The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXII, 2: No. 194: October 1993, 111–145

RICHARD D. ORAM

A Family Business? Colonisation and Settlement in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Galloway

In his study of the processes of domination and conquest within the British Isles, Professor Rees Davies reserves his most trenchant criticism for what he perceives as historians' 'soft spot for conquest'.[1] His criticism is justified, for examination of the chronology on which we rely to mark moments of decisive change shows that it is punctuated by battles or invasions. The same holds true for regional studies, where change locally is most commonly associated with violent political and social upheaval. But, as Davies has so ably demonstrated, invasion represents only one stage in the process of 'conquest', and could indeed be only a relatively minor part of the business. Military invasion, he suggests, might come after years of increasing cultural or economic domination, as in the Edwardian conquest of north Wales. The converse could also be true for, where initial attempts at outright military conquest might fail to achieve concrete results, lasting success could be attained through more subtle means. Economic dependence, slow acculturation through the medium of colonisation, or indeed the gradual absorption of the native aristocracy into the ranks of the dominant society, may well have played a greater part in engendering change than our bellocentric sources would suggest. After all, battles usually give a spectacularly visible result—the deaths of kings and rulers, the elimination of a nobility—but slow acculturation does not.

In Galloway the above argument rings particularly true. There the relationship with the Scottish crown in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is generally portrayed broadly in terms of a series of invasions by the Scots and violent reactive rebellions by the natives, an image dictated wholly by the bias in the nature of the surviving annalistic sources for the history of the region, and by

1 R. R. Davies, *Domination and Conquest: The experience of Ireland, Scotland and Wales 1100–1300* (Cambridge, 1990), 1.

RICHARD D. ORAM is a freelance historical researcher, and tutor in the Department of History, University of Aberdeen. This is an extended version of a paper first delivered to the Scottish Baronial Research Group in Edinburgh on 13 March 1993.

the manner in which past scholars have chosen to interpret those same sources. These are wholly foreign accounts and focus on four particular years: 1160, 1174, 1185 and 1235.[1] Beyond details of the 'rebellions' of those years, other records of Galwegian affairs are dominated by descriptions of involvement in wars in England, Ireland or in Man.[2] This concentration on military events distorts our understanding of Galwegian society, because it obscures evidence for the aspirations of the region's rulers and for the relationship which existed between the Galwegians and the Scots. More particularly, the heavy emphasis on invasion, rebellion and conquest has meant the development of a negative view of the Anglo-Norman, or rather Anglo-Scottish, settlement within the lordship and the growth of a 'cataclysmic' interpretation of the evidence for colonisation. Indeed, the focus has been drawn solely to the military and aristocratic aspects of the 'conquest' of Galloway, to the neglect of the ecclesiastical, economic and administrative elements within the process: knights alone do not a conquest make. But even the knights, when freed from the more pejorative overtones of the term 'conquest', can be seen in a less sinister light, their presence far removed from the consequences of invasion and rebellion. When considered as part of the steady processes of cultural assimilation, development of economic, political and ecclesiastical ties with neighbouring regions, and the slow absorption of the lordly dynasty into the ranks of the Anglo-Scottish aristocracy, the appearance of foreign settlers within the lordship of Galloway could even assume a benign character.

Later twelfth-century Galloway has long been seen as the last bastion of Celtic conservatism and violent 'anti-feudal' sentiment in Scotland south of the Mounth. It has been represented as a region where the spread of 'feudal' settlement had to 'creep tentatively along the shores' of the Solway[3] under constant threat of attack from almost pathologically xenophobic natives. This reputation stems largely from the apparently late development in Galloway of what historians of the pro-feudal school see as the classical 'feudal' institution—the knight and his fee—and the savage anti-foreign reaction which occurred there in the period from 1174 to 1185. This latter event, though patently directed at Scots and the visible symbols of their overlordship, has been

1 See, e.g.: *Chron. Holyrood*, 136–7; *Chronica Rogeri de Hovedon*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Ser., 1868–71), ii, 57, 60, 63, 299, 309; Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, ed. H. R. Luard (Rolls Ser., 1872–84), iii, 364–6; *Chron. Lanercost*, 42.

2 *Chron. Man*, i, 89, 91, represents our chief source of information for the activities of Alan of Galloway and his brother, Thomas earl of Atholl, in Man and the Hebrides in the 1220s, and is to be compared with *The Annals of Ulster*, ed. W. M. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy (Dublin, 1887–1901), ii, 253, 257, or *The Saga of Hacon* in *Icelandic Sagas*, trans. G. Dasent, iv (Rolls Ser., 1894), 150, 152–3.

3 G. W. S. Barrow, *Kingship and Unity: Scotland 1000–1306* (London, 1981), 47.

represented as an 'anti-feudal' movement[1] But it is difficult to reconcile that with the fact that during this same period Gilbert lord of Galloway entered into a relationship with Henry II of England that was more overtly 'feudal' than any aspect of the Scottish overlordship which it replaced.[2] Certainly, the violent reaction against the supposed spread of Anglo-Norman settlers and their influences is unique in southern Scotland and finds parallels mainly in Moray and the far North.[3] The emphasis in the argument, however, needs to be changed: it was a backlash against royal encroachment, not against the institutions of knight service.

The processes of 'conquest' in all their varied forms as defined by Davies had been active in Galloway since the early decades of the twelfth century. Whilst colonisation by Anglo-Norman settlers—the feature taken traditionally to be most symbolic of foreign influence within the region—did not get under way until the 1160s, other factors were at work from the 1120s. Chief amongst these was the revival of the see of Whithorn by Archbishop Thurstan of York, welcomed by the Galwegians as a possible means of staving off domination by the Scottish Church, and so of reducing the risk that Scottish ecclesiastical domination could lead to political mastery. This eagerness to escape from the threat of subjection via the back-door of ecclesiastical dependence saw the Galwegians accept York's metropolitan supremacy and open the way instead to greater English influence.[4] The link to York was nothing new, representing a reinstatement of ties dating from the eighth-century establishment of a Northumbrian bishopric at Whithorn.

The twelfth century saw the strengthening of ecclesiastical links which became a pointed reminder to the Scots that Galloway lay outwith their sphere of influence. Gilla-Aldan (*c.*1128–*c.*1151), the first known twelfth-century bishop, appears from his name to have been a local man, but his two immediate successors, Christian (1154–86) and John (1189–1209) were probably appointed by Henry II and Richard I respectively and were associated closely with York and with monasteries in northern England.[5] Their

1 The anti-feudal aspect runs strongest through the work of P. H. M'Kerlie, *The History of Lands and Their Owners in Galloway* (Paisley, 1906).

2 *Chron. Roger of Howden*, ii, 105; *The Chronicle ... of Benedict of Peterborough*, in *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Ser., 1867), i, 126.

3 See, e.g., B. E. Crawford, 'The earldom of Caithness and the kingdom of Scotland 1150–1266', *Northern Scotland*, ii (1974–7); also (revised) in *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland*, ed. K. J. Stringer (Edinburgh, 1985).

4 R. D. Oram, 'In obedience and reverence: Whithorn and York *c.*1128–*c.*1250', *Innes Review*, xlii (1991).

5 Christian appears to have enjoyed a close relationship with the Cistercian Abbey of Holmcultram in Cumbria; see, e.g., *Register and Records of Holm Cultram*, ed. F. Grainger and W. G. Collingwood (Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Soc., 1929), nos. 120, 120A, 121, 141.

appointments reinforced the English links of the see, so when Scottish ecclesiastical independence of York was secured by the papal bulls *Super anxietatibus* (1176) and *Cum universi* (1189 or 1192), Whithorn was specifically excluded and remained suffragan of the archbishop.[1]

There is little evidence for the activities of these first bishops within Galloway beyond material which records their part in the resistance to Scottish encroachment, but their episcopates coincided with the period of most rapid ecclesiastical reorganisation in their see. Under their guidance the full pattern of secular clergy was set in place, the parish system regularised and the structure of diocesan government instituted.[2] Further foreign influence through Church channels was promoted by the foundation of monasteries. Dundrennan, founded in 1142, has a traditional association with David I and Fergus of Galloway, yet there is nothing to link the king directly with its foundation.[3] Admittedly, the foundation date, coinciding with the temporary Scottish domination of the Solway region during the Matildine wars, and its colonisation from Rievaulx, an abbey with which David had strong links, provide circumstantial evidence for such involvement. Walter Daniel, however, when commenting on Dundrennan's foundation, fails to mention any part played by the king, but is otherwise at pains to emphasise elsewhere David's connection with Rievaulx.[4] This may be an innocent omission, but it is more probable that David is not mentioned because he was not involved closely in the process. One obvious factor against the attribution of Dundrennan to David I is that the king possessed no lands west of the Nith with which to endow an abbey: the only man with the landed resources to do that was Fergus himself.

Fergus had worked in alliance with David from at least 1136 and assisted him in the campaigns of 1137 and 1138.[5] Indeed, the Galwegians are singled out in chronicles narrating these cam-

1 Oram, 'In obedience and reverence', 90.

2 R. D. Oram, 'The Lordship of Galloway *c.*1000 to c.1250' (St Andrews University Ph.D. Thesis, 1988), 296–308.

3 J. S. Richardson and C. J. Tabraham, *Dundrennan Abbey* (Edinburgh, 1981), 18–19; J. G. Scott, 'The origins of Dundrennan and Soulseat Abbeys', *Trans. Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Soc.*, 3rd ser., lxiii (1988); arguments in favour of David are advanced by Keith Stringer in 'Galloway and the abbeys of Rievaulx and Dundrennan', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., liv (1979), 174–7.

4 Walter Daniel, *The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, ed. and trans. F. M. Powicke (London, 1950), 45–6, 74.

5 Fergus is mentioned nowhere by name in the contemporary accounts of David I's campaigns in northern England; see, e.g., Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Regis Stephani et de Bello Standardii*, in *Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed R. Howlett (Rolls Ser., 1884–90), iii, 155–9; Ailred of Rievaulx, *Relatio Venerabilis Aelredi, Abbatis Rievallensis, de Standardo*, in *Chronicles of Stephen*, iii, 187–90, 196–7. But he appears in July 1136 in David's company at the consecration of Glasgow Cathedral, where he witnesses a charter as 'Fergus de Galweia': *Glasgow Registrum*, no. 3.

paigns as perpetrators of the worst excesses. Resistance to the invasion of 1138 had been organised by Archbishop Thurstan, who nominally led the army which defeated the Scots at Northallerton. Fergus, then, had been in arms against his spiritual overlord and had also led the warriors who committed the worst crimes amongst the invaders. There can be no doubt that he suffered ecclesiastical censure for this, possibly with the threat of some spiritual sentence. As a result, it is not impossible that Fergus agreed to the foundation of an abbey as the price of forgiveness and it may be suggested that the idea was Thurstan's; David's involvement, if any, would have been as a 'facilitator', perhaps using his established contacts with Rievaulx to prepare the ground for Fergus's approach. Negotiations for the physical establishment of Dundrennan were presumably in train before the archbishop's death in 1140 and may have started as early as September 1138, when the legate Alberic came to Carlisle to discuss peace terms with King David.[1] Amongst matters agreed there was that the Galwegians would free the female captives taken as slaves in the campaigns, and it is possible that separate negotiations with Fergus led to the foundation of Dundrennan as a move designed to tighten the spiritual influence of York within Galloway.

Whilst Whithorn's ancient ecclesiastical link to York was being strengthened, political ties between Galloway and England were also being reforged. These ties, at first on a personal level between the lord of Galloway and the English king, had a profound effect on the development of the lordship and guided its political course into the thirteenth century and beyond. From as early as *c.*1120 Henry I was extending his influence in the Solway region in parallel to David, Prince of Cumbria, who had been established in power in southern Scotland with English aid after the death in 1107 of his elder brother King Edgar.[2] Henry's scheme for stability on his northern frontier may well have involved, amongst other things, the marriage of one of his illegitimate children to Fergus, which would have linked a powerful regional lord with the Norman dynasty. The marriage of the king's daughters formed an important element in royal policy, for any taint of illegitimacy was more than compensated for by their royal blood. They were important as items of royal patronage, their main value being in tying members of the Norman or French nobility to the English royal house.

Henry had a clear policy with regard to his twelve or so illegitimate daughters. Family ties were forged with the ducal house of Brittany, the counts of Perche and the lords of Breteuil, Montmirail,

1 Richard of Hexham, *De Gestis Stephani*, 169–71.

2 For a recent attempt at analysis of Henry I's policy in the North, see W. E. Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and its Transformation 1000–1135* (London, 1979), chapter 7.

Beaumont and Montmorency, men whose lands were strategically important in the border areas of Normandy on the frontiers with Maine and Anjou.[1] A similar function lay in the marriage of Sibylla to Alexander I of Scotland, a union which underscored the closeness between Henry and the Scottish ruling house. The marriage of another daughter to the lord of Galloway represented a continuation of that policy, for it forged a link with a man in a key position on the north-west flank of England. If such motives lay behind Fergus's marriage, the date of the union becomes vitally important. When Fergus first appears as a charter witness in 1136 he is accompanied by his son, Uhtred, who must have been at least fifteen years old to have acted as a witness.[2] This points to a marriage date of *c.*1120 for his parents. It was around that date that Ranulf Meschin, Henry's protégé as lord of Carlisle, was to surrender Carlisle to become earl of Chester. David was creating lordships for the Avenels, Bruces and Soules in south-west Scotland within a few years of this, so Fergus's marriage may have compensated Henry I for the loss of Ranulf in the English north-west and redressed the imbalance in David's favour by establishing a personal bond with the dominant power on the latter's south-western frontier.

It was this personal bond which went furthest towards opening up Galloway to foreign influences in the course of the twelfth century. But it needs to be stressed that it was a *personal* bond and that its most immediate and obvious effects were to be seen in the aspirations and behaviour of the ruling family within Galloway. It cannot be seen to have opened the lordship up to a rapidly swelling flood of foreign ideas and ways, let alone any rising tide of colonisation, but it did change the social and cultural perspectives of Fergus's family. The clearest implication of the union was that Galloway had been drawn firmly into the world of northern British power-politics and that its rulers had been propelled from the periphery towards the centre of the stage. They continued, nevertheless, to pursue their own independent policies, particularly in Man where, in the late 1130s or 1140s, Fergus arranged a marriage alliance between his daughter Affreca and Olaf Godredsson.[3] It was natural for him to seek closer ties with a kingdom from which Galloway had suffered attack down to 1098, but it was also highly advantageous for Olaf as it provided him with a link to the Anglo-Norman dynasty. Certainly Godred II, Olaf's son by Affreca, valued this kinship tie, its existence being recognised by Robert of Torigny in 1166 in his account of diplomatic dealings between Henry II and Godred.[4]

1 *Complete Peerage*, xi, Appendix D, 105–21.
2 *Glasgow Reg.*, no. 3.
3 *Chron. Man*, i, 61.
4 *The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, in *Chronicles of Stephen, etc.*, iv, 229.

Although Man remained of key importance to Fergus and his successors, it was to England that they turned increasingly as the century progressed. The marital tie with Henry I's family, rather than political dependence on the Scots, probably lay behind the involvement in David's English campaigns. English weakness in Stephen's reign and in the early years of Henry II's does not appear to have caused a corresponding weakening of their influences within Galloway. It is clear that Bishop Christian's appointment in 1154 was an act of Angevin royal policy:[1] the tie with York was being strengthened, not diminished, despite the hegemony of the Scots in the northern counties of England. Nevertheless, David's possession of Carlisle must have seen some increase in Scottish influence within Galloway, and it is likely that the close ties with Cumbria which become apparent after 1160 began to develop during this period. The long-term effects of this cross-Solway connection had a profound impact on the development of the lordship.

Central to the formation of still closer ties with England—and with the English north-west in particular—was the marriage of Fergus's elder son, Uhtred, to Gunnilda, daughter of Waltheof of Allerdale, the younger brother of Cospatric, earl of Dunbar.[2] Waltheof's lordship lay in the southern half of David's territory in Cumbria, and he was related to the Scottish king, being descended from Maldred, the younger brother of King Duncan I. He was clearly an important figure in the political structure of the English north-west, inclining towards the Scots but Anglian and Anglicised in his background. Marriage into his family may have been intended to bind Uhtred to the new Scottish establishment in the Solway region and counterbalance his kinship ties with the English crown, but any advantage so gained was negated by the Scots' loss of Carlisle within four years of David I's death. We cannot determine the precise date of the marriage, but it was clearly arranged before the king died in 1153: Roland, the eldest son of Uhtred and Gunnilda, was deemed old enough to witness charters by about 1165.[3] Through this marriage Uhtred gained entry to the closely-knit world of the Cumbrian nobility and acquired Torpenhow in Allerdale, the first of his family's estates outwith Galloway.[4]

With the Allerdale connection there is raised the question of

1 *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae Occidentalis, series VI: Britannia, Scotia et Hibernia, Scandinavia*, ed. D. E. R. Watt (Stuttgart, 1991), i, 25; Oram, 'In obedience and reverence', 90–1.

2 *Scots Peerage*, iv, 137.

3 F. W. Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters—four concerning Cardew and one the Westmorland Newbigging', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., v (1916–18), no. 2; the original is Carlisle, Cumbria Record Office, Lowther Archive, MS. D/Lons/L5/1/S1.

4 *Holyrood Liber*, no. 24.

colonisation or conquest as agencies of change in later twelfth-century Galloway, for from the time of Uhtred's marriage there can be detected an accelerating pace of development within the social structure of the lordship. Marriage into the Cumbrian aristocracy brought Uhtred into direct contact with the new world on his doorstep and gave access to a social circle which had a profound effect upon his thinking. On the basis of the surviving evidence, which is admittedly fragmentary, it was links with Cumbria which provided the lords of Galloway with the means of finding most colonists to introduce into their domain. But what factors decided them to begin the colonisation of their land? Was it solely a matter of choice, made in emulation of the Scots, or did it stem from the violence which characterised the relationship between Galloway and the Scots in the 1160s and 1180s?

Two views of foreign settlement in the lordship can be detected in Scottish historiography. One, a cataclysmic interpretation, saw it as an imposition by a hostile agency, in other words as the deliberate establishment of knights loyal to the crown by Malcolm IV in the aftermath of his 1160 'conquest' of Galloway.[1] This takes the presence of Anglo-Norman settlers as evidence for the imposition of crown agents and for their use to secure the good behaviour of the lordship and hasten its assimilation into the kingdom—strangely disregarding the fact that the crown itself retained no land there as part of any scheme of colonisation. Opposed to the above interpretation is the view that the growth of 'feudalism' within Galloway was a gradual process, fostered and encouraged by the crown, but not imposed as a harsh act of arbitrary policy.[2]

The first evidence for Anglo-Norman settlement concerns the pacification of the lordship in the aftermath of Fergus's overthrow in 1160. Here, colonisation has been seen as a consequence of Malcolm's victory. Arguments in the past which proposed earlier settlement during Fergus's lifetime stem largely from misapprehension of his relationship with David I and misinterpretation of documentary evidence. The views espoused by the arch-xenophobe M'Kerlie in the nineteenth century, to the effect that Fergus was a non-native governor of 'feudal' sympathies foisted on the lordship following the convenient elimination of the native rulers in 1138, naturally gave rise to the premise that he introduced 'Norman' knights to help keep the country in subjection.[3] While the belief that Fergus was of Anglo-Norman stock cannot be

1 E.g., *Wigtownshire Charters*, pp. xvi–xix; Barrow, *Kingship and Unity*, 45, 47–50; A. A. M. Duncan, *Scotland: The Making of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh, 1975), 182–3.

2 Oram, 'Lordship of Galloway', 189–200; D. Brooke, 'Fergus of Galloway: Miscellaneous notes for a revised portrait', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., lxvi (1991).

3 M'Kerlie, *Lands and Their Owners*, i, 109–15.

credited, the view of him as architect of the 'feudalisation' of Galloway has proved more resilient.

If the military aspect of tenure alone is taken as representative of the land-holding system under Fergus, there is no indication that knight service played any part in obligations to the Scottish crown. It was bodies of lightly-armed foot soldiers that Galloway contributed to David I's and William the Lion's campaigns. As late as 1212 Fergus's great-grandson, Alan, was providing substantial bodies of such men for service in 'feudal' armies.[1] This seems to be a form of forinsec service, whereby all landowners, irrespective of rank, were eligible for the performance of military duties. Only in a few isolated instances does such forinsec service seem to be reinterpreted in terms of knight service, a development intended to provide the lords of Galloway with knights for their own army and to meet changing royal demands.

First indications of a significant change are provided by a charter of a Hugh de Morville, which records the grant of the church of Borgue to Dryburgh Abbey.[2] This survives as a transcript, shorn of its witnesses, in the fifteenth-century Dryburgh cartulary, where it lies out of sequence in a group of thirteenth-century grants by subsequent tenants of Borgue. The compiler of the cartulary headed his transumpt 'Prima donatio super ecclesiam de Worgis', which, with the assumption that the Hugh de Morville in question was the Constable of Scotland under David I and Malcolm IV, led Sir William Fraser in his edition of the cartulary for the Bannatyne Club to propose a date of *c.*1150 for the issuing of the charter. Rather than interpret 'prima donatio' as referring simply to the first grant concerned with Borgue, he assumed that the transcriber had intended to signify that this was the first grant made to Dryburgh after its foundation in 1150. That, however, would have required the Constable to have had Borgue over a decade earlier than the next surviving record of Anglo-Norman estate-holders in Galloway. In an endeavour to fit what is known of the first major period of colonisation after 1160, it has been proposed that Hugh received his estate as part of an otherwise unknown settlement forced on Fergus at an earlier date.[3] But such argument rests on too many imponderables to be readily acceptable. Indeed, the natural conclusions are that the charter has been dated at least a decade too early, that the identification of the granter with Hugh the Constable is an error, and that some other Hugh de Morville is involved. In view of Uhtred's and his family's known connections with Cumbria, it is probable that this Hugh was the son and namesake of Hugh the Constable, who entered the service of

1 *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland* [*CDS*], i, no. 529.
2 *Dryburgh Liber*, no. 68.
3 Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 164.

Henry II (in 1170 acquiring lasting infamy as one of the four knights responsible for the murder of Thomas Becket) and received from that king the lordship of North Westmorland previously held from David I by his father.[1] Alternatively, he may be a son of Simon de Morville who held the lordship of Burgh-by-Sands in Cumberland in right of his wife. Hugh son of Simon, a household knight of Henry II, came into this inheritance in 1167; as lord of Burgh-by-Sands he was a near neighbour of Uhtred's Torpenhow estates and, as Henry II's protégé, was a natural candidate for advancement in pro-English Galloway.[2]

Re-dated to the 1160s, the grant of Borgue to Hugh de Morville can still be viewed as part of a progressive colonisation of the lordship after Fergus's death. Malcolm IV's victory provided the Scots with an unprecedented opportunity to break the independence of the south-western lords and to define their relationship with the crown. Whilst it is implicit in the chronicles that Malcolm attempted to administer or oversee the region through royal officers, and to supervise it through a military settlement based on Dumfries,[3] it is also clear that he sought to conciliate the sons of Fergus. Despite his victory, Malcolm did not push his advantage home, for there is no indication that he attempted to set out in clear tenurial terms the relationship between the lords of Galloway and the kings of Scots. Moreover, Uhtred and Gilbert, between whom the lordship was divided, do not appear to have attended court regularly,[4] but their few appearances suggest a recognition that there was advantage to be gained. For Uhtred such posturing brought territory. Possession of Desnes Ioan, the region between the rivers Urr and Nith, came to Uhtred on the dismemberment of the lordship of lower Nithsdale in about 1165.[5] But Malcolm IV also gained, for he had apparently neutralised the lordship and its lords may have been allowed to succeed their father only on the king's terms. Furthermore, it would appear that for his new lands between the Urr and Nith Uhtred entered into a relationship with the crown which defined his service obligations in overtly 'feudal' terms. This was not part of the ancient lordship, and here Malcolm could impose what conditions of tenure he wished. It is probable

1 G. W. S. Barrow, *The Anglo-Norman Era in Scottish History* (Oxford, 1980), 31, n. 3, 74–6; but see also 81–2.

2 F. Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (London, 1986), 236, 258. Barlow, however, has confused this Hugh with the Constable's son, wrongly attributing to him a part in Becket's murder; cf. Barrow, *Anglo-Norman Era*, 74–6.

3 *Chron. Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 67.

4 Their appearance as witnesses to royal charters can be taken as indicative of the regularity of their presence at court. See: *Paisley Registrum*, 249; *Regesta Regum Scottorum* [*RRS*], i, nos. 131, 159, 265; ii, no. 80.

5 R. D. Oram, 'Fergus, Galloway and the Scots', in *Galloway: Land and Lordship*, ed. R. D. Oram and G. P. Stell (Edinburgh, 1991), 124–6.

that Uhtred's inclusion in the partition of Nithsdale was intended to facilitate the enforcement of royal rights in that district; for instance the levying of cain in Desnes Ioan may have been expedited. But the consequences were more far-reaching than a simple improvement in the collection of crown revenues, for the military aspects of tenure were uppermost in Malcolm's mind; no charter granting Desnes Ioan to Uhtred survives, but his subsequent endeavours to find colonists for his new property surely indicate the basis on which it had been granted.

Once the relationship had been defined, the introduction of men to provide the service required from Desnes Ioan seems to have been Uhtred's responsibility. Mr J. G. Scott argues that soon after 1165 a permanent royal presence was established in Dumfries with the installation of a 'proto-sheriff' in the person of Roger de Minto.[1] His authority may have extended over Uhtred's property in Desnes Ioan from a base at Dumfries, the chief stronghold of Radulf of Nithsdale in Malcolm IV's reign. Its defence seems to have been provided by castleguard service drawn from tenants of Radulf's former lands. R. C. Reid, in a study of the garrison of Dumfries in the fourteenth century, showed that less than half the castleguard was accounted for by the tenancies lying in an arc around the burgh to the north and east.[2] Scott expanded this to propose that the remaining service was provided from Desnes Ioan. The few surviving charters from Galloway indicate that it was in Uhtred's new lands between the Urr and the Nith that most early colonists were settled, such as Walter de Berkeley at Urr and Richard fitz Troite at Lochkindeloch.[3] The colonists, however, did not come as part of the package. Although it is perhaps possible that Walter de Berkeley received his estate at Urr on the suggestion of the king, it is clear that the initiative for finding sub-tenants who would perform the service demands attached to the new territory devolved largely on Uhtred.

Although Uhtred was generous with his newly-acquired estates, it was not a generosity restricted solely to secular colonists, nor did he prodigally grant away his new territory. The paucity of source material renders it impossible to reconstruct in full the tenurial pattern created by Uhtred in the lands east of the Urr. Nevertheless, it can be seen that a substantial portion of Desnes Ioan remained in his hands as part of his personal demesne, while further elements were used as endowments for the nunnery which he founded at Lincluden and for the abbey of Holmcultram in

1 J. G. Scott, 'An early sheriff of Dumfries?' *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., lvii (1982), 90–1.

2 R. C. Reid, 'The feudalisation of Lower Nithsdale', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., xxxiv (1955–6), 104–5.

3 *Holm Cultram Register*, no. 120a; Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters', no. 2.

Cumbria. The extent of the nunnery land cannot be determined, since, like all other south-western monasteries, its cartulary has been destroyed. Indeed, the nunnery's suppression by Archibald, third earl of Douglas in 1389 and its refoundation by him as a collegiate church[1] would have rendered its original charters redundant. From the evidence of the collegiate church's lands, however, it can be determined that part of the parish of Terregles around the confluence of the rivers Cluden and Nith, slightly upstream on the west bank from Dumfries, formed the core of the nunnery estate. Holmcultram's properties are better recorded. Uhtred granted the monks in feu-ferme the lands of Kirkgunzeon in the uplands of central Desnes Ioan,[2] bordered to the north and west by Walter de Berkeley's barony of Urr, to the south by Cospatric's lands in Colvend, and to the south-east by Richard fitz Troite's estate of Lochkindeloch. Composed mainly of moorland, scrub and bog, Kirkgunzeon was not the kind of land to inspire the enthusiasm of an incoming colonist, but the efforts of Cistercian Holmcultram saw its development as a valuable monastic grange specialising in sheep.[3] That the grant was made in feu-ferme rather than in free alms is perhaps significant in view of Uhtred's need to meet the service obligations due from Desnes Ioan to Malcolm IV.

Most of the remainder of Desnes Ioan was at first retained in the hands of Uhtred and his heirs. Kirkpatrick Durham in the hilly north-west was described as a 'tenement' in Dervorgilla Balliol's foundation charter of Sweetheart Abbey of 1273, where part of it was also described as having formed a grange of Dundrennan Abbey.[4] The status of the rump of the estate in the twelfth century cannot be determined. It is possible that it, along with the upland parish of Kirkpatrick Irongray, the remainder of Terregles and the low-lying Troqueer, formed a chain of lordship demesne along the boundary with Nithsdale and Glencairn. Terregles certainly formed a portion of Uhtred's lands and remained in the possession of his heirs down into the fourteenth century, when it eventually passed into the hands of the Herries family.[5] Troqueer likewise formed a discrete block within the lordship demesne until its partition between the heirs of Alan of Galloway after 1234.[6] On

1 *Calendar of Papal Letters to Scotland of Clement VII of Avignon*, 1378–1394, ed. C. Burns (Scot. Hist. Soc., 1976), 145.
2 *Holm Cultram Register*, no. 120.
3 *Ibid.*, no. 133.
4 *RRS*, vi, no. 235.
5 *RRS*, vi, no. 210; *Registrum Magni Sigilli* [*RMS*], i, no. 193; cf. *ibid.*, i, App. 1, no. 123.
6 *CDS*, ii, no. 824 pt. 4, shows Elena la Zouche as having held one-sixth of Troqueer in 1296. The remaining five-sixths would have been held by John Balliol (three-sixths), the earl of Buchan (one-sixth) and William Ferrars (one-sixth) as parceners of the Galloway estates, the holdings of one-sixth representing the three-way split of the lands of Helen de Quincy, elder sister and co-heir of Dervorgilla Balliol, between her daughters.

their forfeiture the lands were reunited and passed eventually to the Douglases, Archibald Douglas granting them to the hospital of Holywood in 1372.[1] And the final component, Kirkbean at the south-eastern extremity of Desnes Ioan, comprising mainly the subsequent barony of Preston, was certainly under Douglas superiority in the later fourteenth century; within it, the land of Airdrie was held by Gilbert 'the dispenser' from Uhtred's son Roland.[2]

Outwith Desnes Ioan, on the other hand, there is little evidence of significant colonisation, something which again points to demands concerned with Dumfries only. The existing evidence, moreover, is exclusive to Uhtred's property east of the River Cree, which has resulted in his being called 'pro-feudal'—while the lack of similar evidence from Gilbert's land has led to his being labelled 'anti-feudal'.[3] This comparison depends on charter distribution, which locates all known colonists in the period before 1185 in the lands east of the Cree in Uhtred's lordship. On this basis alone Uhtred has been portrayed as a man of vision who was not averse to the benefits of introducing foreign settlers, whilst Gilbert is depicted as the conservative die-hard who stubbornly resisted crown interference in territories under his control. The negative evidence speaks strongly against Gilbert, but may reflect a distorted truth.

West of the Urr, Uhtred can be shown to have introduced only two men for whom there is documentary evidence. These were David fitz Terrus, who received Anwoth at the mouth of the Fleet, and Hugh de Morville at Borgue. No similar evidence survives from Gilbert's lands in the west, but the loss of the cartularies of Whithorn and Soulseat perhaps helps to account for this situation. There is evidence from Carrick which implies either that Gilbert gave land there to at least one man, or that a former tenant of his in western Galloway moved to Carrick after 1185 when his son, Duncan, was dispossessed by his cousin, Roland son of Uhtred. It relates to Roger of Skelbrooke, a minor Yorkshire knight who between 1186 and 1196 granted land at Greenan in the lower Doon valley in Carrick to Melrose.[4] In his charter Roger describes Gilbert as 'my lord', a wording which implies a vassalic relationship which survived the upheavals between 1174 and 1185 and was reaffirmed by Gilbert's son, Duncan, who is likewise described as 'my lord'. Roger was succeeded by daughters, of whom one married into the local Celtic nobility,[5] hence the quick disappearance

1 *RMS*, i, no. 483.

2 K. J. Stringer, 'Periphery and core in thirteenth-century Scotland: Alan son of Roland, lord of Galloway and Constable of Scotland', in *Medieval Scotland: Crown, Lordship and Community*, ed. A. Grant and K. J. Stringer (Edinburgh, 1993), Appendix (A), no. 1.

3 Duncan, *Making of the Kingdom*, 182–3; *Wigtownshire Chrs*, p. xix.

4 *Melrose Liber*, i, nos. 31, 34.

5 *Ibid.*, nos. 33, 26.

of this Anglo-Norman family. Although this is hardly conclusive evidence for feudal grants by Gilbert, it serves to illustrate the dangers inherent in accepting the surviving charter distribution at face value. In addition, it must be remembered that Duncan, son of Gilbert, lost his inheritance in Galloway after 1186, and his father's supporters and tenants had either to quit and follow him or to come to an accommodation with Uhtred's son.

More can be said of the men whom Uhtred settled on his lands. Of the known five who may have settled prior to 1174 (three gaining estates in Desnes Ioan), four share the common factor of initial holdings in Cumbria, where they were relatives or near neighbours to the lords of Allerdale. These were Cospatric fitz Orm of Workington, a son of Waltheof's niece, David fitz Terrus of Over Denton, Richard fitz Troite, who held land near Carlisle, and Hugh de Morville. Of these men, only Hugh was of distinctly Anglo-Norman background, the remainder being from the largely Anglian nobility of the English north-west. The fifth man, Walter de Berkeley, was chamberlain to William the Lion and alone of the colonists may have owed his presence to royal influence.

Of the four Cumbrian knights, Cospatric alone cannot be proved conclusively to have settled in Galloway prior to the 1174 rebellion. He was influential in the Cumbrian power structure, and his son, Thomas, inherited sufficient wealth from him to be able to found the Premonstratensian abbey of Shap in Westmorland.[1] In 1174, described as a white-haired old man, Cospatric was Henry II's constable of Appleby and drew much opprobrium for his spineless surrender to William the Lion.[2] His complaisant capitulation to an army in which the lords of Galloway were serving may be attributed to kinship with Uhtred, or to the conflicting loyalties of a man who held land both in Galloway and in England. Uhtred's son Roland raised Cospatric's family to prominence in the lordly household and they emerged in the early thirteenth century as one of the most eminent noble families in eastern Galloway.

David fitz Terrus is the most problematical member of the group. He is believed to have come from Over Denton in Gilsland in eastern Cumberland,[3] quite removed from Uhtred's network of alliances around Allerdale. He cannot be shown to have had any kinship tie with Waltheof's family, nor is he known to have served either David I or Henry II within Cumbria. A connection with Gilsland, however, may have cost him his possessions when Henry II took over the Tyne Gap district in the later 1150s, and he may

1 H. M. Colvin and R. Gilyard-Beer, *Shap Abbey* (London, 1963), 5.
2 *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R. C. Johnston (Oxford, 1981), 151.
3 *Wigtownshire Chrs.*, p. xxii.

thus have been a willing colonist. Uhtred gave him Anwoth in the hilly district to the west of the Fleet, with its caput at Boreland of Cardoness. He granted the church of his new lordship to Holyrood, his overlord's favourite monastery, but the charter itself has not survived.[1] Evidence for his role in Galloway is otherwise slim; he appears as a witness on only one occasion.[2]

Hugh de Morville never appears as a witness to any surviving act of the lords of Galloway. Beyond his possession of Borgue, he seems to have had no interest in properties north of the Solway and made his career as a knight in the service of Henry II.[3] As (most probably) the lord of North Westmorland, Hugh de Morville was a neighbour of Waltheof of Allerdale and of Uhtred's own manor of Torpenhow, and it is probably through this that a tie to Uhtred had its source. Hugh's death may have ended the Morville connection with Borgue, there being no indication of a link to the families of his daughters who inherited his English property. It is likely that the estate reverted to the lords of Galloway before its regrant within a few years of Hugh's death to the de Campania family.[4]

It is an unfortunate consequence of the poverty of the charters that there is no evidence for the nature and extent of the lordships of such men as David and Hugh, or of the conditions of tenure. Thus, when one such document does survive, there are inherent dangers in assuming that it was representative of grants made to other tenants. This is a charter of Uhtred bestowing the lands of Lochkindeloch on Richard fitz Troite, brother of the sheriff of Carlisle.[5] The grant gave 'the whole land of Lochenelo to be held by fee and heritage for the service of one knight'. In addition, Richard received an array of rights and privileges which ranged from the possession of the mill and control of pannage in the woods of his estate—matters of economic importance to his dependants—through to deer-hunting rights and the sole entitlement to keep hawks and to take the eggs of birds of prey. In this sense the charter is little different from, although perhaps more detailed than, other contemporary grants to private individuals, but conditions attached to the *reddendo* clause make the initial generous allotment of land and privileges considerably less attractive.

Over and above the burden of knight service, Uhtred required an annual rent of eight pounds in silver for as long as he had to

1 *Holyrood Lib.*, no. 49.

2 Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters', no. 2.

3 Barrow, *Anglo-Norman Era*, 31 n. 3, 81–2, for Hugh's role in Henry II's service. This point is equally valid for Hugh de Moreville of Burgh-by-Sands, for whom see Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 236, 257–8.

4 *Dryburgh Lib.*, no. 64, shows Borgue in the possession of Radulf de Campania, while *Lindores Chartulary*, no. 112, puts 'Castleton of Borgue in Galloway' in the hands of Robert de Campania.

5 Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters'.

pay cain to the crown from Desnes Ioan, in which district Richard's estate lay. This money-rent compares favourably with the ten pounds received from the monks of Holmcultram for Kirkgunzeon, which was granted in fee-farm, not in free alms.[1] It was agreed that this payment would free Richard from all other service obligations, and the charter ends with the optimistic promise that when Uhtred was 'free and quit of payment of cain, he (Richard) shall hold freely the aforesaid land by the service of one knight'. This extra payment of cash from the tenant and the desire to be free from cain from a wider geographical area lends support to the view that the crown was demanding service from Desnes Ioan in general, probably connected with Dumfries, and that Uhtred was struggling to meet those demands.

In tandem with these obligations to the crown, Richard's lordship was probably burdened with additional dues owed to Uhtred as overlord. This is not stated in the original charter, but in the later thirteenth century, when the estate had reverted to the lords of Galloway, additional burdens are recorded in the grant of the property as the basis of the monastic demesne of Dervorgilla's abbey of Sweetheart. Her foundation charter of 1273 shows that the land had continued to be burdened with traditional Celtic renders, such as sorran, as well as the 'feudal' obligations of customs, aids, assizes, gelds and so on,[2] until its grant in free alms to the monks. Cain, however, had disappeared from the formula of lordly perquisites, translated probably into the legal semi-fiction of knight service and converted in reality into a money payment, although certain of the 'feudal' casualties would include elements of these ancient rights of overlordship. The survival of these rights surely illustrates continuity of practice rather than the replacement of the old system by a completely alien regime. Old rights may have been redefined to meet new circumstances, but little other than terminology relating to the more general aspects of lordship was actually changed.

Thus, in view of the apparently limited nature of this settlement in Galloway after 1160, and the shallowness of the changes which required their introduction or were caused by their arrival, it is impossible to accept that the rebellion of 1174 was a conservative backlash against 'the feudalising tendencies' of the Scottish crown.[3] Any hostility which erupted after William's capture at Alnwick was directed against visible symbols of Scottish control, of which alien settlers were only one aspect. Anti-foreign sentiments need not imply 'anti-feudal' feelings, as there is evidence to suggest that Fergus's sons were not averse to the benefits which could be derived from changes in the structure of lordship and service.

1 *Holm Cultram Register*, no. 120.
2 *RRS*, vi, no. 235.
3 *Wigtownshire Chrs.*, p. xxi.

The anti-foreign aspect of the rising is at once evident from the chronicles which record the event. These describe the particular hostility towards men seen as crown agents. Roger of Howden describes the expulsion of royal officers, attacks on foreigners and the storming of strongholds held by royal servants,[1] while the Benedict of Peterborough version of his work specifically mentions assaults on 'bailiffs and wardens' imposed by the Scots.[2] Limited archaeological work undertaken in Galloway has produced only slight indications for the direction of these attacks, but Walter de Berkeley's great motte at Urr has produced some evidence for destruction and subsequent dereliction for an uncertain time.[3] Walter is the only one of Uhtred's tenants who probably owed his possessions in Galloway, remote from his main lands in eastern Scotland, to direct royal influence: he served as chamberlain to William the Lion.[4] In 1174, moreover, he was active in William's campaign and acted as envoy in the Scottish attempts to persuade Robert de Vaux to surrender Carlisle.[5] He remained in captivity in England after the settlement of the Treaty of Falaise in 1175 as a hostage to ensure his master's good behaviour.[6]

Walter, then, was in no position to defend his Galwegian property. As the caput of a man associated with the household of the hated Scottish king, it is probable that his motte was regarded as a royal outpost at the western end of the road through Desnes Ioan rather than as the residence of one of Uhtred's vassals. Certainly, his stronghold does appear to have had a garrison capacity; its extensive bailey—probably a re-used prehistoric earthwork[7]—may have served as the defensive enclosure for the housing of soldiers. Work in Ulster has suggested that this garrison role is a feature of the early mottes associated with the beginnings of colonisation in that province,[8] and it is perhaps significant that both David fitz Terrus's motte at Anwoth and that of Hugh de Morville at Borgue likewise possessed bailey enclosures.[9] Equal significance should be added to the fact that only four of the mottes in Galloway display

1 *Chron. Roger of Howden*, ii, 57.

2 *Chron. Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 67–8.

3 B. Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr. Interim Report 1951 season', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., xxix (1950–1). 167–72.

4 *Holyrood Lib.*, no. 17; *Holm Cultram Register*, nos. 122, 123, 126.

5 *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 103.

6 *Chron. Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 97–8.

7 G. P. Stell, 'Medieval buildings and secular lordship', in Oram and Stell, *Galloway: Land and Lordship*, 146.

8 T. E. McNeill, *Anglo-Norman Ulster* (Edinburgh, 1980), 65–8, 85–7.

9 C. J. Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway: Recent fieldwork in the Stewartry', in *Studies in Scottish Antiquity Presented to Stewart Cruden*, ed. D. Breeze (Edinburgh, 1984), 91–4, 96–8, 114, for mottes with baileys at Anwoth, Borgue and Urr. The fourth motte with bailey is at High Drummore in the Rhins peninsula: *The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Scotland*, 24 (Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland, 1985), no. 188.

definite indications of the former existence of a bailey, which hardly supports belief in an extensive system of supervisory garrisons distributed throughout the territories of Uhtred and Gilbert: four mottes with baileys hardly constitute a solid basis on which to postulate an army of occupation holding down a restive Galwegian populace in the 1160s and 1170s. Indeed, the main evidence for royally-inspired colonisation and a system of supervision lies beyond the frontiers of Galloway, especially in Clydesdale.[1] It is likely that Dumfries was the closest centre of royal authority, probably the administrative centre of the bailiffs and wardens mentioned by Howden. The 'old castle of Dumfries', presumably the stronghold of Radulf taken over by the new royal administration, was destroyed:[2] its ominous presence on the Nith was too close a reminder of the overlordship of the king of Scots to be stomached by the Galwegians. The importance of Dumfries to the crown as a replacement for Carlisle saw the speedy construction of a new castle there once William was released from captivity in Normandy in December 1174.

Since the initial revolt of 1174—in the course of which Gilbert had had his brother Uhtred killed—Gilbert had acted as sole lord of Galloway with the support of Henry II, who forced William the Lion's grudging acceptance of that position. Fresh hostilities broke out in the early 1180s, perhaps because Gilbert saw the new Dumfries castle as a threat, but for the most part Gilbert was able to maintain his position (though Uhtred's son Roland may have established himself in Desnes Ioan). With Gilbert's death in 1185, however, this Indian Summer of native Galwegian resurgence came to an abrupt end. Gilbert's heir, Duncan, was a hostage at the court of Henry II, which left Gilbert's followers leaderless; that enabled his nephew, Roland son of Uhtred, to take over the lordship of Galloway.[3] The chroniclers regarded Roland as governing Galloway both by right of inheritance and by right of conquest,[4] having defeated his uncle's erstwhile vassals and established his own supporters on their confiscated lands. It is assumed that Roland's victory depended on Anglo-Norman knights drawn from Scotland and northern England, for, since Uhtred's murder in 1174, he had spent much of his time at the Scottish court or with families such as the Morvilles.[5] The apparent speed with which he raised an army and invaded Gilbert's domains, however, suggests that he drew on resources available to him within Galloway itself.

1 Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Upper Clydesdale', 114–28.
2 For the 'old castle' at Dumfries, see *Glasgow Reg.*, no. 50.
3 *Chron. Roger of Howden*, ii, 299; *Chron. Benedict of Peterborough*, i, 339.
4 William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, in *Chronicles of Stephen*, i, 237.
5 Roland's presence in the household of the Morvilles is attested by his appearance as a witness to several of their acts, e.g. RRS, ii, no. 236; *Melrose Lib.*, i, nos. 94, 108, 111.

As already remarked, it is likely that Roland had maintained a hold on at least part of his father's lordship, probably in Desnes Ioan, so he may have preserved the support needed to reverse the events of 1174. The actual 'foreign' element amongst his supporters may thus have been very restricted, if the number of colonists to whom he granted land after securing control of the lordship is any indication of the scale of non-Galwegian involvement. It is probable that the bulk of Roland's support was drawn from his father's former following within eastern Galloway, the men whom William of Newburgh describes as assisting Roland in his resistance to Gilbert in 1174.[1]

The emergence of most Anglo-Norman families in Galloway is commonly ascribed to Roland's generosity in response to their support for him in the campaign against the native supporters of Gilbert.[2] It does appear that men possibly ejected from their lands in 1174 were restored to lost estates. In Walter de Berkeley's case, however, restitution may have occurred soon after his release from captivity in England, as the tight parameters for dating his dispute with the monks of Holm, his grant of land to them and Roland's confirmation of the same,[3] indicate his control of Urr by 1185–6, possibly in advance of Roland's campaign against Gilbert's supporters. Evidence otherwise of widespread infeftments is absent, and what seems instead to have occurred is a restoration of the situation as existed between 1160 and 1174, with the bulk of newly-recorded settlement still being made in the lands between the Urr and the Nith. Walter's lordship of Urr formed the major component in the pattern of estates in this region, again probably a reflection of royal influence over infeftments in Desnes Ioan in the years before Uhtred's rebellion. Urr stood at the western limit of an old routeway running from Dumfries westward into Galloway. The motte itself occupied a frontier position on the boundary between Desnes Ioan and the lordship proper, being sited at the principal ford on the Urr and less than two miles upstream from a stronghold of the lords of Galloway at Buittle. The extent of Walter's barony is unknown, but the parish of Urr, together with Blaiket to the north, a portion of Kirkgunzeon to the south and at least part of Lochrutton to the east, appear to have been encompassed by its limits. The eastern part of the estate, centred on the lands of Corswadda, was granted in about 1189 to William fitz Richard for the service of half a knight,[4] probably to ease financial burdens on the more extensive lordship if Walter held on terms similar to Richard fitz Troite.

1 William of Newburgh, *Historia*, i, 186–7.
2 *Wigtownshire Chrs.*, pp. xxi–xxix.
3 *Holm Cultram Register*, nos. 120a, 121–3.
4 Anderson, *Diplomata Scotiae*, no. 77.

To the south of Urr lay Colvend, the lordship of Roland's relatives the lords of Workington. Their tenure stemmed undoubtedly from kinship with Uhtred, who may have granted Colvend to his wife's first cousin, Cospatric fitz Orm, but it was his sons who were to build a considerable landed interest in this region and emerge as close associates of Roland's son, Alan. The elder brother, Thomas, who inherited the paternal estates at Workington, received the moiety of Colvend,[1] his family eventually acquiring the territorial designation of 'de Culwen' as a surname. Gilbert, the younger brother, acquired the neighbouring lordship of Southwick[2] and made his mark as one of the most active members of the household of the lords of Galloway. He occurs most frequently in a Galwegian rather than a Cumbrian context, whilst his brother's retention of the family lands across the Solway saw him remain predominantly an English knight.

In the cases of Walter de Berkeley and the sons of Cospatric the association with the lords of Galloway stems from long before 1185, and, although they may have assisted Roland in that year, they did not receive their estates as a reward for military service. There is also no indication that they gained lands from Gilbert's former demesne or the estates of his former vassals in western Galloway. All three men remained solely lords of property in Desnes Ioan, and it would not appear that this was due to Roland's having to spread his patronage more thinly over a larger group.

Despite Howden's statement that Roland seized Gilbert's estates and those of the native lords of western Galloway,[3] there is little documentary evidence to support the belief that he used this windfall to reward his own supporters. Indeed, there is only one documented case where a wholly new family, the de Vieuxponts, was introduced into western Galloway by Roland. Again, the loss of the cartularies of the Galwegian monasteries has probably distorted this picture, but even so the fragment which can be reconstructed hardly supports the belief that western Galloway had been subjugated by an army of 'feudal' colonists based on fortified strongpoints. Proponents of the cataclysmic thesis of conquest and colonisation would point to the plethora of mottes throughout the lordship, and argue that this alone is sufficient evidence for the sudden and dramatic imposition of a hostile and alien elite.[4] But the problem with arguments for and against the use of the mottes as evidence for colonisation of the lordship in Roland's time is that there are many more mottes than known Anglo-Norman colonists.

1 *The Register of the Priory of St Bees*, ed. J. Wilson (Surtees Soc., 1915), no. 92.
2 *Holm Cultram Register*, no. 131.
3 *Chron. Benedict of Peterborough*, ii, 339, 349.
4 *Wigtownshire Chrs.*, pp. xxii–xxiii.

There is also a large question-mark over the association of such earthworks with foreign adventurers: by the fourteenth century many of the lordships with mottes were in the hands of clearly native families such as the Maclellans, McCullochs, M'Kies and Askelocs, a level of native ownership which cannot be attributed solely to genetic accidents such as saw the disappearance of the Skelbrookes in Carrick.[1] A further complication is that little is known about the chronology of mottes in Galloway, for evidence suggests that they were a long-standing form of defence there, remaining in vogue into the early fourteenth century.[2]

An absence of concrete evidence for large-scale colonisation implies an exaggeration of the traditional Anglo-Norman role in Roland's conquest. The converse of this is that the native Celtic nobility of the lordship survived the upheavals of 1174–85 and remained the dominant factor in the land-holding pattern of central and western Galloway. The extent of this survival is considered below, but it needs to be stressed here that while records of Anglo-Norman colonists in Galloway are slight, documentation relating to the native nobility is entirely lacking before the middle of the thirteenth century, and any extrapolation back is made on the basis of the damning silence of the negative evidence. Native families may have suffered social degradation rather than extinction under Roland's regime—but if this were the case they were resurgent in the later thirteenth century when they headed the knightly class. Such a renaissance is unlikely to have occurred had the old nobility been entirely displaced by an incoming elite. It is, therefore, perhaps preferable to see Roland's colonists as a thin veneer over the existing native aristocracy, who slotted into gaps within that group of families linked to him by bonds of kinship.

Such was the case with the one documented instance of Roland settling a family on land seized from Gilbert or his vassals, that of the de Vieuxponts.[3] In common with most families introduced into Galloway in the twelfth century, the de Vieuxponts were prominent in Cumbria. Significantly, they were a family linked closely with Henry II's administration, as well as being related by marriage to Roland's wife, Helen de Morville. They eventually acquired the barony of North Westmorland as a result of English

1 Hope-Taylor, 'Excavations at Mote of Urr', 170.

2 Tabraham, 'Norman settlement in Galloway', provides the best published starting-point for investigation of this question, but this covers only the modern Stewartry District. Despite Tabraham's reticence, there is good reason to believe that Balmaclellan was possessed by the Maclellans before 1300. It has been suggested to me recently that the apparently Anglo-Norman family of de Gelston, lords of Gelston to the south-east of Castle Douglas, can be identified with the Maclellans (personal communication from W. D. H. Sellar). The caput of the Gelston's lordship lay at Ingleston motte (NX 774579). In Wigtownshire the motte of Myrton near Port William is associated with the McCullochs.

3 R. C. Reid, 'De Veteripont', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., xxxiii (1954–5), 96–106.

royal patronage: William de Vieuxpont received Henry II's permission to marry Matilda de Morville (daughter of the younger Hugh de Morville and aunt of Helen).[1] Ivo, the youngest son of William and Matilda, received the manor of Sorbie in the Machars of Galloway from his cousin's husband, Roland.[2] The estate consisted of the parishes of St Michael and St Fillan, which became known as Sorbie Minor and Sorbie Major respectively by the later twelfth century, and lay adjacent to a stronghold of the lords of Galloway at Cruggleton. On Ivo's death the estate was split between his sons, Robert and Alan.[3] Robert lost control of his portion, Sorbie Major, by the middle of the thirteenth century, possibly as the result of a mortgage.[4] Alan's lands passed to his son, Robert, but there is no evidence for its descent from him. In neither case had the estates escheated through failure of heirs or through forfeiture, yet, in less than a century of its introduction as colonists, a prominent Anglo-Norman family was removed from the social landscape as effectively as if it had never existed.

When considered as a whole, the evidence for the colonising movement directed by Roland highlights the importance of his maternal links with Cumbria. Where settlement can be attributed to Roland the deciding factor was kinship: the de Vieuxponts, Colvends and Southwicks were all related to him in varying degrees. Those families not related to him directly, such as the Berkeleys, fitz Troites and fitz Terris, had been introduced by Uhtred, or had perhaps used family connections with the Morvilles to provide an entry into the inner circle of vassals of the lords of Galloway. Whilst the impact of the incomers on the settlement pattern of the lordship appears less than previously believed, their impact on the lords' household was profound. This is revealed by the personnel who witness the charters of the lords. In these a dichotomy emerges between Uhtred and his successors in terms of the cultural background of the men involved. Uhtred was eclectic in his choice, drawing on men of Anglian and Scandinavian background as well as from the Celtic aristocracy.[5] Natives such as Gillemore Albanach, Gillecrist MacGillwinin and Uhtred's foster brother, Gillecatfar, feature regularly as witnesses to his charters. Where men of definite Anglo-Norman background are recorded it is in connection with grants pertaining to the Allerdale

1 *Ibid.*, 91

2 *Dryburgh Lib.*, nos. 75–7, where Ivo de Vieuxpont grants the church of Sorbie Major to the canons of Dryburgh.

3 *Ibid.*, nos. 72–3; nos. 71–3 place Sorbie Minor in the hands of Robert de Vieuxpont, while no. 75 records possession of Sorbie Major by his brother Ivo.

4 CDS, i, no. 1808.

5 See, for example, the witness lists of *Holyrood Lib.*, nos. 23, 24, or Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters', no. 2.

properties, or where one of their own close circle was involved.[1] The character of a witness list reflects the men present at the time of the document's preparation, and would comprise largely of those commonly in attendance on the lord. Uhtred's charters thus proclaim the Celtic nature of his following; under Roland and Alan, on the other hand, they show a profound change in the character of the inner group of supporters. Men with Celtic names almost disappear from the charters, replaced by men bearing Anglo-Norman ones; but whether this was conscious policy, evidence for the adoption of Anglo-Norman names by the Celtic nobility, or the result of a growing involvement with affairs outside Galloway is open to question.

Charters issued by Roland which deal solely with Galloway are rare, rendering it impossible to state categorically that he consciously set aside natives and replaced them with foreigners. His experiences between 1174 and 1185 may have coloured his outlook and, having spent some of that time in attendance on the Morvilles and at William's court, he was perhaps more used to moving in an Anglo-Norman milieu. Certainly, he is known more frequently by his French alternative name, Roland, than by the native Lachlan as which he is recorded in charters in his youth,[2] and in this we may catch a glimpse of the psyche at work within the man. With Roland, unfortunately, we receive only one side of the picture, but it is one which shows a man who by taste and inclination had bedded his ambitions firmly in the world of Anglo-Scottish politics: the lords of Galloway were outgrowing their cultural roots. And yet it has to be emphasised: this is only one side of the story.

The thrust of the argument so far has been to highlight the limited nature of the Anglo-Norman colonisation which occurred in Galloway and to underscore the control over it exercised by the ruling lords rather than by the king of Scots. The few charters of Alan, son of Roland lend further support to the image of the Normanised lord surrounding himself with foreign dependants: identifiably 'native' families are nowhere to be seen.[3] Dr Keith Stringer, however, in a recently published study of the political career of Alan of Galloway,[4] has drawn attention to his Janus-like character, underscoring the hybridity in Alan's political personal-

1 Ragg, 'Five Strathclyde and Galloway charters', no. 2.

2 Cf. *Holyrood Lib.*, no. 24, and *Holm Cultram Register*, no. 120, for Lachlan alias Roland. Barrow raises the same point: RRS, ii, 13–14. While Roland is standardly accepted as representing the commonly used Latinised form of Lachlan, it is probable that it was the form of name used in everyday life by the lord of Galloway. Where he is mentioned by name in that most Gaelic of chronicles, the Annals of Ulster, he is referred to as 'Rolant mac Uchtraigh: *Annals of Ulster*, ii, 235.

3 See, for example, the witness lists to CDS, i, no. 553; Stringer, 'Periphery and core' (in *Medieval Scotland*, ed. Grant and Stringer), Appendix (A), no. 1; *St Bees Register*, no. 42.

4 Stringer, 'Periphery and core', especially 98–9.

ity. As Stringer puts it, 'Alan, though the son of a Norman mother, a great feudal magnate, and the Constable of Scotland, was also the hereditary chieftain of a semi-independent Celtic province on Scotland's western fringe'.[1] It is certainly clear from Alan's behaviour in the 1220s that he was acutely conscious of his status as a Celtic warlord of the western seaboard, but what Stringer's essay brings out in particular is Alan's Anglo-Norman urbanity, his elevated social position within the Scottish aristocracy, and the significance of his dealings with the Scottish crown. Alan himself attached a striking importance to his title and office of Constable of Scotland, which takes precedence in charter formulae over his hereditary title of lord of Galloway.[2] That perhaps suggests a duality in Alan's political situation, but if so, it is probably more apparent than real; it is unlikely that Alan entertained any conflicting ideas in his own mind about his social position. Who he was mattered less than where he was, for the circle of men moving around him changed with whatever portion of his vast inheritance he was in at any given time. His attendant entourage is, of course, a key source for our understanding of Alan. In his charters men of identifiably native stock are conspicuous by their absence; Stringer, indeed, speaks of 'social exclusivity' amongst those regularly in attendance on the lord of Galloway.[3] The significance of such charter evidence, however, is difficult to assess. Does it indicate the separation of the lord from his native supporters and people, who are relegated to secondary roles in the pursuit of his interests; or was the support of 'invisible' native landlords an essential prerequisite for Alan's far-flung activities? The problem is that the documentary material which survives for the lords is primarily non-Galwegian in origin and character—of the seven *acta* reproduced in Dr Stringer's essay, only one involved land in Galloway and that lay outwith the ancestral lordship in Desnes Ioan.[4] Thus it is impossible to say how disposal of land within the original lordship inherited from Fergus was treated. As is argued above, from Uhtred's documents it can be seen that the witnesses to the lords' charters were drawn from different groups depending upon the location of the subject matter of the grant and to whom the grant was being made; different personnel are employed as witnesses in different contexts. A useful comparison can be made with Carrick: the charters of the earls survive in proportionately greater numbers than those of their kinsmen in Galloway and relate exclusively to

1 *Ibid.*, 82.
2 *Ibid.*, 101.
3 *Ibid.*, 98, where the quotation is taken from R. Bartlett, 'Colonial societies of the High Middle Ages', in *Medieval Frontier Societies*, ed. R. Bartlett and A. MacKay (Oxford, 1989), 29.
4 Stringer, 'Periphery and core', Appendix (A), no. 1.

the earldom itself.[1] Carrick witness lists show a continued dominance there of a native aristocracy, and reveal also the interest of the earls' kindred in the disposal of property within the earldom. It would not be stretching the fragmentary evidence from Galloway too much to suggest that similar circumstances prevailed in the intensely Celtic lordship of Roland and Alan; where the patrimony of the lords in Galloway was involved, the interests of the kindred and the native aristocracy must have been considered.

An alternative to the above suggestion would be that the kindred was ignored by Roland and his son and that the native aristocracy had been eliminated as a social or political group whose sensibilities required due consideration. Alan's charters could perhaps be read in that light. But, even allowing for distortions produced by the fragmentary documentation, the evidence for such significant colonisation as would produce that kind of situation is far too slight to support any belief in the wholesale elimination of the native nobility and its replacement by an alien elite. And the necessary concomitant of this is that the native aristocracy still remained significant in Galloway after the traumas of 1185. To take the witness lists to the acts of Roland and Alan as demonstrating its elimination is to distort reality, by argument from negative evidence: the non-appearance of men of identifiably Celtic background in the household or curia of the lords, or amongst the land-holding elite who witnessed their charters, need not be taken as an indication of their non-existence. What is much more likely is that, as Stringer remarks, 'for all Alan's familiarity with feudal practices, the support of Galloway's native community was crucial to his personal supremacy'.[2]

Admittedly, such contentions rest on a fragile documentary base, but there exists a body of later thirteenth and fourteenth-century sources which permits retrospective comment on the underlying character of the Galwegian nobility. The two decades after Alan's death constitute a hiatus in the documentation concerned with the lordship, which produces a sharp contrast between the evidence pointing *prima facie* to the domination of Galloway by, or reliance of the lords on, an alien elite in the time of Roland and Alan, and quite different evidence pointing to the prominence of native Galwegian landholders during the time of Alan's daughter, Dervorgilla, and her son and grandson. This contrast cannot be overstated, and it calls into doubt the traditional interpretation of the pre-1234 material.

We can state confidently that no major influx of fresh colonists and hangers-on occurred after 1234, but there *is* a clear change in

1 E.g. *Melrose Lib.*, i, nos. 2932, 36, 189; *North Berwick Carte*, nos. 1, 13–15.
2 Stringer, 'Periphery and core', 83–4.

the personnel witnessing documents of the ruling lines. Long-established colonist families such as the de Cardoness descendants of David fitz Terrus, or the de Twynholms, are well-represented,[1] but families such as the de Mundevilles from Nithsdale and the de Stobhills from Liddel,[2] members of the wider family and tenurial circle of the Balliols, register a new presence. Alan's three sons-in-law certainly introduced administrative staff of their own, as illustrated by the case of Philip Lovel, an English clerk who served Roger de Quincy as steward in Galloway in the 1240s.[3] But he was a household clerk, not a landless knight attached to Roger's retinue, and put down no roots in Galloway. The elimination of the Aumale line of Alan's heirs in 1246[4] and the subdivision of the de Quincy inheritance between the Comyns, Ferrers and Zouches in 1263–4,[5] however, saw the emergence of the Balliols as the major family in Galloway and the use of the title of 'lord of Galloway' being restricted to Dervorgilla Balliol's line alone,[6] even although it was not the most senior. As the titular heads of aristocratic society in Galloway, the Balliols constituted a real replacement for the heirs of Fergus and were to attract the support and following of a noble elite whose composition appears radically different from that visible in the lordship under Roland and Alan.

Documents relating to Balliol Galloway are few, but they provide a series of illustrations of the land-holding elite which looked to Dervorgilla's family for leadership. The earliest, a witnessed debenture of *c.* 1251, dates from the return to stability after the upheavals which followed Alan's death.[7] It is neither dated nor located, but internal features suggest that it was drawn up at Buittle Castle, the Balliols' caput in Galloway.[8] It records terms for repayment of cash borrowed from Dervorgilla's husband by Maurice Acarsan, a man of native lineage, and is witnessed by members of the Galwegian nobility. Adam of Twynholm, for example, was a member of a Cumbrian family holding the lands of Twynholm north of Kirkcudbright, which extended its influence in Galloway in the course of the thirteenth century.[9] Andrew de Kirkconnel came from one of two families sharing

1 *RRS*, vi, no. 235; *CDS*, ii, no. 212.

2 *The Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford Historical Soc., 1913), no. 592.

3 Matthew Paris, *Chron. Maj.*, v, 270–2.

4 *Ibid.*, iv, 341.

5 *Scots Peerage*, iv, 142.

6 For the use of the title 'lord of Galloway' by Dervorgilla's husband and son, see, e.g., *The Chronicle of Walter of Guisborough*, ed. H. Rothwell (Camden Soc., 1957), 189, 233.

7 *Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, no. 592.

8 Amongst the witnesses is Adam, chaplain of Buittle, who may have been the clerk who recorded the deed.

9 William son of Gamell of Twynholm granted the advowson of the church of Twynholm to the canons of Holyrood before 1234: *Holyrood Lib.*, no. 67. Walter of Twynholm was keeper of the sheriffdom of Wigtown for Edward I in 1296: CDS, ii, no. 824.

Kirkconnel in Troqueer as tenants of the lords, both taking their surname from that estate.[1] These men represent colonist families who appear earlier in the thirteenth century on the fringes of the noble circle around the lords of Galloway, but who never enjoyed such prominence as, say, Gilbert fitz Cospatric, Alan's second cousin.[2] Their emergence was a consequence of the breaking of the close kin-based associations between Alan's heirs and their principal tenants in the lordship as the original recipients and granters of land aged and died. A further consequence is represented by a third Galwegian witness, who is drawn from the native nobility supposedly destroyed by Roland. Gillespoc son of Gilbothyn is undoubtedly of native stock, and later sources indicate that his family were Balliol tenants for some part of Buittle.[3] Too much can be read into the significance of this one man of clearly Celtic origin, but here, after three-quarters of a century of silence in the written record, is the first unequivocal evidence for the continued existence of a native land-holding class.

When comprehensive evidence for an inner circle around Dervorgilla does emerge, it depicts a curia still dominated by descendants of some of the twelfth-century colonists. The 1273 foundation charter of Sweetheart Abbey is the closest we come to this circle.[4] Here the secular witnesses are led by five knights, headed by David and Robert Marshall, Balliol tenants in Wigtownshire.[5] After the knights come Walter de Twynholm, Bertram de Cardoness and Michael son of Durand, the last sub-tenant of the Kirkconnels for Mabie in Troqueer.[6] All are drawn from colonist families, with the exception of one knight: Cane Macgillolane, probable head of the Maclellan kindred,[7] a family entrenched in the land-holding pattern of the northern Galloway uplands. In him we establish contact with a world radically different from the tight-knit community of colonists visible before 1234. The Maclellans form one of the extensive 'lineage'-based power-groups identifiable in Galloway and Carrick from the end of the thirteenth-

1 *Holm Cultram Register*, nos. 116–19, 148–55.

2 Gilbert fitz Cospatric, lord of Southwick, witnesses: CDS, i, no. 553; K. J. Stringer, 'The early lords of Lauderdale, Dryburgh Abbey and St Andrew's Priory at Northampton', in Stringer, *Essays on the Nobility*, appendix, no. 7; *St Bees Register*, nos. 42, 60, 62; Stringer, 'Periphery and core', Appendix (A), nos. 1–3.

3 *CDS*, ii, nos. 824, 1588, for Patrick M'Gilbochyn. Bain suggested that the 'Patrick de Botel' who submitted to Edward I at Berwick on 28 August 1296 (*CDS*, ii, no. 823) may be the same man. He may be a son of Gillespoc.

4 *RRS*, vi, no. 235.

5 *CDS*, iii, no. 258, records the lands of Tocstruther (Toskerton in the parish of Stoneykirk), held by the Marshalls in the early fourteenth century.

6 *Holm Cultram Register*, nos. 144–6, 148, 151–4.

7 D. Brooke, 'The Glenkens 1275–1456: Snapshots of a medieval countryside', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., lix (1984), 49–50.

century onwards.[1] The existence of a specifically Maclellan lineage cannot be established until the reign of David II, when Gilbert McGillolane received the captaincy of the kindred of 'Clenconnon',[2] but members of this powerful kin-group figure prominently in the records of the period 1273–1352 as amongst the most active of the Balliol and pro-English party in Galloway. Sir Donald MacCan, who can perhaps be identified as Cane Macgillolane's son, appears first in a Balliol context in 1285.[3] After his submission to Edward I in 1296, MacCan became a leader of the native party supporting the English in the pre-Bannockburn stage of the Wars of Independence, his former Balliol connection being demonstrated by the pension he received from Edward I to replace land granted to him by John Balliol in lieu of a pension previously granted by Dervorgilla.[4] He was active in the field after 1297 and fought against the Bruces until his capture in 1308.[5] The re-opening of the Bruce-Balliol conflict in the 1330s saw the re-establishment of the former Maclellan association with the Balliols. Sir Matthew Maclellan and his son, John, maintained their support for Edward Balliol until the mid-1350s,[6] long after it had become apparent that the Balliol cause in Scotland was effectively dead. Nevertheless, they returned to the allegiance of David II and were to become well established in the new power-structure of the lordship as reconstructed under the Douglases.

The Maclellan/MacCan kindred is not an isolated phenomenon in the power-structure of later thirteenth-century Galloway, nor was it alone amongst native families in its support for the Balliols. A legal memorandum of April 1285 recording an action in the court at Wigtown reveals further native families active on Balliol business.[7] Here we have no Morvilles, Vieuxponts or Colvends, the secular nobility being represented instead by Sir Donald MacCan, Thomas McCulloch and Roland Askeloc. Askeloc, or McGachen as he appears also to have been known,[8] headed a Wigtownshire family which displayed connections both with the heirs of Helen de Quincy—the Comyns, Zouches and Ferrars—and Dervorgilla. From Dervorgilla Roland had apparently received land

1 See *CDS*, i, 253, for the 'chief men of the lineage of Clenafren' in Galloway; and, for discussions of the office of 'kenkynnol', H. L. MacQueen, 'The laws of Galloway: a preliminary survey', in *Galloway: Land and Lordship*, ed. Oram and Stell, and H. L. MacQueen, 'The Kin of Kennedy: "Kenkynnol" and the Common Law', in *Medieval Scotland*, ed. Grant and Stringer.

2 *RMS*, i, app. ii, no. 912, dated to *c.*1344.

3 *Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, no. 601.

4 *CDS*, ii, no. 1712.

5 For the career of Donald MacCan see *Chron. Bower* (Watt), vi, 444, n. 54.

6 *CDS*, iii, no. 1578 (3).

7 *Oxford Deeds of Balliol College*, no. 601.

8 For Askeloc/McGachen see: *CDS*, ii, nos. 823, 824 (1).

in Borgue in Kirkcudbrightshire,[1] perhaps that resigned by Robert de Campania in 1282.[2] This was forfeited in 1306 for his support of Robert Bruce,[3] a connection with the Balliols' rivals which is also found in the pardon for murder and other crimes obtained by Bruce on behalf of Roland's son, Hector, in February 1302.[4] But any such flirtation with the Bruce cause appears to have been short-lived, if the 'Roland' named as a casualty fighting with Donald MacCan against Edward Bruce in 1308 is correctly identified as Roland Askeloc.[5] A greater degree of steadfastness was displayed by the McCullochs. Thomas, his brother Michael, and a William McCulloch, all of the county of Wigtown, submitted to Edward I at Berwick in 1296.[6] Loyalty to Edward had its rewards, Thomas being appointed sheriff of Wigtown in 1305.[7] Submission to the triumphant Bruces amounted to nothing but ensured the retention of their property. Adherence to the Balliol cause after 1331 saw the forfeiture of that land and by 1342 his family were landless refugees in England, petitioning Edward III for a pension.[8] Like the Maclellans, the McCullochs maintained their allegiance to the descendant of Alan to the bitter end, for Patrick and Gilbert McCulloch formed part of the closely-knit group of native lords adhering to the lost cause of Edward Balliol in the 1350s.[9]

A fourth—perhaps the greatest—native kindred in Galloway was the MacDowells. This is not the place for a detailed analysis of their central role in the bitter war against the Bruces in Galloway in the fourteenth century, but some consideration is required. In view of the dominant position which they enjoyed in the native society of south-western Scotland, the main issue to consider is the nature of their relationship with the family of the lords of Galloway. There is a strong popular tradition which links the families by blood,[10] but this cannot be established conclusively. Nevertheless, there are segments of the lordly dynasty from which no descent has been traced, and it is possible that one of these is represented by the MacDowells. The strongest contender for a role as founder of a MacDowell segment is Fergus, son of Uhtred, who was active on behalf of his nephew, Alan of Galloway, in the early thirteenth century.[11] It is perhaps significant that Fergus and Uhtred feature as Christian

1 G. W. S. Barrow, *Robert Bruce and the Community of the Realm of Scotland* (3rd edn, Edinburgh, 1988), 381, n. 8.
2 *CDS*, ii, no. 212.
3 Barrow, *Robert Bruce*, 326.
4 *CDS*, ii, no. 1291.
5 *Chron. Bower* (Watt), vi, 445, n. 58.
6 *CDS*, ii, nos. 823, 824 (1).
7 *Ibid.*, ii, no. 1691.
8 *RMS*, i, app. ii, no. 1114; CDS, iii, nos. 1390–2, 1412.
9 *Ibid.*, iii, no. 1578.
10 A. Agnew, *A History of the Hereditary Sheriffs of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1864), 613.
11 *CDS*, i, no. 573; *Melrose Lib.*, i, no. 115; Stringer, 'Early lords of Lauderdale', appendix, no. 6.

names in the MacDowell family in the fourteenth century.[1] The MacDowells never appear to have voiced claims to such kinship, but it may be through this association that they came to hold their leading position in native Galwegian society after 1296. Certainly, from the deposition of John Balliol by Edward I until the establishment of Douglas power in Galloway in the 1360s, the MacDowells were unquestionably the single most important family, and this position was recognised by both the Scots and the English who sought to win or preserve their allegiance.[2]

We have no surviving body of evidence from which to reconstruct a pattern of estate-holding for the MacDowells before *c.*1300, but it would appear from the leading involvement of Dougal MacDowell in the defeat and capture of the brothers of King Robert at Loch Ryan in 1307 that their properties lay mainly in Wigtownshire.[3] This appears to be confirmed by the Chronicle of Lanercost's description of the events of 1334, where MacDowell raised the Galwegians 'beyond the Cree', in other words to its west, against Edward Balliol's supporters in eastern Galloway, a flirtation with the Bruce party which was to be of short duration.[4] There appear to have been attempts by both Balliol and Bruce to buy the support of rival segments within the MacDowell kindred, and by the 1350s branches of the family held land and offices throughout the lordship.[5] But this is simply an extension of existing power, for it is clear that the MacDowells were well entrenched in the patterns of lordship in Galloway long before 1300.

How, then, is this material to be evaluated? At the most basic of levels it can be seen that a complete reappraisal of traditional views concerning the relationship between native and settler in Galloway, the very nature of the processes, and the implications of colonisation, is required. As historians this means that we are faced with the dilemma of questioning the reliability of our principal source for the history of Galloway in the later twelfth century, the chronicle of Roger of Howden, a man who, because of his personal involvement in the affairs of the lordship after 1174 and close relationship with the household of Henry II, has come to be regarded as an unimpeachable authority for all things Galwegian. Can we on the one hand question his motives in reporting affairs in Galloway as he did, while continuing on the other to accept his narrative as the basis for interpretation of the three-way relationship among Galloway, Scotland and England in the reign

1 *RMS*, i, no. 722 and app. ii, nos. 835, 1007.
2 R. C. Reid, 'Edward Balliol', *TDGNHAS*, 3rd ser., xxxv (1956–7), 52–9.
3 *Chron. Lanercost*, 179.
4 *Ibid.*, 286–7.
5 *RMS*, i, app. ii, nos. 835, 1006, 1007, 1147 and 1176.

of Henry II? At the very least, his statements concerning the consequences of the revolt of Gilbert and Uhtred in 1174 and the nature of Roland's settlement after 1185 must be regarded as hyberbolic, if not deliberately misleading for propagandistic reasons. For archaeologists, the implications of any question-mark against the reliability of Howden's writings, or rather the reliability of the traditional interpretation of Howden by historians, are far-reaching: gone are the convenient chronologies for the dating of mottes and the simplistic social reconstructionalism which portrayed the relationship between native and colonist as one of confrontation and domination of one by the other. But the removal of reliance on such conventional interpretations as dictate that all mottes in Galloway are the product of the 'conquests' of 1160 or 1185 removes also the straightjacket which requires the presentation of the relationship between motte-builders and local population in conventional black-and-white terms of a clash of cultures. Perhaps too much attention has been devoted to change, or the degree of change, rather than to the levels of continuity which underlie the documentation?

Clearly it is continuity which we should be seeing in Galloway, not the major social upheaval which we have in the past read into the fragmentary contemporary written evidence. Previous historians have taken a blinkered approach which, perhaps wilfully, ignored material which did not suit a particular thesis. The survival of a distinctive Galwegian lawcode, for example, which demonstrates that the lords of Galloway were not in a position to ride roughshod at will over native traditions and replace all native institutions with Anglo-Norman innovations, is a clear sign of where the real power in the lordship lay.[1] The existence of a native lawcode in Galloway as late as the fifteenth century must imply that the society living under that code drew its traditions largely from its earlier medieval ancestors. That such a code could and did survive is, furthermore, surely an indicator of the superficial nature of any 'conquest' of Galloway by Anglo-Normans in the late twelfth century. As Professor Davies has pointed out, 'the imposition of peace and good order and the establishment of sound laws'[2] were used by Anglo-Normans as the justification for conquest and were two of its more obvious results; the examples of the introduction of English law into Wales and Ireland and of Edward I's plans for Scotland need only to be considered. For a supposedly dominant Anglo-Norman aristocratic elite to have lived and functioned

1 For the laws of Galloway see MacQueen, 'Laws of Galloway: a preliminary survey'. The longevity of Celtic legal traditions in the south-west is discussed in MacQueen, 'The kin of Kennedy'.

2 Davies, *Domination and Conquest*, 114.

under a wholly alien lawcode without engineering its replacement or radical restructuring is without parallel.

Keyhole history, as exemplified by our traditional interpretation of the Galwegian material, has produced a distorted picture of local relationships, of the attitudes of native rulers to the innovations of the twelfth century, and of the dynamics of change: we have taken positive evidence and produced a negative image. The most damning aspect of this 'keyhole' approach, however, is that it has led to the neglect of the counter-evidence which has always been available to redress the imbalances. Awkward later thirteenth- and fourteenth-century material has usually been set aside, to be presented in terms of a late Celtic revival which happened only because the Anglo-Norman families declined. Such presentation always sat uncomfortably with the contention that the self-same native nobility which can be seen dominating Galloway in the 1300s had been destroyed over a century earlier and replaced entirely under the direction of the lords of Galloway by a wholly alien social group.

That colonisation did occur is not in dispute. What needs to be reconsidered—and it is a subject which has profound implications for our understanding of the relationship between the Celtic 'fringe' and the 'feudalised' core of the Scottish kingdom—is the direction and motivation of the movement. Can anything be learned from the Galwegian model? The most striking feature, if any weight at all is to be placed on the surviving documentary evidence for colonisation between 1160 and 1234, is the distribution of the estates granted by the lords to the incomers. In the first place, the bulk of these lay in the 'acquired land' of Desnes Ioan, outwith the patrimonial lands west of the River Urr. Part of the reasoning for this has already been noticed above, but there are deeper aspects which need to be considered, especially in the distinction between inherited and acquired land. It is possible to detect similar attitudes being displayed by successive kings of Scots from David I down to Alexander II in their treatment of lands outwith the heartland of Scotia between the Forth and the Mounth: Lothian, the central and western Southern Uplands, and Moray and Ross saw the principal drive towards colonisation—which was not necessarily a colonisation dictated by the military realities of 'conquest-driven' expansion of the sphere of Scottish royal authority. Certain further parallels can be seen in this context, particularly with regard to the actual mechanics of royal control in these new frontier zones. The campaigns into Moray after 1130, for example, provided a buffer between the settled zone of the North-East east of the Spey and the mountainous country west of Inverness. Comparisons can be drawn between the devel-

opment of Inverness as an advance-base for a fledgling royal supervisory system in the fractious territory of Moray, and the same use for Dumfries with regard to Galloway in the 1160s. As with Galloway, moreover, it was largely *behind* these advanced outposts of royal power that the bulk of the colonisation, both royal and as the result of subinfeftment, took place until after the campaigns of William the Lion north of the Beauly Firth in 1179. The parallels with Malcolm IV's policies in upper Clydesdale are obvious.

A similar attitude towards the introduction of foreign colonists and ideas has been identified by Dr Cynthia Neville in her study of the earldom of Strathearn in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[1] She has shown that within the heartland of the earldom the native earls introduced no 'foreign' colonists nor involved themselves in a process of subinfeftment. Indeed, as with Galloway, there appears to have been no attempt by the crown to define the relationship between the earls and the kings of Scots, thereby obviating any necessity for such a policy. Where men of Anglo-Norman background can be seen to establish footholds within the earldom lands, they are men whose relationships with the earls stemmed from ties of marriage, an arrangement which parallels closely the circumstances whereby most alien settlers in Galloway received their lands from Uhtred and his family. Significantly, it was also on lands peripheral to the core of comital power in central Strathearn, mainly on the southern and eastern fringes of the earldom, that such men were settled. As with the policy of the lords of Galloway whereby control was maintained over the extensive uplands of northern Galloway, the upper reaches of Strathearn, especially around Loch Earn, were retained in the hands of the native earls—a split pattern of landholding which survived to the mid-fifteenth century.[2] Clearly modern economic perspectives, moulded by the post-eighteenth-century reshaping of the rural landscape and demographic patterns, have distorted current views on what constituted valuable property.[3] The key factor in Neville's argument, however, is in her underscoring of the essential role played by the earls in determining the nature of colonisation in their lands: the crown may have wished to see greater foreign influence within an earldom which lay in the heart of the kingdom, but without the co-operation of the earls the means of extending that influence was denied. Only in territories outwith Strathearn proper, acquired later in the twelfth century, can crown influences

1 C. J. Neville, 'The Earls of Strathearn from the Twelfth to the Mid-Fourteenth Century' (Aberdeen University Ph.D. thesis, 1983), 30, 63.

2 A. Grant, 'The Higher Nobility and their Estates in Scotland, *c.*1371–1424' (Oxford University D.Phil. Thesis, 1975), 232–9.

3 For the value of upland territory to medieval landlords, see A. J. L. Winchester, *Landscape and Society in Medieval Cumbria* (Edinburgh, 1987), 19–22.

over service dues and tenure be identified. The similarities to the situation obtaining in the acquired lands of Desnes Ioan in eastern Galloway under Uhtred are immediately striking.

What, then, of the heartland of the old lordship? Here we are handicapped by the lack of substantial documentation, particularly with regard to the native families and the demesne estates of the lords of Galloway retained in lordship control during the main phase of colonisation. Nevertheless, by using certain sources considered above, together with major late records such as the Exchequer account by the chamberlain of Galloway in 1456, which details the forfeited demesne of the Douglas lords of Galloway,[1] we can go some way towards a reconstruction of the circumstances prevailing in the pre-1234 period. The principal observation to be made here is that all the documented incidences of colonisation occur in the lower-lying districts of Galloway, especially around the estuaries of the rivers Urr, Dee and Fleet and, whilst the lords also retained major demesne estates in these lowland areas, the bulk of their property lay in the uplands. Where we have evidence for the possessions of native estate-holders, such as Gylbycht McMalene who held lands in the Glenkens,[2] or the Maclellan lords of Balmaclellan,[3] it would appear that they also had their holdings concentrated in the upland zone. This, too, is a phenomenon which can be detected outwith Galloway. It tallies strikingly with the pattern of medieval lordship and settlement across the Solway in the English Lake District depicted by Dr Angus Winchester.[4] Or, in Scotland, closest to hand is the earldom of Carrick, created as a separate lordship for Roland's cousin, Duncan, after the 1185–6 revolution in Galloway. An extent of the earldom estates prepared in *c.*1260 when two-thirds of the demesne was in royal hands during the wardship of the countess, Marjory, shows a similar concentration of demesne lands in the hilly areas of Carrick, including Straiton, Glengennet and Bennan, but with other major estates in the more fertile zones such as Dalquharran in the Girvan Valley and Turnberry on the coast.[5] In Carrick, too, colonists can be seen receiving estates in the more fertile—and peripheral—arable lowlands of the lordship, such as the lands granted to Roger of Skelbrooke in the Doon valley at Greenan, south of Ayr.[6] Here, however, Anglo-Norman colonisation seems to have been on a minor scale and the essentially Celtic nature of Carrick society

1 *Exchequer Rolls*, vi, 191–210.
2 *RMS*, i, app. ii, no. 316.
3 Scottish Record Office, Register House Charters, MS. RH.6/219; *RMS*, ii, 907.
4 Winchester, *Landscape and Society in Medieval Cumbria*, 19–22, 81–5
5 I. A. Milne, 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *ante*, xliv (1955), 46–9; J. Fergusson, 'An extent of Carrick in 1260', *ante*, xliv (1955), 190–2.
6 E.g. *Melrose Lib.*, i, nos. 31–36.

remained undisturbed. But Carrick was a poor earldom and the earls could not afford to alienate substantial portions of their demesne as grants to incoming foreigners.

If doubts remain about the essentially Celtic nature of the families holding significant estates in Galloway in the Middle Ages, the steadily increasing volume of documentation from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards dispels any lingering question.[1] Such families surface as the long-established leaders of society, not as a resurgent Celtic underclass. What is displayed, underscored by the events of the Wars of Independence in Galloway from 1286 to 1356, is the continuing identification of leading native families with the dynasty founded by Fergus, and especially Dervorgilla's line which was dominant in Galloway from the mid-1260s. Through her, some semblance of the old lordship was preserved to serve as a focus for a society left leaderless by Alan's death and the defeat of his bastard son's rebellion in 1235.[2] Dervorgilla offered continuity with the great days of the lordship and inherited the loyalty of her ancestors' native supporters. Her curia, and the background of the men who were prepared to fight in defence of the rights of her son and grandson, demonstrate that the Anglo-Scottish conquest of Galloway was a figment of the imagination of Roger of Howden and his copiers, a smokescreen that has diverted attention from the underlying nature of Galwegian society. Despite all the 'Normanised' aspects of their characters, the lords of Galloway were Celtic lords, and it was on their Celtic aristocracy and people that Dervorgilla, like her father, grandfather and great-grandfather before her, depended for their power and position.

1 E.g. *RMS*, ii, no. 907; *Morton Registrum*, i, pp. lix–lxi, 'Rentale Quarundam Baroniarum Dominorum de Dalkeith, 1376'.

2 *Chron. Melrose* (Bannatyne), 143–7.

The Scottish Historical Review, Volume LXXII, 2: No. 194: October 1993, 146–166

DAVID H. CALDWELL AND GORDON EWART

Finlaggan and the Lordship of the Isles: An Archaeological Approach

The National Museums of Scotland are undertaking a research excavation at Finlaggan on Islay, the centre of the Lordship of the Isles. The strategic design for the programme envisages five seasons of work, the third of which was completed at the end of September 1992.[1] The project owes its inception to the desire to demonstrate that archaeology can make useful contributions to our understanding of an historical period in Scotland for which historians' efforts at interpretation have been significantly constrained by the lack of written documents.

In recent years the Lordship of the Isles has been the focus of attention of several Scottish historians.[2] Among other things, they have particularly stressed the unique nature of the Lordship. The title 'Lord of the Isles', a translation of the Gaelic *Ri Innse Gall* (King/ruler of the Hebrides) meant much more in status and power than anything aspired to by mainland magnates—as was amply demonstrated by the Lords' ability to field large armies in opposition to royal forces, for instance in 1411, 1431 and 1491. On the other hand, although the MacDonald Lords were the most important patrons of Gaelic art and culture, their Lordship was not totally Celtic or dependent on a clan system; to a considerable extent land was held by feudal tenure and succeeded to by primogeniture just as elsewhere in Scotland.

The uniqueness of the Lordship of the Isles can also be explored by means of an archaeological approach. Such an approach might well be one of several different things. Some

1 Four interim reports on the project, covering the years from 1989 to 1992, have had a limited distribution in typescript. A revised version of all four together is about to be published by The Finlaggan Trust, The Cottage, Ballygrant, Isle of Islay.

2 See, e.g., the work of J. Bannerman, K. A. Steer, J. and R. W. Munro, and A. Grant, all cited below; in addition, we should mention J. W. M. Bannerman, 'The Lordship of the Isles', in *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. M. Brown (London, 1977); and D. Sellar, 'The Sons of Somerled' and 'Lords of the Isles', in *The Sunday Mail Story of Scotland*, i (1988), 135–7, 228–32.

DAVID H. CALDWELL is the Curator in charge of the Scottish Medieval Collections of the National Museums of Scotland and Director of the Finlaggan excavations. GORDON EWART, of Kirkdale Archaeology, is Deputy Director of the excavations. Both authors wish to thank Dr John Bannerman and Mr R. W. Munro for helpful comments and advice on an earlier draft of this article.