /th/ to better approximate /ð/. Lade, on a peninsula 3km from Trondheim, is associated with various kings of Norway and the jarls of Hlaðir in high-medieval histories (Finlay and Faulkes 2011, 57, 83; 2014, 33). Therefore, it is (a portion of) Trondheimsfjorden that being referred to as the pool/body of water of the Hlaðir (Etchingham 2007, 28). Wamers (1998, 28) is slightly sceptical of his own suggestion due to the lack of archaeological evidence for Insular grave-goods in its immediate vicinity. Recent work has begun to fill in the gaps (Heen-Pettersen 2013; 2014).

### Table 6.5. Alternative theories for the location of Laithlinn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proposed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rogaland, southwest Norway</td>
<td>Marstrander 1911, 250–1; 1915, 56–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Britain</td>
<td>Dolley 1966; Sawyer 1971, 2, 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Isles or Hebrides</td>
<td>O Corráin 1978; 1998b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin (as a muddy pool)</td>
<td>Ahlqvist 2005, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestfold, southeast Norway</td>
<td>Valente 2008, 64–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trondheimsfjorden</td>
<td>Wamers 1985; 1998, 66; Etchingham 2007, 28; 2014, 33–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nord-Rogaland and Sunnhordland, southwest Norway</td>
<td>Kruse 2015; 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the appearance of Laithlinn, a distinction is made from AU851.3 onward between Dubgennti and Finngennti [‘black gentiles’ and ‘white/blonde gentiles’, variants of
both terms commonly appear with -gail]. Speculation as to the identity of these two antagonistic groups (summarised and critiqued by Downham 2011) has ranged from Danes and Norwegians, black- and blonde- haired foreigners, unfamiliar and familiar foreigners, to new and old foreigners. Their appearance demonstrates that at least two rival groups were operating in the Insular Zone.

Dumville (2008, 354–6) argues that even specific terms such as Dani [Danes] and Nordmanni [Northmen] appearing in Insular sources can be used to indicate that the raiders were Scandinavian, but no more than that (cf. Downham 2007; 2009; 2011; 2017). Derived from the lost *Northumbrian Recension (Hart 1982), ASC787/D–E describe the appearance of “iii scipu Norðmanna” [three ships of Northmen], from Hæreðaland/Hereðaland arriving near Portland in Wessex. While this might be retrospective, it is too specific to be stereotyping, and thus an indicator that the Hōðar from Hordaland in the Norwegian Vestland were involved in the earliest Insular raids. Distinct clusters of Insular material as grave-goods appear along each of the main fjords in the Vestland (Wamers 1985). Further clusters appear in neighbouring Rogaland. This sheds new light on Marstrander’s (1915, 56–8) speculation that Rogaland and Hōðar are related to the Irish words Lochlann and Iorrua used to refer to Scandinavia and Norway. A further cluster in Vestfold might indicate either raiding or trade via emporia such as Kaupang with regions such as the Vestland.

While the details of high-medieval sagas and histories are to be doubted for this period, an intertextual coherency is visible in relation to the existence of a political elimination contest involving these areas of Norway in the ninth century played out in Scandinavia and the Insular Zone. It was probably fuelled by the flow of material wealth into Scandinavia from raiding in western Europe, but also through the establishment of (possibly seasonal) market settlements e.g., Kaupang (Skre 2007; 2008; 2009) and Steinkjer (Grønnesby and Grav Ellingsen 2012). Apart from this, and the shift away from the use of enclosed hilltops (bygdeborger) in the centuries immediately preceding the Viking Age (see Ystgaard 1998; 2004), little else seems to have changed. Ninth-century settlement generally consisted of a mixture of long-established dispersed rural settlements some with high-status associations, with others probably associated with free farmers (Myhre 1998; 2000; Hansen 2005; Iversen 2009; Stylegar 2016). This stability might have been maintained by moving any excess population overseas (Myhre 1998; 2000), including perhaps the elites that lost out in the process of political centralisation, not to mention non-inheriting members of elite families—a major driver in other expansions elsewhere in medieval Europe (Elias 2000; Bartlett 1993).
6.3.3 Scotland and Ergadia

It is difficult to imagine that Ergadia was unaffected by the sequence of events discussed above, even if there are no references to longphorts or battles between secular dynasties and the various groups of Scandinavians operating in the Insular Zone. Whatever the case may be, it is obvious that the colonial episode in the Ergadia case study was qualitatively different from that in Ulidia even as early as the expansion phase.

ASB847 notes that Northmen seized control of the islands around the Scotti, who had been assailed by them and made into tributaries for many years prior to this (Waitz 1883, 35). While this entry might refer to islands in Ireland (Nelson 1991, 65), it more likely refers to the Hebrides (Woolf 2007, 94). The ASB entry seems to imply the prior operation of a system of tribute extraction, which might explain why Iona was not raided after AU825.17. That the occupation occurred nullo resistente [with no resistance] might mean that territory had been acquired not by conquest but by grant, possibly under duress.

Cináed son of Alpín (see Section 1.2.1) died as king of the Picts in AU858.2 (AI858; CMel859), having ruled the Picts for sixteen years, proceeded by his ruling Dál Riata since c.AD840, according to the late/problematic CKA (Hudson 1998, 142, 152). His succession may have been disputed and must be seen in the light of the events of AU839, when the principal figures of the ruling dynasty of Fortriu, descended from Onuist (d.AU761.4) were killed in a battle against the gennti, with Wrad and Bred ruling AD939–42 (discussed Woolf 2007, 71–6). Considering that Cináed was also under pressure from Northumbria and Strathclyde (Woolf 2007, 101), it might mean that Cináed was unable to prevent any seizure of land in the west and/or north. This could have been exacerbated if Cináed had brought any supporters east from Dál Riata to support his claim to the overkingship of the Picts AD839–42—if he might be associable with Dál Riata at all.

This might have weakened local resistance to land seizure in an area that seems to have been partially or fully incorporated into the Fortriu-led Pictish overkingdom (Map 1.1) after Onuist’s mid-eighth-century defeat of the Cenél Loairn and Cenél nGabráin (Chapter 5; A.5), which might have involved restrictions on local military capacity. Macniven (2015, 112–4; also, Downham 2007, 178) suggests that a reasonably small force might have been required to seize territory, if it proceeded island by island. There were certainly Scandinavian armies in Ireland at the time large enough to do this. The process could have been facilitated by the flight of islands’ inhabitants after the first few attacks (Woolf 2007, 292–3). This might help explain the divergent distributions of Old Norse placenames and furnished burials in the region on the islands vis-à-vis the mainland.
The presence of various major political figures from Scandinavia operating in Ireland in the AD840s might have left certain Insular rulers in a position to strike a deal—or have a deal forced on them—involving the payment of tribute or grants of land in return for protection, non-aggression or some other form of alliance. Considering his insecure position, Cináed may have opted to cede territory to ensure overall stability. That he acquired the kingship in collusion with the Gaill might be to stretch the evidence too far (cf. Cowan 1993; Macniven 2015, 115). A handover/lack of official resistance might explain why there is little evidence for a violent takeover and a lack of identifiable longphorts in the region—none have been identified physically or in the textual record, leaving scholars reliant on four longphort toponyms, two of which are promising (Table 6.6; see 3.13; Map 3.23). Similar arrangements occurred across ninth- and tenth-century Europe as kingdoms adapted to troublesome marcher territories and external raiders (Coupland 1995, 197–9; 1998; 2003; 2011; Smith 1995, 183–4; Woolf 2007, 71–6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS name</th>
<th>Gaelic form</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Specific Location</th>
<th>VA Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baranlongart</td>
<td>Bàrr an Longphoirt</td>
<td>Knapdale</td>
<td>Clachbreck</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr an Longairt</td>
<td>Bārr an Longphoirt</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>north of Kilfinan</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalinlongart</td>
<td>Dail an Longphoirt</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>near Ardnadam and Kilmun</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinlongart</td>
<td>Cùl an Longphoirt</td>
<td>Kintyre</td>
<td>Glen Breaclerie</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The arrival of new groups in the Insular Zone in the AD850s might have rendered the beneficial elements of any agreement redundant for Cináed and his kingdom. This might explain the raid into the territory of the Picts to Dunkeld and Clunie (Hudson 1998, 142, 153), and subsequently those of Hálfdanr (ASC875/A, D–E, ASC876/B–C, Æ875), Óláfr and Auisle (AU866.1, with Ívarr AU870.6; AU871.2; see A.6). The original grantees might have prevented other Scandinavian groups from encroaching on their granted territory or the terms of the grant there. This might explain the continuity at the principal ecclesiastic sites demonstrated in Chapter 3. References to Iona (Figure 3.45) continue throughout the period AD800–1000 (Jennings 1998) at least as frequently as many of the contemporary major monastic sites in Ulidia (Figure 4.26). The movement of Colum Cille’s relics between Iona, Dunkeld and Kells in this period (AU829.3; AU831.1; AU849.7; CKA) might have had more to do with high-level politics as it had to do with any pressure on the site.
(Herbert 1988, 68–77; Bannerman 1993; 1997; Clancy 2004). This might be paralleled by the movement of the centre of Bláán’s cult from Kingarth to Dunblane (see Woolf 2007, 102), despite the lack of archaeological evidence for disruption at Kingarth. However, this move might have begun the previous century due to the connection of the Cenél Comgaill to the Pictish king Nechtan mac Der-Ilei (Clancy 2004). Even when Colum Cille’s relics were taken to Ireland “taken in flight to escape the Gaill” (AU879.9), Woolf (2007, 124) points out that this might refer to Dunkeld, related to a year-long occupation of Pictland by the Gaill CKA (CKA, Hudson 1998, 149, 154).

One potential disruption to the general pattern of continuity at Iona (Figure 3.68) might have occurred in the period between the Indechtrach taking the relics of Colum Cille to Ireland (AU849.7) and the death of Óengus son of Muircertach, tanaisé of the abbot of Iona (AFM935.6). In this period, Cellach, abbot of Kildare and Iona (AU865.2), is noted as dying “in the region of the Picts”, and Máel Brigte son of Tornán is described on his death as abbot of Armagh and Iona (AI927.1) or coarb of Patrick and Colum Cille (AU927.1; CS927). Máel Brigte was succeeded in Armagh by Ioseph, of a branch of the Cenél Loairn (Chapter 5). Feradach (d.AU880.1) and Flann/Faelán (AU891.1; AI891.2) are the only other abbots of Iona noted in this period. Indechtrach is mainly noted as coarb of Colum Cille in his obit (AU854.3; CS854) with only AI854.1 having him as abbot of Iona. Cellach may have replaced him as both coarb and abbot and could have acquired the offices by any number of means beyond Iona (or Kildare) being ‘abandoned’. Subsequently, if the coarb or most senior member of the Columban community was based in Kells (e.g. AU1008.1), Derry (AFM1150.8), or occasionally Armagh (AU989.7), then it may be that younger abbots were appointed in Iona, which might account for the longer gaps between obits after AU891.1 (A.3 entry for Iona).

Unlike in Ulidia, where no major shift is apparent (Chapter 4), the Scandinavian contact and expansion phases in Ergadia correspond to a major fall-off in the dating evidence from enclosed settlements. The fall-off is dramatic, but an *argumentum ex silentio* would not be persuasive enough on its own, considering the nature of the documentary and archaeological evidence. Furthermore, in many instances, the fall-off began at the end of the Iron Age, as can be seen in the Hebridean portion of the case-study. It may be that the collapse or contraction of Dál Riata as an independent overkingdom in the mid-eighth century was a major influential factor on this process. Moreover, the collapse might not have been total, as the limited evidence from Dunollie indicates.

Hudson (1998, 149, 155) proposes that the *Innis Solian* mentioned in relation to a victory of Domnall son of Constantín over “Danair” during his reign as king of Pictland (AD889–900)
in the CKA refers to the islands of Seil in the territory of the Cenél Sailech branch of the Cenél Loairn (Map 1.2). This might indicate that part of the former Dál Riata was under the control of the kings of Pictland at the time (Hudson 1998, 139; Woolf 2007, 125). It is important to note that the districts of Lorn and Cowal preserve the names of the Cenél Loairn and Comgaill, whereas the names of the Cenél nGabráin and Cenél nÓengussa are not preserved (Woolf 2007, 100). This might indicate a partition of the former overkingdom of Dál Riata—possibly the source of the division of western Scotland into Innsi Gall [islands of foreigners] and Airer Goidel [coast of Gaels] in the tenth–eleventh centuries (see Woolf 2004, 94–5; Wadden 2016, 173–4).

Woolf (2004, 98–9; 2007, 225–30) suggests that the district names of Gowrie and Angus might be derived from the names of the Cenél nGabráin and Cenél nÓengussa. He bases this in part on a unique passage preserved in the BB and Lecan recensions of Genelach Albanensium (Skene 1867, 115–6 footnote 7; Broun 2015). It states that the main line of kings of Alba descended from Domnall Brecc son of Eochaid Buidhe (d.AU629.4, son of Aedán son of Gabrán), the Gabranaig are the clann of Fergus Gol son of Eochaid Buidhe and the Fir Ibe are the clann of Conall Cerr son of Eochaid Buidhe. This may well be, as Skene and Woolf suggest, a statement that the men of Gowrie and Fife were seen in the eleventh century as descended from cadet branches of the Cenél nGabráin. The Rawlinson B.502 and LL recensions links the men of Moray to the Cenél Loairn (O’Brien 1962, 328–30).

Much of this is genealogical fiction aimed at connecting some of the major elements of the high-medieval nobility to the principal royal Scottish dynasty. However, it might also preserve some sort of series of grants of land given to the nobles (and possibly their principal tenants) of the former territory of Dál Riata in the core area of the Pictish overkingship, either for service given or in compensation for land lost either voluntarily or involuntarily in Dál Riata. The lower social orders, such as unfree tenants and labourers, may have moved with the nobles, continued to live on the land as before, or fled elsewhere. Most likely it was a combination of all of these.

6.3.4 Gall-Goidil and ninth-century Ireland

The appearance of the Gall-Goidil in Irish sources in the mid-ninth century requires some explanation. It is argued here that the appearance of the Gall-Goidil in mid-ninth-century Ireland (Table 6.7) might best be understood as a displaced group of Gaelic-speaking warriors from Ergadia (Macniven 2015, 107, 114). They have been the source of much speculative
debate (cf. Jennings 1994; Jennings and Kruse 2009a; 2009b; Barrett 2003; 2004; Macniven 2006; 2015; Clancy 2008; Downham 2015). *Gall-Goidil* is best translated as ‘foreign/stranger Gaels’ or ‘Gaels not from around here’, as it is the *Goidel* part of the compound that is subject to grammatical declination, rather than *Gall*, which indicates that *Gall* is being used as a qualifier (Jennings and Kruse 2009, 124). Therefore, tempting as it might be to read transculturation from the term, they were not Gaelicised foreigners (or vice versa), ‘Vikings’ from a Gaelic area, or ‘Norse-Gaels’, as previously asserted by several scholars (listed in Clancy 2008).

An example of similar thinking might have been behind the description of Conmach, abbot of Clonmacnoise as of the “*Cenél Echach Gall*”, i.e. of the foreign *Cenél nEch[d]ach*, a branch of the *Cenél Loairn* (5.4; A.5; Charles-Edwards 2006, 320). Similar thinking also lay behind the use of *Gall-Óglaig*, anglicised as ‘Gallowglasses’ to refer to Gaelic-speaking mercenaries recruited from northern Britain to fight in Ireland from the thirteenth century onward (AU1286.5; Duffy ed. 2007; see section 7.6).

As demonstrated in Table 6.7, the allies of the Gall-Goidil were exclusively in the kingdom of Mide. It is proposed here Caittil/Cathal Find was not the leader of the Gall-Goidil, rather that he was a member of their *Cenél Fiachach* allies. Very little genealogical material survives for the *Cenél Fiachach* and they figure rarely in the annals—not helped by the AT often adding an /r/, leading to potential confusion with the Uí Fiachrach of the Connachta. Lorcán son of Cathal, king of Mide, was blinded by Aéd Findliath, one of the enemies of the Gall-Goidil and Mide. Lorcán could have been the son of the probable Clann Colmáin figure Cathal son of Conchobar (d.AU843.2), as proposed by Jaski (2000, 308), but it is unlikely that he was of the Luigne (contra Charles-Edwards 2000, 484), rather than his son being an ally of the Luigne (AU901.1; cf. AFM896.5). The later references in Table 6.8 might support the *Cenél Fiachach* interpretation. Any of these options should be favoured over Smyth’s (1977, 117–9; 1984, 154–9) identification of Caittal Find as Kettíl *fletnefr*, a twelfth–thirteenth-century literary figure associated with Norway, the Insular Zone and Iceland who appears in *Landnámabók*, and *Laxdaela saga* (supported by Jennings and Kruse 2009, 126; criticised Ó Corráin 1979, 301; Downham 2008, 18 fn. 44).
Table 6.7. The *Gall-Goidil* in ninth-century Ireland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allies</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Máel Sechnaill (king of Mide, king of Tara, Clann Colmáin)</td>
<td>gennti</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>AU856.3, CS856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath (Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td>Glenelly, Co. Tyrone</td>
<td>defeated</td>
<td>AU856.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caittal/Cathal Find</td>
<td>Ívarr and Óláfr (Dublin)</td>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>defeated</td>
<td>AU857.1, CS857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenél Fiachach</td>
<td>Ívarr (Dublin), Cerball mac Dúnlainge (Osraige)</td>
<td>Ara Tire (northern Tipperary)</td>
<td>defeated</td>
<td>CS858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8. Context for the Gall-Goidil in Ireland in the mid-ninth century AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mide figures</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none stated</td>
<td>Óláfr and Ívarr (Dublin)</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>AU859.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none stated</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath (Cenél nEógain), <em>Gaill</em> (unspecified)</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>AU861.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máel Sechnaill (king of Mide, Clann Colmáin)</td>
<td><em>Gaill</em> of Dublin</td>
<td>Laigin</td>
<td>won</td>
<td>CS861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none stated</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath (Cenél nEógain), Flann mac Conaing (Brega), kings of <em>Gaill</em> (unspecified)</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>Mide plundered</td>
<td>AU862.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lorcán son of Cathal</strong> (king of Mide); Óláfr, Ívarr and Auisle</td>
<td>Flann mac Conaing (Brega)</td>
<td>Brega</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU863.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lorcán son of Cathal</strong> (king of Mide, Cenél Fiachach)</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath (Cenél nEógain, king of Tara)</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>blinded</td>
<td>AU864.1, CS864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conchobar son of Domnchad <em>(leithrí</em> of Mide, Clann Colmáin)</td>
<td>Óláfr (king of <em>Gaill</em>)</td>
<td>Clonard</td>
<td>drowned</td>
<td>AU864.2, CS864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Cernachán son of Tadc (Luigne), un-named son of Lorcán son of Cathal (Luigne or allied with Luigne)</td>
<td>Máel Ruanaid son of Flann son of Máel Sechnaill (Clan Colmáin), Maelchrón (king of Cenél Lóegaire)</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td>AU901.1, CS901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máel Craíbe son of or ua Cathalán (king of Cenél Fiachach)</td>
<td>men of Mumu</td>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>killed</td>
<td>AI907.1, AFM896.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergal son of Lorcán (king of Cenél Fiach[r]ach)</td>
<td>Connachta</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>killed</td>
<td>AT985.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.5 Dál Riata in Ireland: refugees or continuity of settlement?

Moving slightly ahead in time, Diarmait son of Selbach, king of Dál Riata, was killed in the Battle of Grellach Eilte in Mide, as part of a large force under the leadership of Niall Glúndub of the Cenél nEógain (CS913; not listed in AU914.7). The patronym seems to have been added as a secondary insertion into the CS (cf. Hennessy 1866, 186–7) and the entry might be late in general. It does raise an interesting possibility, though, that the Dál Riata continued to have a presence in northern Antrim beyond their apparent decline in western Scotland. Dunseverick was attacked twice in this period (AU871.3; AU926.1), and while there is no strong evidence ever linking Dunseverick to the Dál Riata, the attacks might have something to do with them.

Table 6.9. Potential references to continuity in Dál Riata in northern Ireland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Named</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunseverick</td>
<td>sacked for first time by Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath, Gaill</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain,</td>
<td>AU871.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Limerick Gaill?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>raiding in Mide</td>
<td>Diarmuid son of Selbach, king of Dál Riata (in Ireland?)</td>
<td>Niall Glúndub, Cenél nEógain; (Cenél Loairn?)</td>
<td>CS914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseverick</td>
<td>raided by Gaill</td>
<td>Gaill of Strangford</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>AU926.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dál Riata</td>
<td>invaded with Dál nAraide and Ulaid</td>
<td>Brian Bóruma</td>
<td>Dál gCais</td>
<td>AU1006.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Muirchertach Ua Néill killed by the Dál Riata</td>
<td>Muirchertach Ua Néill</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>AU1013.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>death of king of Dál Riata</td>
<td>Cú Ulad son of Deорadh Ua Floinn</td>
<td>Uí Tuirtre</td>
<td>AT1158.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dál Riata</td>
<td>raided by Ulaid along with Uí Méith, Uí Bresail Airthir</td>
<td>Ua Lochlainn</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>AU1165.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumbo, Dál Riata</td>
<td>raided, raider defeated by de Courcy’s supporters</td>
<td>Domnall Ua Lochlainn</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>AU1182.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Sections 4.9 and 5.2.3, occupation at the series of enclosed settlements on outcrops in northern Antrim similar to some SSEs and MSEs across the North Channel would seem to date to the ninth century at the earliest. Admittedly, this is based on a small number of sites in what might be the most poorly archaeologically surveyed area of the island of Ireland. Rather than their being related to a migration stream in operation due to the conquest
of western Scotland by the sons of Erc (McSparron and Williams 2011), their construction might be related to the incorporation of northern Antrim into the territory of the Corcu Réti in the seventh century or perhaps even the displacement of elements of the Dál Riata by Scandinavian settlers in the ninth century. Far more research would be necessary to test this proposition. The appearance of course pottery in northeast Ireland c.AD800 is a similarly tempting proposition: could its use have been brought to northeast Ireland from western Scotland by population displacement? Armit (2008) is likely correct in his suggestion that souterrain ware represents “part of a regional expansion of western Scottish pottery styles.” Armit’s (2008, 1) dating of souterrain ware to the seventh–eighth centuries is probably too early (cf. 2.4.2.b). Conversely, it is unlikely that the adoption of souterrain ware in northeast Ireland began after AD850; therefore, it might not be directly linked to mid-ninth-century population displacement from the Hebrides. It would be tempting to see the adoption of souterrain ware as connected to the incorporation of the Dál Riata into the Pictish overkingdom c.AD750. However, it is more likely that coarse pottery was adopted in Ulidia due to continual low- and high-level contacts between the two regions, even if some form of population displacement might also have been a factor.

If there was an inward flow of people in the ninth century from Dál Riata to northeast Ireland, it might account for some of the political instability. As Table 6.10 demonstrates, the Éilne, the most dominant of the Cruithín groups, effectively vanish from the historical record after their defeat at the hands of the Cenél nEógain in AD849. This left the Uí Chóelbad as the dominant Dál nAraide group, and Bécc Ua Lethlobair was described in a late poem attached to his obit (AFM904.8) as ruirí [GC ‘chief’] of Tuagh Inbhir, a late name for the area around the mouth of the Bann. The Fir Lí seem to have been established there by the eleventh century (e.g. AU1004.4), but that leaves quite a gap. It may be that the Dál Riata took advantage of the situation, possibly even with the encouragement of the Cenél nEógain.

This situation might have been the political context within which the VT was written: with a Dál Riata confined to northeast Ireland with memories of western Scotland and a Dál nAraide centred on Mag Line and the Uí Chóelbad, with this image fed into the synthetic histories and thus all of the later genealogies, the MSFA included (Chapter 5).
Table 6.10. The Cruithne nÉilne and Dál nAraide in Tuaiscert in the Irish annals; *italics* = proposed relationship; parenthetical insertions contain information only available in MG genealogies. All dates AD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Floruit</th>
<th>Gesta</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conn</td>
<td>×574</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>AU563.1, AT562.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Báetán Cáech son of Conn</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>Took part in Battle of Móin Daire Lothair</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; AU563.1, AT562.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiachna/Fiachra Cáech son of Báetán</td>
<td>574×608</td>
<td>King of Tara; Won Battle of Mag Dola (w. of Lough Neagh); Became king of Ulaid; Killed Aé Dub; Won Battle of Eodonn Mór (Edenmore, Brega); Won Battle of Sliabh Cua (Mumu); Defeated Fiachna son of Déimáin at Kilkeel (Down); Killed among/by the Cruithín</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; Baile Cuinn §21; AU574.3, AU574.3; AT587.5; AU588.4, AFM592.3; AU594.1, AT592.1; AU597.2, AT595.2; AT600.3, CS602; AU608.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congal Cáech (son of Scandlán) (son of Fiachna?)</td>
<td>×637</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide); King of Tara; Defeated by Cenél Conaill at Dún Ceithirn; Defeated at Mag Rath by Cenél Conaill</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; LL 32 41e; Bechbretha §§31–2; AU629.2, AT631.3; AU637.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bécc son of Fiachra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.B502 162 b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandlán son of Bécc son of Fiachra</td>
<td>×646</td>
<td>Killed as king of Cruithín</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; AU646.1, AT647.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máel Caích son of Scandlán</td>
<td>×666</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide); Died as king of Cruithín</td>
<td>LL 32 41e; AU666.2, AT666.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cathasach son of Máel Caích)</td>
<td>666×690</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide)</td>
<td>LL 32 41e;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dúngal son of Scandlán</td>
<td>×681</td>
<td>Killed with king of Ciarraige at Dún Ceithirn by Cenél nÉógain</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; AU681.1, AT681.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailill son of Dúngal Éilne</td>
<td>×690</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide); Killed with no title given</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; LL 32 41e; AU690.1, AT690.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CÚ Cuaráin (son of Dúngal R; son of Ailill)</td>
<td>×708</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide)</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b; LL 32 41e; Lec. 126 RC 6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Congal Cáech son of Cú Cuáin)</td>
<td>Killed by Ciarraina as king of Cruithne Ulad</td>
<td>AU708.1, AT708.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fiachra Cossalach)</td>
<td>(genealogy)</td>
<td>Lec. 126 RC 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dub Dá Inber son of Congalach</td>
<td>Killed as king of Cruithin</td>
<td>AU726.8, AT727.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dubhtach son of Congal)</td>
<td>[probably = Dub Dá Inber]</td>
<td>LL 32 41e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathasach son of Ailill</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide)</td>
<td>R.B502 162 b;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killed at Rathveagh as king of Cruithin</td>
<td>LL 32 41e;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flathrua son of Fiachra</td>
<td>(King of Dál nAraide);</td>
<td>AU749.1; AT749.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Died as king of Cruithin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cináed Cairgge son of Cathasach</td>
<td>(= Cinaed mac Cathain, king of Dál nAraide?)</td>
<td>LL 32 41e;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Killed at Battle of [a?] Drong</td>
<td>AU776.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eochaid son of Fiachna</td>
<td>774×792 Defeated Cináed at Battle of Drong, allied with Uí Chóelbad; Killed Uí Chóelbad king of Dál nAraide;</td>
<td>AU776.7;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bresal son of Flathrua</td>
<td>792 (King of Dál nAraide); Died as king of Dál nAraide</td>
<td>LL 32 41e;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eochaid son of Bresal</td>
<td>808 (King of Dál nAraide, killed by his associates); Killed by his associates as king of Dál nAraide in Tuaisceirt</td>
<td>LL 32 41e;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cináed son of Eochaid</td>
<td>832 Killed by his associates as king of Dál nAraide in Tuaisceirt</td>
<td>AU832.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannacán or Flann son of Eochaid</td>
<td>849 Killed by Cenél nEógain as king of Dál nAraide in Tuaisceirt</td>
<td>AU849.9; AI849.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Consolidation: Ulidia

It is argued here that a process of consolidation was underway in Ireland in the second half of the ninth century. Members of the Scandinavian diaspora (as they might properly be called at this stage) in Ireland became a series of settler communities aiming at the acquisition of wealth and/or territory in the Insular Zone, rather than continuing as colonies aimed at resource extraction on behalf of the homeland(s) in Scandinavia. Making this distinction perhaps helps understand the actions of different groups within the Scandinavian diaspora in Ireland, England, Wales, Man and Scotland AD850–1050. The shift in intention might have altered the nature of the material flow(s) back to Scandinavia; traded items such as brooches and pins might have (partially) replaced plundered material. Other forms of wealth, such as slaves, bullion, agricultural surplus commodities such as leather may also have been transferred, but this would require further research. Such commodities might have been traded in non-Scandinavian towns and emporia for goods such as wine and weapons.

6.4.1 Furnished burials and ON-derived toponyms

It is argued here that the series of furnished burials in both Ulidia and Ergadia might be best seen as related to the consolidation phase in both case studies, as settlers sought to build ties with the landscape by burying their dead within it. As demonstrated in 4.18–4.19, the distribution of furnished burials and toponyms derived from Old Norse in Ulidia is quite localised (Maps 4.22–4.23). The Larne burial is located close to Úlfreksfjörðr (Larne Lough) and the townland of Ballylumford (baile + longphort). The St John’s Point (Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 656) and Skerry (Day and McWilliams 1992, 115; Ó Ríagáin 2016) weapon burials might be related to deaths on campaign rather than settlement in the immediate vicinity. The evidence from Rathlin might indicate both settlement and burial and there might be at least one ON-derived toponym on the island.

As argued in 4.19, Ballyholme might be baile + túaim [mound, tomb] rather than + hólmr (Ó Riagáin 2016, 162; contra Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 601). It is the only furnished burial in Ulidia gendered female, which might indicate that colonial activity in the area moved beyond contact and expansion. There is a possibility that the lost charter granting peace and protection to “conventum Bechorin” by Haraldr Maddaðarson, jarl of Orkney, refers to Bangor, Co. Down (proposed by Crawford 1971, 71; 2013, 258; Topping 1983, 109–12; Brown 2017, 146), close to Ballyholme. Even if this is a reference to Bangor, Co. Down rather than Bangor, Gwynedd or Banchory, Perthshire, it might, however, be related to unrecorded ecclesiastic activity further
north than Bangor’s daughter house at Applecross (AU673.5; AFM721.2). Even if the grant were to be related to “a territorial interest in the region” (Brown 2017, 146; see attack on Inis Lachain, AU1170.7), it might not be related to the burial.

As will be argued for Ergadia, while the initial naming of elements of the landscape might date to as early as the contact and expansion phases, the existence of a user group to make those names ‘stick’ belongs to the consolidation and outcome phases. Furnished burials might occur across all phases; the nature of the evidence in Ulidia would seem to indicate the burials belonged to the expansion and especially the consolidation phases. The toponyms might also be early, at least those referring to bodies of water with settlements.

6.4.2 Alliances and enmities

Dál Fiatach and the Gaill

In Ulidia, consolidation would seem to have been facilitated as much by a system of alliances as any seizure of territory. No raids are recorded on ecclesiastic sites in Dál Fiatach or Dál nAraide from Connor (AU832.6) to Coleraine (AU932.5). This period was characterised by a growing involvement of the Scandinavian diaspora in internecine Irish dynastic politics (A.6; Downham 2007, 17–62). The shore of Lough Neagh is located mainly in the territory of Dál nAraide and the Uí Echach Cobo (Map 1.3). However, it was Louth and Armagh that were raided by the Gaill when based on the lake rather than anywhere in Ulidia (AU839.7; AU840.1). The attack by the Finngennti involving Stein and Jarnknê on the Dubgennti at Carlingford (AU852.3, CS852) might also have involved Matudán of the Dál Fiatach (d.AU857.3) on the side of the Finngennti, if the late FIA235 account is accurate. The killing of Matudán’s Leth Cathail rival by Northmen the following year (AU853.6) might not have been coincidental, if Matudán had allies among the Gaill. This might be the origin of the statement in Lebor na Cert (§X lines 1958–1961; Dillon 1962, 132–3) that the king of Ulaid should have a fleet on Strangford Lough and be connected by marriage to the king of the Gaill.
Table 6.11. Battles in Ulidia involving the Scandinavian diaspora, AD830–900.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Killed</th>
<th>Perpetrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loughbrickland (Uí Echach Cobo)</td>
<td>attacked, Congalach taken to ships</td>
<td>Congalach son of Eochaid (Uí Echach Cobo)</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>AU833.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlingford Lough (Uí Echach Cobo)</td>
<td>battle, Finngennti and Ulaid attacked Dubgennti</td>
<td>Jarnkné (Finngennti)</td>
<td>Dubgennti</td>
<td>AU852.3, FIA235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>battle, co-king of Ulaid killed</td>
<td>Cathmal son of Tomaltach (Leth Cathail)</td>
<td>Northmen</td>
<td>AU853.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un-named longphorts (Cenél nÉógain, Dál nAraide)</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>un-named Gaill</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath (CE)</td>
<td>AU866.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunseverick (Dál Riata)</td>
<td>attacked</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>CE and Gaill</td>
<td>AU871.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strangford Lough (Dál Fiatach)</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Hálfdanr, dux of the Dubgennti</td>
<td>Finngennti</td>
<td>CS877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>co-king of Ulaid killed</td>
<td>Eiremón son of Aéd (Dál Fiatach)</td>
<td>Halldór Jårknésson (Finngennti)</td>
<td>AU886.1 (cf.AU883.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Óláfr Ua Ívarr (Dublin); Glún Tradna Jårknésson (Finngennti)</td>
<td>Aitíd son of Laigne (Uí Echach Cobo)</td>
<td>AU896.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td>AFM896.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cenél nÉógain and the Gaill under Aéd Findliath

Aéd Findliath of the Cenél nÉógain is found acting in alliance with some elements and acting against other elements of the Scandinavian diaspora (Table 6.12). His alliances would endure across several generations (Downham 2007, 7). ASC921/E[=AD919] notes that Sigtryggr Cáech killed his brother Niall, which hints that Niall Glúndub, son of Aéd Findliath was Sigtryggr Cáech’s uterine half-brother. This would presumably make Sigtryggr, Niall and Domnall Mide of the Clann Colmáin each grandsons of Cináed mac Alpín, but the late-medieval Lecan compilation Banshenchas only lists the last two (Dobbs 1930, 311; 1931, 186).

Niall’s niece seems to have married Uathmarán Bárðarson (AU933.1) of Limerick. Uathmarán son of Óláfr (Ua Ívarr d.AU896.7?) died while on campaign with Niall (AU914.7).
Aéd plundered all of the longphorts in the territories of the Cenél nEógain and Dál nAraide, taking away “their flocks and their herds”, and won a battle at Lough Foyle against the Gaill (AU866.4). This might indicate that the longphorts had been there with Aéd’s permission, with the actions coming in relation to his shifting relationship with Dublin after he replaced Máel Sechnaill (d.AU862.5) as the most powerful king in Ireland. His move might have been to bring the longphorts under submission, rather than destroy them. Aside from his family connections, a longphort at Lough Foyle survived for several decades (CS898; AU921.7; CS943), and the attack on Dunseverick by the Cenél nEógain in alliance with the Gaill (AU871.3) would seem to be connected to this alliance. It is in this context that the killing of the final king of Éilne named in the annals (AU849.9; Table 6.10) by the Cenél nEógain must also be understood; could it be that a settlement of the Gaill was encouraged by Aéd at Inis Lachain in Éilne?

Table 6.12. Selected references to the relationship(s) between Aéd Findliath and the Gaill.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allies</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaill (unspecified)</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>Mide invaded</td>
<td>AU861.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flann mac Conaing</td>
<td>Clann Colmáin</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>Mide plundered</td>
<td>AU862.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brega), kings of Gaill</td>
<td></td>
<td>North of Ireland, Lough Foyle</td>
<td>plundered, submission?</td>
<td>AU866.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none stated</td>
<td>Longphorts in Cenél nEógain and Dál nAraide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connachta</td>
<td>Carlus Óláfsson and Gaill, Brega, Laigin</td>
<td>Brega</td>
<td>Carlus killed</td>
<td>AU868.4, CS868, AFM866.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none stated</td>
<td>Laigin</td>
<td>Dublin, Gowran (near Kilkenny)</td>
<td>Laigin plundered</td>
<td>CS870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 6.2. Battles in Ulidia AD830–900 involving the Scandinavian diaspora, with furnished burials also shown.
6.4.3 Consolidation and secondary expansion in an era of diasporic dynastic rivalries

Instability in Dublin

The death of Hálfdanr on Strangford Lough is significant (Table 6.13), as he had been one of the leaders of the Great Army in England and effectively ruled Northumbria in the AD870s (Woolf 2007, 68–86). That he was killed by the Finngaill, having been described as Dubgaill (CS877) might indicate that the former group continued to play a role in Ireland in this period. His death occurred in a period of political uncertainty (Table 6.13) that corresponded to a higher level of interaction with Britain (Table 6.14).

With Ívarr and Óláfr dead (Table 6.13), it might be that the alliance of all/most of the various groups associated with the Scandinavian diaspora in Ireland broke up. In this respect, it is important to note the prominence of the Finngaill Jarnknéssons in these decades, argued here as descended from the Jarnkné killed at Carlingford (AU852.2). It is not certain as to who was expelled from Dublin by the Laigin and Brega (AU902.2), but it is likely to have only involved elements of the ruling class. The event is to be regarded as the culmination of 25 years of dynastic uncertainty in shifting political sands in Ireland. All the known sons of Ívarr and Óláfr were dead by the mid-890s, with the Jarnknéssons and Sigfrøðr of York (AU893.4; Æ893, possibly Hálfdan’s son) contending with Ívarr’s grandsons for control of Dublin (A.5).

Aitíth Ua Bresail, king of Uí Echach Cobo, seems to have taken advantage of this uncertainty to establish himself as overking of Ulaid and briefly the most powerful king of the north (Table 6.15). His move against the Gaill (AU896.7) might have been to impose tribute on Carlingford and/or Strangford, both of which might be regarded as satellites of Dublin at this stage.

Table 6.13. Destabilising events of the AD860–70s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure(s)</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auisle</td>
<td>unknown (but related)</td>
<td>Dublin?</td>
<td>Killed in parricide or by Fratres</td>
<td>AU867.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlus Óláfrsson</td>
<td>Aéd Findliath and Connachta</td>
<td>Brega</td>
<td>Carlus killed</td>
<td>AFM866.9 (cf. AU868.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ívarr</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>AU873.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hálfdanr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Split of Great Army</td>
<td>ASC875/A, D–E, ASC876/B–C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óláfr</td>
<td>Picts</td>
<td>Pictland</td>
<td>Óláfr killed</td>
<td>CKA866 (AD871×874)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oystein Oláfsson</td>
<td>Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Dublin?</td>
<td>Oystein killed</td>
<td>AU875.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Finngennti</td>
<td>Strangford</td>
<td>Hálfdanr killed</td>
<td>CS877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.14. Shift of focus away from Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Figure(s)</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of Pictland</td>
<td>Óláfr and Auisle</td>
<td>Pictland</td>
<td>Pictland</td>
<td>AU866.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of Great Army,</td>
<td>Ívarr and Hálfdanr</td>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>Æ866; HRA(§8)970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landing in East Anglia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Army takes York</td>
<td>Ívarr and Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>AU867.7, CMel866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASC867/A, D–E,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASC868/B–C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siege of Alt Clut</td>
<td>Óláfr and Ivarr</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>AU870.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captives brought back to</td>
<td>Óláfr and Ivarr</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>AU871.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Britons, Picts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasion of Strathclyde,</td>
<td>Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>Strathclyde</td>
<td>ASC875/A, D–E,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictland</td>
<td>Britons, Picts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASC876/B–C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Northumbria</td>
<td>Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Northumbrians</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>ASC876/A, D–E,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASC877/B–C, Æ876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.15. Career of Aitíth son of Laigne Ua Bresail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allies</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Bécc son of Éiremón (Dál Fiatach,</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Bécc killed</td>
<td>AFM889.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>king of Ulaid)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Flaithbertach son of Murchad</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>peace imposed by Armagh</td>
<td>AU893.2, AFM89.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Flaithbertach son of Murchad</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Flaithbertach killed</td>
<td>AFM891.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Muiredach son of Eochucán (Dál</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Muiredach killed</td>
<td>AU895.4, AFM890.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiatach, co-king of Ulaid)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaille</td>
<td>Óláfr ua Ímair (Gaill), Glún Tradna Jarnknésson (Gaill)</td>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>Óláfr and Glún Tradna killed</td>
<td>AU896.7, CS896, AFM891.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muiredach son of Étigh</td>
<td>Máel Finnia son of Flannacán</td>
<td>Ráth Cró (Brega)</td>
<td>Aitíth defeated, escaped wounded, allies killed</td>
<td>AU897.2, AFM892.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(king of Dál nAraide), Máel</td>
<td>(king of Brega)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mochéirge son of Indechtrach</td>
<td>Máel Bairne (Uí Echach Cobo?)</td>
<td>Aitíth murdered</td>
<td></td>
<td>AU898.1 AFM897.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(king of Leith Cathail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Expulsion from Dublin

The internecine rivalries among the ruling families of Dublin culminated in the weakening of their position and their subsequent expulsion from Dublin by the kings of Brega and Laigin (AU902.2). This necessitated a shift in area of focus to the north of Ireland, northern and western Britain (Table 6.16; Downham 2007, 83–91).

Table 6.16. Activity in northern Ireland and Britain after the expulsion of the Uí Ímair (descendants of Ívarr) and the Jarnknéssons (descendants of the Finngennit) from Dublin in AD902.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Figure(s)</th>
<th>Opponent(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh</td>
<td>Gaill on Lough Neagh</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM895.8 [=AD902]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh and Armagh</td>
<td>relics of Patrick seized</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>AFM895.8 [=AD902]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td>slaughter of Gaill</td>
<td>Ulaid</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM896.8 [=AD902]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>battle at Rhos Meilon</td>
<td>Ingimunðr</td>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>AC902, Brut900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral, Cheshire, Lancashire</td>
<td>settlement in northwest Mercia</td>
<td>Ingimunðr</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>FIA459 [=902×910]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>Ailech plundered</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain</td>
<td>CS904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictland?</td>
<td>Ead, king of Picts killed</td>
<td>Ívarr ua Ímair, Catol (of Strathclyde?)</td>
<td>Picts</td>
<td>CS904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictland?</td>
<td>Ívarr ua Ímair killed</td>
<td>Ívarr ua Ímair</td>
<td>Fortriu</td>
<td>AU904.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>Battle of Tettenhall</td>
<td>Northumbrians under Eowils and Hálfdanr</td>
<td>Edward of Wessex</td>
<td>ASC911/C–D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast of England</td>
<td>New fleet of the Ulaid defeated</td>
<td>Genniti</td>
<td>Cumuscach son of Máel Mocheirgi of Leth Cathail</td>
<td>AU913.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast of the Isle of Man</td>
<td>Naval battle, Bárðr defeated</td>
<td>Rǫgnvaldr Ua Ímair</td>
<td>Bárðr Óttarrson</td>
<td>AU914.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn valley, coast of Wales, Cornwall, Ireland</td>
<td>Raids on Severn from Brittany, raiders pushed out, land in Waterford</td>
<td>Óttarr Jarnknésson, Hroald Jarnknésson (killed)</td>
<td>Edward of Wessex</td>
<td>ASC914/A, ASC915/B–D; AC913/A–C; Brut911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reconfiguration of the Scandinavian diaspora in Ireland: secondary expansion in Ulidia

The following decade saw an escalation in battles (Table 6.17), related to the general reconfiguration of power relations in the Insular Scandinavian diaspora at that time. The period AD914–30 saw the Sigtryggsson and Guðroðarson branches of the Úi Ímair establishing themselves in Dublin, Annagassan, Carlingford and Strangford, and the Úi Ragnaill or Rǫgnvaldsson branch displacing the ruling group in Waterford, with all three seeking to impose themselves on Limerick (A.5; Downham 2007, 27–42; Valente 2008, 101–8). All three groups were heavily involved in Northumbrian politics during this period (A.5) and were also involved in Mercia, North Wales, Man, and western Scotland. This period also saw a renewed interest in Ulidia from Dublin and its rivals.

Table 6.17. Battles involving the Ulaid or in southern Ulidia and adjacent territories involving the Scandinavian diaspora, AD919–27 (see also Map 6.3); references are to unique information only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Defeated</th>
<th>Perpetrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Cheshire</td>
<td>Raid on Chester region</td>
<td>Óttarr Jarvnsson</td>
<td>Mercia</td>
<td>AU914.5, CS914; CS915; FIA459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunblane, Alba</td>
<td>Raid on Dunblane</td>
<td>Óttarr Jarvnsson</td>
<td>Alba</td>
<td>HRA.§6.912 [=917]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbridge on River Tyne</td>
<td>Battle of Corbridge</td>
<td>Óttarr Jarvnsson</td>
<td>Alba</td>
<td>AU918.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Whether or not the longphorts, camps and bases in Ulidia (Table 4.4) had been occupied continuously up until the AD920s is difficult to determine. Unfortunately, there is no documentary evidence from Larne or Inis Lachain at this time, but the archaeological evidence from both could date to the consolidation phase in general (Table 6.20). The steatite vessel from the sandhills at Crossreagh East (May and Batty 1948, 141, 154; Sindbæk 2015, 205, 212), and the silver pseudo-penannular brooch from Lisserluss (McGonagle 2018a) might both date to the same period and be thus related to this activity.

The phrasing Gaill of Carlingford (AU923.4; AU926.2) implies continuity of use at the longphort on Carlingford. Conversely, the phrasing of AU924.2 and AU926.5 would seem to indicate the (re)establishment of bases at Strangford Lough and Linn Duachaill, under the leadership of Hálfdan Guðrøðarson of the Dublin Uí Ímair (Downham 2007, 38). Some of the series of stray finds across eastern Co. Down (Map 6.4; Table 6.21) might be related to this settlement activity, including the armrings from Inishargy, Ballylesson and Myra Castle. The series of events in AD926 at Carlingford, the River Dee and Crown Mount (Table 6.17, identifications Hogan 1910; NIPD) might indicate a continuous area of settlement from Newry to the southern end of Dundalk Bay, similar to the areas around Dublin, Wexford, Waterford and Limerick (Bradley 1988; Ó Riagáin 2010). This might be the source of the three silver ingots found near Newry (Armstrong 1914–16, 189–90; Bøe 1940, 105–7; Sheehan 1998, 199; Graham-Campbell 2011, 83–5; Map 6.4; Table 6.19). The territory held by the Scandinavian diaspora in this area might correspond to the block of land that might later have made up the bulk of the twelfth-century foundation grant to Newry Abbey (O’Donovan 1832; Reeves 1847, 116–9) and the thirteenth-century royal holdings around Carlingford and Greencastle. Future research might uncover unenclosed Scandinavian-diasporic farming settlements in this area.
similar to Cherrywood, Co. Dublin (Ó Néill 2006).

This settlement activity was countered by Limerick’s associations with Lough Neagh and Lough Foyle as part of a wider campaign where the rival communities sought to consolidate their positions in Ireland and around the Irish Sea (Table 6.16; Downham 2007, 39). The death of Sigtryggr Cæch (AU927.2), the expulsion of Guðrøðr Ua Ímair from York by Æthelstan (ASC927/E), and the defeats at Limerick (AU924.1) and Carlingford–Lins (AD926) seem to have triggered intensified action by Limerick to oppose Dublin across Ireland (Table 6.17). It was ultimately unsuccessful, with the defeat of Óláfr Cennairech (CS837) and imposition of Haraldr Sigtryggsson (d.CS940 as king of Limerick).
Map 6.3. Battles in Ulidia (and beyond) AD900–927 involving the Scandinavian diaspora, with longphorts and furnished burials also shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Defeated</th>
<th>Perpetrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>Shannon churches and Mide plundered</td>
<td>Mide</td>
<td>Þórir Helgisson</td>
<td>AI922.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Erne</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaill (Limerick?)</td>
<td>AU924.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>king of Ui Maine</td>
<td>Kolla Bárðarson</td>
<td>CS924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>attack by Dublin under Guðrøðr Ua Ímair</td>
<td>Dublin, heavy</td>
<td>(Þórir?) Helgisson</td>
<td>AU924.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Gur</td>
<td>camp established by Waterford Gaill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaill of Waterford</td>
<td>AI926.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmallock</td>
<td>Slaughter of Waterford fleet</td>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>Gaill of Limerick allied with Mumu</td>
<td>AI927.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Corrib</td>
<td>base on Lough Corrib, Connachtta slaughtered</td>
<td>Connachtta</td>
<td>Gaill of Limerick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh</td>
<td>fleet on lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Þórulf Helgisson</td>
<td>AU928.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruib Mena,</td>
<td>longphort established</td>
<td></td>
<td>Þórulf Helgisson</td>
<td>AU930.2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Neagh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Bethrach (Osraige)</td>
<td>Dunmore Cave and Loch Bethrach raided</td>
<td>1000 killed</td>
<td>Gaill of Limerick</td>
<td>AI930.1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag Raigne</td>
<td>Osraige invaded</td>
<td>Osraige</td>
<td>Gaill of Limerick</td>
<td>CS930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Osraige)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>base on Lough Ree, islands plundered</td>
<td>Mide, Connachtta</td>
<td>Gaill of Limerick</td>
<td>CS931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not stated</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Þórir Helgisson (d.)</td>
<td>Muirchertach son of Niall (and Dál nAraide)</td>
<td>AU932.2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM930.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>Airmedach, princeps killed</td>
<td></td>
<td>AU932.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag Uatha</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Muirchertach son of Niall</td>
<td>Fergal son of Domnall (Cenél nEógain), Sigfríðr son of Uathmaráin</td>
<td>AU933.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruba Con Chongalt (Ulaid)</td>
<td>attack on Dál Fiatach</td>
<td>Ulaid, high casualties</td>
<td>Conaing (AU) Daagh (CS) son of Niall, Gaill of Lough Neagh (CS, AFM)</td>
<td>AU933.3, cf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS933,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM931.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilclief</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>Son of Bárðr</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM935.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Ree</td>
<td>defeated, brought to Dublin</td>
<td>Óláfr Cenncaireach</td>
<td>Óláfr Guðrøðarson</td>
<td>CS837;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFM935.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At this point, the situation becomes very complicated. As demonstrated in Tables 6.17–6.18, both Limerick and Dublin were opposed by Muirchertach son of Niall of the Cenél nEógain, but Limerick was allied with his first cousin Fergal son of Domnall. This was the beginning of the Ua Néill vs Ua Domnaill (later Meic Lochlainn) split within the Cenél nEógain that would define northern politics for several centuries (Table 6.19). The Dublin–York Guðrøðarson and/or Sigtryggsson factions were allied with the Dál Fiatach mainline but opposed by the Leith Cathail. The events of AU921.7 and AU928.4 are best explained by the action of a third group of Gaill (contra Downham 2007, 40), proposed here as coming from northern Britain, which might make Acolb the earliest known leader from Innsi Gaill. The unnamed son of Rǫgnvaldr killed after raiding Downpatrick is similarly difficult to fit in (AU942.2). The Carlingford, Strangford and Lough Neagh longphorts are not mentioned again after the heavy defeats of their occupants (AU926.2; AU943.1; AU945.2).

Table 6.19. Selected references to Cenél nEógain and the Scandinavian diaspora, AD920–45.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Defeated</th>
<th>Perpetrator(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grellach Eilte</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Niall Glúndub, Uathmarán son of Óláfr (d.) on Niall’s side</td>
<td>Clann Colmáin</td>
<td>914.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Battle of Dublin</td>
<td>Niall Glúndub (d.); Aéd son of Eochucán (DF)</td>
<td>Sigtryggr Cáech Ua Ímair and Gaill</td>
<td>AU919.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lough Foyle (+ Lough Swilly?)</td>
<td>attack by Gaill under Acolb</td>
<td>Acolb</td>
<td>Fergal son of Domnall</td>
<td>AU921.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanad peninsula</td>
<td>attack</td>
<td>Cenél Conaill, (Gaill of Lough Swilly?)</td>
<td>(Sigfrøðr) son of Uathmarán son of Báðr</td>
<td>AU921.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>Armagh plundered</td>
<td>community of Armagh</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Ua Ímair and Gaill of Dublin</td>
<td>AU921.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near Armagh</td>
<td>Dublin army defeated</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Ua Ímair and Gaill of Dublin</td>
<td>Muirchertach son of Niall (Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td>AU921.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>killing</td>
<td>Donnchad son of Domnall (d., Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td>Northmen</td>
<td>AU928.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fir Rois</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Muirchertach son of Niall (d., Cenél nEógain)</td>
<td>Blákari Guðrøðarson (Dublin)</td>
<td>AU943.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracht Mugha (Donegal)</td>
<td>battle</td>
<td>Cenél nEógain, Gaill of Lough Foyle</td>
<td>Ruaidhri Ua Canannáin (Cenél Conaill)</td>
<td>CS943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lough Neagh fleet destroyed, heavy casualties Breisi, Gaill of Lough Neagh Domnall and Flaithbertach, sons of Muirchertach (Cenél nEógain) AU945.2 CS945

Whether or not the disappearance from the annals of the longphorts on Carlingford, Strangford and Lough Neagh was related to the shifting interests of the compilers of those annals or whether the sites fell out of use in the mid-tenth century cannot be determined definitively. Raids continued in Ulidia, as did alliances with and against the Gaill (Table 6.20; Map 6.4) well into the tenth century, but these might have been conducted at a distance. The material culture evidence associated with interaction with the Scandinavian diaspora (Map 6.4; Table 6.21) spans either side of the disappearance of the longphorts from the record. This evidence cannot be used to demonstrate settlement, but it at least provides an idea of the levels of exchange in the area in the Viking Age.

Table 6.20. Tenth-century raids on ecclesiastic sites in Ulidia. AU832.6 raid included to demonstrate the long interval between it and the next raid recorded in Ulidia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Perpetrator(s)</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connor and Maghera</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AU832.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>Gennti</td>
<td>Airmedach, princeps of Coleraine killed</td>
<td>AU932.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilclief</td>
<td>son of Bárðr (Limerick?)</td>
<td>plundered, dámliac burned</td>
<td>AFM935.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>son of Ragnall (Waterford?)</td>
<td>plundered, plundered attacked on his island by Gaill from overseas</td>
<td>942.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>Tanaide son of Odar, coarb of Bangor killed</td>
<td>AU958.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>Artgar son of Matudán (Dál Fiatach), Gaill</td>
<td>plundered with (or against? [co = ‘to’ or ‘with’]) the Gaill, many beheaded</td>
<td>AU970.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechru (Rathlin or Lambay)</td>
<td>Gennti (the Isles? Limerick?)</td>
<td>Ferdal, airchinnech of Rechru killed by gentiles</td>
<td>AU975.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nendrum</td>
<td>(could be accidental)</td>
<td>SétNA Ua Demmáin, airchinnech of Nendrum</td>
<td>AU976.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>plundered and burned</td>
<td>AU989.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilclief and Inch</td>
<td>Sigtryggr Olafsson of Dublin</td>
<td>plundered, many captives taken</td>
<td>AT1002.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechru</td>
<td>Gaill</td>
<td>plundered</td>
<td>AT1038.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 6.4. Battles and raids in Ulidia (and beyond) AD928–1038 involving the Scandinavian diaspora, with portable material culture, longphorts and furnished burials also shown.
Table 6.21. Material culture from Ulidia potentially associated with interaction with the Scandinavian diaspora. All dates AD; d. = penny/pennies; SF = stray find; MD = metal-detector stray find(s); CG = coin group; Frank. = Frankish; PPB = pseudo-penannular brooch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Prov.</th>
<th>Found</th>
<th>Coins Total</th>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>A-S Coins</th>
<th>Arab Coins</th>
<th>Dublin Coins</th>
<th>Manx Coins</th>
<th>Frank. Coins</th>
<th>Armring whole</th>
<th>Armring frag.</th>
<th>Ingot</th>
<th>Jewellery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(near) Antrim Town</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1059×1108</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballyaghagan (Ballylesson)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballywillin (not specified)</td>
<td>coin hoard</td>
<td>mound</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>“a few”</td>
<td>850×1000</td>
<td>???</td>
<td>???</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickland</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>metal detecting</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 gold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnacavill</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>980×1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnsampson (The Trench)</td>
<td>coin hoard</td>
<td>mound or souterrain</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>930×975</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave Hill (Mac Airt’s Fort)</td>
<td>bullion hoard</td>
<td>near EP</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 silver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrykeighan</td>
<td>mixed hoard</td>
<td>works at eccl. site</td>
<td>1843 (1834?)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>838×975</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 silver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>CG (&lt;5)</td>
<td>exc. at eccl. site</td>
<td>1987; 1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>997×1003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drumbo</td>
<td>stray</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1120×1170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmall (Garron Point)</td>
<td>bullion hoard</td>
<td>near EP</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CA RHP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Find Date</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(near) Groomsport</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1000</td>
<td>silver ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inishargy</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850×1100</td>
<td>finger ring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Magee</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>×2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1020×1040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilclief</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750×1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisserluss (Desert Hill)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1000</td>
<td>silver PPB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magheralagan</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>775×950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry</td>
<td>bullion</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>800×1000</td>
<td>3 silver forks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathlin Island</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>980×1100</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Bay</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>840×852</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrabo</td>
<td>coin</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1002×1170</td>
<td>108d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poobles (Soldierstown Road)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850×1000</td>
<td>1 silver frag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walshestown (Myra Castle)</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Consolidation: Ergadia

As already noted, there was an escalation of interest by the Scandinavian diaspora in northern Britain in the AD860s and 870s (Tables 6.14, 6.16). The connection between York and Dublin through Ívarr and his brother Hálfdanr means that the Gaill of Ireland and Alba that invaded Pictland under Óláfr and Auisle (AU866.1) were probably based in York rather than Scotland. That said, “the Gaill of Alba” might also be how Irish annalists would have described settlers in the islands of northern Britain, even if Alba would only seem to be used from c.AD900 to refer to northern Britain rather than Britain as a whole (Watson 1926, 10–3; Broun 1994, 21; 2007, 21–2, 70–89; Woolf 2007, 122). No Gaels are mentioned as among the captives from Óláfr and Ívarr’s campaign against Strathclyde and Pictland, with only Angles, Britons and Picts mentioned (AU870.6; AU871.2). This might be an indication that territories where Gaelic-speaking groups lived were not raided during these campaigns, possibly due to their already being under the control of, or displaced by, colonists.

Considering that the expansion phase was very different in Ergadia, a settler mentality may have developed from the beginning. It is unknown if any wealth was exported from the region back to the homeland, but it is possible that the colony was in a tributary relationship either to the kings of Pictland/Alba or to more powerful members of the Scandinavian diaspora elsewhere in the Insular Zone, if not in the homeland. Considering that so few settlements have been physically identified or excavated, there is little information available regarding the concentration of agricultural surplus or any other economic activity, beyond the grave-goods found in the series of furnished burials.

6.5.1 Furnished burials

It is argued here that the series of furnished burials in Ergadia (Map 3.23; Tables 3.11–3.16), especially those containing multiple weapons, primarily belong to the period of consolidation. The visibility of this relatively small series of burials represents a deviation from the norm; it must be remembered that the remains of the vast majority of those who lived in the past—Viking Age or otherwise—are undetectable (Price 2008, 259). The associated dating evidence (Figure 3.50–3.54) would place them during, if not after, the decline, especially in the islands and Kintyre, in the ‘traditional’ forms of enclosed settlement previously in use for c.1000 years (3.3–3.10). As elaborately furnished burials, they take a very different form to the series of known burials from elsewhere in Ergadia in the period AD500–1400 (3.11–3.12).

The consolidation phase was characterised by a (re)negotiation of the social status of the
colonists relative to one another through the medium of funerary dramas, the endpoints of which the furnished burials represent. Elaborate furnished burials might occur at times of social uncertainty, either when the status of those carrying out the funeral is sufficiently insecure to require overt (re)statement (Parker Pearson 1999, 23), or when the heritability of the deceased’s position in social space is either contested or under threat (James 1989, 34; Halsall 2000, 2013; Harrison 2015, 307). They might also occur when a group or individual’s position in a landscape is contested by external groups, especially in a colonial setting. In all of these instances, funerary elaboration is a form of conspicuous consumption, a display of the resources available to those leading the ceremony, and thus an attempt to legitimize their position in social space within the colonial group and in relation to the colonised (Ó Ríagáin 2016, 148). This might be contrasted with the subsequent domination phase, which probably began in the early tenth century, if not before, and was characterised by a more firmly embedded system of asymmetric power relations around which an ideological system of legitimation was constructed. By then, there might have been less of a widespread need for material displays of the access to social power resources, with such displays possibly confined to a shrinking elite.

The group of furnished burials is heterogenous, containing of elements from different region-specific traditions within Scandinavia. Some scholars see the archaeological differences as due to different parts of Ergadia being settled at different times by different groups (Dumville 1997, 15–6; Downham 2007, 178). It is proposed here that they are all broadly contemporary. Some colonial episodes can bring about a phenomenon describable as a ‘colonial funnel’ (Ó Ríagáin 2016, 156), where several culturally similar groups but with varying traits in relation to language, religious practice, etc., come to settle the same landscape, usually under the sponsorship of one dominant group. For example, the horse burials, mainly found in southern Scandinavia (Sikora 2004; Pedersen 2014), at Kiloran Bay and Machrins 1 (and possibly Port Lobh), and potentially at Conaig Beg on Tiree, or the presence of cremations and furnished inhumations in Ergadia. Similar would have occurred in England in the years that the Great Army was active (e.g. Biddle and Kjolbye-Biddle 1992; Richards 2004; Jarman et al. 2018).

Excluding one child burial and two gender-neutral burials, the 9:5 gendered male:female ratio in Ergadia differs from the ratio of about 4:1 ratio elsewhere in the Insular Zone, Ulidia included (Brown 1997, 229; Graham-Campbell and Batey 1997, 143–54; Harrison 2015, 301–6; Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014). This might also be contrasted with the overall ratio in Norway of about 5:1, with western Norway being slightly more equal at about 3:1 (Solberg 1985; Stylegar 2010, 73; Harrison 2015, 301–4). The presence of such a high proportion of graves
gendered female by artefactual means indicates that these are not the graves of raiders passing through the landscape, rather it would seem to indicate the presence of settlers in the landscape (Graham-Campbell and Batey 1998, 150–2; Harrison 2015, 299–301). It has been argued elsewhere that these burials had much to do with displaying the access to social power resources of those carrying out the burials (James 1989; Halsall 1995; 2000; Parker Pearson 1999, 72–94; Harrison 2015; Ó Riagáin 2016).

6.5.2 Toponyms
As will be argued for the distribution of manors and vills in Anglo-Norman Ulidia in Chapter 7, it is likely that the division of colonised areas of Ergadia by settlers into agricultural land units began in the consolidation phase and continued in the period of colonial domination. This is reflected in the proliferation of habitative toponyms related to farming settlements, with further farming settlements named for topographic features. On first glance, it would seem as though the placenames represent an episode of plantation colonialism, with several social orders moving into the landscape (Maps 3.24–3.28), especially considering the potential for the later replacement of ON farm-names with baile names in certain areas in the high–late medieval periods (Macniven 2015, 64–7; cf. Reeves 1858–61; MacCotter 2008 on different uses of baile).

Map 6.5 demonstrates a strong relationship between high-medieval churches and chapels and the total distribution of all forms of Iron Age and EMP enclosed settlement in Ergadia. Churches and chapels indicate the presence of a congregation and thus people. Therefore, while direct continuity cannot be confirmed on the current evidence, it can be demonstrated that people made similar choices about where to live across all periods.

Macniven (2013; 2015) demonstrates a relationship between farm-names in Islay, both Gaelic and Old Norse, and the high–late-medieval distribution of churches and chapels. Map 6.6 demonstrates qualitatively that such a relationship also occurs on Coll and Tiree, with localised clustering in Ardnamurchan, Mull and Arran. A major shift would seem to have occurred in Kintyre, with either renaming occurring in the vicinity of the churches and chapels, or a move in settlement foci. Considering that many of the parish churches were on greenfield sites, the latter might have occurred. Colonsay has the highest density of burials, but no ON farm names survive on the island, despite an obvious continuation in population density. Elsewhere, ON toponyms occur without any relationship to earlier settlement, e.g. on Jura and in Northern Argyll.
Map 6.5. Heatmap of sum of Iron Age and early medieval enclosed settlement in relation to Old Norse habitative toponyms (including topographic names used habitatively), furnished burials and Viking Age cremations, along with high-medieval churches and chapels. Heatmap radius set at 3km with maximum value of five (i.e., darkest patches contain five sites or more within a 3km radius).
Map 6.6. Furnished burials along with high-medieval churches and chapels overlain on heatmap of Old Norse habitative toponyms (including topographic names used habitatively). Heatmap radius set at 3km with maximum value set at 3 (i.e., darkest patches contain 3 sites or more within a 3km radius).
Further research is necessary in order to detect physical settlement evidence to accompany the series of names. In the vast majority of cases, each toponym has un-dated, but probably post-medieval, structural remains visible directly in association on satellite imagery. It has already been stated that unenclosed settlement is the great uncertainty looming over any study of settlement in Ireland or Scotland (3.2; 4.2). Perhaps targeting lowland coastal machair areas similar to those in which Cille Pheadair (Parker Pearson et al. 2004; 2018) and Bornais (Sharples 2005) rather than more visible enclosed settlements might prove especially fruitful in this respect. Lewis’s (2007) work using currently occupied rural settlements (CORS) to investigate the successful high-medieval English rural settlements that were not abandoned might also be instructive. It may be that rural settlements still in use today, or those forcibly abandoned during the Highland Clearances, might then help provide a solution.

Nicolaisen (1977–80, 108) suggests that commemorative or connotative practices might be employed by “colonists in a hurry”, which might account for the similarity of many names in Norway, Scotland and Iceland. However, he draws attention to the difficulties inherent in differentiating between connotative/commemorative and denotative names (2001, 126–7), with the case for the direct reuse of names from the homeland at times overstated due to “the important part it has placed in the naming of settlements in the New World across the Atlantic”.

Some bólstæðr names might have been used as primary farm-names during the initial shaping of the landscape in the image of the colonist. Such toponymic practices might be expected in the expansion and consolidation phases of an episode of plantation settler colonialism, and their continued use is a demonstration of cultural ossification—the preservation of traits after they have disappeared in the colonial or diasporic homeland (1.3.2). Further bólstæðr names could later be coined in relation to the sub-division of larger units over time, which would account for the naming events occurring as late as AD1100–1500 in some parts of Scotland (Macniven 2015, 71–3; Gammeltoft 2001, 162–3). Some dalr names might also be late, potentially related to the expansion of farming into valleys outside the core areas of the colony, or the acquisition and renaming of pre-existing farms. This might account for the farms on Map 6.5 with no relationship to earlier enclosed settlement, e.g. on Jura and Arran.

Macniven (2015, 80) suggests that the lack of innovation found in the habitative toponyms in Islay was related to a “mass plantation of Old Norse speakers on the island” seemingly “accompanied by the suppression of the native Gaelic name traditions”. While it would seem as though there was a mass-naming event associated with an episode of plantation colonialism or settler colonialism, with the previous occupants displaced either forcibly or by a centrally organised transplantation, there might be some arguments against the totalising
extent of this process.

As noted in Chapter 3, the preservation of *staðir* names indicates the grouping together of smaller farm units, some of which may well have had Gaelic names and were inhabited by Gaelic-speaking tenants. Similar occurred in the HMP in cases of subinfeudation, i.e., a single unit was divided up by its holder and divided between tenants paying to that holder. The presence of Irish ‘betaghs’ [from *biatach*, plural *biataigh* ‘supplier of food, farmer’ (eDIL)], on subdivided estates in Anglo-Norman Ireland (Section 7.6) provides an instructive parallel in this respect.

The betaghs might also be instructive when addressing the low number of ON-derived names for outlying farms and areas of upland pasture across the case-study region discussed in Chapter 4. Old Norse and Gaelic user-groups could have lived in close proximity in some areas (for Tiree, see Holliday 2016, 207). It may well be that Gaelic-speaking lower-status farmers, unfree tenants and labourers continued to farm in areas where the toponymic evidence indicates large-scale settlement by speakers of Old Norse, with the names of the associated settlements either not surviving or so generic as to render them chronologically distinct. Johnston (1991, 135–6, 317–8) draws attention to Port Treallabhig on the east coast of Coll, with an associated land-unit appearing on the Langlands Map (1801) as Trelvick. The name seems to preserve ON *þrœll* + *vik* [unfree (person) + bay]. This does not have to mean ‘slave’, but it could refer to a farm held by unfree tenancy.

For these lower-status unfree tenants, exchanging one protector/surplus-extractor for another might have changed very little about their lives, almost invisible as they are in the archaeological record. Considering that elites and ‘the peasantry’ have at many times spoken different languages across the European past (Bartlett 1993; Elias 2000), that the new colonial elite spoke a different language might have made little difference. Considering also that material practices have differed between social strata across the history of human society, this again would have made little difference to the lower orders of colonial society in Ergadia.

Considering the number of small, poorly-dated houses found in the *machair* areas of the case study, it may be that some of these are the residences of precolonial inhabitants. Appendix 3 discusses some possibilities in this respect right across the timeframe of this dissertation (Map 3.3), but excavations at Machrins, Inchmarnock kilns and Ardnave have indicated that such structures were potentially occupied during this period (A.3.2). The corpus of unfurnished burials from this period might also be instructive in this respect (Table 3.16–3.17; Map 3.23). Taken together, there might be evidence for the survival of a near-invisible class of colonised ‘natives’, who may or may not have continued to speak Gaelic and may or may not have
transculturated in similar ways to the colonists in terms of material cultural practices. Of course, they may also be themselves colonists, but considering the lessons of other forms of medieval colonialism in Ireland and Britain, there is usually some form of upward mobility used as an incentive to attract settlers (Ó Riagáin 2010c; Veracini 2010). Unfree tenant status is more about the stick than the carrot; therefore, it might be reasonable to suggest that any such groups would consist of the colonised rather than the coloniser.

6.6 Resultive processes: Ulidia

There is no direct evidence that any of the longphorts in Ulidia went on to become towns, unlike at Dublin (Wallace 2016) or Cork (Hurley 1998; 2010), for example. On the current evidence, the impact of Scandinavian colonialism on pre-existing settlement traditions would seem to have been very low; if anything, the evidence for settlement becomes more extensive in the period c.AD800–1000, as discussed in Chapter 4. The adoption of souterrains and widespread use of raised raths might have its roots in the period prior to AD800, but ninth-century social changes and cycles of violence might have acted as a catalyst. Clinton (2001, 60) and McCormick (2008, 221) see the rise in the number of souterrains as connected to growing numbers of slave raids. However, as Edwards (1990, 30) points out, they would be death-traps if used as refuges in a sustained attack. It is argued here that the spread of raised raths was due to emulative practice related to the smaller group of earlier platform raths whose occupants had access to metal jewellery and long-distance trade (Chapter 4).

While Larne and Inis Láchain (Loughan Island) are poorly documented, they both might be likely candidates for some sort of continuity of settlement, even if it did not involve the Scandinavian diaspora (Table 6.22). It would be tempting to connect Domnall Ua Uathmaráin, king of Fir Lí (d.AU1036.1; cf. AU1081.2), within whose territory Inis Láchain was located, to the Cenél nEógain and their ally and kinsman Sigfróðr son of Uathmarán, but it may just be another use of the name (see O’Brien 1962, 749 for other appearances of the name).

It is important to note that the majority of portable material culture evidence associable with the Scandinavian diaspora (Map 6.4; Table 6.21) dates to after AD970, if not AD1000. Steatite bowls and silver armrings might date to anywhere between AD800 and 1100, buts several more closely datable wealth-deposits are known from the case study. The north coast has the greatest concentration, which includes the large late tenth-century hoard at the ecclesiastic site of Derrykeighan (Lindsay 1844; Dolley 1965; Bateson 1973, 49; Hall 1974, 78; Krogsrud 2012–3, 60), the large eleventh-century hoard from and Carnsampson (Dolley
1961–2; 1973–4; Warner 1975; Hall 1974, 89; Krogsrud 2012–3, 60), the smaller one from Rathlin Island (Dolley 1974b; Hall 1974, 80), and the possible small hoard at Ballywillin (Briggs 1974). Further south, the mixed hoard from the crannog at Magheralagan dates to 875–950 (Briggs and Graham-Campbell 1976, 22) and the large hoard from a cairn on Scrabo Hill (Carruthers 1853; Hall 1974, 81; Woods 2013 II, 290–1) dates to the early/mid-twelfth century.

The presence of this material in the region does not necessarily imply the presence of settlements, especially seeing as many hoards occur at settlements not associable with the Scandinavian diaspora or in non-settlement contexts. The material might provide evidence of intensive interaction between local elites and that diaspora. It may be that certain trading, if not military, outposts may have been maintained from Dublin or elsewhere by agreement with local and regional elites. This might represent an alternative source for the Ulaid’s marriage alliance and the Strangford fleet referred to in Lebor na Cert (§X lines 1958–1961; Dillon 1962, 132–3) than that proposed in 6.4.1. Such an agreement might have emerged after the series of battles in the first half of the tenth century or during the political/military decline of Dublin in the eleventh century. It might also account for the potential survival of sites such as Inis Lachain and Larne played a role in these interactions, but comparatively little is known of the history of the north coast after the decline of the Cruithne nÉilne and Latharna in the documentary record. Thinking in terms of the resulsive processes introduced in 1.3.1, it is impossible to argue for a domination phase in Ulidia, but it may be that there was an element of incorporation at work, of settlement by agreement with settlers taking part in the local political system, similar to what occurred on a wider level in Limerick and Waterford (see Ó Riagáin 2010c).
Table 6.22. A summary of the evidence for the potential Scandinavian diasporic settlement at Larne and Inis Lachain (Loughan Island) and the evidence for possible continuity beyond the tenth century. See A.4.13 entries for full discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Larne</th>
<th>Inis Lachain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered inlet with several rivers meeting the sea, overlooks North Channel</td>
<td>River island close to mouth of the Bann, close to major fording point and prominent early ecclesiastic site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Several clearly visible, see LiDAR image, Forsythe and McConkey 2012, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Male weapon-furnished burial</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray finds</td>
<td>Woods Group F Hiberno-Scandinavian coin from Island Magee</td>
<td>Type H sword pommel; gold brooch; steatite vessel from mouth of Bann; reference to the “Sword of the Jarl” (AU1165.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toponyms</td>
<td>Ballylumford across harbour; Úlfreksfjörðr as former name of harbour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early references</td>
<td>?AU866.4</td>
<td>?AU866.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status associations</td>
<td>Later manor and borough centre</td>
<td>Easter house of king of Ulaid (MCB1165.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian diaspora</td>
<td>Site of (possibly fictional) battle between Einar of Orkney and Conchobar c.AD1018 (Orkneyinga saga §17)</td>
<td>Attacked by Orcadian fleet (AU1170.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later settlement</td>
<td>Borough of Drumallyss; port; cluster of parochial centres;</td>
<td>Manorial centre, possible village, parochial centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 Domination: Ergadia

6.7.1 Innsi Gall

The first reference in the Irish annals to secular events in western Scotland in over 150 years is to Muirchertach son of Niall of the Cenél nEógain plundering Innsi Alban [islands of Alba] (CS941) or Innsi Gall [islands of the foreigners] (AFM939.6) with a fleet. He may well have been attacking a fully consolidated colonial polity, even if its territorial extent might be somewhat uncertain (see McDonald 2008; Oram and Adderley 2011 for shifting territorial designation). It might originally have referred to Man, the Hebrides, and possibly even Orkney
and portions of mainland Britain, but it was used in Irish sources to at least AU1363.3 to refer to the (southern) Hebrides, with Man often referred to specifically (e.g. AU1073.5).

As discussed above in 6.4.2, Muirchertach son of Niall campaigned extensively against various Gáill groups AD919–43, as did his sons. His attack on the Hebrides (CS941) seems a northern extension of this activity, even if it was probably motivated by revenge for an earlier attack on Ailech that resulted in his capture and ransom (AU939.3). It perhaps demonstrates that groups in the Isles were becoming involved in an expanding Insular political sphere. As mentioned, the attack on the Cenél nEógain by Hególfr (AU921.7) might have been from the Hebrides as might the attack on an un-named son of Rǫgnvaldr, probably on Strangford (AU942.4). ASC937/A has Muirchertach’s enemy Óláfr Guðrøðarson of Dublin (and claimant to York) and Causantín of Scotland defeated at Brunanburh by Æthelstan. John of Worcester later describes him as “king of the Irish and many islands” (s.a. AD937, Thorpe 1848, 132; Etchingham 2001, 167). AClon931 (recte 937; Murphy 1896, 150–1) has a unique—possibly unreliable—list of the dead at the battle, including “Gebeachan king of the Islands”. Jennings (1994, 203) sees Gebeachán’s epithet as equivalent to later terms used for the kings of Innsi Gall. Etchingham (2001, 167) suggests he was “a local (south?) Hebridean magnate subordinate to Óláfr Guðrøðarson’s overlordship”, if he existed at all (Downham 2007, 183–4). This might explain Óláfr’s enemy Muirchertach’s 941 attack. His name might indicate that Gaelic naming practices were still in operation in the region, but it might have been due to intermarriage with Gaelic-speaking groups elsewhere.

The identification of further figures relies on more tenuous evidence. Contra Jennings (1994, 206–7), rather than being Innsi Gall, the Aéd Albanach in AFM939.13 is a late addition to a sparser CS941 entry based on a misplaced appearance of a daughter of Aéd Find’s son of Eochaid of Dál Riata (d.AU778.7) married to Tuirgéís (d.AU845.8) and in love with Cellachán of Cashel (d.AU954.7) in the propagandic twelfth-century saga Caithrēim Cellacháin Chaisil (CCC §29, Bugge 1905, 17–9). It should be noted, though, that the arguments for the CCC’s historicity have been demolished by Ó Corráin (1974, 54–7).

However, the mention of “Éiric righ na n-Innse” in the CCC (§§44–5, Bugge 1905, 25) might be more difficult to explain away, as Eiríkr Haraldsson was the last king of York (ASC954/D–E). Woolf (1998, 190) points to the appearance of this figure as king of York—without the patronym—in the tenth-century Vita de S. Cadroe Abbate Metis [life of Catroe, abbot of Metz], and his marriage to Catroe’s relative, a Strathclyde Briton (see Bolland 1668, 476; trans. Anderson 1922a, 441), while also noting that Dyfnal, king of Strathclyde was also Catroe’s relative. Eiríkr was unlikely to have been the Norwegian figure Eiríkr blóðøx, son of
the mythical Haraldr hárfagri, but could have been of the Uí Ímair (Downham 2007, 115–20; contra Smyth 1979, 176; cf. Ágríp §2, Driscoll 2008, 4–5; ASC952/E). Eiríkr’s connection to Innsi Gall in CCC might have been a late rationalisation of his position in York, but a connection with the Haraldssons of Innsi Gall (AD970×989) cannot entirely be ruled out, especially given Eiríkr’s marriage ties to Strathclyde. A link to the North Channel might be indicated by the presence of a penny of his in hoards from Iona, Machrie, Douglas (Man), and Derrykeighan (Dolley 1965, 33)—indicating participation in a wider network.

The appearance of Sigtryggr Cam, son of Óláfr Guðrøðarson, in Ireland supported by the Lagmenn, who subsequently campaigned in Mumu to avenge their brother Óin (AFM960.14[=AD962]), is an important step in the integration of the Isles into Irish politics. Sigtryggr Cam’s activity in Ireland represents the final stage of the exclusion of the Guðrøðarsons from power by the Sigtryggssons (see A.5 tables), and they disappear from the record with Óláfr Sigtryggsson (d.AT1034.2). The Lagmenn’s support indicates a continued connection between the Hebrides and the Guðrøðarsons, but whether the Isles continued to be in a subordinate position in this alliance cannot be determined.

The Lagmenn of the Isles are mentioned again in connection to a raid by Maccus Haraldsson on Scattery Island, with Ívarr of Limerick taken captive (AI974.2; AFM972.13). Woolf (2007, 213; cf. Ó Murchadha 1987) sees the references to na Ladgmain [from ON accusative Lǫgmann, ‘Lawman’] of Innsi Gall (AFM960.14; AFM972.13) as evidence of the possible social organisation of the Isles in this period, possibly along the lines of the provinces of the Swedish interior, ruled by assemblies of freeholders rather than adhering to an earldom model (cf. Jennings 1994, 99–100). However, the reference to two or more related individuals might hint at hereditary officeholders drawn from an elevated social class, that than elected officials of a farmer republic. They were likely the equivalent of holdar, hereditary landowners ranking below jarls (Swanton 2000, 94; cf. Norðleoda Laga, Liebermann 1903, 461; ASC911/C–D; Orkneyinga saga §58, §81–3, §111), potentially an equivalent to ‘lord’ or even ‘baron’ in some later contexts. This would accord better with the competitive display in earlier burials and with later references to the principes Insularum [princes/chiefs of (each of) the Isles] to whom the kings of Man were occasionally answerable (CRMI1075; CRMI1077; CRMI1098; CRMI1144). Gebeachán may well have held a similar position. This might lie behind the description of the Meic Suibhne of Knapdale as “lochlynnych is armyn eaid”, modernised by MacLauchlan and Skene to “Lochlanaigh is ármuinn iad” in the fourteenth-century poem Dál chabhlaigh ar Chaistéal Suibhne (MacGregor §263, ed. MacLauchlan and Skene 1862, 116–8, 151–4; ed. Meek 1997; discussed Simms 2007, 110–1; 2018, 436–40;
Jesch 2015). Ármuinn is a loanword from ON ármaðr, pl. ármenn, “stewards” or “officials of royal estates” (Simms 2007, 110–1; definition from Cleasby and Vigfusson 1874, 44; cf. Orkneyinga saga §§104–5, §117, for use in compound nouns: §§80–1).

The appearance of the Haraldssons in the documentary record is related to their activity outside the Hebrides (Table 6.23); up until then, they may have been engaged in an elimination contest with other elite families for control of the Hebrides. Haraldr Sigtryggsson, briefly king of Limerick (d.CS940) is a tempting potential father in light of the Haraldssons’ involvement in the region (Downham 2007, 253). However, he is more likely to be the father of Eiríkr Haraldsson, which would explain Eiríkr’s claim on York. Considering the timespan of Maccus and Guðrøðr’s, their father might have lived slightly later. While they were certainly active in Limerick and Munster, Haraldr seems to have been imposed on Limerick from Dublin (A.5), with the other kings of Limerick not of the Uí Ímair prior to, and possibly after this. The history of Islesmen’s involvement with Limerick might extend back to Hególfr’s attack on Limerick’s outpost at Lough Foyle (AU921.7), or perhaps even to the ninth century.

Table 6.23. Activity of the Haraldssons of the Isles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maccus Haraldsson, 970×984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plundered Penmon on Anglesey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference at Chester with Edgar of Wessex, Cináed of Alba, Máel Colm of Strathclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plundered Scattery Island with Lagmenn, made circuit of Ireland, carried off Ívarr, lord of Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on losing side of Battle of Tara with Gaill of the Islands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naval expedition to Waterford, allied with Brian and Dál gCais, attacked Dublin, Osraige and Uí Cennselaig together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guðrøðr Haraldsson, 971×989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devastated Anglesey (or Man), subjugated whole island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devastated Llýn Peninsula and Anglesey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on losing side of Battle of Tara with Gaill of the Islands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naval expedition to Waterford, allied with Brian and Dál gCais, attacked Dublin, Osraige and Uí Cennselaig together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attacked Anglesey, Maredudd driven to Ceredigion and Dyfed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devastated Dyfed and Mynyw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(probably) imposed tribute on Maredudd son of Owain of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guðrøðr’s son Rǫgnvaldr (d.AU1005.1) seems to have succeeded him in *Innsi Gall*. He might be identified as the Ua Arailt noted as dying in Mumu in AI1004.5, and Wadden (2016, 174) suggests that he may have been part of Brian Borúma’s retinue, and thus that the kingdom of the Isles may have recognised Brian’s overlordship in this period. However, it is equally likely that this Ua Arailt was a descendent of Haraldr of Limerick and had no connection to the Isles.

Ágrip (§23) has Hákon Eiríksson (d.ASC1030/C) installed as king of the Suðreyjar (the Hebrides, “southern islands”, or *Innsi Gall*) by Óláfr inn helgi in the early eleventh century. The historicity of this event is doubtful (Campbell 1949, 72; Driscoll 2008, 97 note 78; Woolf 2007, 246) and might be related to claims on the Hebrides by the kings of Norway when Ágrip was produced c.AD1190 (Section 7.6). It might also be an attempt to cover up Hákon’s installation as ruler of Norway by Knútr at Óláfr’s expense (ASC1028/D–E). Eiríkr and Hákon, appear as attestors in several of Knútr’s English charters (A.6.2.4). Hákon was earl of the area around Worcester under Knútr (Keynes 1994, 61–2; Bolton 2017, 97, 154–7). Hákon’s father Eiríkr was the son of Hákon Sigurðarson, potentially the first king to rule all of Norway (Adam of Bremen, Schmeidler 1917, 94), and earl of Northumbria under Knútr (ASC1016/D–E; ASC1017/D–E) and ruler of Norway under or in alliance with Sveinn and Knútr (*Encomium Emmae*, II §7, Campbell 1949, 22–3; see Keynes 1994, 57–8; Gazzoli 2011, 55–6, 65–6). It is conceivable that he might have ruled *Innsi Gall*, but probably only as part of a much wider set of holdings if he did.

Echmarcach Rǫgnvaldsson (d.AU1064.9), Máel Coluim and Mac Bethad later submitted to Knútr (ASC1031/E; kings not named in ASC1031/D). It might be that he succeeded Hákon, or some other supporter of Knútr, rather than his father Rǫgnvaldr. Duffy (1992, 96–9; 2015, 13–9) identifies Echmarcach with Waterford, as son of either Rǫgnvaldr Ívarrsson or Rǫgnvaldr Rǫgnvaldsson (see A.6.2.2 tables). However, Echmarcach’s activity places him in the north, and Hudson (1992, 355–6; 2005, 128–9) and Etchingham (2001, 180–4) correctly identify him as the son of Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson. Echmarcach represents both the highpoint and endpoint of an independent *Innsi Gall*, periodically winning (AT1036.8; AT1046.6) and losing (AT1038.1; AT1052.2) the kingship of Dublin and Man to the Laigin, with Norwegian allies (AU1061.3; Sturluson *Haralds saga Sigurðarsonar* §§54–5, ed. Jónsson 1893c, 149–51,}
trans. Hollander 1964, 618–9; see Hudson 2005, 142–4) to dying in Rome as rex *Innnarenn* (Marianus Scottus, *Chronicon* s.a. 1087[=AD1064×1065], ed. Waitz and Kilon 1844, 559; cf. AU1064.9; *Annála Geara*, Mac Niocaill 1959, 339). This has been identified as *na Renna* or the Rhinns of Galloway in southwest Scotland (Byrne 1982; Duffy 1992, 98–9; Hudson 1992, 356; cf. Anderson 1922a, 592, who places it in Roscommon). Considering that Iona held four churches and their adjacent land on the River Dee in Kirkcudbrightshire until AD1172×1174 (Hay 1840, 41 no. 51), the holdings have been granted this by Echmarcach or his immediate ancestors, or perhaps one of their Uí Ímair rivals. This might in turn demonstrate that this kingdom of *na Renna* included the entire series of headlands and their adjacent territory extending east to Dumfries, rather than just including the hammer-head pairing at Galloway’s eastern end. That it was related to the kingdoms of Dublin, Man and the Isles might be demonstrated through AI1094.5, which notes the killing of Macc Congail, *rí na Rend*, who Byrne (1982) suggests he was the son of Fingall Guðrøðarson, described as succeeding his father Guðrøðr Sigtryggsson in CRMI1051[=AD1071]. Fingall seems to have been displaced by Guðrøðr Cró Bhán Ívarsson in AD1075 (see CRMI1056[=AD1075–1095], and it may be that Fingall continued to rule *na Renna* subsequent to this.

Echmarcach’s sons failed to win back Man supported by their Ua Briain cousins and the Ulaid (CRMI1182[=AD1087]; AU1087.1). After twenty years under the Laigin, the kingship of Man and the Isles passed to two branches of the Dublin Sigtryggssons, with the Manx Haraldssons descended from Guðrøðr ‘Crovan’ Haraldsson (d.AU1095.11) holding it with few interruptions from c.AD1075 to AD1265 (A.5), a period that corresponds to the decline of Dublin as an independent kingdom in the late eleventh century (McDonald 2008).

Contemporary to the Lagmenn and Haraldssons are the first references to a bishop of the Isles, Fothad (AFM961.1), and to a bishop of Iona, Fingin (CS966). Rather than their holding the same office, they would seem to have had bishoprics focussed on Man and Iona, respectively. Considered along with Óláfr (Cuarán) Sigtryggsson’s retirement to Iona after losing the Battle of Tara (AT980.6), and he may have patronised certain Columban sites prior to this (see Woolf 2002). This might indicate that Christianity had become prevalent among the settler community by this time. He had been baptised by Edmund of England in ASC943/D, as seemingly was his rival Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson. However, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, it would be another 200 years or more before ecclesiastic life in Ergadia beyond Iona would be recorded with any regularity, which has more to do with the proclivities of contemporary chroniclers than any lack of activity, as demonstrated by the sculptural and excavated evidence from Kingarth, Inchmarnock and Lismore.
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6.7.2 Dál Riata, Gall-Goídil and Airer Gáedel

It is argued here that the displacement/replacement of the pre-colonial population was not total. Lorn and Cowal (Bute excluded) have the lowest concentration of ON-derived settlement toponyms (Maps 3.24–3.28); it might be possible to add Knapdale and Morvern to them. They also have stronger evidence for continuity of settlement than the Hebrides and Kintyre, including at Dunollie (A.3.10). There is also some slight textual evidence for continuity (Table 6.24). Bute is a more complex case; while there is strong evidence for continuity at Inchmarnock and Kingarth, and possible reoccupation at Little Dunagoil, there are several ON toponyms on the island and several examples of transculturation in Christian sculpture (A.3.11). Whether this was due to direct settlement or proximity to a wider sphere of settlement is difficult to determine.

Along with the discussion on the Gall-Goídil in ninth century Ireland in Section 6.3.4, this is the context within which the AU1034.10 obit of Suibne son of Cináed, “ri Gall-Gaidhel” should be understood, rather than looking forward to the high-medieval marcher territory of Galloway. It is proposed here that Suibne was ruler of a group, ‘the foreign Gaels’, rather than a strongly defined territory, similar to most pre-modern forms of rulership (see Hirst 2005). If this is kept in mind, it is easier to understand how the term Gall-Goídil came to be applied to a territory elsewhere. As demonstrated in Tables 6.25–6.27, Suibne and the Gall-Goídil might be best placed in eleventh-century Cowal, or at least around the Clyde.

Table 6.24. Possible references to continuity in Dál Riata in northern Britain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Named</th>
<th>Associations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>Death of abbot</td>
<td>Ioseph, Abbot of Armagh</td>
<td>Cenél Loairn</td>
<td>AU936.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dál Riata</td>
<td>Danes off the coast</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haraldssons?</td>
<td>AU986.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>Plundered by Danes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AU986.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dál Riata</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Haraldsson killed in (AU) or by Dál Riata (AT)</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Haraldsson</td>
<td></td>
<td>AU989.4; AT989.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.25. Gall-Goídil in Irish martyrologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information (position in main text)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>(comp.) MS Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balaan [sic] epicop Cinn garad hi nGallgaïdaïb (second)</td>
<td>MO 10 August gloss, Rawlinson B505</td>
<td>(12th C) 14×15th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1905, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] Chinn garadh dó .i. a n-Gallgaïdaïb (second)</td>
<td>MO 10 August gloss, UCD Franciscan MS A7</td>
<td>(12th C) c.AD1470</td>
<td>Stokes 1905, 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teit Donnan in Gallgaïdelu</td>
<td>MO 17 April gloss, Rawlinson B512</td>
<td>(12th C) 15×16th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1905, 116 (Clancy 2008, 33–4; Downham 2015, 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teit Donnan <em>cona</em> muintir in Gallgaïdel […]</td>
<td>MO 17 April gloss, Laud 610</td>
<td>(12th C) 15th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1905, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaani Ep. Cinngaradh in Gallghaïdaïbh Udnochtán [sic]. (first, ahead of Tallaght material, probable insertion by copyist)</td>
<td>MT main text 10 August, Lebor Laigin</td>
<td>(12th C) 12th C</td>
<td>Best and Lawlor 1931, 62; Clancy 2008, 29–32; Dumville pers. comm. in Downham 2015, 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epscop, ó Chinn Garadhi in nGâl-ghaoidhealaïbh</td>
<td>MG 10 August gloss, Brussels BR MS 5100–4</td>
<td>(1156×1173) 17th C</td>
<td>Stokes 1893, 154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.26. Further references to Gall-Goídil prior to existence of Galloway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ega nomen fontis in nAlsadain, .i. carrac eter Gallgaïdelu 7 Cend Tiri</td>
<td>Egg is the name of a well on Ailsa Craig, a rock between Gall Goídil and Kintyre</td>
<td>12th C LL composer trying to locate Eigg, confuses it with Ailsa Craig</td>
<td>Ó Riain 1985, 166 §717 (cf. Clancy 2008, 33–4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galwendienses ita construixit, et cogeret cos materias lignorum caedere et ad litus portare ad munitiones construendas.</td>
<td>He compelled the Gall-Goídil [on Man?] to cut timber and bring it to the shore for the construction of forts.</td>
<td>timber tribute and from “Galwendienses” to build forts on Man by Magnús of Norway</td>
<td>CRMI1098 [=AD1102?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galwenses ×9, ocisis prius duabus eorum ducibus Wulgrico et Duuenaldo.</td>
<td>the two leaders of the Galwenses, Ulgric and Domnall were killed</td>
<td>several references to Gall-Goídil in David I’s army at Battle of the Standard</td>
<td>Howlett 1886, 186–198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…] transfretaverunt ad</td>
<td>[…] went to the [area of] attack on “Gaiwedia”</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRMI1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Date (AD)</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et decimam caseorum de can scilicet de Galweia et dimidietatem coriorum</td>
<td>grant of food renders of <em>Galweia</em> at foundation of Selkirk Abbey by</td>
<td>c.1120</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 26–8 §35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coquinae meae</td>
<td>David earl of Northumberland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus de Galweia, Uhtred son of Fergus</td>
<td>attester of grant by David I to Glasgow</td>
<td>1131×1141</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 85–6 §109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus de Galweia</td>
<td>attester of grant by David I to Glasgow of teind from his holdings in</td>
<td>1131×1141</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 95–6 §125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strathgryfe, Cunningham, Kyle and Carrick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus de Galweia</td>
<td>attester of grant by David I to Glasgow of eighth penny of please in</td>
<td>1131×1141</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 96 §126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et decimam animalium et pororum et caseorum de can de quatuor cadrez de</td>
<td>grant of food renders of <em>Galweia</em> by David I to Kelso Abbey</td>
<td>1131×1153</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 156–9 §194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ili Galweia quam vivente rege Alexandro habui per unumquemque annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donation of Dunrod to Holyrood Abbey</td>
<td>1161×1164</td>
<td>PoMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donation of Tynholm to Holyrood Abbey</td>
<td>1161×1164</td>
<td>PoMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus on Cowal visible in Tables 6.25–6.27 might help explain the insertion of a series of references describing an alliance between Colmán Becc of Mide in alliance with Conall son of Comgall, progenitor of the Cenél Comgaill, in a series of raids in the Hebrides (AU567.2, AU568.1, AFM565.3; cf. AI568.1; AFM572.2). The references do not appear in the Clonmacnoise annals and thus possibly postdate the *Chronicle of Ireland, meaning that they likely date to the eleventh century, exactly when Gall-Goidil was being used to refer to Cowal. The references might be a way of making sense of the Gall-Goidil–Mide alliance in the mid-ninth century, discussed above. It does not mean, though, that Cowal was occupied continuously by groups identifying themselves as Gaels, the area may have been drawn into a new socio-political configuration during the decline of York and Dublin, AD954–1014.

The confusion over the location of Eigg (Table 6.26) might have been compounded by its actual location in what would become known as northern Aierer Gaedel [coast of Gaels, Argyll] (Barrow 1999, 144 §185). It is proposed here that Gall-Goidil and Aierer Gaedel were both used in Irish sources to refer to Gaels in northern Britain, similar to AU1165.8’s reference to Máel Coluim son of Henry (Malcolm IV) as of the “Gaidhil by the sea on the east”. The distinction was possibly related to a growing sense of, if not a national identity in Ireland, then at least a differentiation between Gael and Gaill in Ireland and the Gaels in Ireland and those elsewhere. Both might have functioned as the starting point for the spread of Gaelic into the islands over the subsequent three centuries (see Clancy 2010). The term Argyll only seems to have gained currency in the twelfth century (Tables 6.28–6.29), and the distinction between Argyll and Kintyre at this point might have been important (Woolf 2004, 102), even if Somerled mac Gille-Brighde would seem to have held both when he suddenly appears in the historical sources from AD1153 onwards (CHol1153; Tables 6.28–6.29).

The terms might have been used interchangeably up until the rises of Somerled and Fergus necessitated a more explicit division, especially with the growing divergence in their spheres of activity. Alternatively, Argyll might have referred to territory centred on Lorn and Gall-Goidil to a group centred on Cowal. The name Gall-Goidil would seem to have moved south with Fergus and his descendants as they acquired more and more territory (Clancy 2008, 36–9) after the collapse of Strathclyde. It is only in the AD1160s that Fergus de Galwedia can be definitively tied to Galloway (Table 6.27). The territory was subsequently divided between Fergus’s heirs Gille Bhrighde (AKA Gilbert) and Uhtred into Carrick in the north and Galloway in the south at the end of the twelfth century, before being expropriated by the Scottish crown in the thirteenth century, with the Anglo-Norman Stewarts coming to dominate the area around the Clyde (Oram 1993; Brown 2004, 78–9).
Table 6.28. Early charter references to Argyll.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>et medietatem meae decimae de meom cano et de meis placitis et lucris de Kentyr et de Errogeil</td>
<td>Charter by David I confirming property and privileges of Holyrood Abbey</td>
<td>1141–1147</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 116–9 §143; Barrow 1999, 123–4 §147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et concedo eidem ecclesie dimidiam partem decimi mei de Ergaithel et de Kentir</td>
<td>Charter by David I confirming property and privileges of Dunfermline Abbey</td>
<td>1150–1152</td>
<td>Barrow 1999, 136–9 §172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et concede eidem ecclesie dimidiam ‘partem/ decimi de Ergeithil et Kentir. eo scilicet anno quando ego ipse inde recepero Can</td>
<td>Confirmation by Malcolm IV of grant by David I (Christmas after agreement with Somerled)</td>
<td>1154–1159</td>
<td>Barrow 1984a, 182–5 §118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Confirmation of grant to Dunfermline by David I by William I</td>
<td>c.1166</td>
<td>Barrow 1984b, 140–3 §30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idem</td>
<td>Confirmation of grant to Holyrood by David I by William I</td>
<td>c.1166</td>
<td>Barrow 1984b, 148–9 §39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.29. Early chronicle references to Argyll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[…] a Manaind, ocus a Sei, ocus a Loodus; a Cind Tiri, ocus a Airer Goedel […]</td>
<td>List of participants at Clontarf in 1014 on the side of Dublin and the Laigin [back projection]</td>
<td>early 12th C</td>
<td>Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh, Todd 1867, 152–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[…] gur tobhaigsiot an cios rioghdha Shaxan acus Bretan, acus Lemnaigh [Lennox] […] Alban, acus Airer Gaoidhel uile […]</td>
<td>Levies (claimed as) raised by Brian Bóruma</td>
<td>early 12th C</td>
<td>Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh, Todd 1867, 152–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airir Gaedhel</td>
<td>Dispute over Somerled’s appointment of Ua Brolcháin as abbot of Iona</td>
<td>late 12th C</td>
<td>AU1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerledus, regulus de Arregaidele</td>
<td>attacked Renfrew with army of Hybermensium [Irish], killed</td>
<td>late 12th C</td>
<td>CMRH s.a.1164, Stubbs 1868, 449–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerledus regulus Eregeithel</td>
<td>attacked Renfrew with army from Ybernia [Ireland]</td>
<td></td>
<td>CMe1164;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Galienses, Argaidenses and Albanici | Gaill, people from Argyll and Alba in Somerled’s army | late 12th C | Interfectio Sumerledi in Skene 1871, 449; Woolf 2013

Somairle mac Gilla Bhrighde, ri Indsi Gall & Cind Tire | allied with Dublin, killed along with son by “men of Alba” | late 12th C | AT1164.6

The appearance of Somerled and Argyll in the historical record was part of a wider process of realignment of the political geography of northern Britain and the Irish Sea. Somerled’s challenge for the kingship of Man effected the formation of polities centred on Man, Islay and Lorn, to accompany the series of marcher lordships ringing Scotland from Galloway to Orkney (see Brown 2004; McDonald 2008; Oram 2011; Crawford 2013). This realignment could have led to the redistribution of land to followers, changing local elites and potentially effecting linguistic change, just as with the settlement of the Hebrides in the ninth century. Each negotiated a complex, shifting set of alliances with one another, and with the kings of England, Scotland and Norway, as well as various Irish kings, indicating that the leaders of each were comfortable in a range of cultural and political milieux. Its development will be taken up again in Chapter 7.

6.8 Transculturation

To close the chapter, it would be worth examining some examples of transculturation (see 1.3.2) in action. While the use of coins, certain forms of personal adornment, dress and weaponry, language, and living in towns might all have been adopted due to transcultural interaction and transculturation, a discussion of transculturation in Christian stone sculpture is informative of changes in belief and artistic practices working in both directions. The largest corpus of this example of this transcultural colonial innovation is on Man, with 26 examples of tenth/eleventh-century runic inscriptions, compared to 33 from Norway (Wilson and Klindt-Jensen 1980). However, the incorporation of motifs more traditionally associable with art in Scandinavia into Christian sculpture is also visible in other areas associated with the Úi Ímair, such as Strathclyde, Cumbria–Cheshire and Strathclyde (Griffiths 2010, 143–56). Shifts in fashions and styles found over time in Scandinavia also occur in the Insular Zone, albeit in innovative ways and rarely in Ireland (Graham Campbell 2013). Useful for dating purposes, it also provides an important corrective to a historical narrative that rarely mentions movement between Scandinavia and Britain and Ireland between the era of the Great Army and Denmark’s
invasion of England, and even less so in northern Britain and Ireland (seemingly AU853.2–AT1038.4).

Turning to Ergadia (Map 6.7), runic inscriptions appear on two graveslabs otherwise displaying more traditional, regional Christian art motifs, at Iona (Fisher 2001, 16) and Inchmarnock (Fisher 2001, 77–9). Another example occurs further north, at Barra (Fisher 2001, 107). A cross-shaft from Iona has a pictorial representation of a smith and a boat complete with crew, possibly further indication of Scandinavian-style motifs (Fisher 2001, 14). In addition, there is a cross head executed on Manx slate (Fisher 2001, 11), perhaps indicative of Iona’s connections with Man in this period. The use of Ringerike-style ornamentation on a cross-slab from Dòid Mhàiri on Islay (Fisher 2001, 10) might be further evidence of this cultural negotiation/innovation, as might the series of motifs appearing in the Kingarth assemblage (2001, 73–7), and Inchmarnock. Fisher (2001, 9) sees the non-Iona examples as having much in common with the fashions prevalent in Strathclyde and Northumbria in the tenth–eleventh centuries, rather than Man.
Map 6.7. Map of sculpture with either runes or scenes depicting Scandinavian mythology among otherwise Christian motifs, along with sum of furnished burials and Viking Age cremations, overlain on sum of EMP–VA sculpture from ecclesiastic sites (following Fisher 2001), including high crosses, and heatmap of Old Norse habitative toponyms (including topographic names used habitatively), furnished burials and along with high-medieval churches and chapels. Heatmap radius set at 3km with maximum value of 3 (i.e., darkest patches contain 3 sites or more within a
3km radius). Note that all sculptural forms converge on Iona, including several high crosses; precedence is given here to the runic and mythological scenes.

6.8.1 Brooches and pins
As visible in Chapters 3–4, items of personal adornment such as ring-headed pins, penannular and pseudo-penannular brooches figure prominently in furnished burials in Ergadia and Ireland (Figures 3.50–3.54, 4.17: Tables 3.12–3.14; Graham-Campbell and Batey 1998, 150; Harrison and Ó Floinn 2014, 148–59). Similar items are found in graves in Scandinavia (Wamers 1985; 2011; Graham-Campbell 2001; Glørstad 2010; 2012; 2014; Heen-Pettersen 2013; 2014), which might be taken as evidence for Insular fashions being imported into Scandinavia via the migration streams that were opened up during the Viking Age. So too the evidence for brooch production in Norway. Graham-Campbell (2011, 99–100) discusses two examples from Kaupang displaying what he sees as “Pictish and Irish” characteristics were most likely manufactured in western Norway, where “examples of actual Pictish-style brooches have been found”. Another such example might be from Karmøy (Wamers 1985, 111).

It would seem as though this flow of material is a different phenomenon to the flow of plundered and repurposed objects to Scandinavia during the early decades of viking raids in western Europe. That is not to say that items of jewellery were not also plundered. However, if bossed pseudo-penannular brooches date to the tenth century, then the appearance of items such as the brooches found in graves gendered female at Snåsa and Bjugn in the Trøndelag area (Glørstad 2010, 63–4; Heen-Pettersen 2014, 8–9) are part of more complex social phenomena. Glørstad (2014) explores some interesting avenues in relation to their linkage to ethnic and other forms of colonial identity. Graham-Campbell (2001, 36) sees such brooches as examples of exotic material being used to portray social messages, such as the status of the wearer. Glørstad (2010, 124) suggests that such items were brought to Scandinavia along well-established networks and wearing such an item or being buried with it “may well indicate that the women, or at least their families, had a particularly important role within these overseas networks” (see Heen-Pettersen 2014, 9). That is not to say that they were solely the preserve of women—there may be regional variation at work. Pedersen (2014, 132–3) notes that large penannular brooches and ring-headed pins were associated with graves gendered male at Birka, while smaller penannular brooches were associated with graves gendered female. The statement about ring-headed pins would certainly accord well with the series of furnished graves catalogued by her. In the Ergadia graves, ring-headed pins were found in 5/9 graves gendered male, 2/6 female, 2/4 neutral, with one penannular brooch from a further male and
female grave, and a silver pin also from each (Appendix 3).

Whether one sees them as metonymic or indexical (Jones 2007), such items could represent the memory of a colonial career either directly or through gifting or heirlooming, becoming “imbued with the essence of the owner” (see Klevnäs 2016). Their association with certain identities may have triggered a cycle of emulative practice, with the items of personal adornment worn by individuals with connections to wider networks involving the movement of people either directly or indirectly adopted by a wider section of society through the production of copies. In some instances, it might be difficult to tell such items apart without the use of XRF techniques.

6.9 Conclusion

Although subject to the same processes in the contact phase, the two case-study regions had very different fates after this. The colonial episode in Ulidia does not seem to have gotten past the consolidation phase, even if there was evidence of local collusion and support from the centre of colonial power in Dublin. This failure to acquire in Ulidia the permanence found elsewhere might have been a result of the loss of York and the financial and political pressure put on Dublin, Limerick and Waterford by centralising Irish elites. There is very little physical burial or settlement evidence associated with the activities of the Scandinavian diaspora in Ulidia, nor are there many toponymic indications of such activity. Moreover, there is no fall-off in the traditional forms of settlement in the region in the Viking Age, as demonstrated in Chapter 4.

Conversely, while direct physical settlement associated with the Scandinavian diaspora in Ergadia is also lacking, the large number of furnished burials, habitative toponyms and fall-off in the traditional forms of enclosed settlement demonstrate that localised innovation due to inward migration did occur. That the Hebrides became known as “the islands of foreigners”, in contradistinction to a possible continuity in parts of the adjacent British mainland, “the coast of Gaels”, or from an Irish perspective, the “foreign [as in, not originating in Ireland] Gaels” is illustrative of the changes wrought. Ergadia almost disappears from the textual record in this period. When it re-emerges in the mid-tenth century, it seems to have a hierarchical society based on kings and local ‘big-men’ (the Lagmenn?), with key farms in several of the islands having Old Norse names. However, the displacement of the pre-colonial population might not have been total; the lower orders of society may have remained as low-status tenants of an elite that continued to speak a different language. This might not necessitate a genocide/democide-
based interpretation (cf. Barrett 2003; 2005; contra Macniven 2006; 2013a; 2015; Jennings and Kruse 2009), even if it is doubtful that the arrival of settlers and seizure of land was not without its horrific acts of violence. Neither case study was cut off from wider socio-political processes, the kings of *Innsi Gaill* only survive three generations in the historical record before becoming subsumed into Irish, Manx and Scottish politics AD1050–1290.

These events might shed some light on the motivations behind the arrival of a fleet in the Insular Zone led by Magnús Haraldsson from Norway in AD1058. AT1058.4, referring to him only as the son of the king of Norway/Scandinavia, has him acting in alliance with the *Gaill* of the Orkneys, *Innsi Gaill*, and Dublin to attempt to seize England. ASC1058/D notes the presence of a Norwegian fleet directly after stating that Ælfgar, erstwhile earl of Mercia and East Anglia, was restored with the help of Grufudd of Gwynedd. John of Worcester states that Ælfgar and Grufudd were unexpectedly aided by the Norwegian fleet (Thorpe 1848, 207), with CMel1058 having the three acting in alliance, AC1078/B[=AD1058], AC380/C[=AD1058] and Brut1056[=1058] explicitly name Magnús Haraldsson, but are less specific on the nature of his activity in England with Grufudd. Woolf (2007, 263–71) has speculated that the Norwegian force’s original intension was to obtain the submission of Orkney, before becoming involved in the Scottish succession dispute and other events further south. Before establishing himself in Dublin and Man, Guðrøðr Crovan fought under Haraldr at Stamford Bridge (CRMI1047) as part of another Norwegian attempt to seize England. This sets in context the events leading up to the arrival of Magnús berfœttr Óláfsson in Man, the Isles and Ireland and his subsequent death in Ulidia (AU1098.2 AU1102.7; AU1103.6). This demonstrates a socio-political connection with the perceived homeland several centuries after the initial migration—a demonstration of a continued diasporic identity.

Finally, the two brief discussions of transculturation in relation to material practices demonstrate that the textual narrative is very much focused on Insular events, from which might be read that the colonial elite had very little to do with the colonial homeland. The material evidence illustrates that flows of people and ideas continued throughout the contact, expansion, consolidation and resultive phases, even if mass wealth extraction seems to have slowed down once a transculturated settler identity began to form in the second half of the ninth century.
Chapter 7. The Angevin Era, c.AD1150–1400

7.1 Introduction
Similar to Chapters 5 and 6, the narrative textual evidence will be used to frame the analysis, which will be structured in terms of the colonial model and associated theoretical material outlined in Chapter 1. Chapter 5 focussed more on Ergadia, with the focus slightly more equal in Chapter 6. Here the focus will mainly be on Ulidia, as it is Ulidia that the colonial model involving expansion–consolidation–domination can be clearly seen in action. In this instance, the far-greater amount of surviving textual evidence enables a detailed outline of the actions of John de Courcy, under whose leadership the expansion, consolidation and domination processes took place in Ulidia. This provides important insight into how the processes discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 might have taken place. However, the processes at work in Ergadia will also be outlined prior to a discussion of the outcomes of colonial activity in Ulidia in this period so as to provide both balance and perspective.

7.2 Contact: Ulidia
The arrival of Anglo-Norman soldiers to intervene in the Irish political scene on behalf of Diarmaid Mac Murchadha of the Laigin in the late 1160s resulted in their establishing a large lordship in the southeast of Ireland. Such a marcher lordship, even if theoretically subservient to the king of England and a useful ‘safety valve’ to remove potential forces of instability at the core of the kingdom to its periphery (see Tilly 1992, 70–1, 183–5; Elias 2000, 195–273), could also pose a potential threat to the king’s central authority. To counteract this, Henry II arrived in Ireland in 1171 (AI1171.6) to bring these territories on a Dublin–Waterford axis under royal control. The kings of several Irish polities acknowledged Henry II as their overking; Donn Shléibhe Ua h-Eochada, king of Ulaid, did so in along with Tigernán Ua Ruairc (MCB1172.5; full list Flanagan 1989, 308–11). Ua Ruairc was killed by Hugh de Lacy the following year—an early indication to contemporaries that Henry II’s protection was perhaps to be doubted. Furthermore, the submission did not stop the garrisons based at Dublin and other locations from raiding into the outlying territories (AT1176.7). This might have been due to arrears in their pay (Dimock 1867, 339), or merely the actions of soldiers in similar situations elsewhere in space and time.

These events were part of a much longer process of interaction. There is strong evidence
for the role of the Irish Sea as a political connector throughout recorded history, as has been seen in Chapters 5–7. In many respects the arrival of the Anglo-Normans in Ireland was colonialism within a shared cultural milieu (see Gosden 2004 for concept; Davies 2000). This is easy to forget due to the influence of easily accessible texts as the *Expugnatio* and *Topographia*, both of which are very much part of a literature of colonialism justifying conquest/rule in terms of cultural superiority and the proper versus improper use of land (Bartlett 1993, 96–101; cf. More 2016[1516], 57). To take some examples, Muirchertach Ua Briain, then the most powerful ruler in Ireland, is recorded as entering into a marriage alliance with the “Francaigh & Lochlannaigh”, i.e., the ‘French [or ‘Normans’] and Scandinavians’ (AI1102.6), and his family had major interests on Man c.AD1050–1100 (Duffy 1992). Diarmaid mac Máel na mBó, king of Laigin, made himself king of Dublin (CS1052) and Man (AT1061.3 has his son taking tribute and defeating Echmarcach), while also sheltering Harold and Leofwine Godwinson in AD1051–2 (ASC1051/C; ASC1052/D–E[=AD1051]; identified *Vita Ædwardi Regis*, line 533, Luard 1858, 404) and probably providing ships for their invasion of England the following year (ASC1052/C–D).

Prior to the major reforms of the Irish Church in the twelfth century, Canterbury had been making serious inroads into the organisation of the church in Ireland (Flanagan 1989, 7–55; 2010, 6–9). Mac Murchadha himself had a long history of interaction with Henry II—his choice of destination after being ousted from his kingship was no accident (Martin 1987, 48–52; Flanagan 1989, 55–80). Further chronicle evidence has the Cenél nEógain found fighting against (CRMI1144[=AD1156]) *and* forming alliances with (CRMI1176[=AD1177]) the kings of Man. The Cenél nEógain are also found fighting against Orcadians (AFM1170.25), the Ua Briain (CRMI1075[=AD1095]; AFM1096.8; AI1111.5) and the Dál Fiatach in Man (AU1087.7) and Óláfr, the heir apparent of Man at the court of Henry I (CRMI1098).

**7.3 Expansion: Ulidia**

None of the available sources give a complete and un-biased account of the establishment of the colony in Ulidia. However, a basic narrative can be pieced together by combining the Irish English and Manx chronicles/annals, charters and two near-contemporary literary/historical accounts. The history of Anglo-Norman Ulidia is tied up with the agency exercised by a series of key individuals who were subject to the wider processes ongoing at the time. The establishment of the colony is down to the agency of John de Courcy, a relatively late arrival in Ireland in the mid-1170s. It has been demonstrated that John de Courcy was a member of a
cadet branch of the English de Courcys based in northwest England rather than the main line based in Somerset (Flanagan 1999; Duffy 1995b; Flanders 2007). It is also to northwest England that the core of his entourage and the early leading figures in the lordship of Ulster mentioned in the charter evidence c.AD1178–1204 can be traced (Duffy 1995b).

John de Courcy’s ousting of the ruling Meic Dúinn Shléibhe branch of the Dál Fiachrach from their seat at Downpatrick and dispossessing them of their overkingdom of Ulaid is described in a number of contemporary chronicles (AU1171.1; AT1177.3; MCB1178.1; Gesta Henricii I, 137; Chronica Magistri II, 20; William of Newburgh III.9; CRMI1176[=AD1177]). This indicates the events’ perceived importance to contemporaries. Until recently, however, two literary sources have played an overly dominant role in their scholarly discussion.

The *Song of Dermot and the Earl* (Orpen 1892, 198–9 In 2733–6; my translation) recounts:

A un Johan Uluestere,  
Si a force la peust conquere;  
De Curti out a nun Johan,  
Ki pus i suffri meint ahan  

To one John: [he granted] Ulster,  
If he could conquer it by force;  
Courcy was the name of this John,  
Who afterward suffered there many hardships

Orpen (1913a, 32) sees this as de Courcy having been granted something of a blank cheque by Henry II, stating “the original grant or licence to John de Courcy included so much of the northern province as he could conquer”. The text dates to the thirteenth century and is thus retrospective and probably over-simplifying things. Flanagan (1989, 258–9) notes, “there is, however, no independent evidence that John de Courcy had accompanied Henry to Ireland” and that such a grant would be inconsistent with the king’s general policy of relations with Irish kings outside Leinster and Mide at the time. It was noted above that the Ulaid had submitted to Henry II; however, it was also noted how reliable the king’s protection was.

The fullest description of the de Courcy’s early activities in Ireland are found in the *Expugnatio* (§II.15, §§II.17–18), despite the author leaving “his great deeds to be more fully related by future historians” (Wright 1894, 282). In some respects, the rags-to-riches story presented by Giraldus is a literary device to contrast against opponents of Geraldus’s FitzGerald cousins who were active in Ireland at the time. Furthermore, similar to many commentators on the period, down to Orpen and Otway-Ruthven, the admiration held by the author for de Courcy is plainly evident (Duffy 1995a, 1–3). There is something of the romantic in the apparent fulfilment of a prophecy in the seizure of kingdom against enemies numbering their thousands by de Courcy, 22 knights and about 300 soldiers, who had been languishing in Dublin without
regular pay and half-starved (Dimock 1867, 339). However, the romantic and the real are rarely found together, and recent scholars have questioned the accuracy of this narrative (Flanagan 1989; Duffy 1995a; 1995b; 1997; less so Flanders 2008, 144–7).

John de Courcy seems to have arrived in the entourage of William fitz Audelin, appointed royal administrator by Henry II in the wake of the death of de Clare in April 1976 (Flanagan 1989, 259). Flanagan (1989, 259) draws attention to Roger of Howden’s (GRRH I, 137) discussion of de Courcy’s incursion into Ulidia. Here, Roger states that de Courcy’s actions were “against the prohibition of William fitz Audelin, who presided over him”, something also stated by Giraldus, if only to compare de Courcy’s action vs fitz Audelin’s decadence.

While the provisions of the 1275 Treaty of Windsor offering protection to those Irish kings and lords who submitted to Henry II were being bent, if not broken, in the two years since being agreed, there is no mention of Ulidia in the provisions made at the Council of Oxford in 1177 (Flanagan 1989, 259). AT1177.3 might be significant in this respect—its unique details of de Courcy’s imprisonment after his campaign against the Ulaid might preserve evidence of a reaction by Ruaidrí Ua Conchobair, official overlord of Ireland outside the Anglo-Norman colony (Flanagan 1989, 259). However, it may have been an attempt by the Connacht-based AT annalist to portray the local Ua Conchobair in a more favourable light. Alternatively, de Courcy could have been imprisoned by the Dublin government, or by de Courcy’s long-running enemies, the Cenél nEógain. As the accounts of his subsequent actions indicate, he was not a prisoner for long, but Flanagan (1989, 259) raises the interesting proposition that he may have been absent from the Council of Oxford due to this imprisonment.

As Duffy (1995a, 26) points out, de Courcy’s actions indicate “long-term planning and a shrewd understanding of the political ground-rules of the region”. His strong connection to northwest England might indicate that he had at least a passing knowledge of politics around the Irish Sea (see Flanders 2008), to say nothing of the information he might have gained during his military career in the service of Henry II. He can hardly have been ignorant of Richard de Clare’s successes in the 1160s, and he may well have heard of the internecine warfare in the north of Ireland the same decade.

It is informative to compare the Expugnatio’s description of de Courcy being accompanied by 322 soldiers and Roger of Howden’s statement that de Courcy had “assembled a large army and advanced to the town of Dun, the caput of Ulster”. He seems to have gotten this information from Cardinal Vivianus, the recently arrived Papal legate, taken prisoner by de Courcy en route to Downpatrick (CMRH II, 120; GRRH I, 137). Another contemporary chronicler, William of Newburgh (III.9; Howlett 1884, 238, my translation), states “John de
Courcy, joined by a strong force of infantry and cavalry, [...] invaded with hostile thoughts” the province called “Ulwestiria”, i.e., Ulidia or Ulster. There is nothing about the size of the army in the Irish annals, bar in MCB1178.1, which describes it as a buiden, ‘band, troop’, with the eDIL definition drawing attention to the description of a royal buiden as consisting of 700 men in the much earlier law text Críth Gablach (Binchy 1941, 18 §32 lines 457–8). Therefore, while the number referred to by buiden might have changed in the intervening centuries, the weight of evidence would seem to indicate de Courcy may have had a much larger force moving north at the beginning of his campaign.

Table 7.1. Documentary evidence for the initial construction of castles in Ulidia, italics = doubt; double entries separated by semi-colons indicates the rebuilding of castles, usually after their destruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>Downpatrick</td>
<td>ringwork</td>
<td>John de Courcy</td>
<td>AU1177.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath-glass</td>
<td>Ward of Ardglass</td>
<td>motte or masonry</td>
<td>John de Courcy; Jordan de Sacqueville</td>
<td>MCB1180.1; Praestita Roll 12 John, Hardy 1835, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunechthi</td>
<td>Duneight or Dunaghy</td>
<td>motte</td>
<td>John de Courcy</td>
<td>AD1180s, dower charter, Otway-Ruthven 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag Cobo</td>
<td>Seafin</td>
<td>ringwork; masonry</td>
<td>John de Courcy; Maurice FitzGerald or John fitz Geoffrey</td>
<td>before AU1188.5; AU1252.2, 1252 RLCTL 37 Henry III m. 22, Stamp et al. 1927, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>Antrim Town</td>
<td>motte</td>
<td>John de Courcy</td>
<td>before AU1189.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Santain</td>
<td>Mount Sandal</td>
<td>ringwork</td>
<td>John de Courcy</td>
<td>AFM1197.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>masonry; masonry</td>
<td>?John de Courcy; Hugh de Lacy</td>
<td>before MCB1206.5[=AD1205]; 19–30 July 1210, Praestita Roll 12 John m. 6–4, Hardy 1844, 196–208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>Dundrum</td>
<td>masonry</td>
<td>John de Courcy</td>
<td>before CRM11204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymaghan</td>
<td>near Holywood</td>
<td>motte</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>before 28 October 1221 RLPTL 6 Henry III, Maxwell Lyte et al. 1901, 316–7 (and before 1210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketrick or Ballymoran</td>
<td>Strangford Lough</td>
<td>masonry</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>before 31 July 1210, Praestita Roll 12 John m. 4, Hardy 1844, 208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From what can be gathered, de Courcy’s early castles (Table 7.1) were located in the core areas of pre-existing kingdoms. Downpatrick would seem to be the first of his castles in the region (AU1177.1), and it would seem to have been built either within or over the principal seat of the Dál Fiatach. The second castle he built was at Ardglass, seemingly to secure sea access to Downpatrick (MCB1180.1[=AD1179]). It would be tempting to date to this period the motte constructed over Duneight, another site of regional importance associated with the mainline of the Dál Fiatach (AU1004.5; AU1010; but not their ‘capital’, contra MacCotter 2008, 124, see Ó Corráin 2000, 241 for an AD1157×1166 reference to the site), and possibly the central place of the Dál Buinne mentioned in Lebor na Cert (Dillon 1962, 86 §5). Duneight might be the knight’s fee at “Dunechthi” in the AD1180×1193 de Courcy dower charter, but this might also be Dunaghy in northern Antrim (Otway-Ruthven 1949, 78). The foreigners of the castle of Mag Cobo are mentioned in AU1188.5, acting seemingly in alliance with the local Uí Echach against the Meic Lochlainn branch of Cenél nEógain. The foreigners of Dál nAraide are mentioned in AU1189.1, again acting against the same group by killing their leader while he was staying with them. Another Irish king, Cú-Midhe Ua Floinn of Uí Tuirtre was also killed while staying with the followers of de Courcy (AU1194.3), with MCB1193.3 stating that this occurred in Antrim. It might then be concluded that there was a castle in Antrim at this point,
and possibly also by AU1189.1. This trend would seem to have been continued by the construction of a castle in the core of the Mag Eilne territory, at the time held by the Fir Li (AU1197.1).

The pattern of early grants to the Church might be instructive also in this respect. It may well be that de Courcy granted away demesne lands held by the kings of Ulaid around Downpatrick, in addition to confirming lands already held by the Church. This pattern might have been repeated to a lesser degree in Uí Echach Cobo, and so too in the foundation grant to Muckamore, which might have included much demesne land around the central place of Rathmore in Mag Line, traditionally the core of the main line of the Dál nAraide. This would have precedence in Ireland, e.g., the granting of Cashel to the Church by Muirchertach Ua Briain (Ó Corráin 1972, 149; Ó Cróinín 1995, 282–3). It would have been intended to deprive the former rulers of their powerbases, providing something of an insurance policy to de Courcy.

What might be discerned from de Courcy’s actions, beyond the pattern of raids, is a phased expansion into the core territories of the previous overkingdom of the Ulaid, starting with the Dál Fiatach, then onto the Uí Echach Cobo and Dál nAraide, before finally incorporating Mag Eilne into his lordship. This was followed in all cases by a consolidation phase, as will be discussed in the next section.

7.4 Consolidation: Ulidia

The geographical pattern of de Courcy’s activity in the annals demonstrates that his campaigns tended to take place beyond the confines of Ulidia after the mid-AD1180s, indicating that he had sufficiently pacified the core areas of his lordship to enable him to do so (contra Flanders 2008, 160). This would also seem to be reflected in the pattern of dioceses, with the diocese of Dromore, the marcher territory Uí Echach Cobo, being detached from Down, corresponding to the land held by de Courcy (Reeves 1847, 303–6; McNeill 1980, 12). It is surprising that Connor did not split similarly, but it may be that all of that diocese was marcher territory until the late 1190s. The pattern of his charters focussed on Strangford Lough and the area east of Lough Neagh (cf. religious houses in Map 7.1; Table A.7.4.1 for a general indication) also demonstrates that he was firmly in control of the core area of his lordship as the 1180s progressed. Flanders (2008, 150) makes the important point that the foundation of Inch Abbey in AD1187 (AHG1187) may have been an act of penitence mimicking William I’s patronage of Battle Abbey after Hastings. His seizure of the relics of Finnian and Rónán Find (MCB1178.9) and kidnap of the Papal legate and bishop of Down as part of his initial campaign
might indicate that he had much making up to do with the local Church.

The grants and confirmations made to the Church indicate that de Courcy was seeking to enrol the Church to legitimate his position in his lordship. Having the custodians of the principal symbolic universe of explanation on his side would have helped make his recently won position at the apex of the social system in Ulidia seem as though it was part of the natural order of things not subject to human processes, rather to divine or natural processes (see Lukács 1968; Berger and Luckmann 1966). Related to this were de Courcy’s efforts to move St Patrick’s relics to Downpatrick—he ‘found’ the relics of Patrick, Brigid and Colum Cille there, according to Giraldus (Topographia III.18; Expugnatio II.34; Dimock 1867, 163–4, 383–5)—and his commissioning of a new hagiography of Patrick by Jocelyn of Furness (Flanagan 1999, 164; Birkett 2010, 142–53).

De Courcy’s charters also indicate that the Church held a large amount of land in Mag nInis and Strangford Lough (holdings fully listed in 8 July 1336 RLPTL 10 Edward III m. 35 in Maxwell Lyte et al. 1895, 304–5, cf. Reeves 1847, 230–1). This might lie behind de Courcy’s moving the central place of his lordship to Carrickfergus. Such a move might have had the benefit of being better placed for communications with the other areas of the lordship. However, beyond the prior of Carrickfergus witnessing two de Courcy charters in the 1180s and 1190s, there is little evidence for anything at Carrickfergus before c.AD1205, unless it is accepted that there was a mint present there by AD1200 (see Dolley 1987, 817–9).

De Courcy also consolidated his hold on power in other ways. For example, he married Affreca, daughter of Guðrøðr of Man (CRMI1204) before she founded Grey Abbey, so before AD1193 (AHG1193; AHP1193) and possibly as early as AD1180 (Otway-Ruthven 1949, 77).

As de Courcy began to issue charters and coins, it might be argued that by this point the division of the lordship into manors and vills had already begun. This served to reward his followers while also seeking to strengthen his grip on his lordship gained by right of conquest and extract a higher and more regular income from it. This would seem to have been accompanied by the construction of a series of mottes (Flanders 2008, 151), which are usually associated with the consolidation of social power in a landscape (Ó Riagáin 2010c). However, motte construction may have continued—theoretically—to as late as AD1300, especially in outlying areas. The problem is that so few of them have associated absolute dates beyond artefacts dating them to AD1200–1400 (4.20; Figure 4.22), with few of them mentioned in the documentary sources.

This process would have been contemporary to the reorganisation of the localised ecclesiastic landscape into deaneries, parishes and chapelries, following a century of major
reforms (Flanagan 2010). In many instances these were coterminous with one another, having been formed at the same time.

It is argued here, following McNeill, that the grants of land made during the consolidation phase are visible in the distribution of mottes and in the series of landholdings held in return for a single knight’s fee in southern Co. Antrim associated with the same families attesting many of the de Courcy charters (Maps 7.1–7.3; Duffy 1995b; McNeill 1980, 79). Many of the small parishes in this area (Map 7.2) correspond to this series of grants, demonstrated in the churches listed in the 1306 Taxation (Reeves 1847, 1–9, 62–9). Comparison with later documents such as the 1605 Terrier and the 1609 Connor Charter indicates that many of these smaller parishes were later amalgamated (Reeves 1847). Therefore, this system is only partially represented by a map of modern parishes, which is why the earlier distribution was reconstructed in Map 7.2. The same might also be said of the southeast Antrim coast and southern Co. Down (Map 7.1–7.2), especially that portion represented by a 4km band extending inwards from the coast proposed as the initial core of the de Courcy lordship (Buchanan 1958, 36–8).
Map 7.1. Relationship between castles to parish churches, chapels and religious houses in high-medieval Ulidia, overlain on map of the dioceses Connor, Down and Dromore,
Map 7.2. Relationship between manorial centres and boroughs to the distribution of castles, parish churches, chapels and religious houses in high-medieval Ulidia, overlain on map of the high- and late-medieval parishes in the region (reconstructed using Reeves 1847).
Map 7.3. Heatmap of sum of raths, cashels and crannogs in Ulidia with boundaries of early medieval túatha or under-kingdoms; overlain by high-medieval manorial centres and boroughs, castles, parish churches, chapels and religious houses. Heatmap radius set at 3km with maximum
value of five (i.e., darkest patches contain five sites or more within a 3km radius of one another).

As can be seen in Map 7.2, some large parishes do occur. In some instances, they are large due to the presence of large areas of upland or bogland, e.g., Drummaul or Duneane. Others would seem to have been associated with pre-colonial ecclesiastic holdings, e.g., Bangor or the parishes on the western shore of Strangford Lough. In some other instances, large parishes might have been related to high-status demesne lands. Carrickfergus might be an example of this, as might the later manor of Greencastle, seemingly coterminous with the minster-parish of Kilkeel. It is instructive that the manors and parishes associated with the final expansion of de Courcy’s lordship into the area around Coleraine are much larger—perhaps an indication of a more planned settlement without the need to immediately reward followers and consolidate the holding.

The series of small grants with higher than expected social status might be an indication of the pull-factor of acquiring increased status (and perhaps also, income) by taking part in colonial activity. A colonist might become a lord on a holding that would normally be the size (in terms of income, if not spatially) of something held by a free farmer in England. This might have been particularly attractive to various second and third sons of northern English lords. The profusion of small mottes might also be related to the same designs on upward mobility; McNeill (1980; 1981–2) convincingly argues that many of these small mottes were more likely associated with free farmers and the lowest order of nobility in Ulidia, rather than the expected aristocratic associations. This would explain the presence of multiple mottes on single manors (Map 7.2).

However, as Lynn (1981–2, 66) notes, generalising from the distribution of mottes alone does not tell the whole story. It merely represents part of the pattern, and it may be that other forms of settlement were in use that are less visible in the archaeological record. The construction of stone houses on the raths at Carnmeen 23 and Lisduff might be examples of this (A.4 entries). This is worth considering in terms of McNeill’s (1980, 85–7; 1981–2; 1992) comments on the small size of the summit areas of most mottes in Ulidia and the lack of direct evidence for structures on their summits, leading to the proposition that the small mottes in Ulidia have been for use as a last resort in times of trouble. However, these comments should be considered in light of the results from Hen Domen, Montgomeryshire (Higham and Barker 2000), where the use of novel archaeological techniques led to the identification of several structures that did not leave a subsoil trace. Therefore, they would only have been intended for the purposes of consolidation, with a shift to more commodious accommodations elsewhere as
their occupants became more secure in their holdings.

It is important to note that many mottes were built over pre-existing settlement enclosures (A.4.20). While this was probably related to expedience in some respects, it also had much to do with settlers seeking to acquire a patina—a veneer of long-standing presence in the landscape (see McCracken 1990, 32–3). It also had much to do with emphasising the transfer of power to settlers at the expense of the preceding Irish nobility. This might be seen as a rupture portrayed in terms of continuity.

The same might be said of the co-opting of pre-existing territorial divisions, as discussed by Reeves (1861) and MacCotter (2008), with the latter drawing attention to the strong resemblance between the eleven cantreds of the early years of the Earldom of Ulster with the twelfth-century system of rural deaneries, which itself was based on the *trícha cét* system of land division dating to c.AD1000–1180. This, in turn, corresponds in many ways with the groups outlined in *Lebor na Cert*, and possibly back further to the system of *tuiatha* prior to AD800, at least in part (Map 7.3). Another interesting correspondence is the number of *seisreach* divisions in Ireland theoretically adds up to 66,600 divisions of 120 acres each, which is half the actual area of Ireland, indicating that “wood, moor, and mountain […] did not enter into the agricultural calculation” (Reeves 1861, 474). This would also seem to have been the case at the cantredal level, hence the variation in size between them. It does provide an interesting parallel to the number of medieval enclosed settlements of all forms in Ireland, c.60,000 (Map 7.4 for Ulidia examples). Ware (1658; see also AHG preamble and the AMF) gives a figure of 184 cantreds, 5520 *oppida* and 44,160 caracutes; Gerald of Wales (*Topographia* III.5) gives 176 cantreds each normally containing 100 vills. The carucate figure is remarkably similar to the 45,000 known raths or cashels in Ireland (Stout 1997), perhaps both indicate the carrying capacity of farmland under the technologies of time, as opposed to representing some sort of direct continuity. Map 7.3 portrays the distribution of manors, castles and churches against the system of parishes, with the sum of all previous settlement in the background.

It is argued here that the use of pre-existing divisions and occasionally, the pre-existing centres of those divisions is an important part of the process of colonial consolidation, just as the destruction of central places can often be part of the process of expansion and the construction of completely new central places part of the process of domination. Eight cantreds based on earlier divisions are listed in a grant to the Hugh and Walter de Lacy by King John c.AD1204 (MacCotter 2008, 229), with three further, physically larger territories with semi-independent predominantly non-colonial populations, *Oveh, Turtery* and *Dalrede* broadly
corresponding to Uí Echach Cobo, Uí Tuirtre and Dál Riata also in existence around this time.

Map 7.4. Distribution of townlands in Ulidia, overlain by known high-medieval manorial centres and centres of knight’s fee holdings. Note the larger size of townlands in upland areas due to their lower agricultural productivity.
Table 7.2. Continuity and equivalence of land divisions in Ireland, c.AD1000–1600 (from Ware 1858, 13–4; Reeves 1861; MacCotter 2008). The hierarchy is not exact, each division does not exclusively break down into those lower than it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anglo-Norman</th>
<th>Irish (post c.AD1000)</th>
<th>Irish (post c.AD1600)</th>
<th>Ecclesiastic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>earldom</td>
<td>overkingdom</td>
<td>province</td>
<td>metropolitan diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county, shire</td>
<td>tūath or kingdom</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cantred or bailiwick</td>
<td>tricha-cét (= 30 bailte biataigh)</td>
<td>barony</td>
<td>deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manor</td>
<td>baile biatach (= 12 seisrigh)</td>
<td>civil parish</td>
<td>parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villa terra (vill)</td>
<td>(= c.36 seisrigh)</td>
<td>civil parish</td>
<td>parish or chapelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarterland</td>
<td>baile bó or ceathrú (3 seisrigh)</td>
<td>(grouped townlands)</td>
<td>chapelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ploughland, caracut (caracuta)</td>
<td>baile bó or seisreach (120 of farmable Irish acres + uncounted non-farmable)</td>
<td>townland</td>
<td>chapelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tate, poll, pole, sixteenth</td>
<td>60–80 Irish acres</td>
<td>townland</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Domination: Ulidia

It is argued here that, in line with elsewhere in Ireland, the late AD1190s represent the best possibility for the transition from consolidation to domination within the areas already under the control of the king of England, either directly, or by proxy in the various colonial lordships, such as Meath and Ulster. It was precisely the outcome of this transition that rendered a strong marcher lord operating with a minimum of royal oversight like John de Courcy obsolete. This was because the spaces between the various conquest lordships were being filled up by further, less ambitious colonial projects involving grants made by the English king, rather than territories conquered by the first generation of colonists and later confirmed by the king. This is an important distinction, and the latter form was much more stable from the perspective of a centralising royal government. This process was the main driver in the settler–metropolitan friction evident in many colonial episodes, e.g., Spanish creoles in South America and the residents of the English colonies in North America.

From the evidence of his various campaigns in the AD1190s, de Courcy was heavily involved in the politics of Ireland, invading Munster and Connacht with de Lacy (AU1195.7 and AU1201.5), Louth (MCB1196.6). As Orpen (1911, 22) states, perhaps “the real secret of
his success was [that] he was let alone”, as in he was “interfered with neither by king, justiciar, or brother baron”. This engagement with the wider political sphere contributed to his downfall. De Courcy was appointed justiciar by Richard I in AD1194, at a time when Richard’s rivalry with his brother John, nominally lord of Ireland, was at its highest (Flanders 2008, 160). His being drawn into this rivalry, which included his AU1195.7 campaign against supporters of John might have been the first steps towards his removal by Hugh de Lacy at the behest of John in AD1204–6 (AU1204.3; AU1205.3; MCB1206.5). Operating his own mints and descriptions of him as princeps [prince] (e.g., Jocelin of Furness proeme of his Life of Patrick; O’Leary 1904, 133) cannot have helped his relationship with King John (Flanders 2008, 163).

Hugh de Lacy was part of the second generation of colonists in Ireland, the second son of a branch of a family with holdings across Wales, England and Normandy (see Veach 2014 for the family; Brown 2017 on de Lacy himself). He would fall foul of elite politics within a decade of his appointment as earl of Ulster, before regaining his position from AD1227 to his death in AD1243, after which the territory was administered directly by the crown. Walter de Burgh, already lord of Connacht was made earl of Ulster in AD1264, with the earldom subsequently held by his son Richard and grandson William to AD1233, after whose murder (by his de Burgh cousins) saw the earldom pass to a minor female heir and eventually to absentee earls. The murder and subsequent events represent the colonial episode moving into resultive processes other than domination.

Despite these political changes, the core area of the lordship continued to be relatively peaceful and economically productive into the fourteenth century, even if the years between de Courcy’s deposition and de Burgh’s appointment represent something of a ‘holding pattern’. Unlike the expansion and consolidation phases, domination does not require the individual agency of a ruler or leader to succeed it is more systemic. It is precisely within this period that the construction of several masonry castles, the construction of towns and formation of boroughs, and the reorganisation of the territory into a series of bailiwicks occurred, not to mention the transition to a much higher level of economic output. This increasing economic output and relative stability would carry on up until the Bruce invasion, AD1315–8, which, arguably had a more detrimental impact on the earldom than the murder of William de Burgh in AD1333 (see McNeill 1980 for full outline of events).
7.5.1 Military

The stabilising of the core territories of the Irish colonies both enabled and necessitated a push into further territory, despite any assurances given to the Gaelic-Irish (for want of a better term) by the English king. Expansion was a necessary force for stability in a militarised social system with a system of inheritance characterised by primogeniture—there were only so many widows and heiresses, after all (see Tilly 1992; Elias 2000). One example of such secondary expansion is found in the push into the area west of the Shannon after the consolidation of the castle at Limerick and its surrounding territory (AI1202.2; Ó Riagáin 2010c, 74ff.). More relevant for the case study is de Courcy’s construction of a castle at Cell Santain near Coleraine (AU1197.1), seemingly as a springboard for expansion across the Bann and for the consolidation of the territory around Coleraine.

It would seem to be at this point that the initial stages of the masonry castles at Dundrum and Carrickfergus were built—or at least began to be built—and it might be possible that several of the de Courcy charters date this phase also. However, most thirteenth-century masonry castle-building projects (Table 7.1), such as Greencastle, Dundrum, the refurbishment of Mag Cobo, Carrickfergus, and Coleraine, date to the periods of alternating control of the lordship by the crown and Hugh de Lacy (see A.4.21 for full discussion of each). This might be due to the nature of the sources—there is a better chance of references to castles occurring and surviving during periods of direct royal administration.

If the consolidation phase represented the co-opting and repurposing of previous patterns of settlement and land-division, the domination phase in many ways broke with them. Carrickfergus and Greencastle seem to have been built on greenfield sites, with no underlying ringwork or motte, and no important role in the pre-colonial political system identifiable.

While domination phases are characterised by relative stability, not least due to the maintenance of a monopoly on the legitimate use of force, they are not always peaceful. The most salient examples of this are Hugh de Lacy’s campaign to regain the earldom in the 1220s, Brian Ua Néill’s campaign culminating in the Battle of Down in 1259–60 (AU1260.1) and the invasion of Ireland via the earldom by Edward and Robert Bruce 1315–8 (Frame 1974). Internally, cycles of familial violence such as the de Mandeville–FitzWarin feud in the 1270s (e.g. Sweetman 1877, 158–60, no. 929) were also a threat to the functioning of the earldom, both politically and economically.

In some ways, de Lacy’s campaign against the beneficiaries of his loss of the earldom (Otway-Ruthven 1968, 92), which seems to have begun with the razing of Coleraine in alliance with Aéd Ua Néill (AU1222.1), was a proxy conflict for a transnational set of rivalries. Brown
(2017, 145–8; see Sweetman 1875, 179, no. 1179) cogently discusses this in relation to the convergence of de Lacy’s interests with those of Hákon IV of Norway, Óláfur Guðrøðarson of Man, and the jarl of Orkney against Alexander II of Scotland, Alan of Galloway and Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson of Man. Alan and his brother Thomas had been granted extensive lands in northern Antrim and to the west of the Bann on de Lacy’s expulsion (Sweetman 1875, 70 no. 427, 87–8 nos 564–5, 567). Alan does not seem to have fully taken possession of his granted territory (its fee was reduced from 140 to 10 knight’s fees between 1210 and 1215). Also, in possession of the royal castle at Antrim, Thomas built a castle at Coleraine and campaigned against the Cenél nÉógain in alliance with the sons of Ragnall mac Somhairle (AU1214.2; AU1212.4). Donnchad of Carrick, their cousin and rival, was allied with John de Courcy (whose wife was his first cousin) from at least AD1197, when he took part in an attack on the Cenél nÉógain to avenge the death of de Courcy’s brother Jordan, following which he was speculatively granted land west of the Bann (Chronica Magistri IV, 25; Riley 1853b, 404). He was granted territory in Latharna and Glenarm by King John in 1210, following his major involvement against de Lacy. Finally, Rǫgnvaldr, de Courcy’s brother-in-law was granted a knight’s fee near Carlingford in 1212 by King John (Sweetman 1875, 70 no. 428).

From what can be gathered from the sources, Rǫgnvaldr excluded, none of these figures had a good relationship with the Dublin administration, nor Henry III’s circle in general. Donnchad and his nephew John fitz Alexander were stripped of their holdings on pretext of being part of the rebellion of AD1215–6, spending years trying to legally regain them (Hardy 1833, 402; Sweetman 1875, 130 no. 737, 155 no. 874, 156 nos 878–9). Alan and Tomás de Galloway spent years first trying to get royal confirmation of their holdings and then compensation for de Lacy’s actions against them on the north coast, and even seeming to threaten invasion on hearing that peace had been made with de Lacy on the king’s behalf by William Marshall (AU1222.1; Sweetman 1875, 142–3 no. 942, 185–6, no. 1218).

It might be that Alan de Galloway’s increasing role in the governance of the kingdom of Scotland meant that Henry III’s minority administration was reluctant to risk a potential Scottish presence in Ireland. This might indeed have occurred, if the lands had still been part of the lordship of Galloway on the death of the main line and the territory’s seizure by the Scottish crown in the AD1240s (Brown 2004, 36–9). Alan’s role as a powerbroker in Man and the Isles (e.g., Hākonar Saga §163) might have meant that Henry III’s administration wanted to avoid the potential formation of a rival polity consisting of Man, the Isles, Galloway and Antrim. The marriage of Alan de Galloway to Hugh de Lacy’s daughter in AD1229 may have been part of an attempt at peace between the two groups and/or an attempt to retain Alan’s
The de Lacy episode might be seen as a seasoned soldier taking advantage of international politics and the minority of the king of England to re-establish himself in an earldom lost to him due to high-level English politics. While it tested the system of English domination (see Davies 1990), it was more about (re)gaining control of part of the system, rather than an attempt to destroy it.

The invasion of the vacant earldom of Ulster by Brian Ua Néill (AU1260.1) at the head of a large army from Connacht, Cenél Conaill and Cenél nEógain resulted in the overthrow of Greencastle (AHG1260), prior to a heavy defeat near Downpatrick. Ua Néill’s campaign was more of an attempt to halt further expansion beyond the confines of the earldom, while at the same time renegotiating his position among the Irish nobility in non-colonial areas of the island and also his relationship with the earldom—administrative documents indicate that he was in a clientship relationship with Henry III mediated by Nicholas de Dunheved, seneschal (Dougherty 1903, 40).

It is instructive that the cycles of violence in the 1220s and c.AD1260 were both followed by the (re)installation of an earl in Ulster: de Lacy in AD1227 (11 Henry III in Sweetman 1875, 226–7 no. 1498), and Walter de Burgh in the AD1260s (AI1263.2, but the AFM and Chronica of Henry of Marleburgh have it at AD1264; cf. Orpen 1913, 34). In both cases, the Crown was effectively farming out the operation of the lordship, minimising the risk to the king of England while also providing a focus for the ambitions of two creole (i.e., that they were born in Ireland) lords with strong military capabilities (see Brown 2017 on de Lacy; see AI1260.12; AU1262.1; MCB1263.1; ACon1262.11 for de Burgh).

This brings us to an important point. An asymmetric social system with an extractive elite operating in terms of a protection racket can only maintain its position if relative peace and stability can be offered with a reasonable chance of delivery (see Mann 1986; Tilly 1992, Elias 2000). As Fromm (1941) points out, in times of uncertainty, people are often willing to sacrifice freedom to obtain a feeling of security. In this respect, castles and their occupants function not just in terms of oppression, but also as symbols of stability. Considering their economic roles as the focal points of the production, concentration and redistribution of agricultural output, items of material culture of local and non-local origin, castles could represent prosperity in the minds of residents within and without the castle walls. They might also function in terms of an identitive anchor for a community, imbued with the essence of the occupant and the associated set of institutions involved (see Jones 2007), cross-cutting any perceived ‘ethnic’ differences within that community.
7.5.2 Politics, settlement and economics

The holding of a monopoly on the legitimate use of force within a polity is extremely important for the maintenance of a system of asymmetric social relations (Weber 1978; Elias 2000). A basic outline of political events has already been recounted in 7.2–7.5; here the focus is on the local. As the thirteenth century progressed, the system of cantreds was streamlined into a series of bailiwicks (Map 7.5), also referred to as counties: Coleraine (from Twescard and Dalrede), Carrickfergus, Antrim (from Maulyn, Clandermod and possibly Dalboing), Newtown (from Blathewyc and Ards), and Down (cf. the 1306 Taxation’s deaneries with the 1333 Inquisition’s counties). Each of these had a county court, a sheriff and a system of mills (see 1262 Compotus; list in Sweetman 1877, 430–5 no. 1918, 477 no. 2073; 1333 Inquisition). To this might be added a series of boroughs (Table 7.3; Map 7.5), including urban boroughs at Carrickfergus, Down, Coleraine, Newtownards and Antrim, and possibly urban (or at least village) boroughs at Holywood, Belfast and Larne. All other boroughs would seem to have been rural boroughs, perhaps intended to become urban, but never doing so (see Glasscock 1987, 223–4; O’Conor 1998, 43–8).
Map 7.5. Thirteenth-century cantreds in Ulidia, as represented by the system of rural deaneries, with boroughs, manorial centres and masonry castles also marked.
Table 7.3. Boroughs in Ulidia, c.AD1180–1350, where their income is separable from any associated manorial incomes; 1333 figures from 1333 Inquisition (Orpen 1913; 1914; 1915). The burgesses of Portrush and Portcaman are only mentioned in the 1272 Inquisition into the deeds of Henry de Mandeville; they should otherwise be regarded as manors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Manorial</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Mill</th>
<th>pre-Bruce</th>
<th>1333</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>county court</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2 16d 8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Ford (Belfast)</td>
<td>possibly urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmalys (Larne)</td>
<td>possibly urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnmoney</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>county court</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle</td>
<td>possibly urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>serjeancy and court</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywood</td>
<td>possibly urban</td>
<td>probable</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>£2 11s</td>
<td>£1 11s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armoy</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>fortnightly</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1 13s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrush</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>probable</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portcaman</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>probable</td>
<td>not included</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>urban</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>county court</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>£11 10s 4d (1262)</td>
<td>not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below the system of bailiwicks/counties lay a complex series of holdings consisting of manors and villae terrae, usually anglicised as ‘vills’ but often mistranslated as ‘towns’ or ‘villages’ rather than villas or landholdings. There was much variance in the make-up of manors in medieval England (Miller and Hatcher 1978, 19–22). On a fundamental level, “a manor, in brief, was a block of landed property managed as a single unit from a particular centre” (Miller and Hatcher 1978, 19). To this, one might also add that a manor was a jurisdiction within which its ‘manager’, a lord, exercised certain rights and privileges. These privileges usually included the ability to hold, and preside over court cases, to receive any fines arising from them, to subinfeudate land to farmers in return for labour dues, rent and/or renders, and also in relation to military activity (Bloch 1966, 241–54). Usually, a manor contained a mixture of demesne lands, i.e., held and farmed directly by the lord, and land occupied by various categories of farmers. Its occupants could have lived clustered in a village at the core, or in a series of
hamlets, or even dispersed through the wider holding. A manor might also have consisted of one discrete unit of land or spread across a wider area interspersed with holdings belonging to different manors. The lord may have resided in the manor, or he may have resided elsewhere, with the manor part of a wider constellation of holdings.

If the manor failed to adhere to a single ideal type in England, then it cannot be expected to adhere to such in a colonial context such as the Ulidia case study, subject to a greater series of exigencies than a more settled area like the English Midlands. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the distinction between manorium and villa terrae is not always clear, and that they do not adhere to a coherent pattern, and scribes often seemingly moved between them when referring to the same land unit. This is exacerbated by the non-survival of many administrative documents, leaving us reliant on translated calendars.

Thus, no definitive immutable list of manors and vills can be offered up. Applying the most generous criteria, every site that was the central place of a knight’s fee (land held in return for the service of a knight or a financial equivalent) or other major land-holding, the site of a court, a borough or explicitly stated as being a manor has been included here as being a possible manor. While it would be tempting to see the centre of every parish as being a manorial centre, this was not always the case, even if a frequent occurrence. This would give approximately 50–60 manors in Ulidia in the period AD1180–1350 (Map 7.5), although it is doubtful that they all functioned as such contemporaneously. The principal manors are discussed in A.4.23. Accompanying this are the c.200 landholdings mentioned in the sources, usually dependent on one of the manors or an ecclesiastic institution, and which are classed here as villae terrae, or vills.

McNeill (1980, 88–90) discusses how the system of landholdings and agricultural resource extraction in the colonial lordship is based on manors broken up into constituent vills often several kilometres from the manorial centre, with the lords living on renders from these vills. According to his model, the actual farming would have been done by the Gaelic-Irish. He notes that this system served its purposes well, as it avoided overly concentrating resources in one location, and that it lasted a long time. He also states that this system of fixed renders was “based on what the Irish lords took as food renders from the farmers when the Anglo-Normans arrived”, and that “the conquest worked in Ulster [by] intensifying the Irish agricultural productivity”. This, he states, accounts for the stability in the system of land divisions on both a local and regional level, with no need to state the extents of land grants in the numerous charters over the course of hundreds of years (e.g. RLPH 28 October [1603] 1 James I §82.25 in Anon. 1800, 14). It is also what kept manors such as Dundonald functioning after the Bruce
Invasion, despite all of its principal buildings being destroyed (Orpen 1914, 63). Finally, McNeill (1980, 88–90) sees this as the reason that no open-field systems, ridge and furrow or deserted medieval villages have been found in the region.

There is much to commend McNeill’s model, which fits in extremely well with the category of elite replacement colonialism introduced in Chapter 1. It has been endorsed by other scholars such as O’Conor (1998, 43–6). After examining every field in the case study using satellite imagery, there would seem to be little trace of any open field systems, nor of areas of ridge and furrow, although the latter might have been obliterated by largescale pre-Famine (i.e., pre-1845) potato cultivation.

The model might be open to some adjustments, though. There was nothing exceptional about manors modulated into several subordinate vill settlements, for example. Considering the wide variety of village forms in use in England at the time, each of which might leave very different archaeological traces (Roberts 1987), it may be that a new approach to the Ulidia case study is required. John de Courcy and most of his followers did not arrive in Ulidia (Duffy 1995b) from the areas of England where open field systems dominated agricultural production and villages dominated settlement (Donkin 1976, 80–6; Clarke 1984, 28). Furthermore, attempting to identify deserted villages is to only examine part of the story—those villages that failed. Even so, the excavations and surveys at Killyglen (Carver and McNeill 2004; Moore et al. 2004), Portmuck (Anderson and Rees 2004) and Greencastle (Ó Baoill 2007) might all provide evidence that village settlement focused on castle–church pairings did exist in high-medieval Ulidia. The traditional fixation on the internal areas of enclosed settlements to the detriment of the external areas has probably meant that many archaeological traces of such settlement have been obliterated, similar to the external features around raths consistently found on road excavations island-wide in recent years. Furthermore, there may well be traces of clustered settlements underneath currently occupied rural settlements, as has proven to be the case in many areas of England (Lewis 2007). Finally, as O’Keeffe (2000, 64) points out, flat-ploughing may have been carried out in Ireland, even if the soils were not quite suitable in most regions, which would have a very different impact on the fields.

Going further, while Gaelic-Irish tenants probably did much of the actual farming and providing renders or payments in kind to various levels of an extractive colonial elite, there may well have been planted colonists accustomed to non-open field agriculture doing some of the same farming. Therefore, there may have been an element of plantation colonialism in the high-medieval episode in Ulidia.

Extracting as high an income from a territory as quickly as possible was an extremely
important consideration in conquest lordships in a social system characterised by a protection racket where wealth flowed upwards—failure to pay one’s dues could be fatal, just as in similarly structured social systems, such as the mafia (Blok 1988; Santoro 2011). This might have led to the introduction of settlers to boost the level of agricultural production in the case study.

Table 7.4 compares the sum of incomes due per year from the bailiwick/counties of the earldom. Coleraine was omitted from the c.AD1227 account, as it might not have been in royal hands at the time, but the figure from the AD1262 *compotus* of Henry de Mandeville has been inserted instead for the purposes of comparison. In the AD1227 account, the large figure for Antrim might mean that the cantreds of Dalboing and Clandermod were counted along with it. A fairly substantial amount of land was held by the Church in Ladcatheil, i.e., Leth Cathail, the area around Downpatrick and Dundrum (mapped McNeill 1980, 90, listed Reeves 1847, 160–76), which would account for the figure being lower. Lydon (1972, 12) sees this decline as very real across Ireland in the reign of Edward I. However, like is not being compared with like when comparing between the accounts in terms of how they were assessed, especially when comparing incomes due to the crown and to the earl (AD1227 vs AD1333).
Table 7.4. Sum of incomes from bailiwicks/counties in Ulidia, from c.AD1227 compotus of Robert de Vallibus (Orpen 1913a, 31; Sweetman 1875, 222, no. 1468), the 1262 compotus of Henry de Mandeville (Curtis 1929) and the 1333 Inquisition for the figures before and after the Bruce Invasion (Orpen 1913; 1914; 1915; Dougherty 1912, 27); NI = not independent at time of assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>1227</th>
<th>pre-Bruce</th>
<th>1333</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antrim</td>
<td>£390 3s 10d</td>
<td>£17 3s 4d</td>
<td>£6 16s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus</td>
<td>£208 19s 3d</td>
<td>£96 13s 3d</td>
<td>£40 19s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickfergus town</td>
<td>£22 9s 6d</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ards</td>
<td>£117 1s 9d</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>£135 10s 0d</td>
<td>£75 16s 1d</td>
<td>£37 8s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>£62 0s 0d</td>
<td>£61 10s 8d</td>
<td>£14 17s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleraine</td>
<td>£244 4s 8d (1262)</td>
<td>£190 8s 6d</td>
<td>£39 13s 4d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.3 Ideology

No system of asymmetric social relation can maintain itself without an attendant ideological apparatus to reify that social system and legitimate the position of the various actors within it (Lukács 1968; Berger and Luckmann 1966). This is what led Mann (1986) to emphasise the important role played by ideological power resources in the exercise of social power, arguably a failing of the discussion of similar issues by Elias (2000) and Tilly (1992). As already discussed, the principal grants to the Church all seem to have happened in the expansion and consolidation processes, with a small number of additional religious houses founded in the thirteenth century. It is worth noting that very few foundations can be linked to the de Burghs, which is not to say that they did not patronise the Church, rather that something of a carrying capacity for religious houses had already been reached.

During the domination phase, the network of parish churches evidenced in sources such as the 1306 Taxation and still in most instances at least partially visible in the landscape settled down. This network of churches and chapels (Maps 7.1–7.3), along with the religious houses already mentioned and the three cathedrals served as a local reminder of the power of God and the power of the social system legitimated by its portrayal as being divinely ordained. The stone buildings were a materialisation of the power of both God and, by association, the person who built it and the socio-political system they represent.

That is not to say that clerics all sang from the same hymn sheet with respect to the colonial system—there may well have been many dissenting clerics, not least in predominantly Gaelic-Irish marcher territories and in the few remaining religious houses patronised (or at least
founded) by Gaelic-Irish elites. The 1306 Taxation indicates that the Church gained quite a bit of material wealth in the Anglo-Norman era, based on the incomes of the local churches. It also indicates the relative wealth of some areas in comparison to others, although varying parish sizes has as much to do with that as income per acre, especially in relation to the northern parishes with large incomes linked to large manors with similarly large incomes.

During the domination phase, it is apparent that, beyond merely patronising ecclesiastic institutions, the colonial elite also colonised them, in that the major positions came to be staffed with English rather than Irish clerics, especially high-level positions such as the bishops of Down and Connor, the parish priest of Carrickfergus and most of the main religious houses (see Reeves 1847 for lists). This corresponds to an increasing lack of interest in the Irish annals in the staffing of these positions, for which a fairly constant record was kept up until the thirteenth century (A.4.16 entries).

7.6 Colonists, creoles and colonised in Ulidia

The “[high-]medieval rath” has been dubbed an “archaeological chimera” (Lynn 1975), but as McNeill (1975b; 1980) points out, there is strong evidence for their continued use, rather than construction well into the high medieval period, as seen in Chapter 4. Similar occurred elsewhere in Ireland, such as Co. Clare (FitzPatrick 2009). The continued use of earlier settlement enclosures in Ulidia is partially based on radiocarbon-dating evidence, although it should be noted that excavators are usually more interested in identifying the early stages of activity rather than late by these means (e.g., Tully, Harper 1970). Late deposits are often left undated (e.g., Deer Park Farm, Lynn and McDowell 2011), which skews sum-curve diagrams such as those by Kerr and McCormick (2014, with several procedural caveats; repeated without caveats in O’Sullivan et al. 2013, 65). The main evidence for the continued use of a significant number of settlement enclosures (rather than their repurposing as mottes or ringworks) is artefactual. Imported green-glazed pottery (McNeill 1981–2; Hurst 1985) as well as the products of kilns such as Downpatrick and Carrickfergus that included both green-glazed pottery and wheel-thrown cooking vessels are found in the upper strata of several settlement enclosures. A general date of c.AD1200–1400 might be assigned in all of these cases. Moreover, non-wheel-thrown coarse Ulster everted rim ware (Ivens 2001; McSparron 2011)—probably an adaptation from souterrain ware to the new forms of vessels introduced in the decades after the arrival of de Courcy—is also found in similar contexts, although it has a longer date range, c.AD1200–1600. To these might be added CSW and DSW, whose
chronology might be estimated at c.AD1000–1400.

It is argued here that the use of previous settlement forms continued in many areas of the colonial lordship, and not just in the marcher cantreds of Uí Echach Cobo and Uí Tuirtre. This was behind the presence of high-medieval deposits at enclosed settlements whose earlier deposits extend back into the early medieval period, as discussed in Chapter 4 (4.3–4.13; see A.4 entries).

McNeill (1980, 79, 98) draws attention to the evidence for certain manorial tenants often being described as ‘betaghs’, from biatt(í)ach, plural biataigh ‘supplier of food, farmer’ (eDIL), or as Hibernici ‘Irish’. This designation as Hibernici is in contradistinction to Anglici and is related to a different set of legal rights held in the colonised area of the island (see Otway-Ruthven 1950; Lydon 1987c, 242–3). Biataigh had originally been free non-nobles who render services or food to their lords (see MacCotter 2008, 22–3, 52–6). In the colonial system in Ireland, however, it was used to refer to unfree, customary tenants who provided much of the labour for cultivation (Curtis 1935, 63–76; Richardson 1939, 389–91; Davies and Quinn 1941, 7–8; Down 1987, 457–9).

Among the earliest use of the term in the colonial sense is the grant of nineteen cows towards the maintenance of “the king’s service and rents” betachi of Ards in AD1211–2 (PRIE 14 John, Davies and Quinn 1941, 62–3). The homines of Ballymaghan in PRIE 14 John (Davies and Quinn 1941, 62–3) may well be another reference, but it might also be drawing a distinction between Hibernici and Anglici on this manor. Betaghs also appear in William FitzWarin’s report of the lands in escheat in Ulster in the 1270s (MacDonnell 1904, 54). Several Irish tenants of William’s are also mentioned in the account of the attacks made by the de Mandevilles at the head of a group of both Anglo-Norman and Gaelic-Irish on FitzWarin’s holdings in Ulster, mainly in the bailiwick of Carrickfergus (Sweetman 1877, 430–5 no. 1918). That the goods seized from them were all animals does not mean that they were solely pastoralists, though; rather it is related to carrying off as much value as possible during the raid.

The 1333 Inquisition lists several Irish tenants on several levels, for example in Greencastle (Orpen 1914, 60). Eighteen carucates of land in Dundrum townland was held by the Mac Artain family (Orpen 1914, 61) of the Uí Echach Cobo and eight were held by Irishmen in Killyleagh (1914, 66). The account rolls of the lands held by Elizabeth de Burgh, AD1353–60 also list several Irish tenants (McNeill 1980, 136–47). Manorial accounts often list various payments in kind, e.g., in the 1262 Compotus of Twescard (Curtis 1929, 10–11).

Further up the social scale, the manor of Agherton (Ballyaghran) near Coleraine was confiscated from “Peter O’Haugharn” or “Petrus Othatheran” due to his participation in Brian
Ua Néill’s campaign across the lordship in 1259–60 (1262 Compotus in Ferguson 1855, 161; trans. Curtis 1929, 10). The Anglo-Norman knight Roger de Altaribus was granted the manor in return for a knight’s fee (Sweetman 1877, 107 no. 661, 109–10 no. 677), and it was regranted to Robert de Bennes in 1263 for a quarter of that (preserved on dorso of RLCTL 15 James I in Anon. 1800, 354). The reduction in fee might be due to local opposition to the grant, as evidenced in the contestation of the holding by Elias de Sandel against Robert’s heir in 1282 (Sweetman 1877, 450–2 no. 1976), and the de Sandel family held it by the 1333 Inquisition (Orpen 1915, 139). This might be seen as evidence of settler–metropolitan friction, demonstrating local resistance across two generations to a grant made by the royal administration to an ‘outsider’ in the minds of settlers already living in the area.

A more salient example of this is to be found in the fall-out from the death of Walter de Burgh, earl of Ulster (AU1269[=AD1271]). This resulted in the installation of William FitzWarin by Henry III and the future Edward I as seneschal of Ulster to replace Henry de Mandeville (Sweetman 1877, 163 no. 941, 169 no. 971), seneschal under de Burgh and also it seems, on behalf of the Dublin administration prior to de Burgh’s appointment (Curtis 1929, 10–11). De Mandeville was accused of having kept for himself the incomes of several manors and the bailiwick of Twescard and of having extorted several boroughs and manors of cattle, and of murdering several English settlers seemingly in alliance with the Ua Catháin and the Uí Tuirtre (Sweetman 1877, 158–60, no. 929). When distrained by FitzWarin for the monies owed to the crown, the de Mandevilles and their allies burned territory and took hostages in Carrickfergus, before being driven out by Hugh Byset and his allies (1877, 165–6, no. 952). The death of de Mandeville led to a feud between the FitzWarins and de Mandevilles that would only be ended by a tactical marriage between their descendants the following century (by 1327, see Dougherty 1912, 21–4). The situation would be exacerbated following Richard de Burgh’s coming of age in the early 1280s, which led to Thomas, son of Henry de Mandeville being appointed seneschal and proceeding to seize FitzWarin’s holdings and destroy much of the property found there (Sweetman 1877, 430–5 no. 1918). FitzWarin fled, with the help of the Uí Echach Cobo, and appealed directly to the king and outside intervention was necessary to settle matters with a protracted court case.

In addition to providing historians with important information as to the make-up of the earldom at the time, the feud demonstrated the internal rivalries within the earldom, with the de Mandevilles and their allies the de Say and Savage families, as well as the Ua Catháin and Ua Fhloinn on one side and FitzWarin with his Byset and de Logan allies on the other. More importantly, de Burgh sided with the de Mandevilles and Edward I with FitzWarin.
The episode is perhaps best thought of in terms of established–outsider rivalries, where otherwise similarly socially positioned groups distinguish between and discriminate against one another based on the length of their presence in a social environment (see Elias and Scotson 1965). The de Mandevilles might have been established in the earldom as early as 1210 (Orpen 1911, 125), whereas FitzWarin was a career administrator strongly connected to Edward I, with his Byset allies also relative newcomers to the region from Scotland (see Duffy 2004). It might also, relatedly, be thought of in terms of settler–metropolitan tensions (Veracini 2010), where settlers resent what is seen as outside interference by the government of their home region.

There would also seem to have been clientship relations and other alliances between the rulers of the earldom and Gaelic-Irish groups beyond its borders. One example of this would be the relationship of Henry de Mandeville, Seneschal of Tweskard (and probably of Ulster) to Aéd Buidhe Ua Néill, progenitor of the Clan Aodha Buidhe branch of the Cenél nÉógain. Aéd was given £10 in return for keeping the peace on the marches in 1262 (Curtis 1929, 10–11). This alliance would continue into Walter de Burgh’s earldom, with Aéd and de Burgh campaigning together against the Cenél Conaill (AU1265.5), cemented by a formal agreement of clientship in 1268–9 (Bruce 1872, 231), with Aéd married to the earl’s cousin Aleanor and instructed to pay de Burgh 3,500 cows. It also continued into Richard de Burgh’s time, who supported Aéd in his campaign against the Cenél Conaill and the Connachta (AFM1281.2).

As McNeill (1980, 104) notes, “The Cenel Eoghain [sic] were the main threat to the security of the Earldom throughout its life, just as they had been for the Ulaid before them.” McNeill also points out that this threat was met in two ways: alliance, as with Aéd Buidhe, or direct attack. The latter seems to have been the policy of John de Courcy (e.g., AU1177.16; AU1181.3; AU1188.5; AU1196.2; AU1197.4), even if it was to the Cenél nÉógain he fled after his deposition, which might explain Hugh de Lacy’s enmity towards them in his first phase as earl (AU1207.8). De Lacy’s campaign to be reinstated as earl began with an alliance with Aéd Meith Ua Néill (Aéd Buidhe’s grandfather), and this was the beginning of the tradition of alliances between the earls of Ulster and the Ua Néill branch of the Cenél nÉógain.

This tactic of supporting one group in the dynastic disputes of the Cenél nÉógain would occasionally backfire. The permanent displacement of the Meic Lochlainn line from the overkingship in the Battle of Camerighi by Brian Ua Néill in alliance with the Cenél Conaill created something of a problem for the Dublin administration. This led to campaigns against this alliance (e.g., AFM1248.9; AU1252.7). PRIE 45 Henry III (calendared Dougherty 1903, 40) had a detailed account of the money and cattle owed to the earldom by Brian Ua Néill, regulus of Cenél nÉógain, the Irish of Uí Tuirtre, Mac Aonghasa of Uí Echach Cobo and several
others. It may have been in reaction to this, and to the direct campaigns against him that led him to destroy Mag Cobo Castle and Greencastle (AU1253.5; AMF1259.2) before being defeated at the Battle of Down, as noted in 7.4 above. The backing of Brian’s cousin and erstwhile rival Aéd demonstrates that the policy was not abandoned. McNeill (1980, 105–6) lists several other interventions in the affairs of the Cenél nEógain by Richard de Burgh in the subsequent decades. Something of a change in tactics might be apparent as de Burgh’s position became more and more secure, with the construction of Northburgh, a castle on the western shore of Lough Foyle (AU1301.2[=AD1305]) and in the 1333 Inquisition lists several manors and other properties between the Bann and Foyle (Orpen 1914; 1915). This might be coupled with de Burgh’s construction of a masonry castle at Ballymote (ACon1300.4) in relation to his other role as lord of Connaught. With all of this in mind, McNeill (1980, 106) makes the important point that when fighting with Gaelic-Irish groups occurred, it did so in their territory, rather than in the earldom, which he sees as indicating “the relative success of delegating control of a frontier to a resident marcher lord, as against irregular intervention from Dublin”.

What does all of this mean in terms of classifying the colonial episode? In relation to John de Courcy’s activities in northeast Ireland, Duffy asserts that

de Courcy’s grip on Ulster was secured by instituting an elaborate process of colonisation: those who took the lead in this affair, by backing his initial invasion and then planting the newly conquered lands with peasant settlers (1995b, 4).

The footnote accompanying this statement is a discussion of what is referred to by the term Cumbria (where de Courcy’s supporters largely came from) but contains nothing to justify this statement regarding plantation colonialism. The difficulties inherent in identifying non-elite settlers were touched upon above in relation to field systems. As Davies (2000, 150) points out “the great mass of the lesser colonists left few traces in the skimpy records”. A further issue is that names cannot be conflated with ethnic identity, Gaelic-Irish farmers and burgesses might have adopted (or were assigned) an ‘English’ name for legal purposes, for example. The problem is exacerbated by our over-reliance on calendars of royal administrative documents, rather than the documents themselves. For example, a mandate was sent to the justiciar of Ireland to allow Alan of Galloway to lease the lands granted to him in 1210 and to implant settlers upon it (Hardy 1844, 27; Bain 1881, 162 no. 905). Sweetman (1875, 189 no. 1247) mentions none of these details, and one wonders how many other such crucial details have been omitted by other calendars, especially those for which Latin version are unavailable. In the
event, Alan does not seem to have taken up his lands, but the incident does hint at lands in Ulidia being settled by more than just lords and knights.

In reality, it would seem as though the actual producers of the agricultural surplus upon which the wealth of the earls and their followers was based were a mixture of colonists and colonised. The tensions associated with settler colonialism were apparent in the FitzWarin–de Mandeville feud and more minor examples such as the granting of manors to individuals from outside the earldom, or even from outside certain portions of it (e.g., the dispute over Agherton above). They were also apparent in the legal distinction between Irish and English, but at no point is there evidence apparent of the ejection or massacre of the lower orders of pre-colonial society. Similar to Bunratty, Co. Clare, where English tenants were brought in so as to be able to extract as much wealth from the land as quickly as possible, plantation was as much about economic expediency as it was about extending the territory controlled by the king of England (Davies 2000, 147–9). Considering the reasonably high yields of some of the manors in Ulidia, there may well have been plantation colonialism involving free farmers, if not unfree tenants, in the interstices of a system of elite replacement colonialism that involved the displacement and replacement of the previous elites and the incorporation of the remaining orders of society into a new system of domination. Considering the relative peace and stability this new system offered, it may have only required the usual modicum of the impending threat of violence inherent in all societies to maintain the acquiescent involvement of the previous occupiers of the landscape in the new system.

7.7 Ergadia: outcome processes of Scandinavian diasporic episode

Having outlined the main processes at work in Ulidia and the associated events c.AD1170–1350, it is now necessary to do the same for Ergadia before discussing matters relating to both case studies. Section 6.7 discussed the varying outcomes of Scandinavian colonialism in Ergadia, with the emergence of Innsi Gall, Argyll and Galloway as socio-political entities between the tenth and twelfth centuries. Colonial expansion, consolidation and domination are not as clearly identifiable in this period in Ergadia as they are in Ulidia, and in several ways, the situation was more complex. On a fundamental level, the processes at work in Ergadia AD1170–1350 were shaped by the long-term outcomes of Scandinavian colonialism in the Insular Zone coupled with the competition between local elites and between regional powers. In this period, the kings of Scotland, England and Norway were all involved in the region, as were less powerful figures such as the kings of Man, with a shifting configuration of alliances
with the local elites. It is with the activities of the Scottish kings that provide the foundation to understanding the other processes at work, but before turning to that, it is necessary to take up the subject of Somerled again from Section 6.7.

Power in high-medieval Ergadia has traditionally been seen as divided between the Clann Somhairle, the descendants of two of Somerled’s sons:

- The descendants of Dubgall son of Somerled, known as the Meic Dubgaill, centred on Lorn
- The descendants of Ragnall/Rǫgnvaldr son of Somerled, split into the descendants of two of his sons:
  - The Meic Ruaidhri centred on Kintyre and later on Northern Argyll and Lochaber (Garmoran)
  - The Meic Domnaill in Islay, Colonsay, Coll and Tiree

What is obvious from the documentary record is that the permanent split in Innsi Gall between a polity consisting of Man and the northern Hebrides and another in Argyll, Kintyre and the southern Hebrides referred to in CRMI1156 as the outcome of a battle between Somerled and Guðrøðr Óláfsson of Man, and the exile of the latter in Norway AD1158–1164, until the death of Somerled. From the available evidence (Table 7.5), it is difficult to state the extent of Somerled’s holdings and those of his sons after his death. It is also difficult to link Somerled and his sons to any standing remains or archaeological evidence, with the exception of the religious houses founded by Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall son of Somerled (Table 7.7). The pattern of his grants and those of his sons and grandsons indicate a core territory of Kintyre and Arran associated with Rǫgnvaldr, which might indicate that the possibly separate lordships of Kintyre, Lorn, and the Isles held by Somerled (cf. AT1164.6; CMel1164) were divided between his sons Dubgall, Rǫgnvaldr and Aengus during their lifetimes (cf. Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 197–9; McDonald 2008, 68–79).

Table 7.6 indicates that in the time of his grandsons, a division between the Meic Dubgaill in Lorn and the Meic Ragnaill in Kintyre is visible, with the Isles seemingly contested, and with not all of the figures fitting the schema, e.g. Sumarliöi, and some pursuing careers elsewhere, e.g. Óspakr mac Dubgaill and Dubgall mac Ruaidhri. It is only at this point that the archaeological/architectural evidence for settlement and the textual record can be used together to address the processes at work in this period.
Table 7.5. References to Somerled and his sons; all dates AD; *italics* = uncertainty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102</td>
<td>regulus of Argyll</td>
<td>retrospective entry in CRMI notes that he had four sons with a daughter [Ragnhild] of Óláf Guðrøðarson of Man</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130× 1153</td>
<td>hōfðingi (chief); hǫldr (sub-jarl lord)</td>
<td>married Ragnhild, daughter of Óláf Guðrøðarson of Man and Ingibjörg daughter of Hákon Pálsson,</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga §110 (ed. Vigfusson 1887a, 208–11), §100 (trans. Pálsson and Edwards 1978, 207–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1153</td>
<td>hōfðingi, “chief”; hǫldr (sub-jarl lord)</td>
<td>Somerled and his sons Dubgall konúngr (king), Rǫgnvaldr and Aengus referred to as “Dalverja-ætt”, ‘Dalesmen’, prob. derived from ‘Dál Riata’</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1153</td>
<td>hōfðingi, “chief”; hǫldr (sub-jarl lord)</td>
<td>sheltered Gille-Odhrán after he had murdered Helgi, associate of Rǫgnvaldr of Orkney</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153× 1154</td>
<td>hǫldr (sub-jarl lord)</td>
<td>killed (!) along with many of his men while on an expedition with seven ships by Sveinn Ásleifarson</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga §111 (ed. Vigfusson 1887a, 211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>after death of David I of Scotland went into rebellion with his nephews, the sons of Máel Coluim son of Alexander I (rival claimants to throne of Scotland)</td>
<td>CHol1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154</td>
<td>not named</td>
<td><em>mercenary fleet hired from Arran, Kintyre and Man by Muircertach Ua Lochlainn</em></td>
<td>AFM1154.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>declared his son Dubgall as king of Man and the Isles</td>
<td>CRMI1144[=AD1156]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156× 1157</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>defeated Guðrøðr Óláfsson of Man; kingdom divided between Somerled and Guðrøðr</td>
<td>CRMI1156[=AD1157]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>invaded man, Guðrøðr Óláfsson fled to Norway, remained there for six years</td>
<td>CRMI1156; CRMI1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154× 1159</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>Confirmation by Malcolm IV of grant by David I in Argyll dated to Christmas after agreement with Somerled</td>
<td>Barrow 1984a, 182–5 §118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Action(s)</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>implied ruler of</td>
<td>dispute over Somerled’s attempt to move the head of the Columban</td>
<td>AU1164.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men of Argyll and</td>
<td>monastic federation back to Iona from Derry through the appointment of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innsi Gall</td>
<td>Ua Brocháin as abbot of Iona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>king of Innsi Gall</td>
<td>allied with Dublin, killed along with son by “men of Alba”</td>
<td>AT1164.6, MCB1163.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(and Kintyre, AT only)</td>
<td>(CRMI1164 gives no title)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>regulus of Argyll</td>
<td>attacked Renfrew with army of Hybernesium [Irish], killed</td>
<td>CMel1164, CMRH s.a.1164, Stubbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1868, 449–51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amlaib/Óláfr son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102×</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>named as one of four sons of Somerled and [Ragnhild] daughter of Óláfr</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guðrøðarson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>named as one of four sons of Somerled and [Ragnhild] daughter of Óláfr</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guðrøðarson in retrospective entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dubgall son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102×</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>named as one of four sons of Somerled and [Ragnhild] daughter of Óláfr</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guðrøðarson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153×</td>
<td>king (kingdom not</td>
<td>mother stated as Ragnhild, daughter of Óláfr Guðrøðarson of Man and</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga §110, Vigfusson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155</td>
<td>specified)</td>
<td>Ingibjörg, daughter of Hákon Pálsson</td>
<td>1887b, 208–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156</td>
<td>king of the Isles</td>
<td>declared king of Man and the Isles by Somerled and Þórfinnr Óttarsson</td>
<td>CRMI1144[=AD1156]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>grant to Durham at the time Henry II received fealty from the Scots at</td>
<td>Liber Vitae Ecclesiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>York (implies he was in William of Scotland’s retinue—Duncan and Brown</td>
<td>Dunelmensis, Stevenson 1841,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1956–7, 198–9)</td>
<td>135 no. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>listed among donors to Durham, along with his sons “Olaf et Dunechal et</td>
<td>Liber Vitae Ecclesiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raynald”</td>
<td>Dunelmensis fol. 13, b.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson 1841, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gille-Bhrighde son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>killed in battle in Renfrew (not listed in CRMI1102)</td>
<td>AT1164.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102×1164</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>named as one of four sons of Somerled and [Ragnhild] daughter of Óláfr Guðrøðarson in retrospective entry</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153×1155</td>
<td>king of the Isles</td>
<td>mother stated as Ragnhild, daughter of Óláfr Guðrøðarson of Man and Ingibjörg, daughter of Hákon Pálsson</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga §110, Vigfusson 1887b, 208–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164×1209</td>
<td>king of the Isles, lord of Argyll and Kintyre</td>
<td>grant of 12 marklands in Kintyre to Saddell Abbey, named as founder</td>
<td>Balfour Paul 1882, 678 no. 3170(1) [16th C confirmation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164×1209</td>
<td>“same as other charter”</td>
<td>grant of 12 marklands in Kintyre to Saddell Abbey (in 16th C document)</td>
<td>Balfour Paul 1882, 678 no. 3170(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>defeated by his brother Aengus in battle (source of later Crusader story?)</td>
<td>CRMI1192 (Cameron et al. 1897b, 157)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164×1209</td>
<td>lord of Innse Gall</td>
<td>grant to Paisley Abbey with wife Fiona of income from all houses under his rule</td>
<td>Innes 1832, 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1196</td>
<td>king of the Isles</td>
<td>moved against Haraldr Maddaðarson in Caithness on behalf of William of Scotland, held Caithness of him</td>
<td>Chronica Magistri IV, Stubbs 1871, 11–2; Orkneyinga saga, Vigfusson 1887b, 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>king of the Isles and Argyll</td>
<td>died (late tradition)</td>
<td>Book of Clanranald Cameron et al. 1897b, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>battle between the sons of Ragnall mac Somhairle and the men of Skye</td>
<td>AU1209.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aengus son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1102×1164</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>named as one of four sons of Somerled and [Ragnhild] daughter of Óláfr Guðrøðarson in retrospective entry</td>
<td>CRMI1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153×1155</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>mother stated as Ragnhild, daughter of Óláfr Guðrøðarson of Man and Ingibjörg, daughter of Hákon Pálsson</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga §110, Vigfusson 1887b, 208–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1192</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>defeated his brother Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall in battle</td>
<td>CRMI1192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>killed with his three un-named sons (probably by the Norwegian fleet under Óspakr, see Duncan and Brown, 1956–7, 197)</td>
<td>CRMI1210 (Annales Regii 1210, Böglungasaga §18 (short) §39 (long))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.6. Selected references to the grandsons of Somerled; all dates AD; *italics* = uncertainty or proposed attribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>listed among donors to Durham, along with his father, Óláfr and Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall</td>
<td>Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis fol. 13, b., Stevenson 1841, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214×</td>
<td>of Argyll (de Ergadia)</td>
<td>attested charter of Mael Domnaigh, earl of Lennox, to Paisley</td>
<td>Innes 1832, 216–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>Hákon of Norway expressed his displeasure at the kings of the Isles being unfaithful to him, resolved to send Óspakr to rule in their stead</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §163, Vigfusson 1887b, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>taken prisoner along with his brother Dubgall Skraekr by the Northmen, escape aided by Óspakr</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §167, Vigfusson 1887b, 146–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230×</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>founded Ardchattan Priory (Valliscaulian, prob. sponsored by Alexander II)</td>
<td>Extracta, Barclay and Turnbull 1842, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>of Argyll (de Ergadia)</td>
<td>bound by Alexander II to keep the peace of Henry III</td>
<td>Simpson and Galbraith 1986, 25–6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dubgall ‘Skraekr’ son of Dubgall son of Somerled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>Hákon of Norway expressed his displeasure at the kings of the Isles being unfaithful to him, resolved to send Óspakr to rule in their stead</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §163, Vigfusson 1887b, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>taken prisoner along with his brother Donnchad by the Northmen, kept prisoner by Óspakr after Donnchad freed</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §167, Vigfusson 1887b, 146–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Óspakr/Gille-Easpaig ‘suðreyski’ Dubgall son of Somerled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>not listed among donors to Durham, along with his father (Óspakr might have been born after this)</td>
<td>Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis fol. 13, b., Stevenson 1841, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>×1229</td>
<td>member of the Birkibeinar faction in Norwegian Civil War, member of court of Inge Bárðarson and Hákón Hákonarson</td>
<td>Böglungsaga §17/18 (short), §39 (long); Hákonar saga §163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

565
organised raid on the Hebrides from Norway involving the Birkibéinar and Baglar factions Annales regii 1209, Storm 1888, 123; Böglungasaga §17/18

raided the Hebrides with twelve ships, Iona plundered, incurring the wrath of the bishops of Norway (possibly killed Aengus son of Somerled, CRMI1210) Annales regii 1209, Storm 1888, 123; Böglungasaga §17/18 (short), §39 (long)

Hákon of Norway expressed his displeasure at the kings of the Isles being unfaithful to him, resolved to send Óspakr to rule in their stead Hákonar saga §163, Vigfusson 1887b, 144; Annales regii 1230, Storm 1888, 123

invaded Hebrides at head of Norwegian fleet of 11 ships, Donnchad, Dubgall and Sumarliði taken prisoner in Islay Sound, Donnchad freed, Sumarliði killed, attacked Bute, died of wounds Hákonar saga §166, §167

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>battle between the un-named sons of Ragnall and the men of Skye</td>
<td>AU1209.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>raid on Derry and Inis Eógain by un-named sons of Ragnall with Tomás de Galloway and Cenél Conaill</td>
<td>AU1212.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>raided Derry with Tomás de Galloway, valuables brought to Coleraine</td>
<td>AU1214.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>fleet from Innsi Gall</td>
<td>intercepted by Tomás de Galloway en route to intervene in succession dispute in Connacht</td>
<td>AFMI1220.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207×</td>
<td>lord of Kintyre</td>
<td>grant of five pennylands to Kilean church in Kintyre</td>
<td>Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 219 no. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>king of Argyll</td>
<td>un-named son of Somerled killed in Battle of Ballyshannon against Maurice FitzGerald, justiciar of Ireland (prob. Ruaidhri, but could be a son of the Somerled killed in 1230 by Óspakr)</td>
<td>ACON1247.7, AHG1242, (no title in AU1247.1) (cf. Hákonar saga §163, §167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Eógan son of Donnchad and Dubgall son of Ruaidhri</td>
<td>go to Norwegian court to claim title of king over the northern Hebrides (vacated on death of Ruaidhri?)</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §249, Vigfusson 1887b, 241–3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Domnall son of Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1292×1207</td>
<td></td>
<td>grant of income from every house in his realm to Paisley (prob. made at same time as his father’s grant, same attestors, very similar language, see PoMS)</td>
<td>Innes 1832, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>battle between the un-named sons of Ragnall and the men of Skye</td>
<td>AU1209.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>raid on Derry and Inis Eógain by un-named sons of Ragnall with Tomáis de Galloway and Cenél Conaill</td>
<td>AU1212.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>no title given</td>
<td>fleet from Innsi Gall intercepted by Tomáis de Galloway en route to intervene in succession dispute in Connacht</td>
<td>AFM1220.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sumarliði son of (Óláfr? Ragnall? Gille-Bhrighde?) son of Somerled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>Hákon of Norway expressed his displeasure at the kings of the Isles being unfaithful to him, resolved to send Óspakr to rule in their stead</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §163, Vigfusson 1887b, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>one of three kings of the Isles</td>
<td>killed by the Northmen sent by Hákon, having been taken prisoner in Islay Sound</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §167, Vigfusson 1887b, 146–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Máni son of Oláfr (son of Somerled?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Action(s)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>“sýslumaðr” or “steward” of Caithness</td>
<td>appointed as one of three “sýslumenn” to govern Caithness on behalf of Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall</td>
<td>Orkneyinga saga, Vigfusson 1887, 225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.7. Religious houses associated with Continental orders founded in Ergadia in the HMP. Re-F = refoundation on location of earlier monastic site. All dates AD. Architecture = earliest datable architectural features; Sculpture = earliest sculptural or inscription evidence. References in brackets potentially unreliable, references out of brackets first reliable appearance in documentary record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>Re-F</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Mother house</th>
<th>Primary References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iona</td>
<td>Benedictine abbey</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1200×1300</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Rǫgnvaldr son of Somerled (late tradition)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>(Book of Clanranald Cameron et al. 1892b, 202); 10 December 1203, 6 Innocent III in Dunning 1947: 36; 1962: 241 §29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iona St Mary’s</td>
<td>Augustinian priory (nunnery)</td>
<td>1164×1207</td>
<td>1150×1250</td>
<td>1150×1200</td>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>Rǫgnvaldr son of Somerled (late tradition)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>(Book of Clanranald, Cameron et al. 1892b, 202); 1380 Fordun Scotichronicon §10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddell St Mary’s</td>
<td>Cistercian abbey</td>
<td>1160; 1164×1207</td>
<td>1150×1250</td>
<td>1350×1600</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Somerled son of Gille-Bhrighde; Rǫgnvaldr son of Somerled</td>
<td>Mellifont</td>
<td>Cistercian list, Birch 1870, 361b; 20 James IV, 1 January 1507 in Balfour Paul 1882, 678 no. 3170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardchattan St Mary’s</td>
<td>Valliscualian priory</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1200×1300</td>
<td>1350×1600</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Donnchad son of Dubgall</td>
<td>Val des Choux</td>
<td>Extracta, Barclay and Turnbull 1842, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oronsay St Columba’s</td>
<td>Augustinian priory</td>
<td>1318×1353</td>
<td>1400×1500</td>
<td>1350×1600</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Eógan/John Mac Domnaill</td>
<td>Holy Cross?</td>
<td>1353, 1 Innocent VI, in Bliss 1897, 490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.8 Expansion: Ergadia

While Somerled’s origins are obscure, what evidence there is points to his having been a petty king cum marcher lord (the difference is terminological rather than practical) in the same mould as found in Man, Orkney, Moray, Galloway, Wales and Ireland, owing allegiance to more powerful figures when necessary. It is unlikely that there was a ‘Rise of Somerled’ at the expense of David I (Duncan and Brown 1957–8, 195; contra McDonald 2015, 68). The only exception to this might be the acquisition of Kintyre, which is consistently referred to as a distinct entity under his or his descendants’ control. It is argued here that Argyll and Kintyre were already regarded as part of the Scottish kingdom by the AD1140s, the date of the second direct reference to Argyll, in a grant by David I to Holyrood Abbey (see Duncan and Brown 1957–8, especially 194–6; Duncan 1975, 166; Barrow 2003, 133; Oram 2011, 87–8; contra McDonald 2015, 68).

Table 7.8 outlines all of the evidence for Argyll’s twelfth-century participation in the Scottish kingdom, some of which already appeared in 6.7.2 and 7.7. From this evidence, it can be seen that alternative means of expansion might have been used: expansion through clientship. The participation of the men of Lorn at the Battle of Standard in 1138 would seem to demonstrate the good relations between David I and Argyll (Table 7.8). The marriage of an un-named daughter of Gille-Bhrighde to Máel Coluim, illegitimate son of Alexander I, might indicate a relationship between Alexander I and Gille-Bhrighde paralleling Alexander’s own marriage to an illegitimate daughter of Henry I of England (Duncan and Brown 1956-7, 195). This provides the context for the events in CHol1153 and CMel1164, with Somerled taking the side opposed to the succession of David I’s grandson Malcolm IV, just as other magnates had done in AD1124 and AD1130–1134 (see Oram 2011, 70–3). To say that it was some sort of conservative revolt against the increased “feudalisat”ion of Scotland would also be going too far—Somerled’s actions in the Kingdom of the Isles and the flexibility of his descendants might provide evidence to the contrary.

The AD1164 campaign would seem to have been directed at Walter the Steward as much as Malcolm IV, considering that Somerled was killed in the Steward lordship of Renfrew. The date at which Bute fell under Stewart control is usually dated to c.AD1200. Alan, son of Walter the Steward granted Kingarth to Paisley Abbey, in a seeming act of symbolic and/or cultural violence (Innes 1832, 15). Rather than see this as occurring in the first decade of the thirteenth century, the PoMS entry for the grant draws attention to its early date, due to the presence of Roger de Ness among the attestors. Similar to several other figures on that list, Roger seems to
have come from Shropshire to Scotland with Walter, and appears in several of Walter’s charters. If it is accepted that Henry de Ness, granted permission by Paisley to have a chapel at his court in AD1180 (Innes 1832, 68), was Roger’s heir, then the charter must date to AD1177×1180 if Walter died in AD1177 (CMel1177). Furthermore, Alan made the grant of Kingarth, but that does not necessarily imply that he had “added the Isle of Bute to the family lands”, as Barrow (2004; see also 1980, 68) states. Conversely, Duncan (1975, 199) suggests that Bute possibly came into Walter’s possession after the death of Somerled. However, if it is accepted that the territory referred to as of the Gall-Goidil in the twelfth century included Cowal, then it may be that Bute was awarded to Walter the Steward by Malcolm IV for his support in Malcolm’s AD1160 campaign against Fergus de Galloway (CHol1160; Oram 1991, 119), after Somerled made peace with Malcolm (Barrow 1984a, 182–5 §118). While there is no evidence to link the Clann Somhairle to Cowal and Bute, it may be that the Stewart acquisition of Cowal and Bute was then a motivating factor for the AD1164 campaign. Subsequent charter evidence in the Paisley Register (Innes 1832) indicates that the Stewarts may have acted as overlords in southern Cowal and Bute from this time onwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (AD)</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1090–1134</td>
<td>sister of Somerled married Mael Coluim, illegitimate son of Alexander I (not Mac Heth of Moray) of Scotland [if Somerled’s nephews were his sons, then his sister must have been their mother, and before Mael Coluim was imprisoned]</td>
<td>CHol1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1138</td>
<td>men of Lorn and the Islands in third row of David I’s forces in Battle of the Standard</td>
<td>Relatio de Standardo, Howlett 1886, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1141–1147</td>
<td>grant by David I to Holyrood Abbey of “the half part of my tenth from Argyll and Kintyre in the year that I receive Cain”</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 116–9 §143; Barrow 1999, 123–4 §147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150–1153</td>
<td>grant by David I to Urquhart Priory of half his cain of Argyll of Moray and all of the lucre of the same Argyll [not in case study, but included for context]</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 204–5 §255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150–1152</td>
<td>confirmation of grant by David I to Dunfermline Abbey of “the half part of my tenth from Argyll and Kintyre the year that I receive Cain”</td>
<td>Lawrie 1905, 167–71 §209; Barrow 1999, 136–9 §172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1154–1160</td>
<td>confirmation by Malcolm IV of grant by David I of “the half part of my tenth from Argyll and Kintyre in the year that I receive Cain”</td>
<td>Barrow 1984a, 182–5 §118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1166</td>
<td>confirmation by William of grant by David I to Dunfermline</td>
<td>Barrow 1984b, 140–3 §30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1166</td>
<td>confirmation by William of grant by David I to Holyrood</td>
<td>Barrow 1984b, 148–9 §39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.9 Consolidation: Ergadia

7.9.1 Consolidation under William of Scotland

The consolidation process in Ergadia dates to the reigns of William, Alexander II and Alexander III of Scotland. As indicated by Murray (2005, 285–7), the consensus that William adopted a non-interventionist approach in relation to the west during his reign does not quite accord with the evidence (contra Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 197–9; Barrow 2003, McDonald 2008, 69).

Even if there is little material trace of William’s policies towards the west, there are some hints in the documentary record that the consolidation of the expansion of the authority of the Scottish kings into the west is evident as ongoing in his reign.

William’s confirmation of David I’s grants in AD1166 (Table 7.8) might have been an assertion of his overlordship in the region. So too his probable sponsorship of the establishment of the diocese of Argyll at an indeterminate point within his reign—Duncan and Brown (1956–7, 209) propose AD1183×1189, with the first appearance in the documentary record in the c.AD1192 Liber Censuum (Fabre 1889 1.2, 232). However, the diocese is omitted from several other early documents, and a bishop is not explicitly named until the AD1220s (e.g. in 1228, Innes 1837, 25 no. 32). It would seem that William was instrumental in separating the diocese from Dunkeld (discussed in full by MacDonald 2013, 19–60); therefore, the foundation of the diocese might be part of the process of consolidation in the west.

If it is accepted that Dubgall son of Somerled was in Durham in AD1175 after having been in William’s retinue during the treaty negotiations with Henry II of England and William’s subsequent act of homage at York (Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 198–9; Duncan 1975, 198; see CMel1175), then he may have had a relationship with William similar to Somerled’s relationship with David I. This might be difficult to reconcile with William’s AD1172×1174 grant to Holyrood of a cluster of four churches in Galloway held before then by Iona (Hay 1840, 41 no. 51). Barrow (2003, 131) suggests that this was due to William’s alarm at Somerled’s (AU1164.2) attempt to restore Iona as the seat of the Columban Federation of churches. This would not explain the time-lapse between the two events, though. It may be related to an otherwise unknown campaign aimed at bringing Dubgall under William’s control. However, this might be reading too much into the evidence and it might not have been a confiscation at all; nothing from Iona’s archive survives, nor does any cartulary or register (if either had ever been compiled for Iona, see Tucker 2020, 33), and Iona could have been granted something in exchange at the time. Considering that Fergus de Galloway retired to Holyrood and that Holyrood already held other churches in Kirkcudbrightshire by then, e.g. Dunrod
an exchange of dispersed properties may have been the case.

It is likely that William had a similar relationship with Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall, if it is accepted that it was he that moved against Haraldr Maddaðarson on William’s behalf c.AD1196 rather than Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson (fully discussed A.7; see Sellar 2000, 196–7; Oram 2011, 161–2; contra e.g. Murray 2005, 286; Crawford 2013, 250–5; McDonald 2012, 157; 2015, 336). Considering that Rǫgnvaldr son of Somerled had been founding religious houses of Continental orders (Table 7.7) in his territory, he might be regarded as taking on the trappings of high-medieval lordship in this period (cf. Beuermann 2002; McDonald 1995; 2007, 243–7). This may well have occurred under William’s direction.

Murray (2005, 288–9) sees Rǫgnvaldr/Ragnall’s grant to Paisley Abbey as indicating an alliance with the Stewarts. This might also be argued for his sons. It may be that the Stewarts, Rǫgnvaldr and Dubgall were part of a policy by William of devolving power in the marches to magnates. Murray (2005, 288–9) sees the absence of the Stewarts from the attestor list of the foundation charter of the burgh at Ayr (Cooper 1883, 1–4) as part of a wider campaign to contain Stewart power in the region, as well as that of Donnchad of Carrick. Donnchad married Avelina daughter of Alan fitz Walter Stewart in AD1200. Donnchad’s relationship to John de Courcy is discussed in 7.5.1, and Donnchad was John of England’s cousin and a former hostage of Henry II; therefore, the placement of Ayr and William’s strong alliance with Donnchad’s cousin/rival Lochlann of Galloway might hint at a deliberate policy royal at work in the Firth of Clyde. Murray (2005, 289) also states that “William forced Alan FitzWalter to grant the parish of the whole of Bute to the Stewart abbey of Paisley”. It has been proposed in 7.9.1 that Bute was acquired by Walter, rather than Alan, and that Alan’s grant took place very soon after the death of Walter. Furthermore, the Ayr charter probably dates to after Alan’s death recorded in CMel1204 and thus during the long minority of Alan’s heir, the younger Walter Stewart (Barrow 1984, no. 262), which would probably explain the lack of Stewarts among the attestors.

Therefore, the evidence would all point to William using marcher barons to consolidate the Scottish crown’s hold over the west. The dangers of such a policy of granting power to such agents in order to maintain the overall royal position are discussed by Elias (2000, 195–256). As Murray (2005, 285–9) suggests, William might have been alarmed at the alliances built up between those magnatial families. This might have influenced the policies of his son, Alexander II.
7.9.2 Consolidation under Alexander II

The consolidation process moved from the use of marcher magnates to a more intensive approach under William’s son, Alexander II. His AD1222 military campaign in Argyll is poorly documented and only appears in later sources (Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 199). It is argued here that it was not aimed at conquest; rather, it was aimed at consolidating territory already nominally held and bringing its occupants into line, paralleled by his actions against Caithness in the 1220s and Galloway in the AD1230s (Oram 2011, 185–94). It may have been to counteract any potential coalescence of the various factions in the west under a single leader, as might have happened with Somerled and possibly his son Rǫgnvaldr.

Fordun describes Alexander II bringing an army raised in Lothian and Galloway into Argyll due to un-named offensive actions of the inhabitants, some of whom gave hostages and fines and were taken back into his peace, while others fled their possessions and had their lands confiscated and granted to Alexander’s followers (Gesta Annala XL, Skene 1871, 288–9, trans. 1872, 284). Wyntoun briefly notes that the king went with a host to Argyll, which was in rebellion against him, before taking homage and granting holdings to the lords of that land (Cotton MS Book VII, 9.2777–2784 in Amours 1907, 85–7). The outcome would seem to be that Donnchad son of Dubgall of Argyll became more firmly a vassal of the Scottish crown. His c.AD1230 foundation of a Valliscaulian priory at Ardchattan, contemporary to the foundation of Beauly by John Byset and Pluscarden by Alexander II, might be evidence of this (Extracta, Barclay and Turnbull 1842, 93). This alignment with Alexander might have been the source of Hákon of Norway’s dissatisfaction with Donnchad (Hákonar saga §163).

Alexander II may have been acting to establish control over castle construction, learning the lessons of the English kings Stephen, Henry II and John in relation to controlling the military capabilities of the second and third orders of nobility (see Platt 1978, 7–8; Pounds 1990, 118–21). A small number of castles might have already been in existence in AD1222 (Sections 3.17 and A.3.17), but the majority of hall-keeps and castles-of-enclosure in Ergadia seem to have been built in the fifty years after the AD1222 campaign (cf. Cruden 1959; 1960, 38–49; Dunbar 1981, 44–9; Fisher 2005; Caldwell and Ruckley 2005). This involved a mixture of magnatial castles (the Stewarts and the Meic Dubgaill), royal castles, and the castles of more minor lords holding land directly from the king.

As the Stewart case demonstrates, while the Clann Somhairle are extremely important, they were not the only group(s) holding power in the region—something that might be instructive for approaching the Dál Riata several hundred years earlier. Large parts of Ergadia lay outside their control in the early thirteenth century—most notably Cowal, Knapdale and
Mid Argyll. It was argued in 6.7.2 that the term Gall-Goidil might have been applied to this portion of Ergadia prior to its use in relation to Galloway. If Fergus de Galloway had been moved from this area to Carrick and Galloway, it might have fallen into the direct overlordship of the Scottish crown either then or on his removal in AD1160 (7.8; CHol1160), paving the way for the Stewart expansion around the Clyde and for a series of royal grants to more minor lords.

It is likely that the royal castles of Dunaverty and Tarbert were built on the sites of early medieval enclosed promontories in the years after Alexander’s AD1222 campaign. Dunaverty was besieged or stormed by Alan fitz Thomas, earl of Atholl in AD1252 (LRPTL 36 Henry III in Sweetman 1877, 1, no. 2; Bain 1881, 349 no. 1865). This may well have been the castle fortified by Walter Byset in 1248 (RLPTL 32 Henry III in Sweetman 1875, 436 no. 2926), as the AD1252 entry mentions Alan being in a skirmish with the men of John Byset, who was Walter’s son. It was probably surrendered to Hákon of Norway in 1263 by the head of its garrison (Hákonar Saga §320). All of this would indicate that it was held by the crown (for later references, see A.3.16). The castle-of-enclosure at Tarbert might date to the AD1220s (Dunbar and Duncan 1971, 13), but there is no reference to the site until it appears as Sátiris-eið, “Kintyre’s isthmus,” which was attacked in August 1263 by part of Hákon’s army (Hákonar saga §321). The castle was expanded by Robert I of Scotland in AD1325–6, who also installed a constable (Stuart and Burnett 1878, 52–3, 237; Dunbar and Duncan 1971, 14–6; RCAHMS 1971, 182).

It is probable that Brodick Castle on Arran, Rothesay on Bute, and Dunoon in Cowal were royal castles, even if they might also have had associations with the Stewarts. Brodick and Lochranza on Arran are noted as royal castles by Fordun (II.10), but the earliest reference to Brodick is to John Hastings holding it of Edward I in 1306 (The Brus, ed. Innes 1856, 88 line 5; trans. Macmillan 1914, 92 line 388; cf. RCTL 34 Edward I m. 5, Maxwell Lyte et al. 1908, 68). It may have been held by Walter Byset on his death on Arran (IPM 36 Henry III in Bain 1881, 342–3 no. 1836). One wonders whether it was for Henry III that the Bysets held Brodick and Dunaverty. John, “constabularies de Dunnon” is among the attestors of a charter by Lagmann Mac Mail Coluim granting the church of Kilfinan to Paisley Abbey in AD1232×1236 (Innes 1832, 132–3). Fellow attestors include Walter fitz Alan Stewart and two local lords, Dubgall Mac Suibhne and Gille-Pátraic Mac Gille Chríst. That a constable is mentioned might indicate that Dunoon was a royal castle within the growing sphere of influence of the Stewarts. The reference to a stívaðr, “steward,” leading the garrison defending Rothesay in AD1230 (Hákonar saga §167) might either indicate that a constable was at the
castle, or that it was a member of the Stewart family.

Equally important in the process of consolidation is Alexander II’s use of “a number of lesser families greedy for power and lands in a fiercely competitive environment” (Barrow 2003, 136; Tables 7.9–7.11) that can be placed in the territory extending from Loch Awe to West Loch Tarbert to Loch Long. In the thirteenth century, members of these families built and lived in castles, sponsored the construction and maintenance of parish churches, and frequently witnessed one another’s charters (Castle Sween entry in A.3.17 for examples). Later traditions (Skene 1880, 472–4; Walsh 1920) assign several of these families a common origin (first four in Table 7.9), but as Barrow (2003, 136; contra Sellar 1971) points out, the families “may be truly said to have originated in the thirteenth century”. It is argued here that these fictive genealogies and origin stories were used to mask the real source of many of these families’ holdings: the consolidation of Ergadia into the Kingdom of Scotland through “a few well-positioned castles”, to paraphrase Prior (2006). This was further strengthened by the continued cultivation of alliances with Marcher lords, especially the Comyns, Stewarts and Meic Dubgaill in the thirteenth century and the Meic Domnaill in the fourteenth.

**Table 7.9. Basic details of selected landholding families in Ergadia in the thirteenth century, their castles and their origins prior to appearance in Argyll; alliances listed date to AD1200–1290; further details in Tables 7.10–7.11; all origins theorised rather than proven.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Castles</th>
<th>Alliances</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meic Suibhne</td>
<td>Knapdale, northern Kintyre, Glendaruel</td>
<td>Castle Sween, Skipness</td>
<td>Norway, Ua Conchobair, Edward I</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meic Gille Christ</td>
<td>Glassary, Cowal</td>
<td>Fincharn</td>
<td>Alexander II</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meic Lagmainn</td>
<td>mid Loch Fyne eastern Cowal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Meic Dubgaill, Stewarts</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meic Lachlann</td>
<td>Strachur</td>
<td>Castle Lachlann</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meic Neachtain</td>
<td>upper Loch Fyne, upper Loch Awe</td>
<td>Loch Dubh, Fraoch Eilean</td>
<td>Alexander II, Alexander III, Campbells</td>
<td>Strathearn or Loch Tay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewarts</td>
<td>Cowal Bute, Arran, Kintyre, Knapdale</td>
<td>Rothesay, Brodick, Lochranza</td>
<td>Alexander II, Alexander III</td>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combined with the royal castles and the castles held by the Meic Dubgaill, the holdings of these groups based in Cowal and Mid Argyll account for much of the differential distribution of thirteenth-century castles in Ergadia. Map 7.6 sets that distribution over a heatmap of ON farm-names along with the evidence for furnished burials. A clear negative relationship is apparent between the distribution of indicators of Scandinavian(-diasporic) colonial activity and the distribution of castles c.AD1200–1350. To demonstrate its validity, Map 7.7 sets the castles over a heatmap of Iron Age and early medieval settlement, with the distribution of high/late-medieval churches, chapels and religious houses demonstrating the continued use of these areas for settlement contemporary to the construction of these castles. Map 7.8 demonstrates the relationship between castle distribution and farmable land, indicating that several castles were not primarily related to agriculture, but rather controlled sea-lanes.

Alexander II unsuccessfully attempted to purchase the Hebrides from Hákon of Norway in AD1242–5 (Hákonar saga §245). This came at a time when he made most of his land-grants in Argyll. Alexander’s grant in 1242 of territory to Gille-Easpaig and Eógan Mac Gille-Christ included Glassary and holdings in Cowal on lower Loch Fyne, in Ormidale, and mid Loch Long (Macphail 1916, 121–4). Presumably, the Glassary holding included Fincharn Castle on Loch Awe. The Meic Neachtain granted Kilmorich to Inishaffray in AD1241×1248 (Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 64–5 nos. 73–4) and Inishail to Inishaffray c.AD1257 (Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 209 no. 85). Therefore, their holding of Fraoch Eilean, granted AD1267 (Macphail 1914, 107) might be a confirmation of a previous holding, and they may also have held Dubh Loch in Glen Shira at this point. It may be that Alexander was seeking to fence in the Meic Dubgall with a series of territories held by minor lords directly from him (Millar 1966, 121), possibly because the Meic Dubgaill held their castles in Lorn of Alexander but their castles in the Isles of Hákon of Norway.
Map 7.6. Distribution of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century masonry castles and possible mottes in Ergadia set against the sum distribution of furnished burials and longphort names and set over a heatmap of ON farm-names, with the darkest shade indicating three or more ON names within a 3 km radius.
Map 7.7. Distribution of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century masonry castles and possible mottes in Ergadia set along with the distribution of high/late medieval churches, chapels and religious houses and set over a heatmap representing the total of known Iron Age and early medieval settlement, with the darkest shade indicating three or more ON names within a 3km radius.
Map 7.8. Distribution of thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century masonry castles and possible mottes in Ergadia set along with the distribution of high/late medieval parish churches and religious houses, set over the modern Land Capability for Agriculture index.
Table 7.10. Selected landholdings and landholding families in Ergadia, AD1222 to AD1286 (after invasion of Alexander II and before succession crisis triggered by death of Alexander III); italics = uncertainty, (M) = probably manor or equivalent, (VT) = villa terrae or equivalent of sub-manorial holding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meic Suibhne (MacSweens)</th>
<th>Landholding</th>
<th>Castles</th>
<th>First Holder</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Passed to</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knapdale (M)</td>
<td>Castle Sween</td>
<td>Máel-Muire Mac Suibhne?</td>
<td>(retrospective in 4 Edward II m. 14, Macpherson et al. 1814, 90)</td>
<td>Only referred to after it was lost to Menteith</td>
<td>Walter Stewart-Menteith</td>
<td>1263, Hákonar saga §320; Rotuli Scotiae, 4 Edward II m. 14, Macpherson et al. 1814, 90</td>
<td>Probably lost along with Skipness, only referred to retrospectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Northern) Kintyre (M)</td>
<td>Skipness</td>
<td>Dubgall Mac Suibhne</td>
<td>1247, 4 Innocent IV in Innes 1832, 123 (still held 1261, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 120–1)</td>
<td>Confirmation of gift of Kilcalmonell to Paisley</td>
<td>Walter Stewart-Menteith</td>
<td>1262, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 121–2</td>
<td>John, heir of Dubgall named in 1261, but did not inherit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arran (M)</td>
<td>Murchad Mear son of Máel-Muire Mac Suibhne</td>
<td>1263, Hákonar saga §326</td>
<td>Speculative grant by Hákon of Norway, probably not held for long</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendaruel (M)</td>
<td>(Meic Suibhne?); John Stewart-Menteith</td>
<td>22 July 1310, Rotuli Scotiae, 4 Edward II m. 14, Macpherson et al. 1814, 90</td>
<td>(Only referred to after it was lost to Menteith and confiscated from him)</td>
<td>Suibhne son of Murchad Óg Mac Suibhne</td>
<td>12 March 1315, RLPTL 8 Edward II, in Maxwell Lyte et al. 1898, 264</td>
<td>Might not have been ancestral holding of Mac Suibhne, prob. granted in 1210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landholding</td>
<td>Castles</td>
<td>First Holder</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Passed to</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbert</td>
<td>Tarbert</td>
<td>Domnall Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td>Mid-13th C, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 157</td>
<td>Could be Tarbert of Loch Lomond</td>
<td>Crown?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassary (M)</td>
<td>Finchern</td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>1 August 1240, 6 Alexander II, in Macphail 1916, 121–4</td>
<td>knight’s fee holding of M + VTs, corresponds to modern parish</td>
<td>Ralph of Dundee</td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilchrenan (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>north of Loch Awe</td>
<td>Éógan Mac Gille-Christ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascog (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>Southern part of Kilfinan, Cowal</td>
<td>Meic Ferchair</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfinart (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>north of Kilmun</td>
<td>Meic Ferchair</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craganeuer (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eógan Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td>(still held by son in AD1296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathlachlan (M)</td>
<td>Castle Lachlann</td>
<td>Gille Pátraic Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td>1232×1236, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 132–3</td>
<td>Witness to Meic Ferchair charter, Gille-Easpaig Mac Lachlainn</td>
<td>1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td>Runs contrary to the MS1467 genealogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholding</th>
<th>Castles</th>
<th>First Holder</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Passed to</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarbert</td>
<td>Tarbert</td>
<td>Domnall Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td>Mid-13th C, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 157</td>
<td>Could be Tarbert of Loch Lomond</td>
<td>Crown?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassary (M)</td>
<td>Finchern</td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>1 August 1240, 6 Alexander II, in Macphail 1916, 121–4</td>
<td>knight’s fee holding of M + VTs, corresponds to modern parish</td>
<td>Ralph of Dundee</td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilchrenan (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>north of Loch Awe</td>
<td>Éógan Mac Gille-Christ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascog (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>Southern part of Kilfinan, Cowal</td>
<td>Meic Ferchair</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenfinart (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig</td>
<td>north of Kilmun</td>
<td>Meic Ferchair</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 February 1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craganeuer (VT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eógan Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td>(still held by son in AD1296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathlachlan (M)</td>
<td>Castle Lachlann</td>
<td>Gille Pátraic Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td>1232×1236, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 132–3</td>
<td>Witness to Meic Ferchair charter, Gille-Easpaig Mac Lachlainn</td>
<td>1293, APS, Innes 1844, 447</td>
<td></td>
<td>Runs contrary to the MS1467 genealogy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Meic Ferchair (Lamonts via Meic Lagmainn branch)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholding</th>
<th>Castles</th>
<th>First Holder</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Passed to</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bute (part of M or VT)</strong></td>
<td>Ferchar of Bute</td>
<td>Donnchad son of Ferchair</td>
<td>1220×1249, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 127</td>
<td>Attested a charter of Aengus Mór Mac Domnaill</td>
<td>Stewarts? Crown?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kilmun (M)</strong></td>
<td>Dunoon</td>
<td>Donnchad son of Ferchair</td>
<td>1231×1236, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 132</td>
<td>described as ancestral holding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otter (M), later Ardlamont</strong></td>
<td>Cnoc mhic Eoghain</td>
<td>Donnchad son of Ferchair</td>
<td>1231×1236, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 132</td>
<td>May have passed to Lagmann afterwards</td>
<td>Máel-Coluim son of Lagmann</td>
<td>23 July 1295, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 138–9</td>
<td>Indication that it passed to Lagmann’s line, and might have originally been his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loch Gilp (VT)</strong></td>
<td>Lagmann son of Máel Coluim</td>
<td></td>
<td>1231×1236, Paisley Register, Innes 1832, 132</td>
<td>Later charters indicate it was Lagmann’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meic Nechtain (MacNaughtons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholding</th>
<th>Castles</th>
<th>First Holder</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Passed to</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Loch Fyne</strong></td>
<td>Loch Dubh</td>
<td>Gille-Christ son of Máel Coluim Mac Neachtain</td>
<td>1241×1248, Inishaffray Charters, Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 64-5 no. 7</td>
<td>Granted Kilmorich to Inishaffray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Loch Awe</strong></td>
<td>Fraoch Eilean</td>
<td>Gille-Bhrighde son of Máel Coluim Mac Neachtain</td>
<td>29 June 1257, Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 209 no. 85</td>
<td>Granted Inishail to Inishaffray</td>
<td>Gille-Christ son of Máel Coluim Mac Neachtain</td>
<td>12 February 1267, 13 Alexander III, quoted in Crawford MS Macphail 1914, 107</td>
<td>Granted Fraoch Eilean by Alexander III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.11. Lands in Ergadia under the jurisdiction of the Sherifffdoms of Argyll (under Alexander Mac Dubgaill) and Kintyre (under James Stewart) created by an act of parliament in February 1893 by John Balliol (listed in Innes 1844, 447).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Holding (original document)</th>
<th>Holding name</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Holder</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Gen Location</th>
<th>Specific Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terra de Kinnel Bathyn</td>
<td>Cenél Báetáin</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 prob. single unit</td>
<td>Comyns or Meic Ruaidhri</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Northern Argyll or Lorn</td>
<td>Morvern or Benderloch (Baile Mhaodain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Terra de Ardenmurich</td>
<td>Ardnamurchan</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 prob. single unit</td>
<td>Meic Ruaidhri?</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Northern Argyll</td>
<td>Ardnamurchan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Terra de Bothelue</td>
<td>Loch Leven</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 prob. single unit</td>
<td>Meic Ruaidhri?</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>Loch Leven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Lochelue]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Terra Alexi de Argad</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Mac Dubgaill</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>Mid Lorn, Nether Lorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Terra Joh de Glenurwy</td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td></td>
<td>John of Glenorchy</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Lorn</td>
<td>Upper Lorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Terra Gilbi Mc ……</td>
<td>Upper Loch Awe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Brighde son of Máel-Coluim Mac Neachtain (cf. Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 209 no. 85)</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>Upper Loch Awe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terra Malcolmí Mc Iuyr</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Máel-Coluim Mac Ímair</td>
<td>Crown?</td>
<td>Lorn or Mid Argyll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Terra Dugall de Cragins</td>
<td>Craignish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubgall Campbell</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>Craignish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Terra Joh McGile’st</td>
<td>Loch Awe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eógan Mac Gille-Christ</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>Kilchrenan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Terra magri Radi de Dunde</td>
<td>Glassary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ralph of Dundee</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Mid Argyll</td>
<td>Glassary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Terra Gileskel Melachl ……</td>
<td>Strathlachlan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gille-Easpaig Mac Lachlainn</td>
<td>Crown?</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Over Cowal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Holding (original document)</td>
<td>Holding name</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Gen Location</td>
<td>Specific Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Terra of Kintyre cum obiȝ tenentibȝ terras in ead</td>
<td>Kintyre</td>
<td>(see 1296 letter from Alexander of Islay to Edward I, Dunbar and Duncan 1971, 16–7)</td>
<td>Aengus Mac Domnaill, king of the Isles</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Kintyre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Terra Lochmani Mेण kilcoli Mेण Erewer</td>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>Lagmann son of Gille-Coluim Mac Ferchair</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Otter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Terra Eneg Mेण Erewer</td>
<td>Kilmun</td>
<td>Aengus Mac Ferchair</td>
<td>Ancestral</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Kilmun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Terra de ……………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insula de Boot</td>
<td>Bute</td>
<td>Confiscation</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td>Bute</td>
<td>Bute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Terra dni Thom Cambel</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Thomas Campbell</td>
<td>Menteith?</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Ormidale?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Terra Dunkani Duf</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Donnchad Dubh Campbell</td>
<td>Menteith?</td>
<td>Cowal</td>
<td>Inverchaolain?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vicecomitatus de Kintyre (Seneschal of Scotland)**
7.10 Conflicting colonialisms: an overview of Norwegian colonialism

Norwegian activity in the Insular Zone in the twelfth–thirteenth centuries is difficult to classify within the colonial model. It can be seen as reactive to the innovation that brought about the lordship of Argyll, the Kingdom of the Isles and the Kingdom of Man and the Isles, and to Scottish attempts to bring these polities into the ‘community of the realm’ through ‘the winning of the west’, as described—and arguably oversimplified—by Scottish historians (Barrow 1989, 129–46; 2003, xxiii–xxiv; Cowan 1990). The extent of Norwegian overlordship in Man and the Isles and its chronological depth is debatable (cf. Beuermann 2010; Woolf 2014). It may only date the late eleventh century, if not the thirteenth century. This should be kept in mind when approaching sagas focussing on the Viking Age, but also when differentiating between high-medieval political reality and the claims made in the Historia Norwegie (ed. Ekrem and Mortensen, trans. Fisher 2006, 64–5), which claims that the Orkneys under their earls and the Hebrides under their reguli [petty kings] “both pay no mean tribute to the kings of Norway” (utrique regibus Norwegie non modica persoluunt tributa).

Table 7.12 outlines the evidence for personal intervention in the Insular Zone, Table 7.12 selected interactions between the kings of Norway and the Insular Zone AD1050–1300, with Table 7.13 portraying the evidence for submissions to external rulers by agents in the Kingdom of the Isles and Argyll. This information is to set the processes at work in their full context, as it was certainly not obvious in AD1222 that Scottish domination in Argyll and the Isles would be achieved. The outcome to this Norwegian activity was just that, though, as will be discussed in Section 7.11.

Perhaps the only archaeological trace of this activity, beyond the lands and castles held by the Meic Dubgaill and the Meic Ruaidhrí of the kings of Norway, is the reoccupation and repurposing of enclosed settlements across Ergadia (Sections 3.3–3.10). This is most strongly visible in ASRs in Kintyre and to a lesser degree in Lorn (diagrams in 3.18), especially those located on outcrops or other defensible locations. It is also to be found in the continued use of crannogs. Another important group of sites in this respect might be the small group of island settlements. While they are mainly a late-medieval phenomenon (A.3.6.B), activity at the high-status island settlement at Finlaggan (Caldwell 2010) and the island settlement at Loch Glashan (Fairhurst 1969) near the crannog dates to at least as early as the fourteenth century. Considering the number of armies moving through the region c.AD1210–1350, it might not be surprising that elements of enclosed settlement would become popular again. This series of military campaigns might also account for the appearance of longphort toponyms in Ergadia,
used in the later sense of the term, i.e., any form of campaign fortification (see Maas 2008).

Table 7.12. Evidence for direct personal intervention in the Insular Zone by Norwegian kings, AD1046–1263

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1046</td>
<td>Threatened invasion of England, leading Eadward to prepare defences, war with Sveinn of Denmark prevented expedition west</td>
<td>ASC1046/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058</td>
<td>Led invasion of England with forces from the Orkneys, <em>Innsi Gall</em> and Dublin, allied with Grufudd ap Llewelyn of Gwynedd and Ælfgar son of Leofric to restore Ælfgar to earldom of Mercia</td>
<td>AT1058.4, AC1078/B, AC380/C, ASC1058/D, John of Worcester 1058, Brut1056, CMe1058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>Led invasion of England with his son Óláfr against Harold Godwinson, allied with Tostig Godwinson, Pál of Orkney. Guðrøðr of Dublin (later of Man), defeated and killed by Harold</td>
<td>ASC1066/C–E, Brut1066, CRMI1029[=AD1066] (nickname in ASC1066/D and CRMI as hárfragr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>Given safe passage away from Stamford Bridge by Harold Godwinson following defeat in battle</td>
<td>ASC1066/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102–1103</td>
<td>Campaigned with 16 ships in Orkney, <em>Innsi Gall</em>, Galloway/Gall-Goidil, Man, Anglesey and Ireland; makes treaty and marriage alliance with Muirchertach Ua Briain; killed near Downpatrick by the Ulaid</td>
<td>CRMI1098, AU1102.7, CS1101, AT1102.8, CS1102, AU1103.6, AI1103.5, AT1103.5, CS1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Visited Orkney, campaigned in the Hebrides and Clyde region against Alexander III of Scotland, the Stewarts and their allies; allied with Orkney, Man, Dubgall and Ailean mac Ruaidhri, Aengus mac Domnaill, Muiredach Mac Suibhne, Éogan Mac Dubgaill neutral; campaign inconclusive, died on Orkney</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §§314–331, AU1263.6, ACON1263.5, CRMI1263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.13. Selected evidence for interaction between Norwegian kings and the Insular Zone, AD1046–1300; *italics* = proposed, but unproven, association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnús góði Óláfsson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1048</td>
<td>Loðen and Erling raided England and Flanders with 25 ships, possible acting on behalf of Magnús Óláfsson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnús berfætt Óláfsson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1095×1097</td>
<td>Ingemund sent to take possession of the Isles; burned in his house on Lewis by <em>principes</em> of the Isles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inge Haraldsson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Guðrøðr son of Óláfr Guðrøðarson, king of Man, sent by his father to do homage to Inge Haraldsson of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Óláfsson returned from Norway via with Inge’s backing on murder of Óláfr, installed as king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Óláfsson fled to Norway after defeat by Somerled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magnús Erlingsson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1163×1164</td>
<td>Guðrøðr Óláfsson returned from Norway to Man and blinded his brother Rǫgnvaldr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inge Bárðarson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1209–1210</td>
<td>Ships from Baglar and Birkibéinar united and raided Hebrides with permission from Inge, controversially including Iona, ÓspákÍr mac Dubgàill among the leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Aengus son of Somerled and three sons killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson of Man and (his son) Guðrøðr, having been attacked by the ships sent by Inge, summoned to Norway and submitted to holding land by fief from Inge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hákon Hákonarson</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>Óláfr Guðrøðarson goes to Norway to obtain support of Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229–1230</td>
<td>ÓspákÍr mac Dubgall and Guðrøðr Donn Rǫgnvaldsson to be installed as kings over Man and the Isles by force from Norway led by them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>Alan de Galloway threatened to invade Norway with large naval force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Campaign in Hebrides, ÓspákÍr moved against his brothers Donnchad and Dubgall Skraekr, killing Dubgall and his cousin Sumarlíði, Alan de Galloway avoided,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Bute attacked, death of Óspakr, Óláfr Guðrøðarson appointed as commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>Óláfr Guðrøðarson taken under protection of Henry III on his way to visit Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>Gospatrick and Gille-Crist son of Muircertach sent by Hákon to remove Haraldr Óláfrsson from kingship of Man for failing to do homage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>Haraldr Óláfrsson goes to court of Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Haraldr Óláfrsson granted leave by Hákon to return from court to rule Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>repeated attempts by Alexander II of Scotland to purchase the Hebrides from Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247–1249</td>
<td>Haraldr Óláfrsson summoned to court of Hákon, marries Hákon’s daughter, they drown near Shetlands on way back to Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248–1249</td>
<td>Eógan son of Donnchad of Argyll and Dubgall son Ruaidhrí went to court of Hákon seeking kingship over northern Hebrides, granted to Eógan, Dubgall joins Hákon’s retinue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Haraldr Guðrøðarson summoned to court of Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Eógan of Argyll sent to rule Kingdom of the Isles by Hákon, opposed on arrival in Man (also opposed in Argyll by Alexander II of Scotland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>Magnús Óláfsson returned from Norway to take up kingship of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>Magnús Óláfsson travelled to court of Hákon for a year, with backing of Henry III (possibly reversed entries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>Magnús Óláfsson confirmed in kingship by Hákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Exchanges of letters with Henry III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>Bishop Henry and Sira Askatin sent from Orkney to open peace negotiations with Alexander III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264–1265</td>
<td>Eiríkr son of Dubgall mac Ruaidhri sent to Hebrides and Orkneys to make preparations for their defence against Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265–1266</td>
<td>Reginald of Roxburgh sent by Alexander III to Norway to negotiate treaty; kings of Scotland to pay £100 (recte 100 marks) per year in homage to king of Norway for possession of the Isles, with 4000 marks to be paid immediately, which was handed over to Magnús in the Orkneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Return of Reginald to Scotland with Treaty of Perth and chancellor of king of Norway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Magnús Hákonarson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1289–1290</td>
<td>Letter from Guardians of Scotland</td>
<td>Rymer 1745, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1290</td>
<td>Treaty of Bingham confirming Margaret of Norway’s succession to the throne of Scotland</td>
<td>Stevenson 1870 Vol. I, 129–31 no. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>Robert de Brus and his daughter Isabella granted safe conduct by Edward I to travel to Norway, and for envoy of Norway in England</td>
<td>RLPTL 20 Edward I in Stevenson 1870 Vol. I, 336–8 no. 276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eiríkr Magnússon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1299–1300</td>
<td>Letter to king of England claiming the Isles were part of Norway, requesting aid in expelling Scots and stating that Margaret’s dowry was in arrears</td>
<td>29 Edward I in Bain 1884, 303 no. 1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299–1300</td>
<td>Letter to king of England seeking help in acquiring payment for 2800 marks owed by Guardians of Scotland</td>
<td>29 Edward I in Bain 1884, 303 no. 1182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.14. Selected evidence for submissions to and alliances with external rulers by agents in the Kingdom of the Isles (to division in AD1154), and after of King of Man and the Isles (i.e. man and Northern Hebrides) and Kingdom of the Isles (Innse Gall, or Southern Hebrides).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1031</td>
<td>Knútr of England and Denmark (with Máel Coluim of Alba and Mac Bethad of Moray)</td>
<td>ASC1031/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066</td>
<td>Guðrøðr cro bhán Ívarsson (grandson of Haraldr son of Óláfr Cuarán), king of the Isles and Dublin</td>
<td>CRMI1047[=AD1066]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075×1095</td>
<td>Muircertach Ua Briain</td>
<td>CRMI1075[=AD1095×1098]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057×1095</td>
<td>Magnús berfaett Óláfsson of Norway</td>
<td>CRMI1077[=AD1095×1098]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057–1103</td>
<td>Magnús berfaett Óláfsson of Norway</td>
<td>CRMI1098[=AD1102–1103]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097–1103</td>
<td>Henry I of England, who sheltered him from Magnús at his court</td>
<td>CRMI1098[=AD1102–1103]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Guðroðr son of Óláfr sent to Inge Haraldsson of Norway to do homage</td>
<td>CRMI1142[=AD1152];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152</td>
<td>Guðroðr son of Óláfr sent to Inge Haraldsson of Norway to do homage</td>
<td>CRMI1142[=AD1152];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1153</td>
<td>Guðroðr made king of Man, presumably with Inge’s support, after his father’s murder</td>
<td>CRMI1143[=AD1153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158</td>
<td>given armour, pay, and protection by Henry II (presumably having been knighted by him)</td>
<td>PRTL Henry II in Bain 1881, 9 no. 56 and no. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1158–1164</td>
<td>sheltered by Inge Haraldsson, possibly Hákon Haraldsson, and Magnús Erlingsson</td>
<td>CRMI1158; CRMI1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1165</td>
<td>receives liberations of Henry II</td>
<td>PRTL 4 Henry II in Bain 1881, 13 no. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1171</td>
<td>received letter from Ruaidhri Ua Conchobair of Connacht to take part in Siege of Dublin (no evidence that he took part, which would be unlikely considering his relationship to Henry II)</td>
<td>Expugnatio I §22, Dimmock 1867, 265–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>papal blessing for marriage to Findguala, daughter of Niall son of Muircertach Ua Lochlainn</td>
<td>CRMI1176[=AD1177]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson, king of Man and the Isles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1178×1190</td>
<td>John de Courcy of Ulster married to Affreca, sister of Rǫgnvaldr</td>
<td>CRMI1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>provided fleet of 100 ships for de Courcy to take back Ulster from Hugh and Walter de Lacy</td>
<td>CRMI1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>protection granted by John of England to his cousin Rǫgnvaldr</td>
<td>RLPTL 7 John I in Bain 1881, 63 no. 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>grant of £20 from John of England</td>
<td>PRTL 8 John I in Bain 1881, 64 no. 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Inge Bárðarson of Norway compelled submission after Norwegian campaign in the Hebrides</td>
<td>Böglungasaga (long), Storm and Bugge 1914, 51 no. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>granted 1 knight’s fee near Carlingford and given protection of John of England (presumably knighted by John AD1206×1212)</td>
<td>RCTL 14 John I, Hardy 1837, 186; Sweetman 1875, 70, no. 429; RLPTL 14 John I in Sweetman 1875, 70, no. 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>safe contact granted to do homage to Henry III of England</td>
<td>RLPTL 2 Henry III in Bain 1881, 122 no. 696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>granted revenues from Irish exchequer by Henry III of England</td>
<td>RLCTL 4 Henry III in Sweetman 1875, 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>granted revenues from Irish exchequer by Henry III of England</td>
<td>RLCTL 6 Henry III in Sweetman 1875, 189, no. 1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207–1214</td>
<td>William of Scotland imprisoned his brother and rival Óláfr</td>
<td>CRMI1217[=AD1207×1226]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207–1229</td>
<td>supported by Alan of Galloway against Óláfr, opposed by Ferchar of Ross</td>
<td>CRMI1217[=AD1207×1226]; CRMI1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>granted papal protection by Honorius III</td>
<td>7 Honorius III, in Theiner 1864, 21–2 no. 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guðrøðr Donn Rǫgnvaldsson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Inge Bárðarson of Norway compelled submission after Norwegian campaign in the Hebrides</td>
<td>Böglungasaga (long), Storm and Bugge 1914, 51 no. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>granted kingship over Man’s portion of the Isles by Hákon of Norway, with Óspakr to take the other portion</td>
<td>CRMI1229[=1229–1230]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>took possession of Man and the Isles with his uncle Óláfr with Norwegian backing, died soon after</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §§166–7; CRMI1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ruler</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207–1229</td>
<td>supported by Ferchar of Ross against Rǫgnvaldr, opposed by Alan of Galloway, pope</td>
<td>CRMI1217[=AD1207×1226]; CRMI1228; 4 Honorius III in Theiner 1864, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228</td>
<td>granted protection by Henry III</td>
<td>11 Henry III in Simpson and Galbraith 1986, 136 no. 9; RLPTL 12 Henry III in Bain 1881, 182 no. 1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1228×1236</td>
<td>knighted by Henry III</td>
<td>CRMI1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>attempted to do homage to Hākon of Norway</td>
<td>CRMI1229[=1229–1230]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>took possession of Man and the Isles with his nephew Guðrøðr with Norwegian backing, granted all of Man and the Isles on death of Guðrøðr soon after</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §166–7; CRMI1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>safe conduct granted to visit Henry III</td>
<td>RLPTL 19 Henry III in Bain 1881, 226 no. 1236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>safe conduct granted by Henry III to visit Hākon</td>
<td>RLPTL 20 Henry III in Bain 1881, 233 no. 1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1238</td>
<td>Gospatrick and Gille-Crist son of Muircertach sent by Hākon of Norway to depose Haraldr for not doing homage</td>
<td>CRMI1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239–1242</td>
<td>homage done to Hākon, remained at court for two years; reigned in peace with kings of England and Scotland</td>
<td>CRMI1239; CRMI1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>knighted by Henry III</td>
<td>CRMI1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247–1248</td>
<td>summoned to Norway, married daughter of Hākon; drowned near Shetland on way to Man</td>
<td>CRMI1247; CRMI1249; Hákonar saga §264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>deposed by Hākon of Norway; Eògan of Argyll appointed in his place, who was expelled soon after by the locals</td>
<td>CRMI1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253–1254</td>
<td>stayed for a year in court of Hākon, having been appointed king in Man; confirmed as king by Hākon</td>
<td>CRMI1253; CRMI1254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1253  granted protection from kings of Gwynedd and Scotland by Henry III while visiting Norway  RLCTL 37 Henry III in Bain 1881, 357 no. 1917
1254  knighted by Henry III  CRMI1254
1263  part of major raid on Lennox on behalf of Hákon, with Dubgall mac Ruaidhri, Aengus Mór and Murchad Mac Suibhne  Hákonar saga §323

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>granted land to bishop of Lismore, charter notes that it was under the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Scotland, implying Argyll held of Alexander III</td>
<td>Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 219 no. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Eógan son of Donnchad of Argyll and Dubgall son Ruaidhri went to court of Hákon seeking kingship over northern Hebrides, granted to Eógan, Dubgall joins Hákon’s retinue</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §§259–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249–1250</td>
<td>Eógan of Argyll sent to rule Kingdom of the Isles by Hákon, opposed on arrival in Man (also opposed in Argyll by Alexander II of Scotland)</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §264; CRMI1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>homage done by Eógan to Alexander III for Argyll, but refused to give up his castles in the Isles, fled to Lewis</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>part of Hákon’s levy for invasion of Denmark, along with Dubgall mac Ruaidhri, both described as (a) king of the Isles</td>
<td>Hákonar Saga §279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>took side of Alexander III in conflict with Hákon, explains that he held greater territories under oath to Alexander III</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §§319–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>appointed envoy of Hákon to Alexander III to open peace negotiations</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>dispossessed of his holdings under Hákon, granted to Dubgall and Ailean mac Ruaidhri</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268</td>
<td>described as knight in list of attesters of grant by Máel Íosa, earl of Strathearn to Inchaffray (presumably knighted by Alexander III)</td>
<td>Lindsay, Dowden and Maitland 1908, 213 no. 96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dubgall son of Ruaidhrí, king of the Isles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Eógan son of Donnchad of Argyll and Dubgall son Ruaidhri went to court of Hákon seeking kingship over northern Hebrides, granted to Eógan, Dubgall joins Hákon’s retinue</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §§259–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249–1250</td>
<td>became part of Hákon of Norway’s retinue</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>granted title of king of the Isles</td>
<td>1249, Annales Regii Storm 1888, 132; 1249 Skáholts Annaler, in Storm 1888, 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>part of Hákon’s levy for invasion of Denmark, along with Eógan of Argyll, both described as kings</td>
<td>Hákonar Saga §279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>alliance with Aed Ua Conchobair of Connacht, who married his daughter, campaigned against Jordan de Exeter, sheriff of Connacht</td>
<td>ACON1258.6; ACON1258.7; ACON1258.8;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>Aed Ua Conchobair of Connacht married Dubgall’s daughter in Derry, accompanied by 160 warriors (dowry?)</td>
<td>ACON1259.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>asked to join Hákon’s expedition to the Isles; agreed and met Hákon with a large army; headed a major portion of Hákon’s forces</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §317; §319; §320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>brought Murchad Mac Suibhne and Aengus Mór mac Domnaill into Hákon’s peace; Islay granted to Aengus, Murchad to be restored his territories (lost to the Menteith Stewarts)</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>part of major raid on Lennox on behalf of Hákon, with Magnús of Man, Aengus Mór and Murchad Mac Suibhne</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>granted holdings dispossessed from Eógan of Argyll by Hákon</td>
<td>Hákonar saga §326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>led attack on Scottish forces in Caithness on behalf of Magnús of Norway, escaped</td>
<td>Magnúss saga Hákonar sonar §5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.11 Domination: Ergadia

As can be seen in Tables 7.10–7.11, many landholdings changed hands over the course of the thirteenth century. While some of these seizures might be related to the usual changes in tenure when land is held in clientship or in feu of an overlord, others must have been reactive to the events outlined in Section 7.10 in connection with Norwegian-sponsored activity in Ergadia
and beyond. As the thirteenth century went on, holding territory of more than one king became more and more difficult, as seen in the examples of Alan and Tomás of Galloway in Section 7.5.

One important case is that of Eógan (English Ewan, ON Jón) son of Donnchad of Argyll, who was made temporary king of the Isles by Hákon of Norway on the sudden death of Haraldr Óláfrsson of Man while Hákon made plans for a permanent successor (CRMI1250[=AD1249; Hákonar saga §264). Even though Eógan failed to take possession of Man, he invoked the wrath of Alexander II. Eógan seems to have met Alexander II under the protection of four earls after this, but would not give up Cairnburgh and three other castles that he held of Hákon (Hákonar saga §265)—presumably Cairnburgh, Dùn Chonaill, Aros and Duart, rather than Dunstaffnage, Achanduin or Castle Coeffin in Lorn. Eógan fled to Lewis and Alexander III invaded Argyll, before falling ill and dying on Kerrera in AD1249 (CMel1249; see Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 2017–8; Brown 2004, 80–1; Woolf 2007, 84–5).

Eógan of Argyll was taken into Henry III’s protection in AD1255 (39 Henry III in Bain 1881, 387–8 nos 2014, 2017–8). He is also noted as being part of Hákon of Norway’s levy for the invasion of Denmark, in which both he and Ruaidhrí are described as kings and among the noblest of his liegemen (Hákonar saga §279). Whether he had been dispossessed from and reinstated to his territory in the intervening time is difficult to surmise (Duncan and Brown 1956–7, 205). The episode demonstrates the tensions at work within one individual by being caught up in three intersecting colonial processes: the Norwegian attempt to assert control over what it saw as colonies established from Norway in the deep past, increasing Scottish domination through a combination of mid-level elite replacement and high level elite clientship, and the background process of the kings of England claiming to be liege lords over all other rulers in Britain and Ireland (see Davies 1990; 2000; Frame 1990).

Another wave of land-redistribution (Table 7.9, right-hand side) dates AD1262–AD1266, running from Alexander III’s reaching 21-years-old (he was eight in CMel1249), to Hákon’s invasion and regranting of territory (Hákonar saga §§314–331), to Alexander’s invasion of the West (Magnúss saga Hákonarson §2) and the peace treaty with Norway in AD1265 (CMel1265; CMel1266; full text: Innes 1844, 420–1).

Possibly the most striking dispossessions in this period are related to the Stewarts. Walter Stewart, the youngest son of another Walter Stewart, having acquired the earldom of Menteith, also acquired Knapdale and northern Kintyre from the Meic Suibhne c.AD1262 (Innes 1832, 120–1 and 121–2). Cowan (1990, 212–2; 2017, 18–9) draws attention to the anti-Stewart nature of much of Hákon’s 1263 campaign, in which Murchad Mac Suibhne was involved (Hákonar
saga §320, §323, §326) and so too Dubgall mac Ruaidhrí (§320), who seems to have been beset on all sides by the Comyns, Meic Dubgaill and Stewarts.

The list of 1293 Sheriffdoms (Table 7.10) demonstrates that four separate territories were held by members of the Campbell (Table 7.5), and Strachur under Arthur Campbell potentially a fifth (Boardman 2006, 28 fn.22, 80; Lamont 1914, 9 no. 13). The family might have originated in Lennox (Sellar 1973) or Clackmannanshire, but Boardman (2006, 15–21) draws attention to connections to the Menteith inheritance and to the earls of Carrick, indicating that their origin could have been anywhere between Dundee and the Clyde—but external to Argyll.

Their arrival in the region might be contemporary to Ralph of Dundee being granted the former Gille-Christ holding of Glassary by Alexander III (Macphail 1916, 115–7, 124, 129, 132–4). The Meic Neachtain seem to have originated in Strathearn or Loch Tay, Their association with the earls of Strathearn and bishop of Dunblane in the charters might support this (Millar 1966, 128). While they were probably brought to the region by Alexander II, they also seem to have expanded their holdings centred on Loch Fyne and Loch Awe in this period (Table 7.10).

Therefore, local families potentially among those referred to as Gall-Goidil in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were dispossessed by groups who owed everything to the king, rather than tradition. The scattered nature of some of the holdings and the existence of holdings held by brothers potentially indicate either confiscation and regranting, or the division of land acquired by the sword rather than ancestral inheritance. While the Meic Lagmainn seem to have fared well, considering that two of the named holdings in the formation of the Sheriffdom of Kintyre were held by them (Innes 1844, 447). The biggest losers were the Meic Suibhne. The family became one of the first groups of Gall-Óglaig, “foreign warriors”, also known as the Galloglass. Murchad Mear son of Máel Muire, attestor of his uncle Dubgall’s final charter (Innes 1832, 121–2) was captured by a faction of the Connachta and died in the prison of Walter de Burgh, Earl of Ulster and Lord of Connacht (AU1265.2).

The incorporation of the Isles into the Kingdom of Scotland does not seem to have made a huge difference politically for the Meic Domnaill, who along with the Meic Ruaidhri and Meic Suibhne stood to benefit the most from Hákon’s overlordship, should his campaign have been successful. When it was not, Aengus Mór mac Domnaill very quickly went over to Alexander III when he invaded the West (Magnúss saga Hákonar sonar §5). Aengus Mór was a signatory of the declaration that Margaret of Norway was Alexander III’s heir (Rymer 1745 Vol. 1, Part II, 228), just as Alexander of Argyll and Ailean Mac Ruaidhri of Garmoran were. Aengus also signed the Turnberry Band, pledging to support none other than Richard de Burgh,
earl of Ulster (Fraser 1880 Vol. II, 219–20 no. 12). In the Wars of Independence, they fought on whatever side the Meic Dubgaill were not on, which led to their switching from Edward I to Robert I, which saved them from being dispossessed in the reign of Robert I and the flourishing of the Lordship of the Isles over the next two centuries.

Aengus Mór’s contemporary Alexander of Argyll, son of Eógan, largely acted as an integrated baron within the community of the realm of Scotland (Duncan and Brown 1956–7; Barrow 2003), having been made sheriff of Lorn in AD1293 (Innes 1844, 447). Had the succession crisis not occurred in the years after AD1286, he may have become earl of Argyll. It was not to be, though. He was first disposed by Edward I (Rotuli Scotie in Macpherson et al. 1814, 31–2; Fraser 1880, 222–3 no. 16), potentially by a force from Ireland (IPR 25 Edward I, Cullinan 1906, 34) presumably under Richard de Burgh and/or the Bysets for his support of John Balliol. Having come into Edward I’s peace in 1301 along with the Meic Ruaidhrí, Alexander was restored to his holdings by Edward I (RLPTL 29 Edward I m. 17, in Stevenson 1870 Vol. II, 429–30 no. 610; 29 Edward I in Bain 1884, 307 no. 1204). Along with his son John/Eógan, he became Edward I and II’s main ally in the west, and he was as a result dispossessed by Robert I in AD1309 (Fordun CXXVI; The Brus LXXVI, Innes 1856, 223; Macphail 1920, 257). His son John/Eógan managed to hold onto the three castles of Loch Awe briefly after this (2 Edward II, Bain 1887, 16 no. 80). Alexander and John were supported until their deaths by the English crown following their dispossession (e.g. Simpson and Galbraith 1986, 231–2 no. 566). John also conquered Man for Edward II (RLCTL 8 Edward II, Bain 1887, 80 nos 420–1). This might have been a motivator for the Bruce invasion of Ireland the same year.

John Gallda, great-grandson of Alexander, was restored to the core territories of Argyll in 1358, with the exception of the Campbell holdings in Mid Argyll, which in fact may never have been part of that core territory (Webster 1982, 202–3 no. 165; see Boardman 2006, 66–7). Arthur Campbell was granted the constabulary of Dunstaffnage and holdings in Lorn by Robert I (16 Robert I, Robertson 1798, 14 no. 124, 15 no. 15), but it cannot be said that the Campbells ever displaced the Meic Dubgaill in Lorn in the fourteenth century.

Summing up, by the mid-fourteenth century, Ergadia was divided almost along the same geographical lines as it had been in the twelfth. The island portions, Arran and Bute excepted, were part of the Lordship of the Isles, a maritime Gaelic semi-independent lordship occupying the same territory as is most densely covered by ON toponyms and where Viking Age furnished burials were densest. With some exceptions, no castles were found in this territory until the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. However, the same density in the distribution of churches
and chapels is found all across Ergadia. On the mainland, while there is not the same distribution of manors found in eastern Scotland or across the North Channel, there were a notable number of masonry castles, in addition to churches and some unenclosed settlement. In many ways, the mainland portion, with the exception of Ardnamurchan/Morvern was much more like the rest of Scotland in terms of the character of settlement, at least in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

This is in part due to the successes of Alexander II and III in bringing Lorn, Cowal, Mid Argyll and Kintyre into the Kingdom of Scotland—in what can be regarded as an example of Gosden’s colonialism within a shared cultural milieu. The Scottish crown had a much later start in the Isles, due to their being part of the Norgesveldet (Beuermann 2010), albeit remotely, up until the AD1260s—a legacy of the changes brought about by settlement in the region from Scandinavian and by the Scandinavian diaspora, with Dublin as much of an important influence as Trondheim in this respect. However, this division, as seen in Chapter 3, extends back much further, as differences in settlement between the Hebrides and mainland are visible as early as the Iron Age—demonstrated starkly by the cumulative frequency diagrams in Section 3.18.

7.12 Transculturation
Can it be stated that transcultural processes are visible in Ulidia c.AD1180–1350? Despite their heavy involvement in Irish affairs, including in the marches, each of the earls had a strong connection to England via their relatives and to the court of the English king. Of the principal supporters, by the end of the fourteenth century, the de Mandevilles had become the McQuillans, from Meic Uilleam, sons of William (see Curtis 1937). The same might be said of the Bysets, whose Irish line became known as the Meic Eóin Bised (e.g., AU1383.7) and were present in the Antrim Glens until at least AFM1422.8. However, caution should be exercised in this respect, as a Mac X [son of X] designations are frequently used in Irish annals to refer to Anglo-Normans; for example, Henry II is consistently referred to as Mac na Perisi [son of the empress] (AI1171.5). This must be kept in mind in relation to other such uses, e.g. the Mac Martin and Mac Eoin associated with Richard de Burgh in AU1287 [=AD1291]), which would seem to refer to Thomas de Mandeville (Orpen 1915, 125) and Hugh Byset (AFM1262.2). That said, Court MacMartin Castle in Cushendall may have derived its name from the descendants of Thomas son of Martin de Mandeville, but the placename is only first attested in the late sixteenth century (Reeves 1847, 333), and it may refer to another figure.

While the main line of the de Burghs lost the earldom, they would continue to play a
prominent role in affairs in Connacht, having seized it from the legal heir of William de Burgh (Lydon 1972, 52). They would eventually become part of what has been occasionally described—to the stimulation of much debate—as a ‘Middle Nation’ or ‘Third Nation’ of transculturated colonial families (debated Lydon 2008[1984]; Ellis 1986; Frame 1993; not least due to the use of the term ‘nation’ in this way). That is not to say that they were a homogenous group—there is evidence for some groups adopting certain Gaelic customs and becoming patrons of the arts, with cultural ossification evident in other groups. It could not be otherwise with a collection of individual agents each interacting with their social and physical world in their own way. What was common to all was their identity as settlers, in tension with both the homeland and with the colonised. It is instructive to refer, as Lydon (2008[1984], 333) does, to the words Giraldus Cambrensis puts in Maurice FitzGerald’s mouth in 1170: “we are English as far as the Irish are concerned, likewise to the English we are Irish” (Expugnatio I.23; Dimock 1867, 267). This illustrates the tensions inherent in settlers’ relationships with both their home society and the society being colonised (Veracini 2010).

No matter how tenaciously some might cling to the customs of the homeland (e.g., in the areas around Dublin, Wexford, Carrickfergus or Downpatrick), or how acculturated others might become, as a group they transculturated, either by adapting or refusing to adapt. This would lead to their being referred to by James I as “half-subjects of mine”, not least in relation to their adherence to Catholicism (Lydon 1998, 172) or as the ‘Old English’, which by the 1620s came to be a term of exclusion and used to justify land expropriations in Connacht and elsewhere (MacCurtain 1972, 195–6).

While most of this occurred outside of the timeframe being discussed here, it may have had its roots within it. There might be some evidence of the sort of anxieties that bring about ossification present in Ireland AD1180–1350. A fear of colonial degeneracy lay behind the AD1297 Parliament and, subsequently, the Statutes of Kilkenny of 1366 complained of the abandonment of what were perceived as English cultural traits, such as language, manners, the use of a saddle, dress and hairstyle (see Ó Faoláin 1969, 64–5; Watt 1987a, 308–13). Further evidence of this mode of thought is found in the AD1380 letter sent to various abbots in Ireland, including Saul, Inch, Bangor and St Patrick’s Down stating that only persons of English birth born in England or Ireland should be admitted to religious houses situated among the English (inter Anglicos) in the king’s lands, as originally stipulated at Kilkenny (Tresham 1827, 110 no. 117; trans. CIRCLE).

As Davies (2000, 187–9) points out, the language involved is the language of classification and exclusion—a departure from the language of inclusion of the project to bring
together “a well-knit English or Anglicized world within the British Isles”, brought about by “an institutionalized duality of peoples” inherent in the governance of parts of the Insular Zone under English dominance. Even seeming attempts at inclusivity, such as Edward III’s statement in 1357 that “both the English born in Ireland and those born in England and dwelling in Ireland are true English” still maintain that division, especially seeing as he goes on to state that “nevertheless various dissensions and maintenances, by reason of origin, have arisen between those born in Ireland and those born in England” (Frame 1993, 96). Davies (2000, 189) contrasts this to the situation in Scotland, where several groups speaking different languages with different cultural traditions had been brought together under a looser and more all-encompassing identity.

As Ó Nualáin (1969, 65) points out, the process could work both ways. Watt (1987a, 308–9) points to an acculturative or transculturative spectrum, involving both coloniser and colonised, with elements of the latter adopting “English name and speech, dress and fine town house” to successfully act with a colonial urban milieu. McNeill (1980, 103–4) discusses the potential for native encastellation at Doonbought and Connor. Doonmore might also be added to this list. In some respects, Doonbought and Doonmore strongly resemble contemporary platform castles found in Ergadia, e.g., Dùn Àra on Mull (RCAHMS 1980, 199–202) or MacEwan’s Castle, Cowal (RCAHMS 1988, 196, 1992, 296; Marshall 1983). Therefore, they might be part of a similar tradition extending across the North Channel. However, these sites may have been associated with a growing Anglo-Norman incursion into the marcher territory of Uí Tuirtre and the castle at Connor might have been associated with the bishop, or it may have been built under the sponsorship of the administration.

Turning to Ergadia, that members of the same elite families could interact with the kings of Scotland, Norway and England, and with petty kings in Ireland demonstrates their ability to successfully shift between social milieux. In particular, the appearance of three members of the Meic Dubgaill in the Norwegian royal court in the 1230s and 1240s, and Óspakr/Gille-Easpaig mac Dubgaill’s deep involvement in Norwegian politics serves as a reminder that even in Lorn, with its higher density of castles and its deeper involvement with the Scottish crown, the Norse aspect of group identity and social practice cannot be forgotten.

In terms of language, Gaelic does seem to have become re-established in this period as the principal language for coining toponyms, with ON names preserved ex nomine. An example of this is found in Ragnall/Þógnvaldr son of Somerled’s foundation grant to Saddell Abbey in Kintyre, with the term “Glensagadull” used (Barrow 1971, no. 3170.1), indicating that dalr may have lost its significance, necessitating the addition of glen. This has led Islay, and the
Hebrides in general, to be seen today as the bastions of Gaelic culture and language, which might have been very surprising to their eleventh-century inhabitants. However, as discussed in Chapters 3 and 6, areas such as Coll and Tiree continued to use ON in new coinages into the later medieval period. This might still have occurred in a bilingual environment.

We have very little idea about fashions in clothing in these two centuries. Hoop/ring-brooches are known from Achanduin and Dunstaffnage that fit in with wider fashions (A.3.17 entries), and the pottery from Loch Finlaggan, Achanduin and Dunstaffnage differs little from assemblages on the mainland. There were many more imports at Finlaggan, but the excavations there were much more extensive. It is striking that pottery trends from northeast Ireland, such as ERW have not been identified.

The adoption of castles occurred much earlier in Argyll than it did among Gaelic-speaking communities in Ireland, at least on the current evidence. This might indicate that for all the similarities in language, processes of transculturation were serving to emphasise pre-existing differences while also creating new ones between the Gaels of Ireland and what were, to them, the “foreign” Gaels of Alba.

7.13 Conclusion
It is argued here, similar to McNeill (1980), that the Ulidia case-study presented here represents a colonial episode led by the second order of nobility, and mainly by second sons or the sons of second sons of Anglo-Norman families. The numbers involved were fairly small, but after an initial period of expansion and consolidation AD1177–1210, involving a degree of political innovation after the native elite were displaced, a colonial polity was established with direct links to the king of England. These direct links were the source of some friction between the settler elite and the metropolitan government that in some ways were similar to ‘classic’ cases of settler colonialism (e.g., the United States of America). This was also related to the process of feudalisation (Elias 2000, 195–256, 273), where there is constant friction between a centralising royal authority and holders of local authority, leading the monarch to play a balancing act between the members of an overly powerful militarised aristocracy.

The Ergadia case-study is more complex. On one level, it is an example of a colony in its late stages being assimilated into the Kingdom of Scotland in the face of attempts by the Kingdom of Norway to assert more control over a colony that predated both of those kingdoms. On another level, that absorption into Scotland would seem to have involved expansion, consolidation and domination, through the planting of loyal lords throughout Argyll and the
cultivation of relationships with pre-existing local elites. On another level, the attempts of Edward I at extending his rule over the entire Insular Zone meant that two episodes of elite replacement colonialism aimed at political incorporation were in operation for several decades.

Events have a habit of getting in the way of processes—this led to the colonial lordship in Ulidia being relatively short-lived and to the project of assimilating Ergadia into Scotland being incomplete. The Wars of Independence, the Bruce seizure of the kingship of Scotland the Bruce Invasion of Ireland in AD1315–8, followed by another crisis or rule in Scotland, the intra-dynastic rivalries of the ruling elites that resulted in the murder of the earl of Ulster in AD1333 and the plagues and worsening weather of the fourteenth century all combined to impact the long-term outcome of the colonial projects in Ulidia and Ergadia. In Ergadia, the lordship of Argyll remained part of the core of the Kingdom of Scotland, but the Lordship of the Isles had near semi-independent status until the late fifteenth century. In Ulidia, the colony contracted to a couple of outposts by the end of the fourteenth century. This would remain the case until the great changes brought about by the series of wars from the late sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth and the series of associated plantations of English and Scottish settlers, the study of which would warrant its own dissertation. In terms of classifying the colonial episode, it would largely fall into the ‘elite replacement colonialism’ category. However, as discussed above, there may well have been elements of plantation colonialism in some areas of the lordship.
Chapter 8. Conclusions

8.1 Introduction

The historiography of medieval Britain and Ireland is dominated by larger than life figures—often spanning the divide between real and imaginary—who carved out new territories for themselves or reshaped the existing *status quo*. Depending on one’s inclination, these episodes might be treated as the first steps of the march towards the global dominance of the British Empire, part of the state-formation narratives of each of the insular polities and their self-justification as historical entities, historical episodes of migration or even colonialism, or all of these and more. While individual agency and contingency are important factors to consider in relation to figures such as Aedán mac Gabráin, Cináed mac Alpin, Somerled, and John de Courcy, the apparent obscurity from which they emerged illustrates the limits of the available historical evidence. Moreover, our moth-like attraction to these leading lights often confines to the same obscurity many of the wider and deeper processes ongoing at the time.

In an effort to take a different approach from this, this dissertation sought to outline the sum of the available settlement evidence in Ergadia and Ulidia c.800BC–AD1400 using archaeological, textual and toponymic evidence (Chapters 3–4). The aim was to use the continuities and discontinuities visible at a macro-level over time as the basis for posing questions related to three historically attested colonial episodes. Textual sources were used extensively to interrogate the ontological reality of these colonial episodes and to add the micro-level to the analysis through a fine-grained analysis of events and processes and the biographies of those involved in them. What this thesis has presented, then, is a source-critical discussion of three putative episodes of colonialism in the North Channel zone in the context of imperfect evidence bases.

8.2 Summary of the overall settlement dynamic

As noted above, this dissertation has covered a huge sweep of time, from the Iron Age to late Middle Ages. In that time, the main changes in the characteristics of settlement in the case-study regions are as follows:

8.2.1 Ergadia (Chapter 3)

- Atlantic stone roundhouses (ASRs) were in use as a general form of settlement from the mid Iron Age to period AD800–900, but some regional discontinuities are apparent.
- Round ASRs with intramural features and high walls were only in use c.300BC–AD300.
- Other forms of unenclosed settlement were in use throughout, i.e. 800BC–AD1400 and beyond; after AD800–900 it became the predominant form of settlement, as demonstrated by toponymic and, to a lesser extent, archaeological evidence.
- The use of different forms of enclosed settlements varied both chronologically and geographically, but activity at very few post-dates AD800–900
- The introduction of Christianity resulted in the presence of a series of ecclesiastic sites, the density of which increased over time
- Some sites identified as ecclesiastic sites may have been located at familial or community cemeteries, some of which had associations with secular settlement, with ecclesiastic activity dating to much later with the installation of a church or chapel for pastoral purposes.
- The twelfth-century reforms of the wider Church led to the territorial reorganisation of ecclesiastic sites in Ergadia, with a system of parish churches and subordinate chapels apparent in the record.
- Castles were also introduced in this period, but their distribution was focussed on Lorn, Mid Argyll, Cowal and Mull.

8.2.2 Ulidia (Chapter 4)

- The predominantly unenclosed Iron Age settlement tradition in Ulidia was replaced by a system of enclosed farmsteads post c.AD500×600, but the continued complementary use of unenclosed settlement cannot be ruled out.
- Unenclosed settlements become more visible post c.AD800, due to the widespread adoption of underground storage chambers at all forms of contemporary settlement.
- The introduction of Christianity c.AD400×500 introduced a further, dynamic element to settlement in the form of ecclesiastic sites that continue throughout the period, albeit with potential localised hiatuses, and with increasing landscape presence and complexity.
- A small series of clustered defended settlements referred to in textual record AD850–950 as longphorts appeared in the region in association with the Scandinavian diaspora.
- Twelfth-century reforms in the Church led to the reconfiguration of the geographical distribution and function of ecclesiastic sites c.AD1150–1300.
- Various forms of castles were introduced in the late twelfth century, either at new locations or built over pre-existing enclosed settlements.
- Clustered settlement in the form of towns introduced from the late twelfth century; villages cannot be ruled out, even if few have been identified.
- Some earlier enclosed farmsteads continued in use beyond AD1200.
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**Figure 8.1.** Repetition of simplified visualisation of the formative and resultive processes associated with colonialism; black dots = incoming individuals/groups, non-black dots = individuals/groups already residing in territory prior to colonial episode (my thanks to Ina Huppertz for her help with the visualisation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>This Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunistic colonialism</td>
<td>Usually economically motivated, to access resources; can be bottom-up or state-centred; defended settlements may be involved</td>
<td>Phoenician, Greek, Hanseatic League cities</td>
<td>Viking Age Ulidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite replacement</td>
<td>Displacement and replacement of previous elite by incoming actors</td>
<td>Early Roman Gaul, Visigothic Spain, Normans</td>
<td>High medieval Ulidia;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.3 The episodes considered

8.3.1 The North Channel, AD300–700
The origin of the Dál Riata as a group and as a polity is here interpreted as the result of a contact zone in a transcultural nexus at a time when ideas, people and things were moving with renewed pace, and where old identities and polities were being (re)negotiated and (re)constructed following the collapse of the Roman mega-polity and the spread of a new ideological package in the form of Christianity. The new series of fortifications at either green-field or pre-existing sites would seem to be related to a wider Insular material grammar of kingship, focussed on elevated fortified sites, the importation and redistribution of high-status goods, e.g. wine, PRSW and E-ware, and the production and redistribution of items of personal adornment, e.g. copper-alloy brooches.

Categorisation
At the outset of this programme of doctoral research, it was envisaged that appearance of the Dál Riata (Chapter 5) in the textual record would prove to be an episode of elite replacement colonialism, with an incoming group displacing the upper stratum of the local society, but with minimal disruption elsewhere. On the present evidence, this does not seem to have been the case. Classifying this series of processes as a colonial episode would be anachronistic, but it can at least be regarded as an episode of socio-political innovation involving groups in a shared cultural milieu (see 1.3.1).

8.3.2 The North Channel, AD790–1100
Ergadia
In the case of the Viking Age (Chapter 6), interpretation was hampered by incomplete data, but it was quickly realised that this incompleteness was itself evidence. The decline in evidence from previously widespread forms of settlement in Ergadia corresponded to a lacuna in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>colonialism</th>
<th>with modification of previous social system to extract wealth and maintain position with minimum friction</th>
<th>in England, British Raj in India</th>
<th>high medieval mainland Ergadia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plantation colonialism</td>
<td>Movement of several social orders expropriating, displacing or replacing pre-existing population (similar to ‘settler colonialism’)</td>
<td>South Wales, Crusader States in Levant, North America, Australia</td>
<td>Viking Age Ergadia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
textual record of the region, and to the appearance of novel burial practices and farm-names derived from Old Norse (ON). The colonial episode can be classed as an example of plantation colonialism resulting in the domination of the colonists. It might also be regarded as settler colonialism, in that the pre-colonial population was either subordinated or replaced possibly violently in some cases. Toponymic evidence strongly indicates the presence of an Old Norse speech community, with a particularly strong connection to farming settlements in the Hebrides portion of the case study, as well as a smaller concentration in Kintyre. This broadly corresponds to the distribution of furnished burials. The high density of furnished burials on Colonsay in the absence of ON habitative toponyms probably occurred due to the use of Gaelic to coin toponyms in later centuries, something which might also mask ON distributions elsewhere. That said, Gaelic-speaker do not seem to have been displaced across the entire region, which might be the origin of territories referred to as Aírghaedeil (modern Gaelic Earra-Ghàidheal, English Argyll) and Gall-Goidil [‘foreign Gaels’]. The latter initially referred to a group, but eventually referred to the territories they occupied, originally around in the Clyde, but eventually in what came to be known as Galloway in southwest Scotland from the twelfth century onward.

Categorisation
To return to the model introduced in 1.3.1, the activities of the Scandinavian diaspora in western Scotland represents an episode of plantation colonialism that reached a domination stage and resulted initially in innovation, with assimilation phases involving the kings of Norway and Scotland, with the final result that the Kingdom of the Isles was integrated into the Kingdom of Scotland in the fourteenth century. This might be contrasted with the kingdom of Dublin, which was a case of separation in its relationship to Norway, but eventually of incorporation in relation to Ireland.

Ulidia
In contrast to the situation across the North Channel, the introduction of a small number of settlements, toponyms and Old Norse placenames into Ulidia contrasts with the wider evidence for the continued use of the forms of settlement common in the preceding three centuries. This corresponds to the strong evidence for political continuity and continuity at the major ecclesiastic sites in the region evident in the documentary and archaeological records.
Categorisation

Based on the evidence in Chapter 4 and the discussion in Chapter 6, it can be concluded that colonial activity did not progress past the consolidation phase, with no firm evidence for the presence of members of the Scandinavian diaspora residing in the region after c.AD950. In terms of its outcome, it might be regarded as an example of expulsion: the complete failure of a colonial endeavour, with colonists or their descendants removed from the colonised area, as introduced in 1.3.1.

A Scandinavian diaspora?

It is argued here that the colonists active in the North Channel and their descendants exhibited diasporic tendencies. Cohen’s (1997, 26) abstraction of a series of key identifiers of a diaspora community have been fruitfully discussed in relation to the Viking Age by Jesch (2015, 68–81). By the eleventh century, it would certainly seem to be a case of a dispersed set of communities sharing a perceived affinity based on a point of origin in a certain region and culture, dubbing themselves ‘Austmenn’ or similar terms. However, it might be that what we are seeing here is a settler identity couched in terms of a diasporic identity, much the same as the relationship between the USA and England. It could, of course, be a case of both.

As argued in Chapter 6, a settler identity formed early, perhaps through the rite of passage of participating in the composite armies operating in Ireland (principally under Óláfr of Hlaðir and Ívarr of the Dubgaill), East Anglia (under Ívarr and Guðrum), York (under Ívarr and his brother Hálfdanr), Strathclyde and Pictland (under Ívarr and Óláfr). In these cases, a colonial funnel may have been in operation, drawing in individuals and groups from disparate locations. This might have been responsible for variances in burial practices found in England and Scotland, for example (3.14; 4.14). It might be masked by naming these groups using oversimplified terms such as ‘Dane’ or indeed ‘viking’. That Hálfdanr was killed on Strangford Lough fighting another faction of colonists (CS877), having previously murdered Óláfr’s son (AU875.4) demonstrates the fluidity of the situation.

This dual-core settler–diasporic identity might have been used to justify what seems to be the seizure of the kingship of Dublin by Echmarcach of Innsi Gall in the mid-eleventh century. It was argued in Chapter 6 (cf. A.6) that he was not of any of the Uí Ímair lineages, and so might have been using this dual-core identity to justify his position. Conversely, this might also have been played upon by various kings of Norway and their representatives as they sought to impose themselves in the Insular Zone AD1058×1266, either directly, or by
supporting factions in Ireland, Man and the Isles. This might possibly have been inspired by Danish actions in England from the AD990s onward.

Transculturation

It is argued here that the cultural conservativism (often to the point of stereotyping) associated with diasporic communities (Cohen 1997) is akin to the cultural ossification discussed in Chapter 1. This may have occurred in relation to the use of certain forms of domestic architecture, as at Dublin (Wallace 2005), that were no longer used in the perceived homeland. It might also have applied to intangibles such as language—one wonders how the Old Norse spoken by Insular communities would have been perceived in Scandinavia, for example. It might also have applied to material culture; future research based on radiocarbon dating and modelling might indicate varying periods of use for oval brooches, swords, axes, etc. in Scandinavia versus the Insular Zone, to propose one potentially fruitful option.

The most visible example of transculturation in this period is the adoption of Christianity by the settler communities in Britain and Ireland, visible in the use of motifs more commonly seen in Scandinavian art appearing in Christian stone sculpture in the eleventh century. The adoption of Christianity would seem to have occurred by the late AD970s, as Óláfr Cúarán of Dublin retired to Iona in AD980 (Chapter 6; A.6). To take one case, Sigtryggr Cáech, grandson of Ímair (Ívarr) married the sister of Æthelstan of England c.AD926. Through his mother, Sigtryggr was Cínáed mac Alpín’s grandson, Niall Glúndub’s uterine brother and Flann Sinne’s stepson (A.6.2.3). This brings us to the thorny issue of intermarriage, one of the most under-researched aspects of the period. How quickly would the children of a Christian mother themselves become Christian, and to what extent were these children bilingual? How did uterine children see one another? To understand such issues is to understand the social processes ongoing in the Insular Zone at the time.

Another visible manifestation of transculturation was dress, also discussed in Chapter 6. By-names such as Óláfr Cúarán (‘sandal,’ ‘ock,’ eDIL) and Magnús berfœttr (‘bareleg,’ ‘barefoot,’ see Magnúss saga berfættir §16; Finlay and Faulkes 2015, 139) both seem to be related to the adoption of Irish dress practices.

The adoption of Insular brooches and ring-headed pins by the Scandinavian diaspora in the Insular Zone and by people living in Scandinavia itself (Chapter 6) might also demonstrate transculturation, if only on the level of fashions in clothing and personal adornment. However, the associations may well have gone deeper.
8.3.3 Anglo-Norman Ulidia, AD1170–1350
The level of evidence for Anglo-Norman Ulidia (Chapter 7) is much higher, with strong evidence for the introduction of a new colonial elite from the AD1170s onward, and with corresponding changes in settlement practice. By AD1210, if not earlier, the data suggest that the region had become a functioning marcher lordship whose core areas were settled by incoming colonists at an elite level, with either further incoming settlers or elements of the pre-colonial population making up various classes of farmers beneath these Anglo-Norman lords and knights. The lordship also had two inland areas within its confines where pre-colonial elites held territory as clients of the ruler of the lordship, which alternated between being ruled by an earl or directly by the crown. There is also strong evidence that the colonial system of settlement co-opted pre-existing patterns of land-holding and much of the pre-existing economic system.

Categorisation
While some areas might have seen plantation colonialism involving several incoming social orders, as a whole, the Earldom of Ulster was principally a case of elite replacement colonialism. Arguably, assimilation occurred quite early, when direct royal control was instigated—a demonstration of the intertwining of colonialism and state formation when such activity takes place in a shared cultural milieu (see Gosden 2004).

Transculturatio
Transculturation in this period occurred along on several vectors. The most visibly materially was the adoption of pottery forms fashionable in England, and by pre-colonial traditions of coarse pottery being adapted to take a shape similar to these new forms of glazed pottery. Another possibility is that certain individuals may have taken English names for legal purposes, due to the existence of dual legal systems for the ‘native’ Irish and English. This would be advantageous for economic reasons, should the necessity arise to pursue an unpaid debt, for example. A less certain example is the degree to which colonial families adopted fashions in clothing and literature more associated with Ireland than with England. Anxiety over such matters is demonstrated by a series of fourteenth-century decrees, as discussed at the end of Chapter 7. Even less certain is the adoption of the Irish language and naming practices; the appearance of the Meic Uilleam in northern Antrim may be more related to the representation of the name in Irish sources, rather than how the holders used the name in everyday speech.
There is a further option: changing by failing to change, or ossification. By the early modern period, there were demonstrable differences between the English of Ireland and the English of England, especially in relation to religion, but perhaps also in relation to dress, speech and other practices (Chapter 7).

8.3.4 Ergadia, AD1150–1350

Even though the level of evidence from Ergadia in this period is not quite as high as in Ulidia, the processes and patterns at work are still clearly visible. The regionality visible in earlier periods continued to play a very important role. Here more than anywhere else in the dissertation is the line between state-formation and colonialism at its least distinct. On the one hand, the actions of the kings of Scotland, Norway and England in the region can be seen as colonial: the actions of a polity expanding within a shared cultural milieu, a metropole seeking to increasing control over settler colonies overseas, and a quasi-imperial project to create a large, multi-ethnic Western-European empire respectively. On the other, all of these could equally be described retrospectively as state formation—failed in the case of Norway. That is looking from the outside in. From the inside out, competition between local elites, and with other territories such as Galloway and Man, led those local elites to align with whatever external powers they could to maintain their positions.

Categorisation

The Ergadia case-study in this period might best be classified as at least three different forms of colonialism all running at cross-purposes. On the one hand, through a combination of clientship arrangements with elements of the pre-existing elite and the importation of elite military and farming specialists, Scottish activity in Ergadia can be seen as elite replacement colonialism taking place within a shared cultural milieu resulting in incorporation. On the other, it intersects the late stages of an episode of plantation colonialism that resulted in both separation and innovation, but probably not replacement, coupled with an attempt by the perceived homeland (Norway) to establish control over the settler colony. Hovering over both hands is the English imperial project of establishing overkingship across the entirety of Britain and Ireland, which managed to succeed periodically c.AD1290×1350. Whether it can be regarded as colonialism is debatable, as imperial hegemony does not necessarily require colonial activity, but it might still be classed as Osterhammel’s Stützpunktkolonialismus.
Transculturation

To take the example of a single individual, Eógan mac Donnchada Mac Dubgaill could be Jón Dungarðarson to Hákon of Norway, Eugenius filius Duncani or Johannes filius Dungaldi to ecclesiastical scribes, and Ewan de Ergadia to the kings of England and Scotland, and Ewen of Argyll to modern anglophone historians. The great-grandson of Somerled, Eógan seems to have been able to function in several linguistic and political milieux with varying embedded cultural practices. A knight who lived in a castle like the kings of Man, Scotland and England were, he demonstrated the spread of fashions in lordship throughout Europe (see Bartlett 1993). While Eógan might be an extreme example, this was an era when kings with ON names had praise poems in MG composed in their honour, as with Rǫgnvaldr Guðrøðarson (Ó Cuív 1956–7) or the Old French Roman de Fergus (Martin 1872), probably composed for Alan of Galloway (Greenberg 1951) whose main character was one “Fergus son of Soumilloit”.

It is difficult, though, to say anything about transculturation on a non-elite level. If Holliday’s (2016) suggestion that ON continued in use for coining new names on Tiree is correct, then it would seem as though ossification was at work in the late stages of the Scandinavian diasporic colonial episode in Ergadia. Beyond that, the region shared in the same shifts in pottery as the rest of Northern Britain, such as the use of Scottish Redware and Whiteware, and the same green-glazed imports, etc. It would be difficult to assign any of this to colonialism, but the region’s incorporation into the Kingdom of Scotland can be viewed as such. This should be contrasted against the continued use of course pottery and against the low number of forms from northeast Ireland found in the region.
8.4 On colonialism

What are the lessons from all of this for thinking about colonialism across space and time? It is hoped that the dissertation has demonstrated that breaking colonial episodes up into contact–expansion–consolidation–outcomes is a useful means of structuring the analysis of a colonial episode using multiple sources of evidence. Similarly, the validity of categorising colonial episodes is also a useful analytic tool for comparing between episodes over space and time. It is felt that taking this transdisciplinary approach to any colonial episode would yield comparable results if based on a dataset similar in quality.

8.4.1 Identifying colonialism

An important personal lesson from this dissertation is that origin legends involving colonial activity might be suspect when examined in detail using a transdisciplinary approach, as with the case of the Dál Riata. This might be instructive when treating narratives involving the conquest of a territory under the leadership of a charismatic leader followed by a division of that territory between their generals or sons. While such events undoubtedly occurred, in many instances the foundation narrative might be a back-projection to legitimate and normalise the relationship between contending elite elements in a society.

8.4.2 Classifying colonialism

Table 8.1 restates the explanatory categories of colonialism proposed in 1.3.1 and used to structure the interpretation. It is hopefully evident in this dissertation that any classification is not universal across a single colonial episode. For example, Anglo-Norman activity in Ulidia can be confidently classed as an episode of elite replacement colonialism, but as I have demonstrated elsewhere (Ó Ríagáin 2010c), in south-east Ireland it should be seen as plantation colonialism with a very fast move to domination.

The opportunistic colonialism of the Scandinavian diaspora in Ulidia eventually became tied to a very different project centred on Dublin, while still remaining opportunistic. Across the North Channel, Scandinavian colonial activity in the Hebrides portion of the case study was also plantation colonialism, but with innovation in terms of political structure and the formation of a settler identity tied to the local region, if still part of a wider diasporic identity. This contrasts to the rest of the case study, where an oppositional identity, still potentially involving some colonists, developed, the coast of the Gaels (seen from Ireland, the “foreign Gaels” or Gall-Goidil) contrasted with Innsi Gall, “islands of the foreigners”. This division was exploited
by the kings of Scotland, Norway and England, exacerbating it before finally resulting in the region being incorporated into the kingdom of Scotland. This process might have been driven by a state-sponsored elite replacement in Mid Argyll, Cowal and Kintyre, coupled with cooperation with local elites in Lorn and Isles.

What all of this means is that contingency and context play major roles in shaping the outcome of colonial activity. Factors such as regional context, individual agency, non-human factors such as plagues, and wider socio-political events all play a role, as is hopefully evident in the differences visible across the North Channel in the Viking Age and Angevin Era. This should then be kept in mind when approaching case studies elsewhere in space and time.

8.4.3 Beyond binary relations
Colonial episodes do not just involve a binary coloniser–colonised set of relations, rather it is a triad at its most simple of coloniser–colonised–metropolitan, with all three changed by colonial activity on an individual and societal level. Transculturation is constantly at work in all human interaction, and settlers were instantly changed by their act of settlement, becoming neither of their homeland nor of their new land, even where they might explicitly identify with either. As noted in Chapter 7, the words Giraldus Cambrensis puts in Maurice FitzGerald’s mouth in 1170 are instructive in this respect: “we are English as far as the Irish are concerned, likewise to the English we are Irish” (Expugnatio I.23; Dimock 1867, 267). This is visible in the Scandinavian diasporic kingdom centred on Dublin and its satellites (Ulidia included), but also in the hints that we have for social structure in Ergadia in this period. It is also visible in dress practices, such as the use of RHPs and penannular brooches among the Scandinavian diaspora. However, the clearest demonstration of this might be found in the tensions between the settler elite in Ulidia (the de Burghs and their de Mandeville administrators) and officials such as William FitzWarin tied directly to the king of England, with both sides having a configuration of Gaelic allies and enemies (Section 7.6). Perhaps another example would be Hákon of Norway’s miscalculation of his support in Ergadia ahead of his campaign in Scotland in AD1263, despite several of those figures having previously been resident at his court. At the same time, the description of Gille-Easpaig mac Dubgaill as Óspakr inn Suðreyski (Hákonar saga §165), while an accurate geographical designation, might indicate that Hebrideans at this point were seen as something different from Norwegians, even in relation to a figure who had been in Norway for decades and involved in the civil war that brought Hákon to power.
8.4.4 Perspective
This brings us to the role of perspective. What might be seen as colonialism over the short term might be framed as state formation over the long term, or differentiating between them depends on the observer’s perspective. The competition between the kings of Scotland, England and Norway for Innsi Gall is at once part of a late phase of Scandinavian colonialism, part of the formation of the kingdom of Scotland at the expense of other polities such as Orkney, Galloway and the Kingdom of the Isles, and part of the formation process of the current United Kingdom. Seen differently, Alexander II and III were engaging in elite replacement colonialism within a shared cultural milieu, involving castle construction and land grants to supporters both external and internal to the area being colonised. The same could be said of Edward I in northern Britain. Hákon of Norway’s actions are characteristic of a king bolstering his position within his state by attempting to increase his resources, but it is also a case of a settler colony and its metropole following divergent socio-political paths.

Transculturation in colonial contexts is all about time. A FitzGerald or a Burke in Ireland today would be very surprised to be described as Anglo-Norman or English, despite the central role both families played in the first 200 years of Anglo-Norman Ireland. A McDougall or McDonald in Scotland might be similarly puzzled at being seen as anything other than Scottish. As noted in 7.7, in the seventeenth century James I/VI saw the ‘Old English’ in Ireland as “half subjects of mine” (Lydon 1998, 172). The Scandinavian diaspora were referred to as Austmenn in Ireland until the fourteenth century, but at this stage it is difficult to assign any Irish surname to them definitively (contra McEvoy et al. 2006).

8.5.5 Identity shift
This brings us to the final topic. As already stated, transculturation is at work at all times in all human interaction, considering that no individual or group is an exclusively bounded entity. Therefore, we cannot expect shifts in cultural practice, language and identity to happen coherently on a societal level, even if they occur on an individual or small-group level. This can be seen in the differential adoption of and, conversely, continuation of certain dress practices in furnished burials, e.g. ring-headed pins versus oval brooches (6.8). It might also be seen in the adoption of Christianity at different times and in different ways, as seen in carved stones, but most importantly, in the abandonment of furnished burials, leading to the near archaeological invisibility of the Scandinavian diaspora in Ergadia. This is an important consideration, as it demonstrates the difficulties in identifying migration in a post-migration
context characterised by low documentary evidence but high transculturation in material practices. Furthermore, it must be kept in mind that a colonial episode might involve colonists from a wide variety of regions with diverse material and social practices being brought together in what can be termed a ‘colonial funnel’ (6.5.1), with the attribution of the episode to its elite leadership masking any diversity among those involved. Such funnels can also occur in settler colonial contexts, with a settler elite drawing social distinctions between settlers and other migrants—compare e.g. West African slaves, Irish and Italian labourers being seen as migrants to a settler society founded in the image of a much smaller group of settlers in the USA (Veracini 2010, 3).

On an elite level, the differences between the branches of the Clann Somhairle were strongly evident within three generations, something most clearly visible in the differential use of castles. So too with the de Burghs: within four generations they began making use of systems of inheritance characteristic of the pre-colonial legal system, rather than that of England. On a non-elite level, transculturation might be even more difficult to identify and even more varied, ranging from the adoption of English names to use in the English legal system to examples of ossification, where the perceived traits of the homeland are clung to so rigidly that change occurs due to the homeland changing but not the individual or group. This might occur in relation to religion, as with the ‘Old English’ who did not take part in the Anglican Reformation in the sixteenth century, in relation to language and naming practices, but also in relation to material practices such as houses among the Scandinavian diaspora or domestic implements with former Anglo-Norman settlers in Ulidia and Wexford (see Ó Riagáin 2010c).
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