This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author. The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author. When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.
Settlement Patterns and Estate Landscapes

Creating and Applying Estimations of Agricultural Potential and Population Numbers in Annandale, AD 600-1000

By Christoph Otte

PhD Thesis (History)
The University of Edinburgh
2017
To my parents, Hans and Gabi.

Vielen Dank für alles!
Abstract

The present thesis is an examination of the early medieval (c. AD 600-1000) territorial divisions, estates and settlement patterns of eastern Dumfriesshire, specifically Annandale, using the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan as case studies. The history of this region during the late first millennium AD has received little attention in recent scholarship, which can in part be attributed to the virtual non-existence of written sources before the twelfth century. The obstacle of the limited written evidence can be overcome by using theoretical models which have been created for early medieval territorial units and estates in other parts of northern Britain for which the documentary record is less scarce. One of these models is the multiple estate, also known as shire in a Northumbrian and Scottish context. In this idealised type of estate, a number of townships owe obligations, such as renders in kind or labour services, to a central caput or lord’s hall, which functions as the administrative and legal core. Scholars such as J. E. A. Jolliffe, Glanville R. J. Jones, Angus J. L. Winchester and Geoffrey W. S. Barrow have argued that traces of the multiple estate can be gleaned from the written sources and settlement patterns of eleventh-, twelfth- and thirteenth-century Wales, northern England and eastern Scotland, suggesting a common heritage of pre-Anglo-Saxon territorial organisation.

This model can be applied to Dumfriesshire using a multi-disciplinary approach including place-names, medieval and early modern charters, eighteenth-century maps and estate plans, late prehistoric and medieval archaeology as well as spatial GIS analyses. In order to add to the existing body of evidence, a new methodology is proposed which takes into account the agricultural potential of the settlements and territories in Annandale. This approach involves the use of formulae and the reconstruction of land use and land capability to estimate the maximum population which could be supported agriculturally in a given area. The complexity of demographic estimates and agricultural systems means that the calculated numbers should not be understood as absolute values, but rather used to compare territories with each other.

The ecclesiastical parishes of Dumfriesshire seem to have been formally established in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but there is evidence that they represented territorial divisions dating back to before AD 1100. The Anglo-Norman knights’ fees which were created in Annandale in the twelfth century appear to coincide with the parish boundaries, and it is notable that the aforementioned population estimates give similar values for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan, despite the different sizes in area. Place-name patterns for the period from c. AD 700 to 1000 indicate that each parish was sub-divided into territorial or
estate units prior to the establishment of Anglo-Norman lordship. In the parish of Moffat, these territorial units are mostly found to coincide with the natural boundaries of the major river valleys. A possible exception may be the group of farms which appear in the early seventeenth century as the barony of Ericstane, encompassing all of Evandale as well as the western banks of upper Annandale. Similarly, the parish of Lochmaben shows traces of two or potentially three early medieval sub-divisions, which may represent small estate units. In the parish of Annan, hints of the same patterns appear, but the evidence does not allow as detailed an examination as in the cases of Lochmaben and Moffat. In the absence of a detailed contemporary written record, much of the aforementioned findings must remain tentative. Nevertheless, the proposed methodology for the assessment of agricultural potential is shown to provide a valuable tool for further studies within Dumfriesshire as well as other regions with similarly limited documentation.
Lay Summary

The present thesis is an examination of the early medieval (c. AD 600-1000) territorial divisions, estates and settlement patterns of eastern Dumfriesshire, specifically Annandale, using the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan as case studies. The history of this region during the late first millennium AD has received little attention in recent scholarship, which can in part be attributed to the virtual non-existence of written evidence before the twelfth century. The obstacle of the limited documentation for the study period can in part be overcome by taking into account various types of alternative evidence, such as later medieval and early modern written records, eighteenth-century maps, archaeology and place-names. In order to add new material to this existing body of evidence, a new methodology is proposed which involves the use of formulae and reconstructions of soil capability to estimate the maximum population which could be agriculturally sustained in a given area. The many unknown factors in early medieval population estimates and the complexity of agricultural systems mean that these calculated numbers should not be understood as absolute values, but rather used as a means to compare territories and settlements with each other. Taken together, these strands of evidence are used to analyse the relationship between early medieval settlements, the quality of their surrounding lands and the size and shape of the estates, territories and parishes in which the settlements were situated.

The parishes of Dumfriesshire were formally established in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but it is possible that they reflect a much earlier organisation of the landscape. The aforementioned agricultural calculations result in relatively similar population estimates for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan, ranging between 1093 and 1332. This indicates that the at times considerable differences in area size between the parishes were not random developments, but closely linked to population numbers and agricultural considerations. The place-name patterns dating to the period from c. AD 700 to 1000 indicate that each medieval parish may represent an early medieval or late prehistoric (before c. AD 500) territorial unit which, in turn, was sub-divided into estate units or inter-connected groups of settlements. In the parish of Moffat, these territorial units are mostly found to coincide with the natural boundaries of the major river valleys. A possible exception is the group of farms which appears in the early seventeenth century as the barony of Ericstane, encompassing all of Evandale as well as the western banks of upper Annandale. Similarly, the parish of Lochmaben shows traces of two or potentially three sub-divisions. In the parish of Annan, hints of the same pattern appear, but the evidence does not allow as detailed an examination as in the cases of Lochmaben and Moffat. In the absence of a detailed contemporary written record, much for
the aforementioned findings must remain tentative. Nevertheless, the proposed methodology for the assessment of agricultural potential is shown to provide a valuable tool for further studies within Dumfriesshire as well as other regions with a similar lack of documentation.
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“The huntsman he can’t hunt the fox nor loudly blow his horn,
the tinker cannot mend his pots without John Barleycorn.”

- John Barleycorn (traditional)
I. The Evidence on the Ground
1. Introduction

In 1973, Geoffrey Barrow presented evidence for the Scottish equivalent of Glanville Jones’ multiple estate model.\(^1\) The article postulates the existence of an ‘ancient shire system’- territorial units which can be gleaned from the estate and settlement patterns of Anglo-Norman Scotland and whose origins may pre-date the twelfth, or even eleventh, centuries. Although Barrow’s focus lay on eastern Scotland, north and south of the Forth, he remarked that “[the] whole of larger Lothian, together with Clydesdale, and the western counties of southern Scotland would repay a thorough examination for traces of an ancient pattern of shires and cantreds”.\(^2\) Yet, any scholar wishing to investigate the history of settlement patterns and agricultural estates in the region east of the River Nith before AD 1200 is bound to come across the three-fold obstacle of a varied and heterogenous place-name landscape, a virtually non-existent written record, and a large scatter of archaeological sites for which no or insufficient dating is available (see chapters 2 and 3).

Despite this, repeated attempts have been made at studying the early territories of Dumfriesshire. In his article on the prehistoric fort at Castle O’er in Eskdalemuir, Stratford Halliday has commented on the potential continuity of a territory centred on the fort from late prehistory into the thirteenth century and beyond, while Geoffrey Barrow examined the compact Cumbrian territories-turned-fiefdoms along the major river valleys north of the Solway Firth, such as Nithsdale and Annandale.\(^3\) Similarly, the RCAHMS report on the archaeological landscape of eastern Dumfriesshire tentatively suggests that some Anglo-Norman lordships in Annandale preserve earlier estate units, and early medieval estate centres may have existed at Hoddom (parish Hoddom) and the fort of Woody Castle (parish Lochmaben).\(^4\) Often, these territories are either seen in connection with Anglo-Saxon minsters (early monastic communities at the centre of dependent lands or \textit{parochiae}), of which Hoddom may be one, or with the multiple estate or Northumbrian shire (an estate unit composed of

several townships with a central lord’s settlement). These models, and the debates surrounding them, will be explored further in chapters 4 and 5.

All of the aforementioned studies share a common problem: the absence of written and archaeological evidence for the period from the fifth century to the formation of the Brus lordship of Annandale. Place-name evidence has been employed to fill the gaps in the source material, although it was mostly used within narratives of the Northumbrian expansion into Dumfries and Galloway from the seventh century onward, or the tenth-century influx of Scandinavian-speaking settlers. So far, however, the limited nature of the evidence seems to have discouraged larger comprehensive studies on settlements and territories in pre-Norman Dumfriesshire, especially when compared to other regions of the former Kingdom of Northumbria in eastern Scotland and northern England.

Thus, the present study has two aims. It introduces a new methodological approach – the Agricultural Population Potential - to take into account the importance of agriculture and landed resources in early medieval territories and settlement patterns, and it applies this methodology, along with place-name evidence, archaeology and GIS spatial analysis in order to shed light on the settlements and estate units of Annandale (eastern Dumfriesshire), roughly from AD 600 to 1000. Due to the interdisciplinary approach (and thus the required level of detail), the study area is restricted to three parish-based case studies in Annandale, namely the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan (fig. 1).

Discussions of early medieval settlement in northern Britain, both in terms of single settlement sites and larger estate units of two or more settlements, tend to be approached from the directions of legal history and historical geography. Given the nature of the available evidence, this is unsurprising. Glanville Jones’ multiple estate (see chapter 4) owes much to twelfth- and thirteenth-century Welsh lawbooks, and Geoffrey Barrow’s shire, or manerium cum appendiciis, is similarly extracted from lordly charters. Where the identification of

5 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 281-2.
individual estate settlements is possible, broader patterns can be drawn out, such as the pairing of upland and lowland estates postulated by Jones and confirmed in pre-Norman Cumbria by Angus Winchester.10

However, there is a lack of evidence for how factors of labour, mobility and resources affected early medieval settlements and life, and, as a consequence, these questions do not get asked in the majority of studies on settlement patterns, estates and territories. The agricultural quality of the landscape remains very much the elephant in the room, albeit sometimes mentioned in general terms of upland and lowland, or marginal and fertile soils. The concept behind the Agricultural Population Potential, or APP, is motivated by Grith Lerche’s and Hans-Ole Hansen’s medieval experimental archaeology, as well as by ‘micro-histories from below’ such as Eileen Power’s account of the ninth-century Carolingian peasant Bodo in Medieval People as well as John Hatcher’s study on fourteenth-century England in The Black Death.11 In the absence of medieval documentation written by peasants themselves, the process of ‘imagining’ ordinary life does raise important questions: how far would a peasant be prepared to walk to a field for the ploughing? How long would the ploughing take, and how would this be affected by the implements and animals used, such as the ard versus the heavy plough, and oxen versus horses? While often unanswerable, these are essential considerations. As Eileen Power puts it when introducing her Carolingian peasant, “[history] is largely made up of Bodos”.12

Land and landscapes were the stage on which the daily life of the majority of the population took place, as well as the “resource for producing food, and a basis of power”.13 This practical perspective towards mobility and land can often be observed in contemporary documents. The ninth-century Carolingian Capitulare de Villis, a set of regulations for estate management, stipulates that estate officials were not to have more land in their territories than they could ride through in a single day.14 Furthermore, in his twelfth-century Life of Herluin on the founder of the Norman abbey of Bec, Gilbert Crispin wrote that the ideal location for a

---

12 Power, Medieval People, p. 38.
monastery would provide accessible woodland, fresh water and a considerable amount of habitable land.\textsuperscript{15}

On the surface, the methodology behind the Agricultural Population Potential as proposed in this thesis is largely desk-based: it uses eighteenth-century estate plans and maps to reconstruct the soil capability of pre-industrial Annandale, before employing a formula to estimate how many people could be supported with food based on the land surrounding each settlement. The theoretical model has, however, been informed by practical experiences such as horse-ploughing (using a Scottish swing plough) as well as a number of extensive field trips into the study area.\textsuperscript{16}

The thesis is divided into three main parts. It starts by presenting two separate approaches to the settlement landscape of early medieval Dumfriesshire. The first approach consists of a ‘classical’ study of landscape and settlement patterns through the use of archaeological and palaeo-environmental data (chapter 2), historical maps and documents (chapter 3) as well as an analysis of place-names (chapters 6-8). This approach also entails a closer examination of two fundamental concepts which can be used to frame our understanding

\textsuperscript{15} Sally N. Vaughn, \textit{The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State. 1034-1136} (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 10-1, 63-4, 73.

\textsuperscript{16} It should be stressed that the present thesis is not designed as a study in experimental archaeology, and it is acknowledged that horse-ploughing with a modern Scottish swing plough will yield different results from ploughing a field with an ox-drawn ard.
of early medieval settlements: the multiple estate model (chapter 4) and the notion of late medieval parish boundaries as echoes of early medieval units of lordship (chapter 5).

The second part of the thesis is dedicated to the methodology behind the Agricultural Population Potential. Essentially, this part will consist of a step-by-step explanation of the theoretical considerations behind this methodology, starting with the formulae used to translate units of arable and pastoral land into population estimates (chapter 9), followed by an examination of how the land quality of early medieval Annandale could be reconstructed to form the basis of the APP calculations (chapter 10).

It is only then, in the third section of the thesis, that the previous two approaches will be brought together. A synthesis of the various strands of evidence, from palaeo-environmental data to archaeology, and from place-names to population estimates using the APP methodology, is offered to provide an in-depth analysis of the early medieval territorial landscape of eastern Dumfriesshire (chapter 11). Finally, the conclusion in chapter 12 draws together the findings of the case studies, and examines potential future applications of the Agricultural Population Potential methodology.
2. Archaeological and Palaeo-Environmental Context

The analysis of early medieval settlement patterns and estate units must be seen in the context of previous palaeo-environmental and archaeological developments. This necessity arises from the fact that human settlement in an agrarian society relies to a large extent on the ecology of its surrounding landscape. What follows, then, is a discussion of our current knowledge regarding the non-written sources for early medieval settlement and agrarian economy.

Geologically-speaking, Annandale appears to have formed during the Tertiary period, that is, between 70 million and 2 million years ago, although the current shape of the Annandale valley is the result of later glacial modification. Richard Tipping has provided an overview of the landscape transformation in Dumfriesshire during the last 70 million years in the RCAHMS report of 1997, although reference here will only be made to those processes which had a direct or indirect effect on the settlement patterns and agriculture of Annandale.

The fluctuations of climatic conditions in Annandale in the past 10,000 years have been mainly reconstructed using stratigraphic peat-records and pollen sites which give an insight into changing levels of precipitation. Between c. 1250 BC and 500 BC there appears to have been a shift towards a wet climate across northern Europe, accompanied by a drop in mean annual temperature of approximately 2°C (compared to the present-day climate), shortening the growing-season for agricultural crops by up to five weeks. By c. AD 50 the climate seems to have ameliorated, and temperatures during the Roman British period up to AD 400 seem to have been approximately comparable to modern day circumstances. A climatic deterioration after c. AD 400 led to “colder summers and wetter winters”. During the eighth century the climate appears to have become drier again, with warm summers and cold winters, leading up to a phase of aridity in the tenth century. In the period of c. AD 950

---

17 For a recent and concise overview of the relationship between agriculture and settlement, see: Margaret Murphy and Matthew Stout, ‘Farming and Settlement: an introduction’, in *Agriculture and Settlement in Ireland*, ed. M. Murphy and M. Stout (Dublin, 2015), pp. xvi – xxx.
18 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 10-1.
20 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 17.
21 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 17.
23 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 17. According to H. H. Lamb this period of deterioration after AD 400 was comparatively shortlived, not lasting much longer than until AD 600: Lamb, *Climate*, pp. 158-9.
to AD 1300 the climate had ameliorated to warm and wet conditions – the ‘Medieval Warm Epoch’ – before a drop in mean temperatures between c. AD 1350 and AD 1550 led to the comparatively cold period known as ‘Little Ice Age’, the effects of which seem to have lasted into the late seventeenth century and even eighteenth century.\(^{25}\) Climate is an important factor in agricultural activities, and the developments of farming and settlement throughout medieval history should be seen before this background. Yet, its impact should not be seen as the cause of all changes in the rural landscape. Richard Tipping’s palynological study of the early modern Anglo-Scottish Border demonstrates how the abandonment of marginal arable lands was often caused by societal developments, rather than by the effects of the ‘Little Ice Age’.\(^{26}\)

With regard to broad changes in the landscape, palynological evidence from bog deposits in Dumfriesshire can provide a general sense of the development of woodland cover and the concomitant and perhaps related changes in agriculture during the late Iron Age and early historic period, although it must be taken into account that absolute estimates are almost impossible to obtain.\(^{27}\) The decrease in the percentage of tree pollen in the deposits of northern and southern Dumfriesshire during the Iron Age, ranging from c. 500 BC to 500 AD would suggest large-scale woodland clearing in that period.\(^{28}\) In upper Annandale, the bulk of this clearance activity may have taken place during the Romano-British period.\(^{29}\) These developments in the pollen diagram tend to coincide with increases of oat and wheat pollen, suggesting that arable expansion was one of the main incentives for woodland clearance.\(^{30}\) It is likely that the open and tree-less landscape of modern southern Dumfriesshire may largely be attributed to the Iron Age clearances, while the extensive woodlands to the north, for example in upper Annandale, can be attributed to commercial re-afforestation of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There is evidence of brief periods of woodland regeneration for Burnfoothill Moss around AD 300, and at Walton Moss after c. AD 950, but by and large the overall trend suggests a continuous or increasing intensification of arable land use and woodland clearance after the Roman period.\(^{31}\)

\(^{28}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 14-5 and 20-1.
\(^{29}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 20-1.
\(^{30}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 21.
\(^{31}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 22.
The evolution of soils in Annandale, as in all of Dumfriesshire, cannot be traced with any detail. Too many factors play a role, such as the geological parent material, vegetation and climate, as well as erosion and anthropogenic soil exhaustion following extensive farming. Tipping has suggested the methodological caveat that modern soils of good quality, such as brown forest soils, may not necessarily have been sites of dense prehistoric occupation. Rather, intensive early settlement and farming may have exhausted the quality of soils to the point that they would appear as marginal lands on modern land capability surveys, while the intensity of successive agricultural activity is likely to have disturbed or destroyed much of the archaeological remains of earlier settlements in these areas. While this is an important theoretical caveat, the truth of the matter cannot be established by the very nature of the argument. While brown forest soils may not be the best guide to early medieval soil preferences, Helena Hamerow has noted a tendency of early Anglo-Saxon settlements between the fifth and seventh centuries to be situated on or near light soils, such as alluvial river terraces. In part, this pattern may be because archaeological remains are more easily identified on this type of soil. Nevertheless, there must have been a clear agricultural advantage to lighter alluvial soils. They were easier to cultivate than heavier soils, and the regular regenerative silting caused by the river would maintain their fertility when manure was in limited supply. A close adherence to river terraces for arable land can still be observed in eighteenth-century Dumfriesshire. While the quality of soils was no doubt important for agricultural activity, the effects of climate, and particularly precipitation, should not be underestimated and may often be the constraining factor. Thus, one of the main differences between Annandale and the agriculturally more productive eastern coast of Scotland is not the soil composition, but the amount of precipitation, estimated at 600-800mm per annum for the Fife lowlands and Lothian, c. 900-1200mm per annum around Lochmaben and up to 1750-2000mm per annum in the Moffat hills.

32 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 22-3.
33 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 23.
35 Hamerow, Rural Settlements, p. 3.
37 Cf. chapter 11.
The central role played by rivers in early medieval agriculture, transportation, fishing and as a source of fresh water begs the question of how much the outline and size of the rivers has evolved since the early medieval period. Changes in fluvial activity and river courses are recorded for different streams of Dumfriesshire throughout the first millennium AD, and in some cases appear to have occurred as late as AD 1400.40 It has been suggested that a section of Evan Water to the east of Beattock has dramatically shifted its course to the south in the period between the first and the second century AD, based on the positioning of two Roman camps on either side of the river.41 Although these developments should alert the scholar against the assumption that modern maps represent early medieval topography, the lack of specific information available for rivers such as Moffat Water or the Annan means that little can be done to take these caveats into account for the parishes under examination.

Moving away from palaeo-environmental considerations and towards the evidence for earlier settlement patterns, it can be said that the landscape of eastern Dumfriesshire is dotted with a rich variety of prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval archaeological sites. Some of these have been excavated in great detail, such as the early medieval ecclesiastical complex at Hoddom or the Iron Age forts at Burnswark and Castle O’er.42 With the notable exceptions of the monastic site at Hoddom and the possible sixth- or seventh-century timber hall excavated at Kirkconnel, near Springkell, there is very little secure evidence for settlements in the post-Roman and early medieval periods from c. AD 500-1000.43 Thus, there are no traces of the type of elite sites identified at Yeavering, Sprouston or Auldhame.44 This early medieval gap in the archaeological record is framed by a comparatively rich landscape of late prehistoric settlements and forts, dating to the Bronze and Iron Age periods (c. 2600 BC – c. AD 500) as well as by evidence for medieval and post-medieval farmsteads and moated sites pertaining to the period after the establishment of the Bruce Lordship of Annandale in the early twelfth

40 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 25.
41 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 25.
43 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 221; RCAHMS site no. NY27NW 16.
century.\textsuperscript{45} Any study of the early medieval settlement patterns of eastern Dumfriesshire will therefore have to make sense of this ‘evidence gap’.

Figures 2 – 7 show the distribution pattern of late prehistoric fortifications and settlements, as well as potentially medieval and post-medieval buildings and farmsteads in the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan.\textsuperscript{46} The majority of the prehistoric settlements have not been excavated, and dating is only possible based on broad patterns of morphology, comparing excavated settlements with those which only appear as cropmarks and are yet to be excavated.\textsuperscript{47} Similar problems of dating are encountered with the farmsteads and shieling huts listed by the RCAHMS as medieval (and appearing on maps in this dissertation as ‘medieval/post-medieval’), as these can only roughly be attributed to the medieval or early modern time periods.\textsuperscript{48} In several instances the farmsteads among these sites are located in association with rig-and-furrow field systems, which suggests that they post-date AD 1000 and could have been occupied until the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{49}

Generally, most of the archaeological evidence for settlements in Dumfriesshire, both prehistoric and medieval, is best preserved in the uplands and other areas of predominantly pastoral land use, whereas much of the earlier settlement record in the lowlands seems to have


\textsuperscript{46} The basis for these distribution maps are the sites listed in the archaeological gazetteer in the RCAHMS report of eastern Dumfriesshire. For the prehistoric settlements and forts (including those thought to be Roman), see RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, pp. 297-309 (nos. 567-657, 659-1034, 1083-6, 1196, 1208, 1211, 1217, 1219). The Roman roads displayed are from the same gazetteer, p. 310 (nos. 1221-6). In order to provide the complete archaeological context for the parish of Moffat, comparable sites from neighbouring parishes in Lanarkshire, Selkirkshire and Peebleshire, not included in the RCAHMS Dumfriesshire report, have been included. These are referred to here by their Canmore site numbers: NT21SE 26, NT22NE 8 (Selkirkshire), NS92SE 1, NS92SE 2, NS92SW 17, NT02SW 1, NS91NE 1, NS91NE 4 (Lanarkshire), NT12NW 13, NT12NW 15, NT02NE 1, NT02SE 40, NT02SE 41 (Peebleshire). Medieval timber castles, moated sites and rural settlements and farmsteads are included based on the same gazetteer, pp. 311f (nos. 1251-1264, 1267-1271, 1273).

\textsuperscript{47} For example, R. A. Gregory, working on the transition from Neolithic to early and late Bronze Age settlement in Dumfriesshire, suggests that many of the unenclosed hut circles may be of Bronze Age date: Gregory, ‘Bronze Age Landscapes’, p. 70. See also RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 143. While late prehistoric enclosed settlements are usually interpreted as an Iron Age phenomenon (at least compared to earlier Bronze Age patterns), round houses can generally be attributed to either of those periods, further complicating the process of dating in the absence of detailed excavations: Ian Armit and I. B. M. Ralston, ‘The Iron Age’, in \textit{Scotland after the Ice Age: environment, archaeology and history 8000 BC – AD 1000}, ed. K. J. Edwards and I. B. M. Ralston. Second edition (Edinburgh, 2003), pp. 169, 182; Armit and Ralston, ‘Coming of iron’, p. 40.

\textsuperscript{48} RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 221.

fallen prey to the plough and other destructive factors accompanying intensive arable farming. Even in upland areas such as the parish of Moffat, a comparison of locations of visible prehistoric settlements and forts with the extent of arable fields as marked in eighteenth-century estate plans shows that most of the archaeological remains appear either on the fringes of the arable land, or in the midst of rough pasture (figs. 8-10). The deliberate destruction of some deserted medieval settlements during the Improvements of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has added difficulties to the study of early rural settlement patterns. Generally, whenever a site is mapped in the middle of arable fields, it tends to not be upstanding and can usually only be identified through cropmarks and studied by excavation. This pattern seems to be borne out by the Historical Landuse Assessment of 2015 (figs. 8-10).

As a result, most of the evidence of earlier settlement, prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval, can be glimpsed in the parish of Moffat, while Lochmaben and Annan contain only a limited amount of prehistoric, and no secured evidence for medieval or early modern archaeological remains. It is notable that the distribution of prehistoric sites is very close to that of medieval settlements in the parish of Moffat. The two distribution patterns tend to deviate only when shieling huts are considered, as these are generally situated in higher altitudes than the prehistoric sites. It seems that no major discernible change in site location has taken place from the late prehistoric to the late medieval and post-medieval periods, at least in the parish of Moffat. Caution is advised, as always, in transferring this interpretation into lowland parishes such as Lochmaben or Annan. Compared to the open landscape of these parishes, the valleys of Moffatdale, Annandale and Evandale in the parish of Moffat, may have ‘funnelled’ the settlement development of centuries very close to the river runs. While the strong similarity of late prehistoric and later medieval settlement patterns observed in large parts of northern Dumfriesshire may therefore in part be due to the landscape type, there is nevertheless a strong possibility that a similar pattern held true in the lowland areas, too, and was only disguised by the intense land-use in the medieval and post-medieval centuries.

Thus, it is likely that settlement activity in the period between c. AD 600 and 1000 would have generally continued the prehistoric patterns. Of course, the possibility of a disruption of these patterns during the aforementioned evidence gap of the first millennium AD cannot be entirely ruled out. The impact of Roman occupation in the first half of the

---

50 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 26-7 and 57.
52 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 57.
millennium, or the developments towards a warmer and drier climate at the end of the second half of the millennium could have had affected early medieval settlement in such a way that it contrasted with both its predecessor and successor landscapes.  
However, no traces of such a deviation can be archaeologically detected at present.

Apart from the enclosed prehistoric settlements and medieval farmsteads and shieling huts mentioned above, other archaeological features deserving attention in Dumfriesshire are the Roman roads, in particular the route leading from Carlisle to the Devil’s Beef Tub, a valley north of Moffat. The inclusion of Roman roads into a discussion of early medieval settlement patterns may require some explanation. While the roads which have been identified so far would certainly have had an impact on the inhabitants of late Iron Age settlements and forts in south-west Scotland, there is good reason to believe that the routes along which the roads were planned remained important into the medieval period and beyond.

There are a number of arguments underlying such a supposition. Although so far no ‘complete’ Roman road has been excavated, small sections of identified roads have been used to reconstruct the course and direction of a number of major roads. A correlation can be observed between these Roman roads and modern motorways, such as the A74 between Glasgow and Carlisle, or, on a smaller scale, the B723 between Lockerbie and Eskdalemuir. Furthermore, the continued use of the routes formerly containing Roman roads can be traced in the eighteenth-century cartographic record. Roy’s Military Survey, which will be considered in more detail in chapter 11, contains a reference to ‘Watling Street Roman Way’, a road or path running on the upland crest west of Ericstane in upper Annandale. The same road is also depicted on contemporary estate plans of the area, and shown as being directly linked with roads to Edinburgh and Glasgow north-west of the Devil’s Beef Tub.  
Furthermore, John Barbour in his poem The Bruce, written in the 1370s, arguably refers to this road when he described James Douglas’ journey through Annandale: “All by himself he took the road towards the town of Lochmaben, and a little from the Arickstone met the Bruce”.

Some less direct evidence for the use or re-use of Roman roads and routes in the medieval period may be glimpsed from the distribution of mottes and motte-and-bailey castles compared to the reconstructed course of Roman roads (fig. 11). While it is evident that none

53 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 17.
54 WRS, plate 29.
55 NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 5.
of these medieval fortifications lie immediately adjacent to the route-ways, probably due to a preference for greater elevations, their overall pattern seems to respect the paths chosen for Roman road construction. It is therefore conceivable that the course of the major Roman roads in eastern Dumfriesshire was of relevance in the make-up of early medieval (AD 600-1000) territorial units and settlement patterns.

So far, the archaeological evidence discussed has been primarily restricted to sites of settlement and early roads and travelling routes of strategic importance. To this should be added the patterns of late prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Norman medieval fortifications. The significance of these substantial defensive earthworks lies in the considerable work-force or labour hours required to construct them. Barry Cunliffe has argued that the size and siting of many hillforts with their defensive earth ramparts and ditches suggest large-scale communal efforts. While the majority of prehistoric forts in Dumfriesshire has not been excavated and dated, Cunliffe generally dates the Scottish hillforts to the middle or late Iron Age, roughly from the sixth to fourth centuries BC, although some show signs of continued use or later re-use during the first century AD and potentially later. Other factors which are likely to have influenced the site of prehistoric and later fortifications are the availability of building materials and the defensibility of the topography. Generally, lowland Scotland only has small hillforts with enclosures of below one hectare, suggesting relatively flat hierarchical society with little coercive power, but in Annandale the fort at Burnswark may be an example of a minor oppidum of considerable size. With a defensive enclosure taking in about 6ha it perhaps represents a native centre overseeing all of Annandale. Although no specific dates can be established for most forts in Annandale, excavations at Burnswark have provided a dating range from the ninth to the third centuries BC for part of the earthworks, as well as later signs of Roman occupation in the first or second centuries AD.

It may be argued that the location and role of Roman forts in Annandale will give little insight into native territorial divisions, as these sites represent the imposing force of an intruding military power. Nevertheless, they should be included, albeit briefly, in the present

57 For an estimate of the work-force needed to construct the 8.9ha hillfort at Ravensburgh Castle (Hertfordshire), see James Dyer, *Hillforts of England and Wales* (Princes Risborough, 1992), pp. 23-4: Dyer suggests that it would have taken 100 men approximately 219 days to finish the fort, if an eight-hour day is assumed. Since this would leave little time for agricultural tasks, the actual cost in terms of labour and time is likely to have been higher.
62 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 130.
discussion. The reason for this lies primarily in the fact that at least some Roman forts were originally the sites of earlier native settlements or fortifications. Signs for such a Roman occupation of previous settlement sites can be seen at the fortlet at Milton which contains the cropmarks of a potential native settlement, although the chronology is unclear. It appears that the majority of Roman forts were constructed in the late first and mid-second centuries during the Flavian and Antonine phases of Scottish occupation. The fort at Burnswark Hill sheds an interesting light onto the Roman occupation of Dumfriesshire. Originally an Iron-Age native hillfort, the site used to be interpretated as a military training camp for much of the late twentieth century. Recent work has suggested, however, that the Roman ballista ammunition and slingshots discovered at Burnswark Hill may instead indicate that a siege took place, probably before the late second or early third century when the fort seems to have been re-occupied by the indigenous population. Roman forts may therefore not represent ancient native power structures, but their influence on the political and territorial realities of the early first millennium AD are undeniable.

Although an early medieval occupation of some forts which are dated to the late prehistoric or Roman periods is possible, and has been suggested for the site at Woody Castle, north-west of Lochmaben, the evidence for fortifications in the second half of the first millennium in Dumfriesshire is as ephemeral as that for settlements. The earliest traces of a medieval pattern of fortifications in Annandale is associated with the Anglo-Norman lordships of the twelfth century. The most visible Anglo-Norman sites are the timber castles of motte-and-bailey type. There are indications that the size and strength of these castles directly reflect the status of the local lord or noble family, with the mottes near Lochmaben and Annan which were established by the Brus family as Lords of Annandale being the most elaborate timber castles in eastern Dumfriesshire. A number of vassals of the Brus family held timber castles of smaller scale across Annandale, each likely to have represented the centre of a small barony. The moated sites distributed in the study area show a potentially lower stratum in

---

64 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 174-82.
65 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 182.
67 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 136 and 186.
68 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 188.
69 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 192.
70 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 192 and 207.
the hierarchy of Anglo-Norman fortifications, possibly functioning as estate centres for territories below the size of a parish.\textsuperscript{71}

As a whole, the county of Dumfriesshire possesses a diverse palaeo-environmental and archaeological record. While some uncertainties persist, such as the relation between the various extant fortified sites and the extent of early medieval territorial boundaries, it is possible to broadly map the development of the landscape through the first millennium AD in terms of climate and vegetation, and the snapshots of prehistoric and post-medieval settlement archaeology suggest a certain degree of continuity in human habitation before and after the early medieval period. Some of these findings, though tentative, rise in relative importance once the meagre written documentation has been surveyed in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{71} RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 207.
3. The Written Sources

The region of Dumfriesshire is characterised by a poor written record in the period between c. AD 600 and 1000. Contemporary references to this part of southern Scotland are restricted to general remarks by the Venerable Bede on the establishment of the Anglian bishopric of Whithorn and the westward expansion of Northumbrian kings, as well as an entry in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle pertaining to the years 874 or 875. Some insight into the shift of political power on the northern Solway coast from native British rule, possibly the Kingdom of Rheged, to Northumbrian rule is granted by an entry in the Historia Brittonum. Due to their central role for the overall narrative of early medieval Dumfriesshire, these three records will be discussed in some detail below. Another type of evidence introduced in the present chapter are William Roy’s Military Survey of 1747-55, and the eighteenth-century estate plans which have been consulted for the reconstruction of agricultural land capability in chapter 10.

Documents which will not receive individual attention are the nineteenth- and twentieth-century editions and collections of charters, land grants and other written sources which have been consulted for historical spellings of place-names in order to establish their etymologies. In the few cases where the medieval and early modern land grants are used to establish a narrative of territorial arrangements and landholding, the origin and context of the charters are discussed on a case-by-case basis.

3.1 Contemporary Accounts

One of the most comprehensive contemporary accounts of early medieval northern England and southern Scotland before the ninth century is the Ecclesiastical History of the English People, written by the Venerable Bede. Bede, a monk at the twin monastery of Wearmouth-Jarrow, situated near the mouths of the Rivers Tyne and Wear in the early medieval kingdom of Bernicia, lived from c. 672/3 to the 25th May 735. He entered the monastery at the age of 7 and did not seem to have travelled much outside these precincts. He must have visited Lindisfarne at least once, and it is likely that he studied at a monastery in or near York, but no

---

72 Cf. RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 186, and below. On the dearth of written evidence for the Kingdom of Northumbria, see also David Rollason, Northumbria, 500-1100. Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 8-10.
73 HE, p. xiii. Regarding the frontiers within Northumbria, especially between Bernicia and Deira, see Rollason, Northumbria, pp. 43-5.
74 HE, p. xii.
other journeys are known to us. While his personal experience with the Northumbrian landscape and population may have been limited, his personal contacts, illustrated by his correspondence with influential individuals such as Bishop Egbert and King Ceolwulf, suggest that he was well-informed about the political and ecclesiastical developments of the realm. Furthermore, he had access to the library of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow which must have contained a considerable amount of classical and ecclesiastical writing (such as the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius of Caesarea), not least due to the numerous journeys of the monastery's founder to Rome, from which he brought not only relics, but also books.

The Ecclesiastical History of the English People was completed around the year 731. In this eighth-century work, divided into five books, Bede writes about the history, ecclesiastical as well as political, of Britain, beginning with the geography of Britain and the Roman occupation and describing a succession of notable events leading to his present day. While Bede’s social background makes him a valuable contemporary observer, it should be noted that the nature of his sources and training mean that the way in which he presents his information is coloured by classical and biblical models. Like all other sources, the HE should therefore be approached with care, and allowance should be made for the fact that large passages are strongly influenced by Bede's own political and ecclesiastical views, such as the negative position towards the Britons and the obsession with the Paschal Controversy.

Charles Plummer in his edition of the HE counted 141 surviving MSS in 1896, and while minor differences in contents and structure exist, they are not substantial. Although the original text written by Bede has not survived, the four oldest surviving MSS all date from the eighth century, with one exemplar possibly having been copied as early as AD 737.

The HE gives a valuable, if limited, insight into the extent of the Kingdom of Northumbria by Bede’s time, reflected by the establishment of an Anglian bishopric at Whitburn shortly before or in AD 731. The battle between the Northumbrians and the Dal
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75 HE, p. xiv.
78 HE, p. xxiii.
80 HE I, 22; HE III, 3 and 17; Plummer, Opera I, pp. xi-xiii.
81 Plummer, Opera I, pp. lxxxvi, lxxxvi n. 1, xciv; HE, p. xxi.
82 Plummer, Opera I, pp. lxxxvii-lxxxviii, lxxxix.
83 HE III, 4; HE V, 23.
Riata Irish in 603 at the unidentified site of Deganatan, as well as Bede’s assertion that King Edwin of Northumbria had become ruler of the islands of Anglesey and Man suggests that the Northumbrian sphere of military influence in the early seventh-century extended considerably to the west.\(^{84}\) In 684, under King Ecgfrith, a Northumbrian army was sent to Ireland, suggesting that by this time the Northumbrian kingdom had a relatively firm hold of parts of Dumfries and Galloway.\(^{85}\)

Another contemporary source is the *Historia Brittonum* (HB), a late eighth- or early ninth-century collection of prose histories and chronicles. The work is commonly attributed to one Nennius, although his authorship has been called in question.\(^{86}\) It has been argued, however, that the HB belongs into a northern Welsh context, probably the Kingdom of Gwynedd.\(^{87}\) The earliest surviving full text of the HB is contained in Harleian MS 3859, dating to c. AD 1000, although it has been argued that the MS represents a copy of the HB composed around AD 830, close to the hypothetical original date of the *Ur*-text.\(^{88}\) The potential value of the *Historia Brittonum* for the present purpose lies in its record of the marriage of Oswiu, King of Bernicia, with Rhiainnfellt, the daughter of Rwyth, son of Rhun, in the mid-seventh century, at some point in time before Oswiu’s death in 670.\(^{89}\) It has been argued that Rhiainnfellt was the great-granddaughter of Urien of Rheged, suggesting that the Anglian take-over of the northern Solway coast was a peaceful enterprise, especially in the absence of any recorded battles.\(^{90}\) This hypothesis relies on the theory that the Kingdom of Rheged was located approximately in what is modern Dumfries and Galloway. The exact extent and location of Rheged is uncertain, but it is possible that its territory lay either on the northern or southern side of the Solway Firth.\(^{91}\) It is not quite clear whether Rheged would have fallen to Oswiu as a result of this marriage, and Alfred Smyth even considered the acceptance of such a peaceful
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\(^{84}\) HE I, 34; HE II, 9. For Edwin’s conflicts with the British, see also: HE II, 20; HE III, 1.

\(^{85}\) HE IV, 26.

\(^{86}\) Regarding this issue, the two discussions of particular interest are found in David Dumville, "Nennius" and the *Historia Brittonum*, *Studia Celtica*, X-XI (1975-76), pp. 78-95 and the reply in P. J. C. Field, ‘Nennius and his History’, *Studia Celtica*, XXX (1996), pp. 159-165.


\(^{89}\) Dumville, *Textual History*, p. 236, no. 53. Regarding Oswiu’s death, see: HE IV, ch. 5.


scenario “unwise” and not in keeping with “Celtic polity”. The peaceful take-over of Rheged by Northumbrian rulers, if it happened, may be of significance for the continuity, or discontinuity of previous organisational structures and territories. While the section referring to Oswiu’s wife Rhainfellt is likely to be based on Anglo-Saxon genealogies, integrated into the HB in the early ninth century, the late date of the earliest surviving manuscript of the HB means that not too much reliance should be placed on this source. All that can be said with some degree of certainty is that, approximately 150 years after the mid-seventh century, the compiler of the HB thought it possible that the political situation between Bernicia and Rheged would allow for diplomatic relations such as this wedding.

A third written source which is quoted repeatedly for the early medieval history of Dumfriesshire is an entry in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In 874 or 875 the Danish leader Halfdan is recorded to have led a raiding party into Northumbria, raiding “among the Picts and among the Strathclyde Britons”. This passage appears in the Winchester and Peterborough MSS with little variation. The former may be considered more authoritative on the events of 874-5. Its official name is Cambridge Corpus Christi College MS 173 and it is the oldest surviving MS of the Chronicle. A non-surviving earlier version of the ASC was copied into the Winchester MS up to the annal for 891 at the end of the ninth century, before being continued at intervals by different scribes throughout the tenth century. By contrast, the Peterborough manuscript, Oxford Bodleian Library MS Laud 636, seems to have been begun in the early twelfth century by copying entries from a previous version of the ASC, presumably from Canterbury. The reference to the campaigns of Halfdan may be seen as indirect evidence that, by the years 874-5, Scandinavian settlement had not begun on the northern Solway coast.

The early medieval documentation relating to Dumfriesshire with its focus on military campaigns and the expansion or collapse of kingdoms does not lend itself to a detailed discussion of small estate units and the interaction between settlements in south-west Scotland. Despite these shortcomings, the sources provide a good framework for tracing broad migration
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93 Regarding three different models of English, or Anglian, take-over, see Rollason, Northumbria, pp. 65-7.
94 Dumville, Textual History, p. 33.
96 ASC, pp. 74-5.
97 ASC, p. xxi.
98 ASC, p. xxi.
99 ASC, p. xxvi.
patterns of cultural and – more importantly – linguistic groups, knowledge which may in turn be employed in the study of the regional place-names.

3.2 Historical Maps

To make up for the deficiencies of early medieval documents in providing a clearer sense of estate patterns in Dumfriesshire, the APP methodology was developed. This approach has the advantage of being independent of the production or survival of manorial documentation, but it is in turn tied to the reconstruction of relative land capability in terms of arable or pastoral land in the period between AD 600 and 1000, which, as chapter 2 will have shown, is not an easy task. One possible approach to resolve this issue is the use of eighteenth-century maps of Dumfriesshire, as detailed in chapter 10. However, in order to know what to expect from these sources, a brief overview of the maps and plans employed in the present thesis is given here.

William Roy’s Military Survey is a map of Scotland which was created in the years from 1747-1755, following the Jacobite rebellion of 1745. It was created under the supervision of Lt.-Col. David Watson, with his two assistants William Roy, with whom the map would later be associated, and Sir David Dundas. The survey is the most detailed map of Scotland prior to the Ordnance Survey maps of the nineteenth century, and includes farms, villages, towns and woodlands in greater detail than the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century mapping efforts of Timothy Pont or John Blaeu. As such, Roy’s survey is a comparatively early source for the extent of cultivated lands in Scotland in the mid-eighteenth century. With regard to its precision, the map should be treated as a rough sketch of land marks and outstanding landscape features, rather than a detailed topographic survey. The primary purpose was of a military nature, rather than a precise representation of settlement distribution.

The eighteenth century also saw the beginning of the agricultural Improvements and their increasing impact on the Scottish landscape. The access to more precise cartographic

methods and an interest in maximising the productivity of their estates led many land owners to commission estate surveys, plans and maps, outlining the division of lands, their capability and, if applicable, the distribution of plots among tenants.\textsuperscript{104} The lands of Annandale, most of which belonged to the extensive estates of the Duke of Buccleuch and Queensberry and the Marquis of Annandale, were no exception to these developments.\textsuperscript{105} The quality and precision of the resulting maps and estate plans varies considerably, depending on the year of production, on the surveyor in charge and, presumably, on the ultimate purpose with which they were drawn and the means available for the measurement of the land. For example, on plan NRS Ref. RHP218 (\textit{Map of Part of the South Common of Lochmaben, AD 1734}) the surveyor included a remark towards the south of the mapped area, stating that “[this] open space represents a large tract of ground in the surveying thereof I was interrupted by the Kindly Tenants in Hightae who aledged [sic] it was their property and not Commonty Ground.”\textsuperscript{106}

It may be assumed that in each case it was attempted to produce a plan which most accurately reflected the given lands, based on the available technology and financial means. After all, such an approach was in the interest of the land owner.\textsuperscript{107} Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that the plans reflected the physical reality in all aspects. Just as Improvement writers of the eighteenth century tended to downplay the economic validity of pre-Improvement agriculture, contemporary agrarian maps often did not depict what was there, but rather what was possible once the landscape had been improved.\textsuperscript{108}

Even so, it may be argued that the improvements envisioned by the landlords who commissioned these plans would be limited to what was technologically possible at the time. Thus, the relation between what is pictured on the plans and the actual capabilities of the land would still be less distorted than projecting the classifications of modern soil surveys onto the early medieval landscape.

There is another methodological reason why estate plans of the early Improvements may still be a viable source. It is important to note that the calculation of the APP or


\textsuperscript{105} A list of the estate plans used in the current investigation is included in the appendix (volume II).

\textsuperscript{106} NRS Ref. RHP218.


Agricultural Population Potential, which will be discussed in part II of the thesis, is aimed at estimating the greatest possible population which could be sustained on the agricultural resources of a given territory. It is accepted that any such estimate would realistically have to be corrected downwards, based on other demographic factors such as mortality rates, conflicts, diseases and migration. The fact that the eighteenth-century plans may depict a landscape which would have been agriculturally more productive than its first-millennium counterpart is consistent with this approach. It means that any calculated APP value would set the upper limit of the population and would therefore only have to be corrected downwards, rather than upwards, if a realistic population estimate were to be achieved.
4. Multiple Estates and Settlement Foci

In this chapter two important concepts underlying the following discussion are introduced: the multiple estate model, applied as a template to study settlement patterns and their relation with one another, and settlement foci, representing an area of settlement activity, either in the form of a large nuclear settlement, or a cluster of smaller farmsteads and hamlets amounting to roughly the same population, but organised in a scattered pattern.

The examination of the relationship between settlement patterns, agricultural land use, and territorial units or estates would ideally include a two-fold approach: first, the outlining of connections and hierarchies between different estates and settlement groups on a macro-level, such as the differentiation between dependent townships and the lord’s settlement. Secondly, the study of the internal workings of each individual settlement or estate on a micro-level, such as labour services or the renders in kind or money which were due by the estate’s dependent population to their lord. Unfortunately, the lack of contemporary local written evidence, such as legal tracts and charters, means that no certain statements can be made about the way in which settlements in early medieval southern Scotland would be economically, and perhaps hierarchically, connected with each other.\textsuperscript{109} Detailed insights into the, at least nominal, arrangements within an estate, such as provided by the Rectitudines Singularum Personarum further south, do not appear for Dumfriesshire in the first millennium AD.\textsuperscript{110} Consequently, the present thesis will not include a detailed discussion of the micro-level, such as the different social ranks which co-existed in the early medieval estates and settlements of Dumfriesshire: the sources are simply not there.

Similarly, there are no written sources before the twelfth century which would tell the scholar anything about the ways in which estates were created, partitioned, or granted to different landholders in early medieval Dumfriesshire. Detailed studies of estate units such as Rosamond Faith’s examination of Tidenham in Gloucestershire can therefore not be undertaken.\textsuperscript{111} Although landholders and the precise boundaries of the units of landholding


and lordship remain invisible until well into the Middle Ages, it may be possible to catch a
glimpse of the estates or territorial units which governed economy, politics, and society during
the second half of the first millennium. The key to these patterns lies in the multiple estate,
originally coined by Glanville R. J. Jones. This model is based on two fundamental
assumptions. First, it argues that most regions of early medieval Britain shared a similar
territorial and economic system which was based on the general formula of several dependent
settlements or townships being organised hierarchically, if not geographically, around a central
settlement or hall belonging to the lord or his reeve. Secondly, and methodologically of greater
significance, this system has been argued to date back to the period before the Anglo-Saxon
take-over of native British kingdoms and principalities in the fifth century in what is now
England, and in the seventh century in southern Scotland. It is therefore important to note that
the present study is framed by the hypothesis that patterns of settlement and units of rural
economy and lordship retained a degree of continuity, or at least survival, in both form and
function from the second half of the first millennium into the eleventh and possibly twelfth
centuries. No comprehensive outline of the historiographical evolution of the multiple estate
model will be undertaken here, as this has already been competently achieved by Brian K.
Roberts and Paul S. Barnwell in their recent volume *Britons, Saxons, and Scandinavians*.112
However, given that the multiple estate is a useful tool for understanding the settlement
patterns of early medieval south-western Scotland before AD 1000, its principal components
will be addressed.

The multiple estate, which appears as *maenor* in medieval Welsh sources and as shire
in a Northumbrian and Scottish context is an economic as well as political unit.113 It has been
used as model framework of regional lordship and agricultural exploitation in early medieval
northern Britain.114 The term multiple estate is a modern coinage by Glanville Jones and is
most readily apparent in the Welsh lawbooks of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries,
but traces of a similar estate unit have been glimpsed in contemporary Northumbrian
sources.115

---

112 Brian K. Roberts and Paul S. Barnwell, ‘The Multiple Estate of Glanville Jones: Epitome, Critique
and Context’, in *Britons, Saxons and Scandinavians. The Historical Geography of Glanville R. J.
113 Barrow, *Kingdom of the Scots*, pp. 20-3.
114 Jones, ‘Model Framework’, pp. 251, 255; Jolliffe, ‘Northumbrian Institutions’, pp. 9-19; Barrow,
*Kingdom of the Scots*, p. 20.
115 Jones, ‘Model Framework’, pp. 251-3 and 265; Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, pp. 90-3; Barrow,
*Kingdom of the Scots*, pp. 7-33.
In structural terms, the ideal multiple estate consists of a number of settlements or townships which lie in dependence upon a central caput or lord’s hall. These townships in turn would consist of several hamlets or scattered homesteads, and may be identical with the appendicia or davochs identified by Barrow as the constituent portions of an early medieval Scottish shire.\textsuperscript{116} The number of townships or appendicia could vary dramatically, from 4 to 13 or more, depending on local circumstances, and Barrow observed that the shires of Scotia north of the Forth in the twelfth century “tended to be smaller than the shires of Northumbria”.\textsuperscript{117} A recurring feature of the multiple estate model are what Angus Winchester termed ‘estate foci’, that is, places of central importance within the estate unit, often physically containing the lord’s hall and a central church.\textsuperscript{118} These foci are often characterised by considerable continuity, and have been used to argue for a strong connection between parish boundaries and secular estate boundaries. Based on the Welsh evidence, Jones argued that many of these central lord’s settlements later developed into larger villages and market towns due to their central role in the local landscape.\textsuperscript{119} The primary economic purpose of the multiple estate or shire was the provision of revenue for an elite ruling class, and there is evidence that some multiple estates were organised geographically along agricultural principles, whereby each estate had one upland component and one complementary lowland component.\textsuperscript{120} The population of the dependent townships owed renders in kind or money, as well as labour services, to the lord of the estate, although the nature of these obligations could differ regionally.\textsuperscript{121} The ingredients of the multiple estate as presented here cannot all be identified with certainty in Dumfriesshire due to the lack of sources, and only a very broad interpretation of this model can be applied to the landscape of Annandale.\textsuperscript{122}

Despite there being little written evidence confirming that a unit such as the shire or the multiple estate held sway in early medieval Dumfriesshire, it is argued that an analysis of the landscape without this template in mind may run the risk of topographical or geographical determinism, assigning, for example, a higher status to lowland settlements compared with upland ones.\textsuperscript{123} Instead, the model described above, although representing an idealised

\textsuperscript{116} Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 251; Barrow, \textit{Kingdom of the Scots}, pp. 20-3, 49.
\textsuperscript{117} Barrow, \textit{Kingdom of the Scots}, p. 32; Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 252.
\textsuperscript{118} Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, p. 97; Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 252; Barrow, \textit{Kingdom of the Scots}, pp. 50-3.
\textsuperscript{119} Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 262.
\textsuperscript{120} Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, pp. 93-7; Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 252.
\textsuperscript{121} Jolliffe, ‘Northumbrian Institutions’, pp. 4, 6-8; Jones, ‘Model Framework’, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{122} For a detailed list of what constitutes a multiple estate in the strictest sense, see Roberts and Barnwell, ‘The Multiple Estate’, pp. 39-41.
\textsuperscript{123} David Rollason presents another example of problematic topographical determinism in his study on minsters, see David B. Rollason, ‘Monasteries and Society in Early Medieval Northumbria’, in
concept, may provide the necessary building blocks to understand the patterns of settlement and agriculture in early medieval Dumfriesshire.\textsuperscript{124} While influential local towns, particularly with old place-names, may be good indicators of earlier estate foci, it is unclear how much of the original townships can still be glimpsed in the modern landscape. There is a strong possibility that the vills which appear in the documentary record of the twelfth and later centuries may have originally been groups of scattered homesteads before the formation of nucleated villages.\textsuperscript{125} This is no inconsequential matter, as it determines what significance is assigned to each of the place-names discussed in chapter 8. Does each early place-name represent a single early medieval farmstead, so that it has to be taken together with other settlements to form an appendicium or township? Or is each place-name merely the name of the most significant settlement of a given township, included in the charters of medieval Dumfriesshire as a pars-pro-toto to signify a group of hamlets or farmsteads pertaining to, or being in the vicinity of, the mentioned settlement? Again, the matter cannot be conclusively resolved with the little evidence available. Given the archaeological evidence for Anglo-Saxon England between the sixth and ninth centuries, it is likely that groups of hamlets and scattered farmsteads co-existed with more focal settlements.\textsuperscript{126} Judging by the eighteenth-century and modern settlement landscape of the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan, the majority of medieval settlement sites in Annandale seem to have been fairly dispersed farmsteads or fermtouns, which would in part be broken up into individual farms in the course of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{127} The medieval and, possibly, early medieval settlement pattern of this landscape may have looked similar to the scattered farmsteads discussed by David Hey in his


\textsuperscript{124} The concept of the multiple estate has received criticism in the decades after its inception. Since it is only used as a broad template in the present study, due to the absence of written documents to allow for more detailed comparison, a detailed discussion is unnecessary. Much of the negative criticism has been levelled at the apparent claim that the multiple estate represents a generally applicable framework for territorial organisation and lordship across all of northern Britain. It therefore appears that the generalising model character was not fully appreciated: cf. Roberts and Barnwell, ‘The Multiple Estate’, pp. 51-9.

\textsuperscript{125} The literature on the development of nucleated settlements is too extensive to be included here in any representative form. Some arguments pertaining to northern England may be found in: Pamela Allerton, ‘English Village Development. Findings from the Pickering District of North Yorkshire’, \textit{Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,} Vol. 51 (1970), pp. 95 and 105-7. At least for England, there is archaeological evidence that nucleated villages may have made an appearance in the landscape in the ninth century. Before c. AD 800, the archaeological evidence suggests rural settlements with a scattered plan: Hamerow, \textit{Rural Settlements,} pp. 67-94.

\textsuperscript{126} Hamerow, \textit{Rural Settlements,} pp. 67-94.

\textsuperscript{127} WRS, plates 27-9; cf. OS 1\textsuperscript{st} Ed County Map 1:2500 (1861); cf. Adams, \textit{Scottish Estate,} p. 29.
study of the Pennine foothills of southern Yorkshire. Very little of this can, however, be archaeologically confirmed.

Although the study period is given as ranging from c. AD 600 to 1000, this is due to the lack of evidence which would justify a narrower dating. Consequently, little can be said about the evolution, if there was one, of the settlement patterns in this 400-year-period. The broad assumption has to be that all settlements identified as early medieval in the present study were roughly contemporaneous. Another factor of change is the location of settlements from the early medieval to the modern period. Shifting settlements are difficult to assess in the archaeological record, as they require a means of closely dating individual buildings within a site. Helena Hamerow suggests, however, that there were two types of shifting settlements common in Anglo-Saxon England, particularly from the fifth to the seventh centuries: the ‘West Stow type’, where individual buildings were rebuilt in close distance to the original buildings, while the site as a whole remained stable, and the ‘Mucking type’, where a gradual movement of the entire settlement can be witnessed, covering a few hundred metres over the period of three centuries. The reasons for this movement may have been social, agricultural or ecological in nature. It is not inconceivable that the clustered remains of late prehistoric settlements which can be found in northern Dumfriesshire represent successive phases of settlement reconstruction, rather than contemporary neighbouring settlements, and that this may be linked to practices of shifting cultivation in areas with restricted availability of manure (fig. 2). While the following discussion will be analysing potentially early medieval settlements in Annandale on the basis of their current location, it should be noted that the original location may have been within a radius of several hundred metres.

---

132 Grigg, *Agricultural Systems*, pp. 72-3; see also: Chapter 11.
5. Parishes and Lordship

Any study of early medieval settlement patterns must by necessity also be concerned with the territorial and estate frameworks within which these settlements existed. This task is rendered difficult by the dearth of documentary sources on pre-Norman units of lordship in Dumfriesshire. In other parts of Britain, a possible link between later medieval parish boundaries and early medieval secular and ecclesiastical estates has been recognised, albeit often tentatively. As a result, the parish boundaries – often themselves only first mapped in the nineteenth century - were turned into surrogate estate boundaries. Connected with this, there is a danger of projecting modern ideas of clear and cartographically fixed boundaries back onto an early medieval landscape. Scholarship on the nature of boundaries and frontiers in the early medieval and medieval periods would suggest that such ‘neat lines on the map’ did not exist – or were uncommon – 1,000 years ago. What follows, then, is not an attempt at drawing a direct connection between parish boundaries as found, for example, in the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey maps and early medieval estate units. Instead, for the purposes of the present investigation, parishes essentially take up two important functions. On a theoretical level, they represent the early medieval foci of small ‘church communities’, possibly dependent on a central mother church but not as yet formalised as units of assessment for the tithe. On a practical level, their boundaries are understood as the smallest non-arbitrary division of the Dumfriesshire landscape into distinct and comparable units below the level of the county. As such, they will form the framework for the calculations in chapter 9. While it is recognised that these boundaries will most likely not have been as precise in an early medieval reality as they appear on modern maps, the agricultural estimations in the second part of this thesis rely on fixed and geo-referenced boundaries as a starting point. There are of course other ways of dividing the county of Dumfriesshire into smaller ‘chunks’, such as

133 On the connection between parishes and secular boundaries, see for example: Huw Pryce, ‘Pastoral Care in Early Medieval Wales’ in Pastoral Care before the Parish, ed. J. Blair and R. Sharpe (Leicester, 1992), pp. 61-2; Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, pp. 21-2, 50-3; Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, pp. 91-3; The pastoral role of an estate church within a multiple estate or shire is implied by Glanville Jones: Jones, ‘Model Framework’, pp. 251-267; cf. Hadley, Northern Danelaw, pp. 88-90 and 96-7.

134 The frontier-character of the western regions of Northumbria, both in what is now northern England and southern Scotland, has been discussed by Felicity H. Clark: Felicity H. Clark, ‘Thinking about Western Northumbria’, in Early Medieval Northumbria. Kingdoms and Communities, AD 450-1100, ed. David Petts and Sam Turner (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 113-5. The notion of boundaries as ‘clear lines on the map’ does not seem to reflect an early medieval reality, and it is likely that polities and indeed cultural groups were much less clearly defined than could be reconstructed on modern maps: cf. Mark Gardiner, ‘Boundaries of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms: the example of the South Saxons’, in Studies in Early Anglo-Saxon Art and Archaeology: Papers in Honour of Martin G. Welch, ed. Stuart Brookes et al. (Oxford, 2016), pp. 139-42.
Thiessen polygons. However, while the connection between parish boundaries and early medieval estates might seem tentative, Thiessen polygons may be dismissed in this case as creating units which are too artificial for any meaningful historical comparison. Consequently, there are theoretical as well as practical reasons for understanding the origins of the parishes in Dumfriesshire and their possible connection to estate boundaries.

Considering that the parish has been used for some time as one of the basic units not just of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but also of secular lordship in the earlier Middle Ages, not much is known about the parish system before the twelfth century.135 The English term parish is derived from parochia, a word with a particularly flexible semantic history: in sixth-century Gaul, for example, the parochia referred to a well-established church in the countryside, as opposed to an urban foundation.136 In the early medieval Irish documentation, the parochia appears as “the entire territory attached to a major church and over which the bishop of that church had jurisdiction and the duty of pastoral care”.137 A similar meaning seems to have held true in Scotland before the parochia became associated with the parish system as we know it, beginning in the early twelfth century.138 Similar developments took place in twelfth-century Ireland.139 This process was drawn out over a century and seems to have been completed – in Scotland – by 1274.140 The resulting ecclesiastical parishes seem to coincide with many of the nineteenth-century civil parishes, although some had been merged or separated during the Reformation of the sixteenth century.141

The changeable nature of the early medieval term parochia and the dearth in documentary records has led to the creation of hypothetical models for the early stages of what later became a parish system in the modern sense. One such model, primarily concerned with the administration of pastoral care in early medieval southern Scotland and England, is the minster hypothesis.142 At its core, the minster hypothesis suggests that early monastic communities were a driving force behind the conversion of Anglo-Saxon England since the
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140 Cowan, ‘Parochial System’, p. 52.
seventh century and that, as a result, these *mynsters or monasteria* constituted the foci of large dependent areas for which they provided pastoral care.\(^{143}\) According to the general understanding of this model, these early *parochiae* were broken up into smaller units of jurisdiction centred around a growing number of newly founded proprietary churches, both by secular and ecclesiastical lords, in the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries.\(^{144}\)

In Dumfriesshire, a similar process may have taken place. The significance of the river catchments of Annandale, Eskdale and Nithsdale in terms of early medieval ecclesiastical and territorial structures has been the subject of several hypotheses, and in 1975 Geoffrey Barrow remarked that the ancient Cumbrian territories seem mostly geographically determined and were later mirrored in the fiefdoms granted to Norman incomers, such as the Lordship of Annandale, as well as the earliest recorded deaneries of the twelfth century, in particular for the diocese of Glasgow.\(^{145}\) R. C. Reid has gone further and suggested that pre-Norman Dumfriesshire may have been served by three minsters of the type described above, each in charge of one of the major river valleys: Morton or Dalgarnoc for Nithsdale, Staplegordon for Eskdale and Hoddom for Annandale.\(^{146}\) Such a framework is likely to have formed under Northumbrian influence from the late seventh and early eighth centuries onward but first becomes tangible in the tenth century.\(^{147}\) A case in point may be the distribution of tenth-century monumental carvings of the ‘Whithorn school’ in the Machars which co-incides closely with pre-Reformation parishes.\(^{148}\) There is the obvious caveat that these sculptures may have been moved at a later stage, but similar patterns were identified in Nithsdale – with a possible production centre of the sculptures in Penpont – and in lower Annandale around Hoddom.\(^{149}\) More recent investigations into proto-parochial networks in northern England have established comparable links between the distribution of Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture of the ninth and tenth centuries and the later medieval parishes in the North Riding of Yorkshire and in Cumbria.\(^{150}\)


\(^{149}\) Crowe, ‘Parish Formation’, pp. 201-3.

\(^{150}\) Aleksandra McClain, ‘Local Churches and the Conquest of the North: Elite Patronage and Identity in Saxo-Norman Northumbria’, in *Early Medieval Northumbria. Kingdoms and Communities, AD*
monumental carvings provided focal points for small ‘church communities’ – as Deirdre O’Sullivan puts it – in a larger minster landscape. Early medieval northern minster sites such as St Bees in Cumbria and possibly Whithorn and Hoddom in Dumfries and Galloway would seem likely agents in the creation of these monuments and the maintenance of early networks of small communities before their boundaries became formalised as parishes in the twelfth century and associated with the payment of tithes.

That there might be an economic dimension to these minster networks is suggested by the excavations at Hoddom. The archaeological evidence of large-scale grain processing indicates that it was a focal site for the collection, storage and preparation of cereal grain with considerable influence over an agricultural hinterland.\textsuperscript{151} It is possible, therefore, that earlier patterns both of secular lordship and ecclesiastical organisation operated in the framework of large, geographically-bounded territories. That there was a sub-stratum to this framework, in the form of smaller land units - at least by the twelfth century - may be suggested by the pairings of motte-and-bailey timber castles with parish churches in several parts of Dumfriesshire (fig. 12).\textsuperscript{152} While there is a discrepancy, certainly in Annandale, between twelve identifiable timber castles and over thirty known medieval parishes, Peter Corser highlights the fact that the documentary evidence for this period suggests that there were “significantly more estates in Annandale in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries than there are surviving estate centres represented by timber castles”.\textsuperscript{153} Some of the modern parishes may therefore represent earlier territories for which no archaeological or monumental centre survived. Similar patterns have been identified by Angus Winchester for early medieval Cumbria, where the parishes may reflect smaller estate units within the larger territorial divisions of the ecclesiastical deaneries.\textsuperscript{154} The pattern of large minster territories being broken down in the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries is also apparent in northern Yorkshire, where Anglo-Scandinavian lords had a keen interest in ecclesiastical patronage which ultimately led to a landscape “in which nearly every manorial settlement featured a church”.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{154} Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, pp. 90-2.
\textsuperscript{155} McClain, ‘Local Churches’, pp. 159 and 168.
From an archaeological perspective, the possible antiquity of some of these territorial units – certainly in Annandale - may be illustrated through Stratford Halliday’s examination of the landscape surrounding Castle O’er, now in the parish of Eskdalemuir. Halliday argues that the late prehistoric settlement patterns and enclosures may point to a territorial unit with the hillfort at Castle O’er as a fortified *caput*, and that this unit had a degree of continuity as the boundary of a later medieval estate, namely the lands of Tomleuchar and Watcarrick which appear in writing in the second half of the twelfth century.\(^{156}\) Similarly, the fort at Burnswark, commanding the whole of Annandale, as well as the Roman fort at Birrens all point to Annandale having been an administrative or territorial unit before the establishment of the Brus Lordship.\(^ {157}\)

All of the aforementioned case studies have in common that a fragmentation of large minster territories or dependencies can only be observed in the late ninth and tenth centuries – if the monuments are taken to represent a proto-parochial distribution of church communities. However, it may be tentatively suggested that such patterns had existed for some time before they started to show traces visible to the modern scholar. If the parishes of Dumfriesshire are accepted as viable framework within which to interpret early medieval settlement patterns, a next step requires the selection of parishes for further case studies. This is necessary because a detailed examination of more than thirty parishes would go beyond what is feasible within the limitations of a doctoral thesis.

It is for that reason that three parish case studies were selected to investigate broader patterns of settlement and territorial organisation. For the comparison to be effective, it has to be ensured that all of the parishes under examination are similar or equal in terms of available evidence, both written and archaeological, as well as with regard to their physical environment. Meaningful conclusions can only be drawn once the many sources of possible bias have been isolated prior to the comparison. Since the amount of available time only allowed for the study of three parishes, one of two approaches had to be chosen: the first option would be to select three parishes with similar amounts of written and archaeological evidence, ideally located closely to each other. The advantage of this approach would be that any contrasts between the organisation of the parishes are unlikely to result from differences in ecological environment or the bias of written evidence favouring one parish over another. The disadvantage, however, would be that such an examination would only provide a relatively small insight into the broader patterns of Dumfriesshire as a whole. The second option, which has been chosen for

\(^{156}\) Halliday, ‘The later prehistoric landscape’, pp. 100-2; RRS II, p. 296 (no. 264) AD 1180x1193.

the following study, is similar to the first one in all respects but the proximity of the parishes to each other. Each parish was selected to represent a different landscape type: upland (Moffat), lowland (Lochmaben), and coastal (Annan). The disadvantages and advantages of this option are inverted to the first option, but for the purposes of the present study more weight was given to the possibility of illuminating broader patterns. To minimise the distorting impact of different ecological environments on the three case studies, the selected parishes are all part of Annandale and situated along the course of the River Annan. Thus, while there are differences in geological relief, the parishes share the overall climate, which in Britain is largely variable on an east-west axis, rather than the north-south axis. Furthermore, it may be expected that the common reliance of these parishes on the Annan as main water course is another connecting element, eliminating further bias.

From the twelfth century onward, the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan were part of the Brus lordship of Annandale. Annan was the first centre of this Lordship, although Lochmaben later took over this role, presumably at some point in time between 1173 and 1218, as argued by R. C. Reid. The situation of these parishes within the lordship has advantages and disadvantages. Within Annandale, they provide a more comprehensive written record than that of their neighbouring parishes, at least with regard to place-names (fig. 13). On the other hand, the central role of Annandale in the Dumfriesshire landscape, also highlighted by the Roman road which follows the course of the Annan into the southern uplands, suggests that patterns found in this valley may not be applicable to the territorial organisation of Dumfriesshire at large (fig. 11). Whether or not there is such a bias must, however, be determined in a more substantial study in the future.

Given that the parish boundaries form the starting point of the investigation into early medieval territories, only those parishes were considered eligible which had no major history of undergoing splitting or merging from the medieval to the modern periods. For example, the parish of Dalton used to consist of two medieval parishes, which explains the survival of two medieval churches, while the parish of Eskdalemuir parish has none, as it was part of
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Westerkirk in the medieval period.\textsuperscript{162} Although the medieval boundaries may in some cases be reconstructed, this would add another element of uncertainty to the study. There is no evidence for modifications to the parish boundaries of Lochmaben and Moffat in the post-medieval period. In the parish of Annan, it is possible that a sub-division between the churches of Annan and Brydekirk existed before c. AD 1218, but little evidence can be presented for this.\textsuperscript{163} From the first quarter of the thirteenth century onward, Brydekirk seems to have been a chapel within the parish of Annan, indicating no separate parish boundaries.

There is another reason for the focus on eastern Dumfriesshire and in particular Annandale, namely the comprehensive analysis of the archaeological remains in this area undertaken in the 1997 RCAHMS report. This guaranteed that all three parishes under examination had received a similar extent of archaeological scrutiny.\textsuperscript{164} Nevertheless, in terms of the archaeological data within each parish, a clear bias towards upland areas can be detected. Thus, while there is archaeological evidence of early settlement patterns, prehistoric or medieval, in the lowland parishes of Lochmaben and Annan, the density of such sites becomes greater towards Moffat, as discussed in chapter 2.

It is for all of the reasons mentioned above that the following investigation will turn its attention to the study of place-names, settlements and agriculture within the parish boundaries of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan. However, it is accepted that further work on other parishes within Annandale or Dumfriesshire in the future would help to provide a fuller picture of the studied landscape, potentially modifying or changing the conclusions in chapter 11.

\textsuperscript{164} RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}. 
6. Place-Names: The Methodology

“A large variety of extra-linguistic information is, it appears, readily available in toponymic evidence, as long as one knows how to extract it and, equally important, as long as the limitations of that evidence, as well as its scope, are recognised.”¹⁶⁵ In this manner Wilhelm Nicolaisen summed up the potential benefits, as well as the potential dangers, of inferring extra-linguistic information from place-name evidence. The aim of the present chapter is to illuminate the basic methodological considerations behind the use of place-names for the study of early medieval Annandale, including those pieces of evidence which cannot be inferred, except with caution, from the toponymic landscape of south-west Scotland. It will therefore demonstrate the theoretical framework, terminology and assumptions which underlie all subsequent case studies.

Place-names tend to be made up of two elements: the specific, referring to the particular circumstances of the individual place-name, and the generic, which tends to refer to the type of place. In Germanic place-names, such as Broomhill or Esbie, the specific generally precedes the generic. Thus, Broomhill refers to a hill characterised by its predominant vegetation, and Esbie denotes a farm (ON by) which was most likely surrounded by ash trees (ON eski). In Celtic place-names, this word-order is inverted, evidenced by names such as Dumbretton, composed of Gaelic *dùn-bretann ‘fortress of the Britons’.¹⁶⁶ The generic of a place-name can appear in one of two forms: habitative, referring to the status of a settlement (ON by ‘farm’, OE tun ‘enclosure’), and topographic, referring to a landscape feature (OE hyl ‘hill’, ON þveit ‘clearing’).

In order to fully understand the aforementioned problems related to the place-names, or toponymy, of Scotland, a number of terms and theoretical concepts need to be introduced. Since place-names are complex socio-linguistic labels by which people make use of their surroundings, it is useful to look at the question of why we do have place-names. A good way to start is looking at the concept of name itself. Wilhelm Nicolaisen distinguishes three different levels within a name. The first one is the lexical level, or the dictionary meaning of a word. Speakers of the respective language know what it means and it is still commonly used. The associative level of a name describes the reason why a specific lexical item, as opposed to any other, was used for the naming process, while the onomastic level is the meaning of

¹⁶⁵ W. F. H. Nicolaisen, 'Surnames and Medieval Popular Culture', in In the Beginning was the Name, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaisen (Lerwick, 2011), p. 82.
¹⁶⁶ The asterisk (*) before names indicates reconstructed linguistic forms which do not appear as such in the written record.
the name in its own right, that is, as a name or reference. The latter level tends to survive the longest, so that names can continue to be used in a time in which the lexical meaning of their constituent words is no longer comprehensible to the local speaking community.\(^{167}\) The processes involving these three levels are not always clear, as we do not always gain insight into the minds of the people who used them, but for the sake of clarity, one might give the example of Closeburn (Dumfriesshire). In charters from the thirteenth century, it was *Kyllosbern* or *Killosebern*.\(^{168}\) On the lexical level, the name can be divided into two elements, *cill*, Gaelic for ‘church’, and Osbern, a personal name.\(^{169}\) When looking at the associative level, it could be said that the local population seems to have had a particular veneration for a St Osbern and in all likelihood dedicated the local church to his name. Subsequent members of the community might not have understood the original lexical meaning of this name anymore, possibly due to linguistic developments. Their need to change the place-name into the anglicised version of *Close-burn* suggests that the name had ceased to be a lexically productive item, and instead become an onomastic one.\(^{170}\) The differentiation between these levels is essential to understand the dynamics by which places are named, for example in the case of immigrants and their ‘onomastic dialects’.

According to Nicolaisen, the act of naming is the “essential privilege of the people”, a means to turn a “perplexing human environment into a structured society”.\(^{171}\) Nicolaisen is referring particularly to popular naming habits and general onomastics, as opposed to the naming of places, but it is argued that his statement is also applicable to the latter. Place-names like Lockerbie (Dumfriesshire), which was presumably named after a continental incomer, potentially even the new landlord (‘Lochard’), suggest that the landlord’s role in naming a place should not be underestimated. This could have happened directly, that is, by his initiative, or indirectly by people referring to themselves or being referred to by others as living and working at Lochard’s farm. Either way, the name has been preserved in general usage.

\(^{167}\) W. F. H. Nicolaisen, 'Names as Verbal Icons', in *In the Beginning was the Name*, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaisen (Lerwick, 2011), p. 74.

\(^{168}\) LSMC II, pp. 274-6.


\(^{171}\) Nicolaisen, ‘Surnames and Popular Culture’, p. 82.
from the twelfth century until today, and any study regarding place-names should take into account the strong imprint on the linguistic landscape which an incoming elite may make.^[172]

Place-names do not only change in terms of the lexical or onomastic items they contain. Their orthographical make-up may also be ‘corrupted’, making it difficult at times to discern the place-name’s original linguistic background. In Wilhelm Nicolaisen’s words, “it would be dangerous for name scholars to leave the name user out of the picture”^[173]. Names tend to be fully or partially de-semanticised when being transferred from a donor-language to a recipient language. A case in point is the name of the aforementioned medieval settlement of **Kyllosbern** or **Closeburn**.

There are instances, however, when de-semanticisation did not take place and, instead, a place-name seemed to have been translated, at least by the scribes of our sources, from one language into another while retaining the original meaning. Nicolaisen's detailed analysis of the place-name of Falkirk from the eleventh century onward shows that it consists of two naming components, which were successively translated by following generations, from **Varia Capella**, over **la Veire Chapelle** to **Fawkirk** and **Falkirk**.^[174] The study of place-names is therefore reliant on an early written record to trace the development, if any, of the name in question. However, although place-names are considered an important source of information for the current study, mainly due to a lack of other written resources, most Scottish place-names only appear in written documentation (hagiographies, chronicles, charters) from the twelfth century onwards, with evidence becoming more numerous during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.^[175] This general observation made by Nicolaisen also holds true for medieval Dumfriesshire, as will be shown in chapter 8.

^[172] Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names*, p. 35. The earliest written record of Lockerbie dates to 1194x1214: HMC (Drml), p. 39. As May Williamson pointed out, the name forms preserved in the publications of the HMC are not always the original ones, yet remain a useful source when it comes to dating instances of names through charter evidence. For further discussion, see Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. xxviii. Lockerbie appears on William Roy’s military survey from the mid-eighteenth century: WRS, plate 28.


^[175] Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, pp. 19f. While the bulk of place-name forms are extracted from charters detailing land grants of farms and settlements, occasionally a place-name is only recorded as a surname. As hereditary surnames come into lowland Scotland only in the thirteenth century, and are only fully fixed by the fifteenth, it may be suggested that most Scottish medieval surnames refer to a place-name which was still in existence, cf. Nicolaisen, ‘Surnames and Popular Culture’, pp. 83-4; cf. W. F. H. Nicolaisen, ‘Pictish Place-Names as Scottish Surnames: Origins, Dissemination and Current Status’, in *In the Beginning was the Name*, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaisen (Lerwick, 2011), p. 260.
This naturally raises questions as to the reliability of the place-name information, as some toponyms show Scandinavian influence but can only be found in writing 500 years after the earliest phase of Scandinavian settlement in Scotland. While this undoubtedly poses methodological problems, Nicolaisen argues that the situation may not be as dire as it seems at first glance. His argument is based on the fact that a considerable number of northern Anglian place-names for which there is evidence available, such as Coldingham, did not change much between the eighth and twelfth centuries. Thus, generally-speaking, place-names which first appear in the twelfth or perhaps thirteenth centuries may display a degree of continuity with their earlier, unrecorded, forms. However, this does not eliminate the risk that some names may have changed in the 500-year-period (between c. AD 700 and AD 1200) to which we have no written access. Moreover, Nicolaisen’s northern Anglian material is almost certainly very different in nature from those place-names within the landscape of Dumfriesshire, which, as will be discussed below, are characterised by a multitude of linguistic strata from the seventh century into the late medieval period. It is worth considering that the place-names themselves are not the only key to understanding a settlement or its environment. A useful question would be whether there is any significance attached to the first time when a settlement is mentioned. Such an approach would ideally use a much more complete corpus of evidence than the small amount of written material available for Scotland. Regardless, the possibility still exists that a certain place was only first mentioned in the twelfth century not by accident, but due to the influence of political or social changes affecting its relative importance within a landscape or political struggle, or its significance and status.

As the present study is largely concerned with spatial analysis of settlement landscapes, it is important to understand how place-names can be mapped. Two aspects need to be considered when mapping place-names: first of all, every place-name is part of a complex network of synchronic and diachronic, or, as Nicolaisen puts it, horizontal and vertical links. A place-name does not exist in isolation from its contemporary neighbours, its chronological predecessors, nor the past of its surrounding landscape. Nicolaisen regards place-names, both those of natural features (such as hills, mountains, bogs) and human-made environment (settlements, artificial ponds) as “eminently mappable”. Place-names are not abstract

---

176 See also Gotterbie, discussed in chapter 8 and first attested in 1505: cf. RGS II, p. 605 (no. 2844) Godfraby AD 1505.
177 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 20-1.
178 The complex linguistic mosaic of Dumfriesshire includes Brittonic, Gaelic, Danish, Anglian and northern ME or MSc dialects and languages, cf. chapter 7.
179 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 34.
onomastic items, but specifically refer to a “definite ‘there’, answering the question ‘where?’”. Secondly, place-names, just like the landscape features around them, have a temporal dimension. They exist and morph throughout the centuries (unfortunately not always as well documented as in the case of Falkirk), which indicates that any geographical cluster of place-names also contains chronological information. It is thus necessary to understand that even within a single linguistic stratum (for example Old Norse place-names) there are sequential layers of place-names emerging from earlier and later settlement phases. Establishing those layers is an often complicated task, especially where written documentation is scarce, but it is a necessary and helpful operation when trying to make sense of a landscape. An example for such an undertaking would be Fellows-Jensen’s analysis of Norse settlement waves in Eastern Dumfriesshire. Due to the lack of written source material, such an approach cannot be conducted solely on onomastic evidence, as Nicolaisen emphasises. A chronological toponymic study of Scotland is inevitably part of a larger, inter-disciplinary approach, including a more comprehensive understanding of the historical context. Another factor pertaining to the chronological level on which place-names exist is that their spatial reference character might change over time. Jolliffe has argued for the wholesale displacement of entire settlements by medieval landowners in Northumbria. In these cases the settlements seem to retain their place-names, but the latter is connected to a different geographical position. Even before these ‘migrations’ at the landlord’s initiative, early medieval ‘shifting settlements’ seem to have been frequent both in Anglo-Saxon England and on the northern continent, at least until stone became a more common building material.

The Scottish toponymic landscape is shaped by wave upon wave of migratory movements by peoples of different cultures with different linguistic backgrounds. It can be

---

184 As will be discussed later, þveit (‘clearing’) place-names are considered a possible indication of secondary Scandinavian settlement, settling in less favourable areas which needed clearing to allow for habitation: cf. Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names, pp. 301-2 and 415-6; Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 86-7.
185 Nicolaisen, ‘Maps of Time’, pp. 139-143 and 144.
very instructive to understand which places were re-named by a group of immigrants, and which places retained their original place-name. One model to understand the processes involved in new place-name creation or the creation of a new layer of place-names upon a substratum is Nicolaien’s ‘onomastic dialect’. It can be described as a mental and linguistic framework for place-naming which may, like linguistic dialects, migrate with the people who use it and, therefore, assumes a certain systematic nature to place-naming and topographical naming. Although this makes the toponymic landscape seem more structured than reality would have it, such a model could indicate how landscape was perceived and structured, linguistically as well as mentally, by the naming people.188 At the same time one should be aware of the dangers of such an approach, as it assumes that early medieval settlers had a fully-fledged systematic vocabulary for place-naming, which perhaps does not take into account the organic and at times arbitrary character of the processes involved.189

Any toponymic survey of Scotland must take into account the fact that place-names of that country were influenced by at least three Celtic languages (Gaelic, Old British or Brittonic, later passing into the stage of Old Welsh, and Pictish190) and three Germanic ones (Old English, Old Danish and Old Norwegian191). The Pictish language does not play a major part in the settlement history of Dumfriesshire but all other languages affect it to various extents.192 Place-names will not be primarily used here to establish the ethnic composition of the historical landscape. The assumption is that a place is not necessarily inhabited only by Angles if it has an Anglian name or only by Danish people if the name is Danish. Instead, the different linguistic spheres are read as indicators of discrete settlement movements or waves by a given people, while, for example, a potential mixed Anglo-Scandinavian migration would not be taken into account. While migrations will be treated as mono-cultural phenomena, only including a single cultural or linguistic group, the place-names of the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan suggest that, particularly in the second half of the first millennium AD,

188 W. F. H. Nicolaien, 'Scandinavian Shore Names in Shetland: The Onomastic Sub-Dialect of a Coastscape’, in In the Beginning was the Name, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaien (Lerwick, 2011), pp. 112-3; Nicolaien, ‘Surnames and Popular Culture’, p. 82; W. F. H. Nicolaien, 'Is there a Northwest Germanic Toponomy?’, in In the Beginning was the Name, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaien (Lerwick, 2011), pp. 293-4 and 297-9.
189 For example, we do not know who was in charge of giving place-names and what exactly informed their choice. Any given geographical location can be named with regard to its habitative features, characteristic landscape features, economical function and others.
191 Nicolaien, Place-Names, pp. 68-9; Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names, pp. 411-418.
192 Nicolaien, Place-Names, pp. 149-172. The supposed presence of Galloway-Picts, geographically close to Dumfriesshire, is refuted by Watson: Watson, Celtic Place-Names, pp. 172-180.
several linguistic groups co-existed with each other. Attempts are made at dating these migratory and settlement phases using the linguistic evidence in conjunction with any available historical background material. Another use of place-names is their tendency to record modes of land-use. As this chapter will discuss, some habitative place-name elements refer to a specialised function of a settlement or farm, or give insight into its origin, as for example place-names ending in -þveit. Another example for this, although outside the study area, is the name ‘Quier’ on Lewis, meaning ‘cattle-folds’, which specifically refers to a historical livestock husbandry system.\footnote{Nicolaisen, ‘Surnames and Popular Culture’, pp. 83-4.}

What, then, can be learnt from place-names? The general patterns of place-names, especially when they belong to a particular type (for example hām or by place-names) can give insight into the relations between different geographical regions, and even into the relative chronology within the same linguistic stratum. Most importantly, however, it must be noted that place-names only ever record the latest stage at which a place was named, or re-named.\footnote{Examples of settlement names disappearing completely in the fourteenth century only to re-appear, under a different name, in the fifteenth century, are recorded for Galloway, cf. Richard D. Oram, ‘Scandinavian Settlement in South-West Scotland with a special study of Bysbie’, in \textit{Scandinavian Settlement in Northern Britain}, ed. Barbara E. Crawford (Leicester, 1995), p. 130. For the change of the parish name of Trevercarcou to Balmacellian from the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries, see: Daphne Brooke, ‘The Glenkens 1275-1485: Snapshots of a medieval country-side’, TDGNHAS, Ser. III, Vol. 59 (1984), pp. 42-3.}

Therefore, as an absolute dating device, they are unreliable. While this is certainly a disadvantage in a landscape with little evidence of rural settlement archaeology, the fact that some potentially early place-names survived amidst a host of names which appear to have been re-named at later stages of history is, in itself, a useful tool for understanding the relationship between different settlements.
7. Chronological Framework

If landscape is understood as a constantly evolving space in which each instance of human interaction with nature is influenced by past patterns and is going to influence future patterns, then it is necessary to frame the study of early medieval settlement patterns beyond the study period of c. 600-1000.\textsuperscript{195} For this purpose, the broad historical narrative of Dumfriesshire will be outlined here from the late first century to the fourteenth century AD, detailing, where possible, how the place-name patterns of the landscape are affected by successive waves of incoming groups of different linguistic backgrounds. It should be noted that, unless stated otherwise, place-names from now on refer to settlement names, rather than the names of hills, rivers or fields.

Amongst the Celtic and Germanic languages which thrived in Dumfriesshire at different points in history, Old British, or Brittonic, in its Cumbric dialect is the oldest linguistic stratum which can still be discerned.\textsuperscript{196} This may have been the language of the native population during the Roman period, beginning for Dumfriesshire roughly in AD 71, when Petillius Cerialis became governor of Britain, and ending in the second half of the fourth century.\textsuperscript{197} Although initial contacts between the Roman incomers and different parts of the native population of eastern Dumfriesshire may have been hostile, the construction of the Antonine Wall along the Clyde-Forth isthmus suggests that by the time of Antoninus Pius (AD 138-61) Dumfriesshire was considered neutral or cooperative in its interaction with the occupiers.\textsuperscript{198} The earliest Roman forts and fortlets in Dumfriesshire may be attributed to the northern campaigns of Gnaeus Julius Agricola (governor of Britain AD 77-83), using Annandale in particular as a major routeway into northern Scotland.\textsuperscript{199} The history of the Roman occupation of southern Scotland was by no means static, and the archaeological record of abandoned, modified and re-built fortifications reflects this.\textsuperscript{200} About a decade following Agricola’s advance into Scotland north of the Forth, reaching all the way to the estuary of the


\textsuperscript{197} RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, pp. 171-4.

\textsuperscript{198} RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 172. Hanson suggests that the initially hostile disposition of the tribes along the Rivers Nith and Annan towards Rome may be indicated by the locations of the forts in these parts of Dumfriesshire: cf. Hanson, \textit{Agricola}, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{199} Hanson, \textit{Agricola}, pp. 13, 84, 95, 98-9; RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 171 and map on p. 170.

River Tay, there is evidence that the northern boundary of Roman territory was moved from the Clyde-Forth isthmus to the Tyne-Solway line, between c. AD 104 and 109.\footnote{Hanson, *Agricola*, pp. 84 and 162-3.} The construction of a wall along this boundary under the emperor Hadrian (AD 117-38), presumably after AD 122, must have emphasised the peripheral nature of southern Scotland.\footnote{RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 172.} Although the occupation of the Antonine Wall seems to have been relatively short-lived and only lasted until about AD 163, the expansion of Roman influence into Scotland south of the Clyde-Forth isthmus is likely to have lasted longer, from the 140s to the 180s.\footnote{RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 172-3.} After the military expeditions of Septimius Severus (AD 193-211) in northern Scotland and his death in York in AD 211, the Roman grip on southern Scotland seems to have lessened slowly and, by the end of the fourth century, “the Roman army finally conceded even nominal control of Eastern Dumfriesshire”.\footnote{RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 174.} The Roman impact on the indigenous population of eastern Dumfriesshire in the late first and early second centuries AD is unlikely to have been considerable. It would have been largely military in nature, both in terms of loss of lives during campaigns and skirmishes, and in terms of the strains on local agriculture to sustain the Roman army, although the extent of these pressures is difficult to estimate.\footnote{Hanson, *Agricola*, pp. 166-73; RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 185.}

Little is known about local developments from the fourth to the seventh centuries, but by the mid-seventh century it seems that the local dominant British polity, possibly the Kingdom of Rheged, came under Bernician rule during the reign of King Oswy of Bernicia (AD 642-671).\footnote{See chapter 3 and Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 68. The original argument was made by A. Wade-Evans and strongly relies on Nennius’ *Historia Brittonum*, see: Wade-Evans, ‘Study of the Lowlands’, pp. 54-84; Rollason, *Northumbria*, pp. 87-8. Possible archaeological indicators of Anglian cultural and stylistic influence on the northern Solway shore as early as the seventh century can be seen on metal artefacts found at the fort of Mote of Mark, see Rollason, *Northumbria*, p. 114. On the dearth of sources for the post-Roman period, see RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 186.} By AD 731 the Northumbrian control over Dumfries and Galloway must have been strong enough to establish an Anglian bishopric at Whithorn, but details about the Northumbrian occupation of Dumfriesshire are scarce.\footnote{Cf. chapter 3 and HE III, 4 and HE V, 23.} The earliest Anglian place-names and settlements in Dumfriesshire can only be expected from the second half of the seventh century onward. Considerable efforts have been made to establishing the chronology of place-names within the OE stratum.\footnote{Nicolaïsen, *Place-Names*, pp. 69-73; Nicolaïsen, ‘Northwest Germanic Toponomy’, p. 295; OE place-names of the –ingas and –inga-type used to be considered very early, a theory refuted by John Dodgson, who argues that these place-names do not belong to the earliest Anglo-Saxon settlement phase, but to a secondary expansion: see J. Dodgson, ‘The significance of the distribution of the
earliest wave of OE place-names. Relatively-speaking, habitative place-names would be dated to later periods. While these findings hold true for most of Anglo-Saxon England, the case may be the reverse in Dumfriesshire. It was the north-western part of the Kingdom of Northumbria and only a late addition to the OE-speaking sphere during the seventh-century AD. Hence, its earliest layer of OE or Anglian place-names is more likely to be composed of what constitutes later names south of the Humber. In part, this is confirmed by the comparatively later occurrence of topographical names in the written records of Dumfriesshire or by their relatively remote geographical locations. The notable exceptions are Greenhill, Mosshope and Blacklaw in the parish of Moffat, which appear in the written records of 1315x21, an ‘early’ date by the standards of the county. Furthermore, the problem with many of the OE topographical place-names is that they could just as easily represent later, ME, formations. The second argument in favour of the lateness of topographical place-names, at least with regard to settlements, in Dumfriesshire is connected with Nicolaisen’s concept of ‘onomastic dialects’, as discussed in chapter 6. If the seventh and eighth centuries witnessed the formation of new, habitative, place-name types in Anglo-Saxon England, it was likely with this naming framework in mind that the Anglian lords or settlers in Dumfriesshire will have named their settlements. Of course, such an evolutionary argument will necessarily have to remain theoretical, given the dearth of source material.

Dumfriesshire contains only two early Anglian place-name elements which, with some certainty, may be attributed to the Bernician advances into Cumbrian territory: hām (‘village, homestead, estate’), as in Smallholm, and ingtūn (‘enclosure associated with a particular person or people’), as in Shearington. Another potential indicator of early Anglian


209 W. F. H. Nicolaisen, ‘Place-Name Maps – How Reliable Are They?’, in In the Beginning was the Name, ed. W. F. H. Nicolaisen (Lerwick, 2011), pp. 212 and 214; Margaret Gelling, Place-Names in the Landscape (London, 1984); B. E. Crawford, Scandinavian Scotland (Leicester, 1987).

210 See for example: Broomhill (Lochmaben) in HMC (Drml), p. 47 (no. 87) Brummel AD 1486; Cockethill (Lochmaben), RGS VII, p. 253 (no. 683) Cockhairthill AD 1612; Greenhill (Lochmaben), RPC Ser. I, Vol. V, p. 400 Grenehill AD 1597; Harthope (Moffat), HMC (Jhn), p. 14 (no. 12) Harthope AD 1519; Bonshaw (Annan), CPB I, p. 184 (no. 321) the Boneshawe AD 1585. For a broad survey of place-names in -hill, see Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 111-2.

211 Greenhill (Moffat), RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Greenhilotis AD 1315x21; Mosshope (Moffat), RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Moshope AD 1315x21; Blacklaw (Moffat), RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Blaclau AD 1315x21.

212 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 73-76; ‘Smallholm’ is another example for the necessity to examine the earliest written records possible, as the place-name does not contain the Scandinavian element.
naming activity is OE tūn (‘enclosure’), without the infix -ing-, but their earliness must be
decided on a case-by-case basis given that this element remained productive, that is, it was
used to form new place-names, for several centuries. Nevertheless, Fellows-Jensen allows
for the possibility that tūn names in Dumfriesshire represent pre-Norse settlement (before the
tenth century), a point of view with which Nicolaisen seems to agree. The scattered
distribution of the Anglian names in Dumfriesshire leads Nicolaisen to suggest that they
represent the influx of a thin Anglian ruling class, as opposed to full-scale settlement. The
validity of this argument depends on the unknown number of Anglian place-names which may
have been obscured by later linguistic strata.

Kenneth Jackson has argued that the Cumbric place-names of the Solway region may
hint at a strengthening of British polities in south-west Scotland, particularly the Kingdom of
Strathclyde, with the gradual decline of the Kingdom of Northumbria in the course of the ninth
century. Therefore, Brittonic or Cumbric place-names do not necessarily represent a pre-
Anglian settlement landscape, but may be the products of a tenth-century “re-Britticization of
Dumfriesshire”. This scenario would raise the problem that place-names of Cumbric or Old
Welsh origin in the Dumfriesshire area may be chronologically placed either before Anglian,
Scandinavian and Gaelic settlers arrived in the region, or afterwards, leaving a gap of at least
400 years of uncertainty. It should be noted, however, that Jackson’s theory of re-Britticization
has since been called into question, and Charles Phythian-Adams has instead proposed that the
place-names analysed by Jackson would support a view of Brittonic persistence, rather than
re-emergence. While some Brittonic place-names seem to have been superseded by later
linguistic strata, a full-scale displacement of the indigenous Brittonic-speaking population is
unlikely and the Brittonic influence can still be seen in references to Annandale as Estrahanent
in a charter of King David I of Scots.

---

holmr, but the OE hām: ‘Smalham’ s. a. 1302-4, CDS II, p. 426. For further discussion, see:
Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 5 and 7 as well as (on holmr in general) Fellows-Jensen,
Scandinavian Settlement Names, pp. 301-3.

Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 35-6.

Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, p. 79; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 68-9 and
73-5.

Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 77-8.

Rollason, Northumbria, pp. 211, 249-51; Oram, Lordship of Galloway, pp. 24-5; Jackson, ‘Britons in

Jackson, ‘Britons in Southern Scotland’, p. 86; cf. Andrew Breeze, ‘Brittonic Place-Names from
South-West Scotland. Part 6: Cummertrees, Beltrees, Trevercarcou’, TDGNHAS, Series III, Vol. 79
(2005), pp. 91-93.

Charles Phythian-Adams, Land of the Cumbrians. A Study in British Provincial Origins A.D. 400-

CD, p. 62 (no. 16) Estrahanent AD 1124x1129.
The tenth century also witnessed the arrival of Scandinavian settlers in what is now Dumfriesshire. Fellows-Jensen has argued that the Scandinavian settlements began in Dumfriesshire and Galloway between AD 880 and c. 920, based mainly on the point when Scandinavian incomers were likely to have ceased becoming a threat, and started peaceful colonisation. Most of the early Scandinavian place-names are likely to belong to the mid- or late tenth century. If, as Fellows-Jensen and Nicolaisen plausibly suggest, the Scandinavian settlers in eastern Dumfriesshire originated from the northern and north-eastern parts of the Danelaw, established formally in the second half of the ninth century, then the migration of settlers or landlords north-westwards may have taken more than a couple of decades. Furthermore, the low number of Brittonic place-names in an area which was possibly re-claimed by the Kingdom of Strathclyde in the tenth century could be an indicator that, if naming or re-naming of settlements followed in the wake of this political event, then the Scandinavian place-names were formed afterwards.

However, at least the early stratum of Scandinavian names may not be much younger than the eleventh century. Dumbretton, the ‘fort of the Britons’ north of Annan, may be a case in point: while its original Brittonic name (assuming that its modern form was coined in Gaelic) is not known, it may have survived as a strong, culturally or linguistically ‘Brittonic’ community long enough to receive its name from Gaelic-speakers, perhaps in the tenth or eleventh centuries. The fact that this place-name was not superseded by a Scandinavian stratum, as is likely for large parts of the parishes of Lochmaben and Annan, may suggest that Scandinavian place-names were mostly formed contemporaneously with Dumbretton, or indeed earlier, but not later. However, this argument is suggestive, rather than conclusive, and cannot be validated due to the lack of written evidence. Similarly, these proposed

---

Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, p. 80; Thomas Arnold, ed., *Symeonis monachi opera Omnia*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh, 1872), book II, chapter XII. Fellows-Jensen’s argument is not without problems. Her *terminus post quem* of 880 is based on an account of the translation of St Cuthbert’s relics to Whithorn, implying that Scandinavian influence and settlement had not reached that far yet. However, this argument seems to be based on the assumption that Scandinavian settlers and raiders in southern Scotland and northern England were a homogenous group. While the late ninth century certainly saw the establishment of a Scandinavian axis of influence between Dublin and York, the historical accounts also indicate that leaders of groups of ‘Vikings’ or Scandinavians had individual ambitions and interests: cf. Crawford, *Scandinavian Scotland*, pp. 50-62.
developments may have been restricted to the area around Dumbretton in the parish of Annan, or the coastal Solway plain, and may not be applicable further north in the parishes of Lochmaben and Moffat. Instances in which the specific of a place-name was exchanged in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, as may have happened with Lockerbie (see below), may be exceptions, or they may simply indicate that, while by names were not generally formed anew, the place-name generic was still distinctive enough to be modified with a different specific.226 Barrow maintains the possibility, however, that the change of the place-name, or parts of it, entailed the new foundation or re-location of the thus named estate centre.227

Scandinavian settlement activity in Dumfriesshire was primarily driven by settlers from the northern Danelaw. This has important implications for the relative chronology of settlement names and the interpretation of distribution maps of Scandinavian place-names due to the general direction of the migration. It should be acknowledged, however, that Scandinavian settlement in Scotland was not the undertaking of one homogenous group of ‘Viking’ incomers. The Scandinavian settlers came from Denmark or the Danelaw, as well as from Norway, possibly via the Northern or Western Isles.228 The main problem in distinguishing the settlement patterns of Danish and Norse incomers lie in the fact that they are linguistically very closely related, and it is often difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether a place-name in -by began as Danish by or Norwegian byr name.229 The Scandinavian topographical place-names in Dumfriesshire, which, much like their OE counterparts in Anglo-Saxon England, can denote an early settlement stage, are predominantly Danish in origin.230 While there are a few possible Norwegian exceptions, such as dalr (‘valley’), holmr (‘island’) and gill (‘cliff’, ‘ravine’), most topographical names resemble those in the Danelaw and less so the Norwegian names on the Western and Northern Isles. One example are Danish bekkr-names, originally referring to streams but later also to settlements in Dumfriesshire. However, it should be noted that these place-names could remain productive from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries.231 Given the strong evidence for the geographical and linguistic

231 Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 81-3; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 99-100. For a general background on these topographical names and their meaning, see Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names, pp. 76-7, 83-4, 86 and 301-3.
background of Scandinavian settlers in eastern Dumfriesshire, the distinction between Norse and Danish will not be made in the following discussion, except in cases where clear differences in the lexicon are evident. They will be collectively referred to as Old Norse, or ON.

The tenth-century date proposed for the Scandinavian settlement in Dumfriesshire is supported by the fact that most by (‘farm, town’) place-names in the Danelaw are dated to post-AD 900.\textsuperscript{232} While allowance should be made for the possibility that they remained productive into the twelfth century, they generally seem to mark the tenth-century Scandinavian take-over and splitting of old estates in the northern English context.\textsuperscript{233} This contrasts William Pearsall’s argument that by place-names represent ‘settlement from scratch’, occurring mostly on poor or marginal soils which were avoided by the Angles.\textsuperscript{234} In response to Pearsall’s claims, Fellows-Jensen suggests that partial or complete Scandinavian place-names in the area in question probably denote places which were taken over from the Anglian population, and that kirk places might be those settlements where they found a church upon arrival. Therefore, even seemingly new Scandinavian place-names might hide an older, Anglian settlement.\textsuperscript{235} This potential preservation of pre-existing Anglian structures could be the keyhole through which the Bernician landscape can be discerned. Since a high number of Anglian settlement names survive as twelfth-century parish names, these might have been retained by Scandinavian settlers.\textsuperscript{236} The high proportion of by place-names compounded with Norman names, such as Lockerbie (OFr ‘Locard’), Pearsby (OFr ‘Pierre’ or ME ‘Pier’) and potentially Gotterbie (ME ‘Godfrey’), may represent earlier settlements, perhaps even earlier by place-names, in which the name specific has been exchanged for the name of the new landlord.\textsuperscript{237} While this view is not without criticism, it remains a distinct possibility.\textsuperscript{238} Even without the problematic and potentially post-Scandinavian instances of by place-names including Albie, or Albierig, Canonbie, Mumbie, Sibbaldbie and Lockerbie, there is still a

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{235} Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Cumbria’, pp. 75-78.
\bibitem{236} Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, p. 79.
\bibitem{237} Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, pp. 175-179; Barrow, Anglo-Norman Era, pp. 36-40; HMC (Drml), p. 39 (no. 67) Locardebi AD 1194x1214; RGS III, p. 72 (no. 320) Perisby AD 1525; RGS II, p. 605 (no. 2844) Godfraby AD 1505.
\end{thebibliography}
heavy easterly bias of this type of place-name, particularly in comparison with the þveit names.239

The second frequently encountered Scandinavian place-name type in Dumfriesshire are þveit names (‘clearing’). Both in Dumfriesshire and in Cumbria these names predominantly occur in hill valleys.240 Compared to the other major Scandinavian name type in Dumfriesshire, by, the þveit names show a more westerly distribution (fig. 14). In the context of a Scandinavian migration movement from northern England into Dumfriesshire and farther west, the generally proposed chronology is that by place-names were formed earlier than þveit place-names, and that the latter indicate expansion of settlement activity into areas previously uninhabited.241 Given that by names were most likely formed in the tenth century, þveit names may reflect an eleventh-century development, although there will obviously have been exceptions to such a neat chronology.242 There is a certain possibility that þveit names remained productive after the eleventh century once they entered local dialects, as is evidenced in northern England.243 Thus, although Nicolaisen is unaware of any continued use of the term in southern Scotland, complete certainty cannot be gained from the evidence at hand.244 However, for the present purposes, this differentiation is not of major consequence. Ultimately, it can be argued that þveit names indicate areas of little or no previous settlement activity, and that they can help to better understand the landscape of the period before AD 1000.

A third influential place-name type which should be mentioned in a Scandinavian context are kirk place-names (‘church’). It is necessary to distinguish at least two types of kirk place-names: those in Germanic word-order (‘SPECIFIC + kirk’, such as Selkirk) and those in Celtic word-order (‘Kirk + SPECIFIC’, such as Kirkbride). The element kirk is commonly

239 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 112-3.
240 Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 86-7; Cf. Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 103. In Yorkshire, the evidence presented by Fellows-Jensen suggests that þveit place-names either refer to the reclamation of land by Scandinavian settlers, or, if a dialectal origin is suspected, that the names refer to newly assarted land in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries: Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, pp. 183-4. See also: Margaret Gelling and Ann Cole, The Landscape of Place-Names (Stamford, 2000), pp. 249-50: Etymologically, þveit is derived from a word denoting ‘something cut down’. It is therefore unlikely to have been applied to natural clearings.
241 Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 86-7; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 105; Rollason, Northumbria, p. 232.
242 Angus Winchester suggests that, at least in Cumbria, þveit names belong to the period between the tenth and twelfth centuries: Winchester, ‘Multiple Estate’, p. 95.
244 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 105.
associated with ON kirkja, but as northern ME and Scots dialects have adopted this element as kirk through Scandinavian influence, this place-name type may well have been productive beyond the initial waves of Scandinavian settlement. Sir William Craigie noted in the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue that many Scottish kirk place-names seem to have undergone a transition in the twelfth century from OE cirice ‘church’ to the Scandinavian-derived northern ME kirk, for example from Seleschirche, c. 1143x4, to Sellekirke, 1263. This pattern is also apparent in Galloway with regard to kirk names in Celtic word-order, and Daphne Brooke has made the argument that this ‘rebranding’ of church names was part of a development towards more systematic parish boundaries within the diocese of Glasgow, rather than evidence for the mixed linguistic background of the Gall-Gaidhil.

Most of the evidence upon which Craigie and Brooke build their hypothesis is non-existent for the parish of Annan, which is the only part of the study area containing kirk place-names, as much of the written evidence does not date back before the thirteenth century. Scandinavian settlement is considered to have been more extensive in Dumfriesshire than in Galloway or eastern parts of Scotland from which the evidence of the transition from OE cirice to northern ME kirk stems, and thus some kirk place-names in Dumfriesshire may have been original Scandinavian foundations. However, it should be noted that place-names in Cumbria, which in some regard may been seen as connected to Dumfriesshire through its extent of Scandinavian settlement, follow a similar pattern, for example in the case of Chirchebrid (c. 1163), to Kirkebride (c. 1185).

One obscure linguistic layer within Dumfriesshire place-names is the Gaelic evidence. Nicolaisen remarks that the “military and political events affecting the fortunes of the Scottish

---

246 DOST III, ‘kirk’, p. 439. Fellows-Jensen considers it a linguistic possibility that the kirk element in some place-names is derived from OE, but seeing that there are no kirk places in the Anglian dominated border counties, she supports a Scandinavian origin of kirk places in Dumfriesshire, cf. Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 89-92.
247 Brooke, ‘Kirk- Compound Place-Names’, pp. 61-2. The toponymic and linguistic landscape of Galloway is quite distinct from that of Dumfriesshire east of the river Nith. For further discussion, see: Cf. Watson, Celtic Place-Names, pp. 172-3; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 131-3; Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 80-1; Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Cumbria’, p. 72.
248 Cf. chapter 8.
south appear to leave little room for any major Gaelic influence until [the] complete breakdown of the kingdom of Strathclyde, or at least until the middle of the tenth century”. Yet, the distribution patterns of Gaelic place-names in Galloway and Dumfriesshire west of the river Nith call into question the notion that the fate of a language is tied to a political entity to the point whereby the decline of the one is immediately followed by the decline of the other. Nicolaisen proposes that, after the initial settlement of Gaelic-speaking Scots in Dal Riata in the late fifth century, a partial migration or expansion may have taken place into Galloway during the mid-eighth century. In his study, he identifies three Gaelic place-name types which are most instructive with regard to Gaelic settlement: *baile* (‘village’, ‘hamlet’, ‘town’, ‘home’, ‘farm’) and *achadh* (‘field’, originally attached only to field-names). The *baile*-names tend to refer to permanent types of settlement and hence indicate a “well-settled Gaelic-speaking population” in their area of influence. Nicolaisen and Fellows-Jensen argue that Gaelic settlement in the area west of the River Nith was extensive and long-lasting, chiefly because this region contains a great number of *baile* place-names. By contrast, Dumfriesshire to the east of the river Nith may only have experienced sporadic settlement attempts by Gaelic speakers. This may be indicated by *achadh* place-names, probably referring to field-systems and Gaelic ancillary activity rather than primary settlements. When comparing eastern Dumfriesshire with its western counterpart and the other western counties, there is a noticeable bias in distribution: *achadh*-names tend to occur further east. This fits with the distinction between Gaelic primary settlement into *baile* areas in the west and Gaelic secondary or sporadic settlement in *achadh* areas in the east. Gaelic place-names east of the river Nith, and in Annandale in particular, are therefore likely to belong to the ninth or tenth centuries at the earliest, and may have been productive, still or again, in the tenth or eleventh centuries with the decline of the British kingdom of Strathclyde and the influx of Gaelic-speaking settlers under King Duncan I of Scotia (d. 1040). However, the anglicised or otherwise altered forms of place-names such as Ericstane, Rivox and Corehead by the early fourteenth century seem to support Nicolaisen’s view that the decline of Gaelic’s importance as a naming element may have begun under the influence of the Anglo-Norman noble families in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and certainly by the middle or end of the seventeenth century.

---

spoken Gaelic was extinct in southern Scotland. Unless substantial numbers of Gaelic place-names were re-named by successive groups of settlers and landlords, Gaelic-speaking presence is unlikely to have been extensive at any stage of the history of Annandale. Although early medieval Gaelic place-names will likely have been formed by speakers of Old Irish, following the establishment of Dal Riata in the middle of the first millennium AD, it has generally been argued that the “forms of Gaelic as spoken in Ireland and Scotland remained substantially the same until the formative period of Gaelic dialects in the thirteenth and subsequent centuries”.

While the late tenth and eleventh centuries seem to be the period of early Scandinavian and, perhaps less substantial, Gaelic settlement in Dumfriesshire, the early twelfth century saw the increasing influx of a Norman or Anglo-Norman nobility under the patronage of Earl David, the later David I of Scotland. In Annandale, an essential role was played by the Brus family for patterns of lordship and landholding from the twelfth to the early fourteenth centuries. The first Robert de Brus came to Britain as follower of Henry I of England around the year 1100 AD. In a charter of 1103, Henry I confirmed a transaction whereby he exchanged a number of carucates of land with Robert Brus. There he succeeded in establishing a considerable holding in Cleveland and parts of Yorkshire before 1103. These estates and other lands received in northern England were soon expanded by Robert receiving Annandale in 1124 or around that date for his support of Earl David of Huntington and then King of

---

258 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Ayrikstan AD 1315x21; RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Revwaus AD 1315x21; RHM II, p. 31 (no. 41) corr AD c. 1320x1369: the Registrum Honoris de Morton does not specify the date for this charter and merely suggests that it was drawn up during the reign of David II. The charter mentions one Patrick Earl of Dunbar and of March. Since he grants land to William Lord of “kyncauylle”, which has been identified as Conicavel in Moray, the Patrick in question may be the eighth Earl of Dunbar, who married the daughter of Thomas Randolph, first Earl of Moray, around 1320. Since Patrick died in 1369, the charter’s dates may be given as c. 1320x1369: cf. Fiona Watson, ‘Dunbar, Patrick, eighth earl of Dunbar or of March, and earl of Moray (1285-1360)’, in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Volume 17 (Oxford, 2004), pp. 211-2; RGS II, p. 232 (no. 1138) Corehede AD 1473; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 121 and 123.

259 Roibeard Ó Maolalaigh, ‘Place-Names as a Resource for the Historical Linguist’, in The Uses of Place-Names, ed. Simon Taylor (Edinburgh, 1998), p. 12: Ó Maolalaigh points out that such a picture may be too simplistic in the light of recent historical linguistic research, but most of the potential differences between pre-twelfth-century Irish and Scottish Gaelic seem to affect grammar, rather than the lexicon, cf. ibid., pp. 14-7.


261 Blakely, Brus Family, pp. 8-9; RRAN II, pp. 32-3 (no. 648).

262 Blakely, Brus Family, p. 10.
Scotland. Robert I’s sons and grandsons very much continued his tradition of cross-border lordship, with varying degrees of success.

With the exception of place-names beginning in a continental Germanic or French personal name and ending in -by/-bie or -land, there is little evidence that the Anglo-Norman elite had a major linguistic impact on the settlement landscape of Dumfriesshire. Rather, the most recent linguistic strata in Dumfriesshire are less likely to have been affected by migrations of foreign cultural groups, and more by the successive developmental stages of the MSc, northern ME and Modern Scots dialects. This is also, incidentally, one of the most problematic layers: particularly Middle and Modern Scots have adopted such a large variety of ON, OE and Gaelic vocabulary that it is impossible to clearly distinguish between these linguistic layers, and hence to determine the formation period with any degree of precision. Northern ME forms can be expected to have developed from the twelfth into the fourteenth century, and then, until the sixteenth century, its successor dialect in southern Scotland is classified as MSc.

The place-name landscape of Dumfriesshire and the south-west may be one the most diverse linguistic tapestries in northern Britain. Various migratory movements by settlers or landlords of different linguistic groups as well as the waxing and waning of political entities have created a layered place-name pattern which can be dissected to establish relative chronologies, if not of the settlements themselves, then certainly of their naming. At the same time, it is clear that this multi-lingual landscape has, by the twelfth century, been superseded by dialects combining lexical items from several languages, such as Early and Middle Scots which contain Old English as well as Old Norse influences. The chronological picture is confused even further by cognates or related words between members of the Celtic and Germanic language families. In some cases, for example, it is just as likely that an originally Brittonic or Cumbric place-name was Gaelicised by Gaelic-speaking incomers as it is that the place-name was an original Gaelic formation. As a consequence, broad assumptions that Celtic place-names form the earliest linguistic strata and Germanic ones the latest can not be sustained. The following chapter will therefore provide a detailed name-by-name analysis to make sense of the place-name landscape of the three Dumfriesshire parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan.

263 Blakely, Brus Family, pp. 18-9 and 23-4.
264 Blakely, Brus Family, pp. 67-87.
265 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. v-vi.
8. Place-Name Survey

Any investigation into the early medieval settlement landscape of Dumfriesshire will eventually run into the problem of identifying the location and function of these early medieval settlements. Although eastern Dumfriesshire in particular has been subject to extensive and detailed surveys of the archaeological evidence, as well as a major excavation at the site of Hoddom, very few of the archaeological sites can be accurately dated, or in any way confidently associated with the early medieval period.\textsuperscript{266} In fact, most sites have not been excavated and only identified through field surveys or aerial photography and cropmarks. The dearth in written documentation for early medieval Dumfriesshire before the twelfth century and the nature of the available documents means that any reconstruction of settlements and settlement locations based on contemporary records is impossible.

Despite the discouraging context of this lack of written and datable archaeological evidence, place-names are one of the most extensive, though certainly not least problematic, sources. The general methodological benefits and problems of toponymic evidence have been outlined in chapters 6 and 7. The present chapter is designed as a detailed name-by-name survey of place-names within the three parish-based case studies of Dumfriesshire.

The present study is indebted to the place-name surveys by Edward Johnson-Ferguson (\textit{The Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, 1935) and May Williamson (\textit{The Non-Celtic Place-Names of the Scottish Border Counties}, 1942).\textsuperscript{267} Each of these surveys independently contain a number of inaccuracies or imperfections, but when assessed together they provide a very extensive and informative glimpse at the place-names of south-west Scotland. Williamson’s work is generally more accurate and reliable, but Johnson-Ferguson’s \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire} has the advantage of including place-names of Gaelic or Brittonic provenance, which is essential in tackling the existing heavy bias towards Germanic place-names in the written records. Any insights from Williamson’s and Johnson-Ferguson’s pioneering work were then compared with the more recent works by Alan James on the Brittonic place-names in northern Britain (2014), and Margaret Scott’s PhD thesis on Germanic place-name elements

\textsuperscript{266} See chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{267} Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}; Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}. A discussion of the place-names of the parish of Lochmaben will be published in the TDGNHAS. The findings contained in that article are identical to those presented here, but present a stronger focus on their relevance for the parish boundaries: cf. Christoph Otte, ‘The Place-Names of Lochmaben – Reconstructing the Settlement Landscape of Early Medieval Dumfriesshire, c. AD 600-1000’, TDGNHAS, (forthcoming).
in southern Scotland (2003). The interpretation of both single place-names and general distribution patterns of place-names has been aided by more general studies such as W. F. H. Nicolaisen’s Scottish Place-Names. Their Study and Significance (originally published in 1976), Gillian Fellows-Jensen’s Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West (1985) and W. J. Watson’s The History of the Celtic Place-Names of Scotland (originally published in 1926). It should be stressed here that while these works have been used as a guideline, as well as a resource for early spellings of different place-names, their conclusions regarding the interpretation of toponymic features have not been adopted uncritically. Where possible, attempts have been made to add to the corpus of early spellings, or to find alternative and perhaps more likely etymological explanations for different name forms. The author has some experience in English historical linguistics but it should be noted that he is not a trained linguist with specialisation in the early historical morphological and phonological developments of Gaelic, Brittonic and Old Norse or Old Danish.

The complexity of the place-name landscape of Dumfriesshire with its multitudes of linguistic layers has attracted a fair amount of scholarly interest, as indicated by the publications mentioned above. A fully systematic and comprehensive study of the toponymic patterns of the county has yet to be written and would be beneficial to the present settlement investigation. Unfortunately, this study provides neither the scope nor time to explore such patterns, and it is possible that a renewed evaluation of the place-names presented here will have a strong impact on our view of the early medieval settlement patterns of the county.

It is necessary to clarify the criteria based on which the place-names in the current study were selected. In order to ensure a systematic and non-arbitrary approach, place-names were only included if they appeared in the surveys mentioned above and were a) attested in the written documentation before AD 1700 or b) contained a place-name element which may be roughly dated based on the distribution of place-names with similar elements (such as bý or hām names). The cut-off date of AD 1700 has been chosen based on two arguments. First, the emergence of planned villages in the course of the eighteenth-century agricultural improvements may have confused or altered the place-name landscape in a manner which


269 Nicolaisen, Place-Names; Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names; Watson, Celtic Place-Names.

270 For some of the more complicated place-names, especially of Brittonic and Gaelic type, Dr. Alan James and Dr. Jake King were consulted, to whom I am very grateful for their enlightening and patient correspondence.
would distort its potential to shed light on the medieval, and possibly early medieval, situation.\textsuperscript{271} Secondly, while a focus on names appearing in medieval records pre-1500 would have been preferred, this approach has been dismissed as unrealistic since it would unnecessarily shrink the corpus of source material. The majority of the names in question will have appeared at least once in the written record by the end of the sixteenth or early seventeenth century. Since the focus of this thesis rests on the settlement patterns of early medieval Dumfriesshire, only those place-names have been chosen which either referred to settlements or farms themselves, or provided a valuable insight into nearby settlements, bounded units (cf. the discussion of Merebek in the parish of Annan) or land use (cf. the discussion of pveit names). In some cases, the earliest written documentation is unclear about whether a place-name referred to a landscape feature or to a settlement. Names ending in –gill or –hill, for example, might at first glance not go beyond the naming of a prominent ravine or hill, respectively. These names have still been included in the present survey when it was reasonable to suppose that they may have referred to settlements or farms (figs. 15-17).

As argued in chapter 6, place-names record the latest instance of naming or re-naming of a landscape feature or settlement. Thus, the linguistic stratum to which a settlement name belongs does not necessarily give insight into when, and by whom, the settlement was originally formed. In cases of uncertainty, the archaeological record discussed in chapter 2 is consulted to reach a conclusion about whether a settlement may have existed in the period of AD 600-1000. It is important to stress the desired outcome of this survey: the assumption is not that each place-name under investigation will represent a single village or farmstead, and that, consequently, the pattern of settlements which are dated to AD 600x1000 precisely reflect the degree of settlement distribution and density in the early medieval period. Rather, it is more likely that each early place-name represents a focal point of settlement around which smaller farmsteads and hamlets were clustered, similar perhaps to the appendicia which Barrow identified in his model of the shire, or the Domesday vill which would later become a parish.\textsuperscript{272} Of course, once all the early medieval settlement candidates have been selected, the question remains: were these settlements necessarily contemporaneous? The simple answer would be: we do not know. However, as outlined in the place-name discussion in chapters 6 and 7, and as will become clear during the analysis of chapter 11, there is a strong possibility


\textsuperscript{272} See chapter 4; Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, pp. 11, 49, 55; F. W. Maitland, Domesday Book and Beyond. Reprint (London, 1960), pp. 35-6.
that, although the place-names may reflect the influence of different cultural groups, the settlements they refer to may have been fairly stable ‘instances of settlement’, changing ownership, allegiance and perhaps even ethnic make-up while remaining in a framework dictated by landscape and neighbouring settlements.

The survey is structured in alphabetical order by place-name type. The place-name types are determined by their generic element, and by the occurrence of at least two place-names with that element in the study area, such as Crofthead and Corehead, or Granton and Newton. A substantial number of place-names within the three parishes discussed in this study are unique and have been grouped into the categories of Celtic (Brittonic, Gaelic) and Germanic (Old English, Old Norse, Middle English or Middle Scots). In each case, the parish where a place-name can be found, if known, is given in parentheses next to the place-name in question. Sites which are considered early medieval settlement foci based on their place-names or associated archaeology are depicted for convenience in figures 27 - 29.
8.1 Place-names in -bank(s)

The place-name generic bank(e) (pl. banks) ‘bank, ridge, shelf of ground’ is first attested in the ME linguistic period. A Scandinavian derivation from PrN *banki (ON bakki) is possible but unlikely in the cases described below.\(^{273}\) No OE forms of this generic are known, suggesting that these place-names were formed no earlier than the twelfth century.

**Archbank (Moffat)**

This place-name is attested in the written documentation from the sixteenth century as *Ershbank* or *Ersbank*.\(^{274}\) Johnson-Ferguson argues for the first element to be derived from the MSc adjective ersch(e) ‘Irish, Highland, Gaelic’.\(^{275}\) In combination with ME banke, this would give a rough translation as ‘Irish bank’ or ‘bank of the Irish’, whereby ‘Irish’ could also refer to Gaelic-speakers. Williamson suggests a possible derivation of the first element from OE ersc ‘park, warren’ or ‘ploughed land’, although she points out that this place-name element tends to only occur in southern England.\(^{276}\) However, such an interpretation fails to explain the combination of OE with ME elements, so that Johnson-Ferguson’s argumentation seems more plausible. MSc ersch(e) or erisch(e) is first recorded in the fourteenth century and might date the place-name to the late medieval or post-medieval period.\(^{277}\) While the linguistic evidence clearly suggests a naming date after AD 1000, Archbank is surrounded by a cluster of three late prehistoric settlements (fig. 18). This indicates that the area around Archbank, and perhaps Archbank itself, was an attractive location for early settlements. The site may therefore have been occupied in the early medieval period, and renamed at a later stage.

---


\(^{274}\) RGS III, p. 606 (no. 2633) *Ersbank* AD 1542; HMC (Jhn), p. 34 (no. 69) *Ershbank* AD 1592.

\(^{275}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 96.


\(^{277}\) DOST I ‘ersche’, p. 322.
**Dalebank (Annan)**

Dalebank, north of Annan, appears in fifteenth-century documents for the first time. It is also one of the few settlements mentioned on John Blaeu’s map of Annandale. Its name specific is probably derived from OE *dæl* or ON *dalr* ‘valley, natural hollow’, both of which can appear as ME *dale*. Linguistically, this place-name can be dated at the earliest to the ME period. There are no archaeological indicators to suggest an earlier period of settlement (fig. 25).

**Kirkbank (Annan/lost)**

*Kirkbank* is first recorded in writing in 1539. It appears as part of a boundary clause in the vicinity of Sand Pool: “incipien. ad lie Sandy-pule de Kirkbank, Beucherbek, et ascenden. ad sublimitatem de Holingbog”. Based on this description, it is conceivable that *Kirkbank* is identical with the small holding of Birbank (on maps after 1860s: Birkbank) depicted on modern 1:2500 OS maps about 350 m north-east of Sand Pool. Alternatively, Kirkbank may have been a site associated with the church of Brydekirk on the bank of the River Annan. If Kirkbank is accepted as the authoritative version, the first element would be derived from ME *chirche* or MSc *kirk* ‘church’. If, however, it was misspelled in the sixteenth-century record, the later forms *Birbank* and *Birkbank* suggest a derivation from MSc *birk* ‘birch’. Alternatively, it is possible that the two sites are not identical, and the sixteenth-century Kirkbank was located near Brydekirk. In either case, a formation of this place-name before 1100 seems unlikely on etymological grounds, given that the elements are ME or MSc derivations. A Scandinavian derivation from ON *kirka* or *birki* and PrN *banki* (ON *bakki*) is possible, but would be highly speculative given the spelling and late date of the written record. Given the uncertainties about this place-name’s location, and the lateness of its etymology, it is uncertain whether it represents an early medieval focal settlement.

---

278 HMC (Drnl), p. 43 (no. 80) Dalbank AD 1449x50, p. 47 (no. 87) Dalbank AD 1486x7, p. 47 (no. 90) Dalbank AD 1477; RGS III, p. 190 (no. 868) Dalebank AD 1529; Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 2.

279 Smout et al., Blaeu, map 10.

280 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 107; cf. IED ‘Dalr’, p. 95; BT ‘dæl’, p. 194; MED II ‘dåle’, p. 826.

281 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919) Kirkbank AD 1539.

282 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).

283 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 52; cf. MED II ‘chirche, also: kirk(e’, pp. 256f; DOST III ‘kirk’, pp. 439-40.

284 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 144-5; DOST I ‘birk’, pp. 262-3.

Marjoriebanks (Lochmaben)

The settlement of Marjoriebanks is attested in written documentation from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Johnson-Ferguson does not offer an interpretation of the name specific, while Williamson tentatively suggests that it may be derived from a feminine name. The generic, -banks, suggests a date after AD 1100, and the lack of archaeological evidence of early medieval or prehistoric settlement in this location raises doubts as to the significance of Marjoriebanks as an early medieval focal site (fig. 23).

8.2 Place-names in -beck

The place-name generic beck is most likely derived from ON bekkr ‘stream’, rather than its OE cognate bec ‘brook, stream’. The element has been adopted by ME dialects, making precise dating difficult. This type of place-name largely still refers to rivers or burns, although in some cases they signify a human settlement by a river. Wilhelm Nicolaisen suggests that, while beck place-names are a linguistic unifying element between Dumfriesshire and northern England, as a whole, names of this type seem to be older in southern Scotland than in England, and the possibility of it having been adopted by MSc, despite not being listed in the Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, has to be considered.

Bodesbeck (Moffat)

Bodesbeck is first recorded in writing in 1457 as Bodsbeck. Johnson-Ferguson suggests that the specific Bods- is derived from a personal name (although he does not specify the name) and that the generic is OE bec ‘a brook, beck’. Williamson proposes a derivation from ON

---

286 HMC (Drml), p. 47 (no. 87) Marioribank AD 1486x7; RGS III, p. 190 (no. 868) Marjoribank AD 1529.
287 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 89; Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 249; DOST IV, ‘Marjory’, p. 102: The term can refer to a female name, or the herb Marjoram.
288 BT ‘becc’, p. 74; IED ‘bekkr’, p. 57; MED I ‘bek’, p. 694; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 99f.
289 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 99-101.
290 HMC (Jhn), p. 11 (no. 5) Bodsbeck AD 1457, p. 18 (no. 23) Bodisbek AD 1535x43; RPC III, p. 386 Bodisbyeke AD 1581; RPC IV, p. 786 Bodisbeik AD 1590; RGS VIII, p. 300 (no. 826) Boidisbek AD 1625.
291 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 96.
bekkr ‘stream’ and interprets Bod- as possibly identical with ModSc bod ‘person of small size’, which she suggests could be meant in the sense of ‘a brownie or gnome’. The dating of this place-name depends to a large extent on the interpretation of the name specific, Bods or Bodis. Unfortunately, the evidence does not provide any certainty in this respect. As the fifteenth-century record refers to a person from that place, it is likely that the name referred to some sort of farm or settlement from its earliest mention onward. The linguistic situation notwithstanding, there is a late prehistoric settlement approximately 100m to the north of Bodesbeck, as well as a number of medieval or post-medieval buildings or possible shieling huts to the east along the Peatshiel Sike, which suggest that the site may have been in use from the early to later medieval period (fig. 22).

**Butcherbeck (Annan/lost)**

The 1862 OS County Map (1:2500) of the parish of Annan shows the farm or settlement of Butcherbeck on the southern bank of Butcherbeck Burn (NY 19542 70567). It appears first in a boundary clause of 1318x29 as Bochardbech. While the place-name generic is derived from either ON bekkr or its MSc or ME dialectal equivalent beck, the specific, Bochard-, is probably a Norman French personal name, which would date the name formation after 1100. Based on the place-name’s two pre-1700 appearances in the written record, it is unlikely that it was the site of major settlement activity and probably just referred to the natural boundary of the stream of this name. It is notable that when Butcherbeck appears as a farm on the 1860s OS map, the stream carries the redundant, or tautological, name of Butcherbeck Burn, a possible indicator that the stream had to be renamed in order to avoid confusion with the new farm of the same name. The course of Butcherbeck Burn is identical with part of the northern boundary of the parish of Annan, and it seems that the Butcher Beck was part of a medieval and post-medieval boundary (fig. 25).

---


294 HMC (Jhn), p. 11 (no. 5).


297 HMC (Drnl), p. 42 (no. 76); RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).

**Merebek (Annan)**

The burn of Muir Beck appears as *Merebek* in a boundary clause from 1539. Nicolaisen suggests that the name was probably created by English speakers rather than those who spoke Scandinavian languages. Originally, the place-name must have been formed from OE or ME *mer(e)* ‘pond, lake, pool’ or ‘wetland’, or OE *mǣre* and MSc *mere* ‘a boundary’. The latter meaning is especially likely, considering the situation of this river on the eastern boundary of the parish of Annan, as well as its function in the boundary clause of 1539: “abhinc pre mora de Grekane ad lie Merebek curren. in mare”. The full extent of the boundary clause mentions a number of place-names in the eastern part of the parish of Annan, hence the identification of *Merebek* with modern Muir Beck in the east parish, rather than Muirbeck on the west of Annan. From its context, it can be assumed that *Merebek* was not a farm or settlement, but solely referred to a stream. It is therefore not directly relevant to this study’s investigation into settlements, especially if Nicolaisen, as mentioned above, is correct to assume that the place-name was formed when *beck* had become dialectal in southern Scotland, which cannot have happened before AD 1000. Nevertheless, this charter and place-name are instructive: *Merebek*, is described as a boundary line, and the south-eastern parish boundaries of Annan coincide precisely with the run of modern Muir Beck (fig. 26). In the absence of pre-1800 maps of parish boundaries, this charter gives a small glimpse at the recognition of these boundaries in the sixteenth century.

8.3 Place-names in –by

Although the Scandinavian place-name element *bý* has been discussed at length in chapter 7, it should be briefly re-iterated that its meaning is generally translated as ‘farm, hamlet’, and that it mostly likely appeared in the Dumfriesshire landscape in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

299 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919) *Merebek* AD 1539.
300 Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 100.
302 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).
303 IED ‘bær, býr’, p. 92; cf. discussion in chapter 7.
Bomby (Annan)

Bomby (or Bombay) appears first in the written documentation from the late thirteenth century in connection with the personal name ‘John of Bondeby’.\(^{304}\) Even though the document is concerned with the sheriffdom of Dumfries, ‘John’ may be from a Bomby outside of Dumfriesshire. There are a number of references to ‘Bondeby’ or ‘Bondby’ for south-west Scotland, appearing throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but in most cases it is difficult to identify them with the place-name in the parish of Annan, or it is clear from the context that they refer to a Bomby in Kirkcudbrightshire.\(^{305}\) Despite these difficulties, the documents present a reasonable case that the place-name type of Bomby was relatively common in southern Scotland by 1500. Evidence of Bomby place-names in England, which appear in the written record of the eleventh century, as well as the element of \(bý\) suggest that this place-name belongs to an early phase of Scandinavian settlement activity in southern Scotland.\(^{306}\) The first element may be derived from the Scandinavian personal name \(Bóndi\), or from the Scandinavian noun \(bond\) ‘peasant or serf; bondman’.\(^{307}\) Bomby may therefore have been Bóndi’s farm, or a peasant farm, worked by serfs or bondmen.

From 1900 onward, the farm of Bomby in the parish of Annan appears on the OS maps as Blackhills. Neither the distribution pattern of late prehistoric settlements nor that of possible medieval or post-medieval farmsteads is dense enough in the parish of Annan to draw any inferences about the age of Bomby. The only possible indicators of early settlement in the vicinity of Bomby are the cropmarks of two enclosures at Woodhead (c. 1 km SE of Bomby) and Woodhead Cottage (c. 1.4 km SE of Bomby) to the south-east of Bomby in the parish of Dornock (fig. 26). However, given the general distribution pattern of other \(bý\) place-names, and the completely Scandinavian derivation of the name, it is likely that it may be of pre-date AD 1000.

---

\(^{304}\) CDS II, p. 216 (no. 824) Bondeby AD 1296.

\(^{305}\) RGS I, p. 567 (no. 834) Bonthby, Bomby AD 1341x46 or 1357x71, p. 592 (no. 1176) Bondby AD 1341x46 or 1357x71, p. 595 (no. 1221) Bowbey AD 1341x46 or 1357x71; RGS II, p. 662 (no. 3101) Bondby AD 1507; HMC (Drml), p. 15 (no. 14) Bomby AD 1526; RSS I, p. 1 (nos. 3 and 4) Bondby AD 1488.

\(^{306}\) Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 102-3 and 115; Watts et al., English Place-Names, p. 70.

\(^{307}\) Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 1; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 115; IED ‘bóndi’, p. 74.
Esbie (Lochmaben)

The farm or settlement of Esbie appears first in the written record in the twelfth century as *Aschebi*.

While the earliest spelling seems to suggest a derivation from OE *æsc* ‘ash-tree’, the thirteenth-century spellings are indicative of its ON cognate, *eski*, so that the place-name would in both cases mean ‘ash-grove village’. It is unclear whether the transition from twelfth-century *Asche-* to thirteenth-century *Esse-* represents a linguistic development, or whether *Asche-* is the result of the scribe’s linguistic background given the strong English influence on David I’s court. Both the *bý* element, the early documentary attestation and the compounding with another Scandinavian element suggest a naming date prior to AD 1000. Thus, despite the lack of any archaeological settlement evidence in its vicinity, this place-name may indicate the site of early medieval settlement (fig. 23).

Gotterbie (Lochmaben)

Gotterbie in its current form does not survive in the medieval or immediately post-medieval records. However, Fellows-Jensen argues that it is identical with *Godfraby*, a settlement mentioned in 1505.

The documentation suggests that *Godfraby* was close to the lands of Applegarth, which makes the identification of Gotterbie with *Godfraby* seem reasonable. The first naming element of Gotterbie probably derives from a personal name, such as the continental Germanic name *Godefrid* (*Godfrey* in its ME form). This interpretation would date the place-name, or at least the re-naming using the continental Germanic personal name, to the period after AD 1000 or 1100. However, both the possibility that ON *Guðfrøðr* was the personal name and that some early *bý* place-names were likely renamed in the twelfth century suggest that Gotterbie represents a tenth-century settlement. The archaeological record, on the other hand, does not provide insights into the early settlement activity around modern

---

308 CD, p. 60 (no. 15) *Aschebi* AD 1114x1124; DIHS II, p. 91 (no. CCCLXXXIV) *Esseby* AD 1296, and p. 394 (no. DLXXXII) *Esseby* AD 1299: The thirteenth-century occurrences of *Esseby* belong to personal names, while the only early spelling of the place-name when referring to the settlement is the twelfth-century *Aschebi*.


311 RGS II, p. 605 (no. 2844) *Godfraby* AD 1505.


Gotterbie, although the moated homestead on Gotterbie Moor may be related to Anglo-Norman lordship in this area (fig. 23).\(^{314}\)

**Milnby (Annan/lost)**

The farm or settlement of Milnby only survives on modern maps in the name of Milnby Burn (parish Annan). It first appears in the written record in the twelfth or thirteenth century as *Millebi*, and in the sixteenth century as *Howis-mylnbe*, probably a collective mention of the nearby settlement Howes and Milnby.\(^{315}\) The place-name is perhaps derived from ON *mylna* or OE *mylen* ‘mill’ and ON *by*, although the earliest surviving spelling, *Millebi*, may indicate an ME derivation (from ME *mille*) which, from the sixteenth century onward appears in the written documentation as Scots *miln*.\(^{316}\) The reference to a mill cannot be usefully employed as a *terminus post quem*, since archaeological evidence for watermills, at least in England, is attested already prior to the influx of Scandinavian settlers in the ninth and tenth centuries.\(^{317}\)

Although the location of the settlement is now lost, William Roy’s military survey locates it on the western bank of the River Annan, to the south of Blacketlees and just north of the stream which appears as Milnby Burn on modern maps. The remains of an earthwork or possible late prehistoric settlement approximately 370 m north-west of the purported location of Milnby may suggest that this site on the western bank of the River Annan witnessed settlement activity before AD 1000, although any further interpretations are rendered difficult by the lack of datable material associated with this earthwork (fig. 26). While the earliest spelling suggests a ME and, therefore, post-AD 1000 dating of the name formation, Milnby may represent settlement on the west bank of the River Annan before AD 1000. A possible scenario is the later inclusion of the specific, *Mille-*, into a previous *by* place-name, as suggested with regard to twelfth-century personal names in chapter 7. Such an interpretation would indicate a change in the function of this settlement, perhaps in the eleventh or twelfth centuries.

\(^{314}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 208.
\(^{315}\) HMC (Drml), p. 39 (no. 67) *Millebi* AD 1194x1214; RGS III, p. 590 (no. 2570) *Howis-mylnbe* AD 1542.
Newbie (Annan)

Newbie first appears in the written records in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries as *Neuby* and is well recorded in the sixteenth century. The original Newbie no longer exists. Instead, modern maps show Newbie Mains and Newbie Cottages, which presumably lie in close proximity to former Newbie. The place-name is composed of ON *nýr* or ME *neue* ‘new’ and ON *bý* ‘farm’. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine how ‘new’ this settlement was when it was named. The quality of the land around modern Newbie according to eighteenth-century estate plans suggests that it is unlikely that the settlement was formed on a previously uninhabited site. Similarly, there are two archaeological indicators of settlement or fortification, c. 1 km north of Newbie at Hayknowes Farm (fig. 26). Excavations at the possible settlement and defended settlement at Hayknowes suggest a probable dating of these settlements to the pre-Roman and Roman Iron Age, including different occupation phases. Neither settlement still presents visible features. They were discovered through aerial photography, which is common in the southern lowlands of Dumfriesshire and probably due to the intense land use in this area. Of all sites which appear in the medieval and post-medieval written record, Newbie is the closest farm to the late prehistoric settlements. It is possible that the pre-Roman or Roman settlements at Hayknowes Farm, and perhaps Hayknowes Farm itself, were the original site of Newbie. In this scenario, Newbie was further divided from that settlement during the Scandinavian period as the ‘new farm’ and located further south, although there is no evidence for this.

Alternatively, it may be that a substantial pre-Scandinavian settlement existed at or near modern Hayknowes, and that the formation of Newbie to the south later superseded that settlement in importance, which would account for both the appearance of Newbie in the thirteenth-century written records and the simultaneous absence of Hayknowes. In this scenario, then, Newbie may be a tenth century or later foundation which can still be representative of an earlier, Anglian or British settlement.

---

320 Cf. discussion in chapters 12 and 13.


Ouseby (Lochmaben/lost)\textsuperscript{322}

The place-name of Ouseby cannot be found on modern maps. It might have been deserted, or renamed, in the post-medieval period, but in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it still appears in the written records.\textsuperscript{323} The origin of the name’s first element is unclear. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a possible connection with Irish os ‘water’. Although Gaelic place-names in Dumfriesshire were not uncommon, preference is given to the interpretation of Fellows-Jensen and Williamson, both of whom argue that the element is derived from the Scandinavian personal name Ulfr.\textsuperscript{324} This would fit the pattern of bý place-names often carrying personal name elements, and the compound of these two Scandinavian elements suggest a name formation in the tenth century.\textsuperscript{325} Although Ouseby’s location is unknown, it becomes a matter of consequence, given that it may be dated roughly to the same time period as Esbie and Gotterbie. Unfortunately, there have been no archaeological discoveries which may easily be connected to Ouseby, and thus any attempt at localising it forces one to draw inferences from the written record.

One suggestion for its location, based on a charter from 1374x5, has been made in the report on eastern Dumfriesshire by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland.\textsuperscript{326} However, this study will provide a more detailed attempt at determining its original location before the desertion of the site. Ouseby is first mentioned in the Pipe Rolls of Edward I for Martinmas 1303, which lists a number of rent payments: the provostries of Dalton, Mouswald, Smallholm, Hightae and Rockell each pay several bushels of oatmeal, while 7 s. 6 d. are paid “from the farm of the demesne lands of Oseby; 5 s. from that of the grazing of Oseby; 4 l. 15 s. of the farm of the meadows of Oseby, by the hands of Sir John Botetourt”.\textsuperscript{327} Two observations can be made from this entry: Ouseby seems to fall into a different category from other paying units, as it is measured not in kind, but in money. Secondly, the lands and pertinences of Ouseby appear extensive, and it looks like it was a

\textsuperscript{322} The major part of the discussion of Ouseby and its location will also appear in Christoph Otte, ‘The Place-Names of Lochmaben – Reconstructing the Settlement Landscape of Early Medieval Dumfriesshire, c. AD 600-1000’, TDGNHAS, (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{323} CDS II, p. 426 (no. 1608) Oseby AD 1303; CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) Ouseby AD 1360, 28 (no. 127) Hwsbyfeld AD 1366, 50 (no. 223) Usby AD 1374x5; RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143) Usebyfeld AD 1429x30; RRS VI, p. 396 (no. 363) Ousby AD 1366.

\textsuperscript{324} Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names, p. 37; Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 286. The better recorded Ousby in Cumbria supports the etymology of Ulfr + bý, see: Watts et al., English Place-Names, p. 456.

\textsuperscript{325} Cf. discussion in chapter 7 and the place-name Warmanbie, below.

\textsuperscript{326} RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 205. For the charter, see: CDS IV, p. 50 (no. 223).

\textsuperscript{327} CDS II, p. 426 (no. 1608).
fully-fledged estate or part thereof, consisting of demesne lands with separate land units for meadows and grazing.

Another fourteenth-century charter, purportedly from 1360, regulates the temporary division of Annandale between “Sir Thomas de Roos”, warden of Lochmaben castle and Annandale for the Earl of Hereford and “Johan Steward of Dalswyndone”, warden of the West March of Scotland for the King of Scotland. According to this document, “all farms, ‘justiceries, courts’ and other issues” should be equally divided between the king and the earl for one year, except “the vills of Lochmaben, Hagtache, Smallham, Ouseby, and the park of Wodecokheir”, which should be reserved to the earl. This brings Ouseby in context not only with the centre of the parish and administrative unit, Lochmaben, but also with two of the Royal Four Towns which, according to the tradition, should already exist as a unit by this point. It is noticeable that Ouseby is mentioned in cases where Heck and Greenhill are not. Two more indentures from 1366 repeat this grouping, with each referring to “Hwsbyfeld” or “the field of Ousby”. Another document in the Register of the Great Seal of Scotland contains the following passage:

[The] forsaid lord has grantyt and giffin to the forsaid Michel, the keeping of hys Castell of Louchmabane for al the terme of hys lyf wyth this feis, that is to say iii of ponddis of gud and usuale mone of Scotland ilk theyr and the landis of Usebyfeld outakand the medowys to be the lordis awin, and alsua the forsayd Michel sal taik and raise up the malis of Heythathe and Smalhame and thai sal be acontyt and alowit in the some of iii lb. beforsaid.  

In a later confirmation of this document, the lands are listed in the following formula: “we haf gifin and grantit to the said Michel yherly to resayf tak up and joyse thir thynggis under vyrtyn; that is to say the fructis and the profittis of the kyrk of Dalgarnoch; […] Item, Hethach, Smallhame and Usbyfield […]”.

---

328 For more information regarding this arrangement between the Earl of Hereford and the Scottish king, see: Robert Gladstone, ‘The Early Annandale Charters and their Strange Resting Place’, TDGNHAS, Series III, Vol. 6 (1918-19), pp. 137-146.
329 CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47). This text is taken from the translation of Joseph Bain (editor of CDS IV).
330 CDS IV, p. 28 (no. 127), 28f (no. 128).
331 RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143).
332 RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143).
The passages above suggest that Ouseby was located very closely to Smallholm and Hightae. Doubt may be cast on this assumption because Ouseby is mentioned in the text next to the park of ‘Wodecokheir’. This park must have existed nearby today’s Woodcock Air, about one kilometre south-east of Hoddom Castle, but still within the boundaries of the parish of Annan. Therefore, it is comparatively distant from the parish of Lochmaben. However, these doubts may be alleviated because, in another instance, the latter document lists several geographically distant places and Ouseby is noted there in one geographical unit with Hightae and Smallholm: “Item, Hethach, Smalhame and Usbyfield”. It is noticeable with regard to the grouping of these three vills that Heck and Greenhill, belonging to the Royal Four Towns, are missing or replaced by Ouseby. Generally speaking, there are no mentions of Heck or Greenhill in the written record before AD 1500, and after AD 1500, Ouseby disappears from the written record. This may be merely an accident of documentary survival, but is nonetheless suggestive. Two theories could explain this: the settlement of Ouseby may have been renamed in the course of the late Middle Ages, sometime in the late fourteenth or fifteenth century, or Ouseby may have been deserted in that period. Given that both Heck and Greenhill only appear in the written record after Ouseby disappeared, it is at least plausible that either of those settlements became Ouseby’s successor.

A document from the reign of Edward III of England (c. 1374-75) provides a possible indication as to the landscape surrounding Ouseby. In a list of the services required to maintain and repair the castle at Lochmaben, it mentions: “mowing and carriage of 28 wagon loads of ‘thak et rede’ from the field of Usby to the castle”. This suggests that a mixture of materials, both reed and wheat straw, were used for thatching. Thus, the field of Ouseby must have been situated close to a water body. This, however, only underlines that it must have had its location in the eastern part of the parish, close to the lochs around Lochmaben or to the River Annan.

Another aspect which sheds light on the history of Ouseby is the fact that most documents after AD 1360 refer to Ouseby only as ‘Ousbyfield’ or the ‘field of Ouseby’. Is this an indicator that Ouseby was already deserted? A tentative chronology for Ouseby may be as follows:

---

333 CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47).
334 RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143).
335 CDS IV, p. 50 (no. 223).
follows: the settlement of Ouseby may have been founded during the Scandinavian immigration of the tenth century, potentially replacing an earlier Anglian or British settlement. Ouseby is first mentioned in a document from 1302x4, issued under the reign of Edward I of England, which is essentially a tax roll and portrays Ouseby as a substantial estate complex or part of such an estate. About ten years later, Robert I succeeds to the Scottish throne. This is presumably the time when the people of the Royal Four Towns receive their specific rights as part of a group which also comprises Smallholm and Hightae. The other two Royal Towns, Heck and Greenhill, are suspiciously absent in the record. Instead, Ouseby is grouped together with Smallholm and Hightae. After AD 1360, Ouseby tends to be mentioned only in the context of its pertinent fields. From an onomastic viewpoint, the ending –field often denotes a large, open and unenclosed area, which may refer to the meadows and grazing mentioned in the earliest document.\textsuperscript{337} One problem remains: why are Hightae and Smallholm mentioned as settlements, while Ouseby is only mentioned as field in the later records? Potential scenarios are the following:

1) Ouseby and Ousebyfield are identical settlements, and the –field element just refers to the main economic characteristic of this settlement.

2) The original settlement of Ouseby became deserted, but its pertinent fields were still treated with fiscal interest, either because a separate settlement emerged here, or because of commonalty rights or similar arrangements which meant that certain payments of the surrounding settlements were measured in the ‘unit’ of ‘Ousebyfield’.

The latter scenario is mirrored in the desertion of Baschebi in North Yorkshire. It appears in the Domesday record as being close to nearby Appleton. By the thirteenth century, Baschebi was entirely incorporated into Appleton. Yet, sources still refer to places as formerly associated with the lost village, similar to the references to ‘Ousebyfield’.\textsuperscript{338} Given the evidence, Ouseby’s precise location cannot be determined, but it may have been near, or even ‘under’, modern Heck or Greenhill (fig. 24).

**Warmanbie (Annan)**

Warmanbie first appears in the written record in the early thirteenth century as Weremundebi, and can afterwards be traced in several records throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth


\textsuperscript{338} Allerston, ‘English Village Development’, pp. 102-3.
centuries. Johnson-Ferguson derives the first element of the place-name from a personal name, *Vermund*, a suggestion that is shared by Williamson, giving the name as ON *Vermundr*. The combination of Scandinavian personal name with *bý* is reminiscent of place-names such as Ouseby and possibly Bomby and Gotterbie, as discussed. This place-name is therefore likely of tenth-century date, and indicative of early medieval settlement. There is no archaeological trace of early settlement activity in the vicinity of Warmanbie, but this is to be expected in an intensely farmed lowland landscape, as discussed in chapter 2 (fig. 25).

8.4 Place-names in *-gill*

The place-name generic *gill* refers to ‘a deep cleft or ravine’. ON *gil* can refer to early settlements in northern English areas of Scandinavian settlement, when compounded with a Scandinavian qualifier. In a southern Scottish context, the case may be similar; all place-names ending in *–gill* which Williamson lists in her survey of Dumfriesshire tend to appear in the eastern part of the county, predominantly east of the River Annan. This pattern is very close to that of *bý* place-names, although *gil* names can be found slightly farther north, which is expected considering their semantics (fig. 14). However, ON *gil* was adopted into MSc and ME as *gill* ‘rocky cleft or ravine, usually wooded and forming the course of a stream’ and could therefore be productive throughout the medieval period.

**Capplegill (Moffat)**

Capplegill first appears in the written record in the late fourteenth century. Johnson-Ferguson suggests it is derived from N *kapilla* ‘a chapel’, but this seems unlikely as ON names referring to ecclesiastical sites or foundations in Dumfriesshire would be formed with ON

---


344 RHM I, p. 106 (no. 136) *terras de Capilgill* AD reign of Robert II 1371x90, p. 115 (no. 142) *Capilgill* AD 1371x90; RGS VIII, p. 491 (no. 1459) *Capilgill* AD 1629.
According to Alan James, *capel* is the Gaelic form of a potential Brittonic or early Welsh predecessor, *cefel*, meaning ‘a work-horse or nag’. However, it seems to be a cognate of ON *kapall*, ME *capil* and MSc *capill*. Therefore, the potential dating range for this place-name is considerable and it is possible that Capplegill, at least as a place-name, was formed on either side of AD 1000. The archaeological record does not provide any clear evidence of early medieval occupation near Capplegill, but traces of a possible late prehistoric settlement c. 180m north of modern Capplegill, as well as a scooped prehistoric settlement c. 780m south of Capplegill suggest that this area on the western bank of Moffat Water attracted previous settlement activity (fig. 22).

**Middlegill (Moffat)**

Middlegill is first mentioned in the early fourteenth century. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a derivation of ON *methal* ‘middle’ for the first element, probably in order to bring it into line with the Scandinavian generic, *gil* ‘cleft, ravine’. While it is etymologically possible that this place-name was part of an earlier Scandinavian settlement formation, it is equally likely that it was formed during the ME or MSc linguistic period, from ME *middel* ‘middle’ and ME *gill*. Considering it appears in the records in 1315x21, it was possibly formed as early as the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. While the place-name does not necessarily pre-date AD 1000, archaeological evidence denotes this site was occupied before AD 1000. Approximately 500m to the south of Middlegill, the visible traces of a late prehistoric fort have been identified, and c. 170m to the north, a late prehistoric settlement is still visible. To the immediate west of modern Middlegill, the remains of a medieval or post-medieval farmstead with adjacent traces of rig-and-furrow cultivation indicate that this site was considered viable for occupation from the late prehistoric period into the medieval period (fig. 19). Taken together with the relatively early written evidence (compared to other place-names in Dumfriesshire), it may be suggested that Middlegill was in existence during the study period.

---

347 MED II ‘capel’, p. 43; DOST I ‘capill’, p. 433.
348 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Midilkeuille AD 1315x21; SCB, p. 192 (no. 203) Middelgill AD 1581; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) Middilikill AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) Middilikill AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) Middelgill AD 1629.
350 DOST IV ‘mid(d)il(l’, p. 250; MED VI ‘middel’, p. 428.
351 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34).
8.5 Place-names in -head/-heid

The generic -hede, -head or -heid can stem from OE hēafod, or its later derivations ME heved or MSc hede/heid ‘head’, meaning a ‘height, hill-top’ or ‘head of, upper extremity of a valley’. It is notable that the meaning of ‘hill-top’ is not evidenced in the place-names of Anglo-Saxon England, although the generic can refer to elevated places and projections in the landscape. In field names, it may point to the headland required for turning the plough, particularly the heavy plough.

Corehead (Moffat)

The farm of Corehead appears first in the written documentation as corr in the fourteenth century, and as Corehede in the fifteenth century. The modern name specific, Core-, may

---

353 Gelling and Cole, Landscape of Place-Names, p. 175.
354 Gelling and Cole, Landscape of Place-Names, p. 175; Lerche, Ploughing Implements, pp. 63-4 and 74-6. The requirement of a headland within the ploughed furlong has also been experienced personally by the author during horse-ploughing at Cuttlehill Farm, Fife. My gratitude goes to Dave Nelson and Pat and Clark for this opportunity.
355 RHM II, p. 31 (no. 41) [terras] de Grantton de Newton et del corr AD c. 1320x1369; RGS II, p. 232 (no. 1138) Corehede AD 1473; RGS III, p. 618 (no. 2677) Corhede AD 1542; HMC (Jhn), p. 22 (no. 31) Corhead AD 1569.
be derived from Gaelic *corr* ‘tapered, pointed; extremity, end’. Both elements, Core- and -head, describe the situation of modern Corehead accurately, as it is located at the head of a wide valley north of Ericstance. Their almost synonymous character may suggest that this place-name was created in two phases. In the first phase, the place-name was formed by Gaelic speakers at some point between the ninth and fourteenth centuries, as it still appears as *corr* in c. 1320x69. In a second phase, which may be dated from the fourteenth century to the time when Corehead first appears in its modern form, the ME or MSc generic hede was added to a place-name whose original Gaelic significance may have been vague or unknown to the local population. If this interpretation is correct, this place-name may provide an illustrative example of the changing of names in the landscape affected by the cultural impact of languages. Thus, the influence of the Gaelic-speaking landlords and settlers which Jackson saw filling the power-vacuum left by the collapsed kingdom of Strathclyde in the eleventh century may have started to wane by the mid-fourteenth century. There is a possibility that the Gaelic place-name was formed as early as the eighth century, but, as Nicolaisen remarks, the core of early Gaelic-speaking settlement was situated to the west of the River Nith. It is uncertain when the ME element was added, but the surviving documentary record suggests a date between c. 1369 and 1473. This two-phase process is probably similar to the case of the Clochmabanestane in the parish of Gretna, which contains both Gaelic cloch ‘rock, stone’ and the seemingly redundant MSc stane of the same meaning. As this study is particularly interested in the period before AD 1000, it seems that Corehead’s significance is tied to how early its Gaelic origins can be dated. Although the place-name evidence uncovered by Nicolaisen does not suggest any major permanent Gaelic settlement patterns in eastern Dumfriesshire, it is possible that Corehead was settled and named by Gaelic settlers as early as the ninth century. An early date would also be supported by the late prehistoric settlements near Corehead (fig. 20).

**Crofthead (Moffat)**

Crofthead does not appear in the written record before the late sixteenth century. In 1578, it first appears as *Croftheid*. Williamson translates this place-name as “Hill with a croft”, being

---

358 Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 130.
360 HMC (Jhn), p. 27 (no. 45) *Crofthead* AD 1578; RPC Ser. I, III, p. 386 *Crofthead* AD 1581.
a compound of OE or ME *croft* ‘piece of enclosed land’ and ME *heed* ‘height, hill-top’. While it is possible that *-heid* refers to an elevation, the evidence for Anglo-Saxon place-names discussed by Gelling and Cole suggests that it denotes the headland of a ploughed croft field. Both alternatives seem viable considering the geographical location of modern Crofthead (fig. 21; picture 3).

The dating for this place-name poses problems as both the generic and the specific could have been in use from the OE into the ME or MSc periods. If it referred to a headland, this would suggest that the place-name originally identified a field, rather than a farm, during a period when the heavy plough was more widely spread. The current view, proposed by scholars such as Debby Banham, Peter Fowler and Rosamond Faith, is that the heavy plough existed, but was not commonly used before AD 1000 in Britain, and its breakthrough may not have

---

happened until the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The late occurrence in the written record perhaps also indicates this. As a result, the place-name could have been created between the eleventh or twelfth and sixteenth centuries. Another interpretation would be that the name Crofthead simply reflected the elevated position of a farmstead at the head of agricultural lands. Although such a place-name would, etymologically-speaking, still belong to the period after AD 1000, it would suggest the existence of a farm to which these fields pertained, rather than simply being a field on which a later farm was established. The ‘true’ meaning of this place-name cannot be satisfactorily resolved, but the archaeological evidence of settlements to the north and south-west of Crofthead suggests that the area was settled during late prehistory, and perhaps into the early medieval or later period (fig. 21).

Garthheid (Annan/lost)

Garthheid is first recorded in 1612. The name specific seems to be ON garðr ‘enclosure’, or its ME or MSc form garth. The earliest spelling indicates that either the scribe was not familiar with the name of the place, or that various alternative names were in use: Hartheid (vel Garthheid). The alternative name seems to be derived from OE heorot/heort, or ON hjǫrtr ‘hart, stag’. The dating of Garthheid or Hartheid based on its etymology is challenged by the fact that all of its potential elements, garðr or hjǫrtr and heved also survive into the MSc dialect as garth, hart and hede. A further problem is its unknown location. The charter which first mentions it does not identify its location in relation to other settlements. The lack of garðr place-names in the early written records of the Danelaw suggest that they may have either formed relatively late during the Middle Ages, or often referred to minor settlements which bore too little significance to be recorded. Thus, it is possible that the place-name of Garthheid was formed after AD 1000 and that it was not applied to a site of previous settlement. Without knowledge of its location, however, the archaeological record cannot be used to confirm or disprove such a theory.

---

365 RGS VII, p. 253 (no. 683) Hartheid (vel Garthheid) AD 1612.
368 DOST III ‘hart, haírt’, p. 60; MED IV ‘hert’, p. 706.
369 RGS VII, p. 253 (no. 683).
8.6 Place-names in -hill

The topographical place-name generic *hill* can refer to features of the landscape as well as to settlements. The former is generally assumed to pre-date the latter, and Gelling and Cole suggest that the lack of place-names in OE *-hyll* in the written record before c. 730 means that they belong to a later stage of OE name formation.\(^{371}\) None of the *hill* place-names in the study area are attested before AD 1300, as seen below. The difficulty to date the etymology of these place-names lies in the persistence of the word *hill* in the later historical stages of OE, ME, MSc and ModE, and in the fact that it was productive as a place-name element in all of these periods.\(^{372}\)

**Broomhill (Lochmaben)**

Broomhill is confirmed in the written record from the fifteenth century onward.\(^{373}\) The settlement of Broomhill most likely derived its name from the prevalent vegetation in its vicinity, as in OE or ME *bróm* ‘broom shrub’.\(^{374}\) It is uncertain whether the place-name was formed before or after AD 1000. There is significant evidence of early occupation and settlements in the area surrounding the modern farms of Broomhill and Old Broomhill. This includes two enclosures, as seen on aerial photography, and the discovery of a burial cist with included cinerary urn (fig. 23).\(^{375}\) Unfortunately, the cist burial containing the cinerary urn has not been studied in much detail and has not yet been dated.\(^{376}\) Broadly speaking, cist burials with cinerary urns were a phenomenon which could range from c. 2500 BC to about 1500 BC.\(^{377}\) Thus, it can be assumed that some extent of settlement may have taken place in the

---


\(^{372}\) BT ‘*hyll*’, p. 581; MED IV ‘*hil(le*’, p. 177; DOST III ‘*hill*, *hyll*’, p. 131; Gelling, *Place-Names*, p. 169.

\(^{373}\) HMC (Drml), p. 47 (no. 87) Brumell AD 1486; HMC (Jhn), p. 22 (no. 31) Brumehill AD 1569, p. 49 (no. 122) Brumell AD 1589; CPB I, p. 181 (no. 311) Brommell AD 1585.

\(^{374}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 88; BT, ‘*bróm*’, p. 127; MED I ‘*bróm*’, p. 1196.

\(^{375}\) RCAHMS sites nos. NY08SE 26, NY08SE 45, NY08SE 46. See also: RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 301 and 359.

\(^{376}\) W. Jardine, ‘Journal of the Proceedings’, TDGNHAS, Ser. I, Vol. 6 (1871), pp. 7f. Longworth published an extensive list of discoveries associated with urns and cremation in 1984. A number of these finds are located near Dumfries and Lockerbie, but the find from Broomhill Farm is not listed. Although this does not grant any details on the site in question here, it nonetheless suggests that Broomhill was one of many sites in the area following the tradition of collared urn burials: I. H. Longworth, *Collared Urns of the Bronze Age in Great Britain and Ireland* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 295-7.

vicinity of Broomhill during the Bronze Age, but whether any settlement continued into the early medieval period cannot be confirmed. Broomhill may have been settled in the first millennium AD, but the evidence for this assumption is suggestive, rather than conclusive.

Cockethill (Lochmaben)

Cockethill first appears in the written record in the seventeenth century. Any doubts as to whether it referred to a settlement or farm may be alleviated by its mention as “terras de […] Cockhairthill” and its appearance alongside Hartwood and Little Dalton, which were settlements. The etymological background of Cock- is obscure. The earliest spellings of Cockethill are Cockhairthill and Cockarthill, and they appear in two different sources, about 13 years apart, so that it may be assumed that they reflect a generally accepted pronunciation of the place-name. No satisfying etymology could be proposed for this name so far. It may simply refer to local animals, composed of OE or ME coc ‘cock’ or ‘woodcock’, OE or ME heorot/heort ‘hart’ and OE hyll. However, this would be unusual, as it places two unrelated nouns next to each other. Alternatively, it could be a derivation from Scots cok-cairt ‘tip-cart’, although the connection to the topographical location is uncertain. A third possibility may be that Cockhairthill or Cockharthill represent corrupted versions of the surnames ‘Crockatt’ or ‘Crockett’, which appear in the written record from the late thirteenth century onward, and may, in Scotland, be themselves corrupted forms of the name MacRiocaird, ‘son of Rickard’.

None of these options seem conclusive and the onomastic analysis of this place-name remains difficult, given that the earliest known spellings date to the seventeenth century. Archaeologically, the area around the modern site of Cockethill yields no evidence of prior settlement. Given its location on the upland ridge in the south-west part of the parish, near Hartwood, it may be assumed that Cockethill was not settled before AD 1000, as this part of

---


‘Cok-cairt’, in DOST I, p. 575. My gratitude goes to Dr. Alan James for this suggestion and his help on the problem of ‘Cockethill’.

the parish would have been cleared at the time when the *pweit* name settlements were formed (fig. 24).

**Greenhill (Lochmaben)**

The study area contains two place-names called Greenhill. The Greenhill in the parish of Lochmaben was part of the Royal Four Towns of that parish, which also include Heck, Hightae and Smallholm. This ‘barony of Lochmaben’ was inhabited by people known as the ‘King’s kindly tenants’ which is unusual because the tenants of these four settlements claim a set of privileges purportedly going back to an unwritten agreement with the king (hence ‘Royal’) or the local castle’s garrison in the fourteenth century. References to the ‘King’s kindly tenants’, which caused a number of legal proceedings, can be found in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. If these traditions can be believed, all of these settlements can be dated back to at least the time of Robert I’s control of Lochmaben (1314-1329).

The Greenhill in the parish of Lochmaben first appears in the written record in 1597. The specific, Gre-, may be derived from OE, ME or MSc gréne. The name could therefore have been formed throughout several centuries, making a precise dating difficult, if not impossible. The hill in the place-name may have referred to the elevation near the modern farm of Greenhillhead, to the north of the village of Greenhill (fig. 24). The lack of medieval documentation about Greenhill, especially when referring to other settlements in the vicinity
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384 Anne Fairn, *Seven Centuries in the Royal Four Towns of Lochmaben* (Dumfries, 1998), pp. 8-10.
389 During my visit to the parish on 21st May 2015, a local man from Greenhill suggested that the original Greenhill may have been at the site of the farm of Greenhillhead. According to him, when the River Annan flooded a few years ago, the entire area was turned into marsh land, with Greenhillhead being the only prominent feature unaffected by the water.
of the Royal Four Towns, suggests no major settlement in the medieval, and perhaps early medieval, period.

**Greenhill (Moffat)**

The Greenhill in the parish of Moffat first appears in the written record in the early fourteenth century and is the earliest attested place-name in -hill in the study area.³⁹⁰ Although the first record is spelled Grenhilcotis, this was likely a scribal error, as all later instances of Greenhill and Coittis recognise them as separate entities. Similar to Greenhill in the parish of Lochmaben, this name seems to refer to the colour green and a hill or elevation in the landscape.³⁹¹ The *terminus ante quem* for the formation of the place-name Greenhill in the parish of Moffat is 1315, although a slightly earlier date is more likely as the place-name will probably not have appeared in a charter right after its formation. Therefore, Greenhill may have been settled or farmed as early as the thirteenth century. It is possible that it existed before AD 1000, but the lack of archaeological evidence for prehistoric or early medieval occupation of the site further complicates the issue of dating. The only archaeological record for Greenhill are a number of cairns and cairnfields, possibly associated with Bronze Age pastoral activity, although some clearance cairns may date as late as the fifteenth century AD (fig. 19).³⁹² However, it could be argued that the lack of archaeological evidence may be attributed to the specific character of Evandale, rather than the absence of any previous settlement. Given its modern location, and the comparatively early attestation in the written documentation, Greenhill may represent early medieval settlement on the eastern bank of Evan Water, although the name is likely formed after AD 1000.

### 8.7 Place-names in –hop(e)

The place-name element *hop(e)*, either derived from OE *hop* or ME *hop(e)*, refers to a ‘small enclosed valley’, often in remote places with difficult access.³⁹³ Especially in southern

³⁹⁰ RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) *Grenhilcotis* AD 1315x21; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) *Grenehill* AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) *Greinhill* AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) *Greinhill* AD 1629.
³⁹³ Gelling and Cole, *Landscape of Place-Names*, pp. 133-5. The Anglo-Saxon dictionary by Bosworth and Toller does not list a substantive *hop*, and Gelling and Cole note that the only OE
Scotland, where Anglian linguistic influence began only in the seventh century and likely remained fairly sporadic before the ME linguistic period (from c. AD 1100), the formation of place-names in -hop doubtfully occurred before AD 1000. Within the context of northern Dumfriesshire, it is possible that place-names in -hope were formed in the course of a colonising movement, indicating the marginal nature of the areas.

**Harthope (Moffat)**

Harthope first appears in the written record in 1519 as Harthope. This place-name is most likely derived from OE heorot ‘hart, stag’ or its ME or MSc cognate hart and OE or ME hop(e) ‘small enclosed valley’. The etymology suggests that this place-name may have been formed at any point in time between the seventh and fifteenth centuries, although a date between 1100 and 1500 is more likely. The reference to a ‘valley of stags’ may be indicative that this area was of interest to the Anglo-Norman elite as hunting grounds.

The archaeological traces of buildings and rig-and-furrow to the south-west of modern Harthope cannot be dated to the early medieval period with confidence, and may derive from the medieval or post-medieval periods. There are also traces of cairnfields, which may belong to the second millennium BC based on comparative data. Although no early medieval settlement remains can be identified, the area around Harthope was clearly of interest to prehistoric and medieval settlers, and it is likely that an early medieval settlement or farmstead existed here which was later renamed by speakers of ME (fig. 19).

**Mosshope (Moffat)**

Another place-name in OE or ME –hop(e), Mosshope first appears in the written record in the early fourteenth century as Meshope. The etymology of the first element must have seemed straight-forward to Johnson-Ferguson because he did not make the effort to explain it, and instead only pointed out the OE meaning of -hope. Indeed, the most likely interpretation is record of this word is from Beowulf. However, the adjective hópig ‘in hills and hollows’ is attested:


397 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) Meshope AD 1315x21; SCB, p. 192 (no. 203) Litell Mossope, Mossope AD 1581; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) Mossop AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) Mossop AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) Nathir Massope, Ovir Mossope AD 1629.

OE *mos*, or its northern ME cognate *mos* ‘a bog, marsh or moorland’. Mosshope therefore described a ‘valley with boggy ground’. Although the lack of archaeological sites surrounding Mosshope is a feature it shares with most settlements or farms in Evandale, it is unlikely this is due to no settlement activity taking place. It is not certain why Evandale presents such a different archaeological picture to Annandale and Moffatdale, but one possible explanation may be the heavy impact of afforestation upon visible monuments and on the ability of surveyors to spot sites of antiquity. The vicinity around Mosshope shows a cluster of cairnfields (fig. 19). Based on the few examples where cairnfields could be dated, they seem to point to agricultural or pastoral activity in the Bronze Age or earlier, dating to around the first half of the second millennium BC, with a few exceptions producing dates as late as the fifteenth century AD. It is likely that these cairnfields illustrate the bias of archaeological survival within Evandale, as they also survive to the south-west of Harthope, where equally little evidence of early settlements can be found. Similar to Harthope, Mosshope may be an early medieval settlement re-settled by ME-speaking incomers after AD 1100.

8.8 Place-names in –kirk

The place-name generic *kirk* has already been discussed in detail in chapter 7. It can be derived from ON *kirkja* (possibly via OE *cirice*), ME or MSc *kirk*, and was productive from the tenth century onward.

**Barnkirk (Annan/lost)**

The site now known as Barnkirk Point may be indicative of an earlier settlement now lost. Barnkirk appears in the written records from the sixteenth century onwards. Johnson-Ferguson suggests the name is derived from Gaelic *barr na circe* ‘hilltop of the hen or grouse’, but the early spellings do not corroborate such a translation. Williamson interprets the name,
based on its earliest spellings Barmenkirke or Barmkirk, as derived from either MSc barmkin ‘battlement, wall of defence’ or Barnie, the abbreviated form of the personal name Barnabas, and ON kirkja, ME kirke or MSc kirk.\footnote{Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, pp. 52f; DOST I ‘barmkin’, p. 190.}\footnote{Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, p. 179.} While the idea of a defended kirk site seems likely, either because of the proximity to the sea or the Anglo-Scottish border warfare and raiding, there is no traceable evidence of this site anymore. As discussed above, there is a possibility that the ending in –kirk may point to Scandinavian origin, but the first element, if correctly identified as derived from MSc barmkin, would not date this place-name before c. AD 1400. An alternative interpretation may be that the first element refers to the Scandinavian personal names Barn, Barni, Bjorn or Bjarne, or indeed to ON barn ‘child’, but it is uncertain what the place-name would have meant in this context.\footnote{CPL I, p. 54 Bridekirke AD 1218; RGS II, p. 682 (no. 3194) Bridechapell AD 1508; RGS III, p. 26 (no. 124) Brydis-chapell AD 1517, p. 190 (no. 868) Bridkirk AD 1529; RPC IV, p. 786 Brydekirk-Carlile AD 1590; Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 1.}\footnote{Nicolaisen, \textit{Place-Names}, pp. 108-9; Fellows-Jensen, \textit{Scandinavian Settlement Names}, p. 53.}

\textbf{Brydekirk (Annan)}

Brydekirk appears for the first time on the record in the thirteenth century as Bridekirke.\footnote{Brooke, ‘Kirk- Compound Place-Names’, pp. 61-2. Richard Oram supports Brooke’s argument, cf. Oram, ‘Scandinavian Settlement’, pp. 131-3.}\footnote{Crowe, ‘Excavation at Brydekirk, Annan. 1982-1984’, TDGNHAS, Ser. III, Vol. 59 (1984), p. 33.} Although some earlier spellings show –chapell instead of –kirk, this is most likely due to the scribes’ preference of translating the name, whereas other references to Bridkirk or Brydekirk-Carlile in 1529 and 1590 are kept in the vernacular. The place-name contains ON kirkja ‘church’ in a non-inverted compound (Germanic word-order) with a reference to St. Brigid.\footnote{Christopher Crowe, ‘Excavation at Brydekirk, Annan. 1982-1984’, TDGNHAS, Ser. III, Vol. 59 (1984), p. 33.}\footnote{Crowe, ‘Brydekirk’, pp. 39-40.} While scholars such as Daphne Brooke and Richard Oram have suggested a post-AD 1000 formation for many kirk-compounds in Galloway, the Germanic word-order of Brydekirk, along with its strong Scandinavian place-name context in the parish of Annan, may suggest an earlier date.\footnote{Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, pp. 52f; DOST I ‘barmkin’, p. 190.}\footnote{Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, p. 179.} It is possible that the site derives its name from an earlier church dedicated to St. Brigid which the Scandinavian incomers encountered upon arrival.\footnote{Nicolaisen, \textit{Place-Names}, pp. 108-9; Fellows-Jensen, \textit{Scandinavian Settlement Names}, p. 53.} The reference to the early Irish saint and the Scandinavian generic kirkja make an early medieval date around the tenth century plausible. Excavations at the site have revealed indicators of twelfth- to sixteenth-century occupation, and earlier settlement activity must remain hypothetical and rely on the interpretation of the place-name (fig. 25).\footnote{CPL I, p. 54 Bridekirke AD 1218; RGS II, p. 682 (no. 3194) Bridechapell AD 1508; RGS III, p. 26 (no. 124) Brydis-chapell AD 1517, p. 190 (no. 868) Bridkirk AD 1529; RPC IV, p. 786 Brydekirk-Carlile AD 1590; Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 1.} However, if the Scandinavian settlers re-
named a previous site, the settlement may have been formed between the seventh and eleventh centuries, that is, after the possible introduction of the cult of St. Brigid through Gaelic settlers in the sixth century and before the name may have made its transition to -kirk.\textsuperscript{412}

8.9 Place-names in –land(s)

The OE or ME place-name generic land may refer to a patch of soil, ground or an estate, or could have the meaning of ‘new arable land’ in the context of early and central medieval expansion of arable land.\textsuperscript{413}

**Frenchland (Moffat)**

Frenchland first appears in the written record in 1543 as *Franchland*.\textsuperscript{414} In the present case, it probably denotes an estate granted to and belonging to the family of Franche, which held land from the Bruces in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{415} It seems unlikely that these lands contained a significant settlement prior to the grant given to the Franche family. If any previous settlement activity took place, its place-name seems to have been easily overruled by the association of the land to the new tenants. Secondly, if the place-name element land could really refer to ‘new arable land’, it is likely that the new tenants, holding the land for the Bruces, were engaged in expanding or clearing the area for cultivation.

While the place-name clearly refers to settlement activity after AD 1100, namely the distribution of land to Norman or Anglo-Norman landholders, the extant charters describing the transactions between the Brus and William Franciscus families do not indicate that this land had to be cleared or assarted. Instead, it seems to have been settled extensively during the late prehistoric period, with at least three possible late prehistoric settlements remaining to its east (fig. 18). Thus, early medieval settlement activity is possible in this area.

\textsuperscript{412} Regarding the influx of Gaelic-speakers before and around AD 800, see Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{414} HMC (Jhn), p. 18 (no. 23) *Adam Franche of Franchland* AD 1543; RPC Ser. I, IV, p. 786 *Frenscheland* AD 1590.
\textsuperscript{415} Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 98; CDS I, p. 124 (no. 705) c. AD 1218; Black, *Surnames*, pp. 279-80.
**Glaisteriskingland (possibly Moffat/lost)**

*Glaisteriskingland* (lost) is first recorded in the early seventeenth century. Johnson-Ferguson suggests an etymology of Gaelic *glas* ‘green’ and Gaelic *tir* ‘land’. Alan James considers a similar derivation possible for the place-name of Glaisterlands in Ayrshire, although the elements may not necessarily be Gaelic, but Brittonic. It may be that the area was originally given a Gaelic name referring to ‘green land’ and that this place-name was adopted by local Scots speakers. By the sixteenth century it would have been established enough to be compounded with *−kingland*. However, one would expect *−king* to be in the genitive case, as is the case for *Kingsfeild or Kingislandis* in the county of Peebleshire, or *Kinges-medow* in Midlothian. No fully satisfactory etymology of *Glaisteriskingland* can be found, and the place-name remains puzzling. In addition, its location cannot be identified. In the written documentation it appears in the same context as *Coittis* (location also unknown, see below), and it can be argued that the settlement or farm was situated in the centre or western part of the parish of Moffat, perhaps slightly outside the parish boundaries. With the exception of Johnson-Ferguson’s Gaelic interpretation, the etymological evidence suggests the formation of the place-name after AD 1000. The ending in *−land* may indicate that no major previous settlement activity took place, but similar to Frenchland, the archaeological record could theoretically put such a proposition into perspective. Until the location of *Glaisteriskingland* is identified, this will, however, remain impossible.

**Gullielands (Annan)**

Gullielands is recorded from the sixteenth century onward. Johnson-Ferguson derives the name, for which the earliest spellings are *Guldlandis* and *Guildelandis*, from OE *gylden* ‘golden’. While this is possible, it is more likely derived from ME *gölde* or *goulde* or MSc *guld* or *guild(e)* ‘marigold’. Thus, Gullielands may be a portion of land or an estate parcel with strong marigold vegetation. This may be instructive for later purposes of land assessment,
depending on which type of marigold is mentioned. Common Marigold or Field Marigold (\textit{calendula officinalis} and \textit{calendula arvensis}) are commonly found on disturbed soils, such as cultivated lands.\textsuperscript{424} However, according to the \textit{Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue}, MSc \textit{guld} tends to signify Corn Marigold (\textit{chrysanthemum segetum}), an annual weed thriving on acidic and neutral soils in climate zones with cool and moist summers. It was widespread on sandy soils before the introduction of herbicides and its impact on local agriculture may have been significant enough in the later medieval period to warrant the formation of this place-name.\textsuperscript{425} It may therefore have been unproductive arable land. In fact, the land capability maps reconstructed from eighteenth-century estate plans discussed in chapter 10 indicate a pocket of pastoral land in otherwise arable lands around Gullielands (fig. 36).

**Henniland (Moffat/lost)**

\textit{Henniland} (lost) only appears in one entry before 1700. A charter from 1625 records the transaction of the “\textit{terras de Boidisbek et Henniland in parochia de Moffet}”\textsuperscript{426}. Johnson-Ferguson interprets the name specific \textit{Henni-} as a personal name, although he does not provide more detail about the original form of the name.\textsuperscript{427} It is possible that the place-name refers to the land held by William de Henevile or a member of his family, who received land in the vill of Moffat in c. 1218.\textsuperscript{428} Similar to \textit{Glaisteriskingland}, \textit{Henniland} cannot be identified on modern OS maps or even on the eighteenth-century maps and estate plans. Moreover, the context in which \textit{Henniland} appears in the charter does not aid in the process of localisation. Its conspicuous absence from the written record up to the early seventeenth century may suggest that it was either a minor farm, or uninhabited land until the post-medieval period. There is no archaeological record in the vicinity of Bodesbeck which assists to date this site, and the place-name, along with the settlement or farm, seems to have formed after AD 1000.

**Templand (Lochmaben)**

Templand is situated in the north of the parish of Lochmaben and cannot be found in the medieval written documentation. Yet, the naming elements \textit{Temp-} and \textit{-land}, indicate it

\textsuperscript{425} Huxley et al., \textit{Dictionary of Gardening}, p. 611.
\textsuperscript{426} RGS VIII, p. 300 (no. 826) Henniland AD 1625.
\textsuperscript{427} Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{428} CDS I, p. 124 (no. 706) c. AD 1218.
belonged to the Knights Templar. The order of the Knights Templar was founded in AD 1118, and was likely introduced to Scotland under David I. The early twelfth century may therefore be regarded as a very broad *terminus post quem* for the naming of Temland. After the proceedings against the order in 1307-8, many Scottish lands of the Knights Templar passed to the Knights Hospitaller. Whether the settlement of Temland pre-dates its name depends largely on two issues. The first is concerned with the role of the Knights Templar in holding the land. It seems unlikely that the order received the lands in order to clear or improve them. Rather, much like in other parts of Scotland and England, the Knights Templar received lands and estates for their support, financial or otherwise. Secondly, the potentially prehistoric defended settlement which can be found in the near vicinity of the current village of Temland complicates any interpretation (fig. 23). Although it is clear that previous settlement activity occurred in this area, there is no evidence which helps to date this site and it may be too old to indicate any continuous settlement between the prehistoric period and the twelfth century. It is at least possible that the area around Temland was settled, under a different name, before AD 1000.

8.10 Place-names in -shaw

The generic *-s(c)haw* may be derived from OE *sc(e)aga* or ME and MSc *s(c)haw* ‘small wood, thicket, copse’. In England, the element seems to have referred to woods of small size from the late OE into the ME linguistic periods, and some boundary clauses dating from those periods to well after 1500 suggest that these woods were often ‘strips of wood’, forming the border of a field. This is borne out by the evidence in the parish of Annan, where the three place-names in -shaw are located along the parish boundaries (figs. 17 and 25).

---

429 This is suggested by both Williamson and Johnson-Ferguson: Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 197; Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 90.
Bonshaw (Annan)

Bonshaw or Bonshaw Tower is first mentioned in the sixteenth century. Based on the evidence, it is not entirely clear whether this site can be considered a site of settlement. The written record suggests it was a defensive location or the location of a tower house, but not a farm or settlement. Its generic element is OE sceaga or ME schaw. The origin of the first element, Bon-, is less clear. Johnson-Ferguson argues that it is ON bōndi ‘peasant’, while Williamson proposes two options: Gaelic bun ‘bottom’ or OE bune ‘a reed’. Given Bonshaw Tower’s location along the run of Kirtle Water, the OE interpretation of ‘small reed wood’ fits the landscape, without having to account for the mixture of ON or Gaelic and English words. Given that OE bune survives in ME bune ‘reed’, it is likely that the place-name was formed after AD 1000 or 1100, and that the strip of woodland or copse it referred to later gave its name to the estate centre or tower house of Bonshaw. The lack of archaeological evidence supports such an interpretation, although the record in the parish of Annan provides little detail (fig. 25).

Mellingshaw (Moffat)

Mellingshaw is first recorded in writing in the early sixteenth century as Madingschaw. All later spellings are closer to the modern form, such as Malingschaw and Maillingschaw. Johnson-Ferguson interprets this place-name as a combination of the Norman personal name Melville, which may have been confused with the name Melvin, and OE sc(e)aga ‘small woodland’. Williamson agrees with the derivation of –schaw, which can also be derived from ME and MSc s(c)haw. However, she suggests that the first element is MSc or ModSc

436 CPB I, p. 184 (no. 321) the Boneshawe AD 1585, p. 187 (no. 327) house of Bonshawe AD 1585, p. 225 (no. 425) howse of Bonshawe AD 1586; CSP I, p. 191 (no. 396) Bonsheawe AD 1552x3; HP II, p. 456 (no. 318) Boonshaw AD 1544; RGS VII, p. 254 (no. 683) Bonschaw AD 1612.
437 The exception here may be the relatively late entry of 1612, in which Bonshaw is part of an extensive land grant, but this may only refer to estate lands associated with the tower house: cf. RGS VII, p. 254 (no. 683) Bonschaw AD 1612.
439 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 1; Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 210. GD ‘bun’, p. 141. Williamson actually translates OE bune as ‘a weed’, but it is likely that this was a spelling error.
440 MED I ‘bune’, p. 1219.
442 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 99.
maling or mailing ‘rented land or a tenant-farm’. This interpretation is more likely than the personal name, and Mellingshaw seems to have been a farm or perhaps farmed land assessed in merkland, since the earliest records in the sixteenth century. The etymology may refer to a piece of rented farm-land by a small woodland. Nothing remains of Mellingshaw except for the ruins of a sixteenth-century tower house within Greskine Forest in the western part of Moffat parish (fig. 19). The findings of the RCAHMS suggest that Mellingshaw may have been a late medieval estate centre. In addition to this, the traces of rig-and-furrow cultivation in its vicinity suggest arable land use in the fifteenth century, and possibly earlier. It is unlikely in etymological terms that Mellingshaw was settled much earlier than the MSc linguistic period beginning around AD 1400, as the term of maling or mailing is not attested before then. Since Mellingshaw first appears in the written record in 1508, and given the meaning of -shaw, it is likely that Evandale had very little woodland cover, certainly compared with modern Greskine Forest.

Raggetshaws (Annan)

Modern Raggetshaws first appears in the written record in 1539. According to Johnson-Ferguson, its first element is OE rēge ‘a wild she-goat’. The OE term can also refer to a doe. While not impossible, Johnson-Ferguson’s interpretation does not align well with the historical spelling. One would expect the genitive, rēgan, to form the place-name *rēgan sceaga ‘small copse of the wild she-goat’. If the earliest spelling, Raggilschawis, is to be trusted (rather than it being an erroneous version of *Raggitschawis), then the first element may be derived from the MSc or northern ME regyll ‘a groove in wood or stone’. However, this term seems to be primarily used in MSc with regard to the joining of roof constructions, and is not attested as a place-name element. A third option would be a derivation from ME adjective ragged ‘rough or irregular in form’. This is perhaps the most plausible derivation in terms of historical spelling and semantics, and the place-name may have referred to the

---

443 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 11 and 210; DOST IV ‘maling, mail(l)ing’, p. 55.
444 RSS I, p. 269 (no. 1778).
446 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 209.
447 RCAHMS site no. NT00NW 1.
448 DOST IV ‘maling, mail(l)ing’, p. 55.
449 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919) Raggilschawis AD 1539.
450 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 3; BT ‘rēge’, p. 784.
451 BT ‘rēge’, p. 784.
452 DOST VII ‘rag(g)al(l’, p. 42.
precursor of the little piece of woodland to its south-east. From the context of its first written
appearance, it seems that Raggetshaws was a small forest, rather than a farm or settlement, in
1539, and it is unlikely that it represents an early medieval settlement (fig. 25).

**Turnshaw (Annan)**

The place-name of Turnshaw appears in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century records, and is
spelled identically to the modern form. Similar to the previous place-names in -shaw, there
is doubt as to whether it describes a site of early medieval settlement. Johnson-Ferguson
identifies the first element as originating from the personal name Thurwine. Based on the
earliest spellings, this seems unlikely. Williamson proposes a derivation from ME or ModE
*turn*, referring to the turn or bend in the River Annan near this site, which is a likely scenario. Alternatively, the place-name may be derived from OE *pyrne* ‘thorn’, as in the case of
Turnworth in Dorset. Much like Bonshaw, Turnshaw may have been a prominent landmark
- even a boundary marker - which attracted settlement and farming activity only in the later
medieval or post-medieval period in the form of modern Turnshawhead farm (fig. 25).

**8.11 Place-names in -side**

The place-name generic *side* is derived from OE or ME *sīde* ‘lying by a hillside or by a
river’. According to Gelling and Cole, the place-name element *sīde* may be assigned to the
late OE or ME period.

**Breconside (Moffat)**

Breconside only appears in post-medieval written records. It is mentioned for the first time in
1550 when it is occupied by a branch of the Johnstone family. Another document dating to

---

454 HMC (Jhn), p. 32 (no. 61) Turnshaw AD 1587; Smout et al., Blaeu, map 10.
455 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 3.
456 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 213; MED XIII ‘turn’, pp. 1161-3.
458 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 142 and 306; Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of
Dumfriesshire, p. 99; Gelling and Cole, Landscape of Place-Names, p. 219; BT ‘side’, pp. 870-1;
459 Gelling and Cole, Landscape of Place-Names, p. 219.
77: Carruthers and Reid do not actually quote the relevant document, but 40 years later, in 1590, one
c. 1552x3 mentions “John Maxwell of Brakensyd”.\textsuperscript{461} This may refer to the Breconside in the parish of Moffat, but it is more likely identified with Breckonside in the parish of Glencairn in the west of Dumfriesshire.\textsuperscript{462} It is likely that the \textit{sīde} element refers to the position of the farm on the hillside of Breconside Hill. The first element is derived from ME \textit{braken} ‘bracken’.\textsuperscript{463} No OE equivalents of this term can be found in the OED or the dictionary by Bosworth and Toller. Therefore, this place-name was formed no earlier than c. AD 1100. However, the traces of two late prehistoric settlements to the north and south, each c. 550m from the modern Breconside, suggest that this was an area of some settlement activity during the Iron Age (fig. 21) and Breconside may have been the later name of an early medieval settlement in that area.

\textbf{Meikleholmside (Moffat)}

Meikleholmside first appears in writing in the fourteenth century as \textit{Mikylholmesyde}.\textsuperscript{464} The place-name is derived from ON \textit{mikill} ‘big’, ON \textit{holmr} ‘low lying land by a river’ and OE or ME \textit{sīde} ‘lying by a hillside or by a river’.\textsuperscript{465} All of these features adequately describe the topography around modern Meikleholmside, beside the River Annan. It is possible that the Scandinavian elements, \textit{mikill} and \textit{holmr}, formed the place-name *\textit{Meikleholm} in the earlier phase of Scandinavian settlement during the tenth century, and that ME –\textit{sīde} was added at a later point before c. AD 1300. However, both \textit{mekil} and \textit{holm} are also common in the MSc dialect, and may have been so in the early Scots linguistic period before c. 1450.\textsuperscript{466} Meikleholmside may have been paired with another farm in the fourteenth century, as a charter of David II mentions “terras del Holme inferior” in a grant to Robert de Lage.\textsuperscript{467} However, this is the only extant occurrence of this site and it does not survive on the modern map.

---

James Johnstone of Brakenside is mentioned in an agreement with members of the Maxwell family: cf. HMC (Jhn), p. 33 (no. 65) AD 1590.

\textsuperscript{461} CSP I, p. 192 (no. 396) \textit{Brakensyd} AD 1552x3.


\textsuperscript{463} Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, p. 147; Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 96; MED I ‘bráke(n’, p. 1109; DOST I ‘brakan, braikane’, p. 331.

\textsuperscript{464} RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) \textit{Mikylholmesyde} AD 1315x21; RSS I, p. 269 (no. 1778) \textit{Mekleholmesyde} AD 1508; RGS II, p. 757 (no. 3522) \textit{Mekleholmeside} AD 1510; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) \textit{Mekilholmeside} AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 491 (no. 1459) \textit{Meikillholmsyde} AD 1629.


\textsuperscript{466} DOST IV ‘mekill(’, p. 163; DOST III ‘holm’, p. 145.

\textsuperscript{467} RRS VI, p. 524 (no. 513), exact date unknown.
While there is no archaeological evidence of early settlements in the immediate vicinity of modern Meikleholmside, approximately 1km to the north there are traces of two late prehistoric settlements which indicate earlier settlement activity (fig. 20). Considering that Meikleholmside, along with these settlements, are located on a slope below the remains of a Roman road which clearly was still in use in the eighteenth century, there is a strong possibility that Meikleholmside was settled in the early medieval period.\(^{468}\)

**Ruttonside (Moffat)**

The first and only written record of Ruttonside before 1700 is *Rowtansyde* in 1629.\(^{469}\) Johnson-Ferguson interprets the name specific, *Rowtan-*, as OE *hrūtan* ‘to make a loud noise’.\(^{470}\) This verb is related to the ME and MSc verbal noun *routing*, sometimes spelled *rowtan* ‘a loud roaring noise from the sea, or loud bellowing of bulls or monsters’.\(^{471}\) Modern OS maps no longer show the location of this site, and it seems to have been deserted. However, the farmstead can still be identified on nineteenth-century OS maps, on the western bank of Evan Water.\(^{472}\) The ‘noise’ may therefore refer to the river, while the generic, *side*, adequately describes the site’s location on a hillside (fig. 19). While it is possible, on linguistic grounds, to envision a formation of this place-name in the Anglo-Saxon period, there is very little evidence to confirm this. The only written evidence for Ruttonside dates to 1629, and even the deserted farmstead on the OS maps shows no indication that this was a considerable settlement. The eighteenth-century estate plans describing the farms along Evan Water fail to mention Ruttonside.\(^{473}\) Furthermore, the lack of any archaeological indicators of early medieval or prehistoric settlement near Ruttonside suggest that it was either a minor early medieval site, or none at all.

### 8.12 Place-names in –that/-thwaite

The Scandinavian place-name generic *þveit* has been discussed in detail in chapter 7. For ease of reference, it may be reiterated here that *þveit* was most likely used to form place-names

---

\(^{468}\) The Roman road is marked in an estate map dating to 1759x1778, where it connects with the roads from Glasgow and Edinburgh to Moffat, suggesting that it was still in use: NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 5.

\(^{469}\) RGS VIII, p. 491 (no. 1459) *Rowtansyde* AD 1629.

\(^{470}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 100.


\(^{472}\) OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500 (1861).

\(^{473}\) NRS Ref. RHP10151 (AD 1767), RHP10095 (AD 1767), RHP83387 no. 5 (AD 1759 – c. 1778).
from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries in southern Scotland, and referred to areas of cleared land, probably for agricultural purposes.

**Brakanepheit (possibly Cummertrees/lost)**

*Brakanepheit, or Brakansweit,* first appears in the written documentation in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Its naming elements refer to a ‘bracken clearing’, and it may be dated to the same time period as Thorniethwaite or Carthat in the parish of Lochmaben, in the eleventh century. Brakanepheit does not appear on the modern map. However, the “lands of Brekenwhate” are documented on an estate plan from the late eighteenth century, situated between the farms of Murthat and Limekilns to the east and Justinlees (parish Cummertrees) to the south. On Roy’s military survey, *Brackenwhatt* appears just west of the farm of Bent. This position aligns well with the situation of the farmlands shown on the later estate plans. Since Bent is on the western boundary of the parish, Brackenwhatt/Brakanepheit must be beyond the parish boundaries of Annan (fig. 26).

**Carthat (Lochmaben)**

Carthat, surviving as North and South Carthat, was presumably a single settlement, divided at an unknown point in time. Examples of such farm divisions are known throughout Scotland and could have occurred throughout the medieval and early modern period, often as a result of estate re-arrangements, for example in the case of Upper and Nether Roxburgh. Carthat appears in the written record for the first time in 1617, but it can still be reliably treated as a

---

474 HMC (Drml), p. 39 (no. 67) *Brakanepheit* AD 1194x1214, p. 40 (no. 71) *Brakansweit* AD 1271x1318.
476 NRS Ref. RHP 83392, no. 5.
477 NRS Ref. RHP 83392, no. 5; WRS, plate 27.
478 Robert A. Dodgshon, ‘The Nature and Development of Infield-Outfield in Scotland’, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, No. 59 (1973), p. 13. Similarly, monks at Couper Abbey split townships in the fifteenth century to obtain smaller settlements or farmsteads: cf. Dixon, ‘Champagne Country’, p. 55. The farm at Mosshope, in the parish of Moffat, appears as *Mossope* in a charter of 1625, and as *Nathir Massope* and *Ovir Mossope* in 1629, cf. RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) AD 1629. While it is possible that it was split in the four years between the two documents, it is likely that the division occurred earlier and that the differences in the charters are due to context. Certainly, the charter of 1629 is much more interested in portions of land, rather than entire farms or estates. Warmanbie, in the parish of Annan, seems to have been divided by the seventeenth century, and appears as *Over et Nather Wormainebeis* in 1625, cf. RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) AD 1625. It should, however, be noted that unlike the case of North and South Carthat, the partition of Mosshope and Warmanbie is not visible on modern maps, or, in the case of Mosshope, even on the estate plans of the eighteenth century, and therefore may not have had the character of a physical splitting of settlements, but rather a division of estate portions, cf. NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 7.
The settlement of Howthat (parish Mouswald), for which earlier written documents survive, was spelled Holthuayt in the thirteenth century, while appearing with an ending in -that on the modern map. A similar transformation seems likely for Carthat. The place-name specific, Car-, may be ON kjarr ‘brushwood’, or ME derivative, ker ‘a bog, marsh’. As previously argued, the þveit element would suggest that Carthat was the product of agricultural expansion in the eleventh or twelfth centuries. This is likely to have occurred before the construction of the motte-and-bailey at Rockhallhead, with which Carthat seems to be associated (fig. 24).

Hartwood (Lochmaben)

Hartwood can first be found in the written documentation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The modern place-name Hartwood is misleading as the aforementioned documents show its spelling as Harthweth or Harthwart. Its first element is commonly identified as OE heorot/hoert, or ON hjǫrtr ‘hart, stag’. Geographically-speaking, Hartwood may be the archetypical þveit place, as it is located on top of the south-western upland ridge of the parish of Lochmaben (fig. 24). This suggests that it belonged to a period when marginal lands were added to the pasture or arable lands. Aerial photography of that upland area shows traces of rig-and-furrow cultivation, and it may be argued that early medieval woodland was cleared in order to open land for agricultural purposes during the warm period in the central Middle Ages.

Murthat (Annan/lost)

Murthat is a þveit type settlement in the parish of Annan. Similar to Brakanepheit, it does not appear on recent OS maps. However, it is on the same estate plan as Brakanepheit, as well as the first edition of the OS county maps, where it is noted as “Murthat (Remains of)” (NGR NY 17103 69090) (fig. 25). Although no written documentation for Murthat from the period up to AD 1700 was discovered for this study, medieval and post-medieval records of other

---

479 RGS VII, p. 574 (no. 1591) Carthat AD 1617.
480 HMC (Drml), p. 40 (no. 69) Holthuayt AD c. 1218.
482 RGS IV, p. 325 (no. 1433) Harthweth AD 1562; RGS VII, p. 253 (no. 683) Harthwart AD 1612.
483 Scott, Germanic Toponymicon, p. 468; Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 89.
484 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 17 and 35.
485 NRS Ref. RHP 83392, no. 5.
Murthat or Moorthwaite place-names in Dumfriesshire and northern England suggest that these naming elements were used for settlements by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The name of Murthat in the parish of Annan is most likely derived from ON móir/mýrr ‘moor, marshland’, or ME or MSc muir ‘barren open country, moorland’. It is unlikely that this site was settled before AD 1000.

**Thorniethwaite (Lochmaben)**

The settlement of Thorniethwaite appears in written documents from the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, always recognisable as a þveit place-name. Similar to Carthat, this place-name may go back to the eleventh century. Its first element is derived from either OE þyrne or ON þyrnir, each referring to a ‘thorn-bush’, possibly referring to the predominant vegetation before being cleared. It is notable that Thorniethwaite, along with the other þveit place-names in the parish of Lochmaben, Hartwood and Carthat, all appear in the south-western upland area of the parish (fig. 24). The ramifications of this pattern will be discussed in chapter 11.

**8.13 Place-names in -ton**

As discussed in chapter 7, the OE place-name element tún ‘enclosure’ may refer to Anglian settlement names formed in the pre-Norse period of Dumfriesshire, between the seventh and ninth centuries. However, tún could be productive in the guise of ME and MSc toun throughout the medieval period, and an early medieval date should only be assigned with care to any settlement with this name generic.

---

486 The other ‘Murhat’ in Dumfriesshire is situated to the north, in the parish of Kirkpatrick-Juxta, and appears in the written records in 1550. The English equivalents tend to occur earlier, throughout the Middle Ages, which is most likely due to the patchy written documentation of early Dumfriesshire; RGS IV, pp. 97 (no. 428), 116 (no. 503), 121 (no. 533), 121 (no. 534); see also: Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 103; Fellows-Jensen, Scandinavian Settlement Names, pp. 90, 148.


488 HMC (Drml), p. 40 (no. 69) Thornhuayt AD c. 1218; CPB I, p. 181 (no. 311) Thornythwate AD 1585; RGS III, p. 673 (no. 2874) Thornequhat AD 1542x3.


Auldton and Aldcongayle (Moffat)

Auldton first appears in the written record in 1542 as Altoun. The earliest spelling is more indicative of MSc toun than of OE tún, and it is likely that Altoun or later Auldtoun, the ‘old farm or group of farms’ may have been established in the late medieval or post-medieval period. It should be noted, however, that such an interpretation would be based on only two written instances of this place-name before AD 1700. In the Acts of David II Bruce Webster has equated Auldton with the place-name Aldcongayle appearing in a fourteenth-century charter, probably dating to 1341x46 or 1357x71. Webster did not specifically justify this decision, which is all the more significant given that Johnson-Ferguson identified Aldcongayle as a separate Gaelic place-name derived from allt ‘stream, burn’ and conghal ‘tumult, uproar’. An alternative interpretation may be a formation consisting of Brittonic al ‘rock, stone’ or alt ‘steep hill, cliff’ and the saint’s names Conval or Comgal. Linguistically, it is difficult to maintain that Auldton is identical with Aldcongayle. Two scenarios seem possible. Auldton may have been the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century ‘translation’ by a new Scots-speaking community of an earlier Gaelic place-name, much like has been argued for Corehead in the same period (see above). Alternatively, Aldcongayle may represent a corrupted spelling of a hypothetical *Auldtongill. However, neither explanation can satisfactorily make sense of the ending in -gayle which is not attested in later and modern forms of Auldton. The lack of evidence does not allow for any certain conclusions, and in the following discussion it will be assumed that Aldcongayle was a separate place-name and settlement, now lost.

If Alt- and Auld- actually refer to ‘old age’, the question would be what this name specific was describing. Presumably a newly founded settlement would not be called auld. Instead, one would expect place-names such as Newbie ‘new farm’, in the parish of Annan. There is no clear-cut solution to this problem. It is conceivable that Auldtoun was renamed at

491 RGS III, p. 606 (no. 2633) Altoun AD 1542; RGS VIII, p. 300 (no. 826) Auldtoun AD 1625; Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 96.
492 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 17f; MED VII ‘ōld(e, also: āle, aulde’, p. 137; DOST I ‘ald, auld’, p. 46.
493 RRS VI, p. 524 (no. 513). For the same entry in the register of the Earls of Morton, see RHM II, p. 94 (no. 119).
495 James, Brittonic Language II, pp. 9, 12, 137.
some point during its history, and branded as the ‘old farm settlement’ as compared to a new settlement. Another possibility would be that it was established on the site of an early, deserted settlement, the remains of which gave the site the name of Auldtoun. The area around the modern farmstead of Auldton or Alton is scattered with remains of early settlements. Although these have been broadly categorised as belonging to the late prehistoric period by the RCAHMS, it is possible that some remains were considered signs of earlier occupation by medieval settlers, who then ‘preserved’ this evidence within the name of their newly established farm name. Given the evidence, this will have to remain speculation.

Although there is no archaeological evidence of early medieval settlement at Auldton, traces of late prehistoric settlements can be found along a radius of c. 550-600m around Auldton to the north, north-east, east and west (fig. 18). All still have visible remains, with only one exception, and it is likely that a contemporary or successive settlement could be found underneath Auldton itself. The prehistoric settlements which can still be traced are therefore possible indicators of much more intense settlement, part of which may have been destroyed or superseded by Auldton. In light of this possibility, Auldton may be an indicator of early medieval settlement.

**Granton (Moffat)**

The settlement or farm of Granton is first recorded in the early to mid-fourteenth century as Grantton, but appears in the written records throughout the following centuries. However, it should be noted that all later instances of this place-name appear with the ending –toun(e).

It may be that the place-name came under the influence of dialectal MSc in the course of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, changing Grantton to Grantoun. The late medieval formation of this name is improbable, as it appears in a fourteenth-century charter without any evidence that it was recently formed. As the evidence stands, this tūn place-name could be dated to the period between c. AD 730 and c. AD 1300. The name specific, Gran- or Grant-is ambiguous. Johnson-Ferguson interprets it as a personal name, but does not specify which one. Williamson is more precise and considers two possibilities: the ON personal name Grani, or the English surname Grant. It should be noted that the only written record for

---

496 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 299f (nos. 698 and 699).
497 RHM II, p. 31 (no. 41) Grantton AD c. 1320x1369; RGS II, p. 232 (no. 1138) Grauntoune AD 1473; RGS III, p. 618 (no. 2677) Grantoun AD 1542; HMC (Jhn), p. 22 (no. 31) Grantoun AD 1569; RGS XI, p. 112 (no. 230) Grantoun AD 1662.
498 Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 98.
499 Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 35.
Granton that Williamson discovered dates to 1633. She argued that this late spelling may indicate that the surname was more likely.\textsuperscript{500} If a derivation from ON *Grani* were accepted, this may date the place-name to c. AD 900-1100. After 1100, one would expect a stronger Norman or Anglo-Norman influence on naming, although the continuity of some Scandinavian names such as Grani should, naturally, not be discarded completely.\textsuperscript{501} Gillian Fellows-Jensen, in her discussion of hybrid names in -tūn (containing a Scandinavian personal name and OE place-name generic tūn) proposes that, at least in northern England, these place-name formations may be the results of earlier estate units or landholdings granted to incoming Scandinavians.\textsuperscript{502} A similar scenario may be possible for southern Scotland. This trend would be comparable to byrplace-names, which may have changed their specific, but not their generic, elements as late as the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{503} While uncertainty remains as to when this place-name was named, the remains of a late prehistoric settlement 200m north-east of modern Granton, may indicate that this site has been chosen for settlement already prior to AD 1000 (fig. 20).

**Newton** (Moffat)

The place-name of Newton in the parish of Moffat is first attested in the mid- to late fourteenth century and is not surveyed by Johnson-Ferguson or Williamson.\textsuperscript{504} As in the case of Newbie (see above), the place-name’s specific is probably derived from ON nýr or ME neue ‘new’, while the generic, -ton, may be OE tūn ‘enclosed settlement, farm, village’, or its MSc derivative toun.\textsuperscript{505} Similar to Newbie, the question is how ‘new’ Newton was at the time of its earliest written appearance. Unlike Newbie, however, the landscape surrounding Newton is not characterised by the absence of previous or contemporary settlements, either based on the archaeological record, or the place-name evidence of the fourteenth century and later. Based on both its proximity to Granton and on the place-name generic which they share, it may be possible that Newton was a new formation which had split from Granton, perhaps some time during the thirteenth century or earlier. Whether this occurred before or after AD 1000, which is the crucial factor in the present study, is difficult to distinguish. Approximately 600m to the

\textsuperscript{500} Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{501} Fellows-Jensen is inclined to believe a derivation from the Scottish surname Grant (derived from Fr grand), arguing for a possible Norman influence in this place-name: cf. Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names*, p. 422.
\textsuperscript{502} Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, pp. 172-5. It should be noted, however, that she did not explicitly envision such a possibility for Granton in Dumfriesshire.
\textsuperscript{503} Cf. the discussion in chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{504} RHM II, p. 31 (no. 41) [*terras* de Granston de Newton et del corr] AD c. 1320-1369.
\textsuperscript{505} Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, pp. 17f, 37 and 285.
north-west of modern Newton farm, and 720m to its south, there are remains of late prehistoric forts and settlements (fig. 20). While these may indicate early settlement at or near the modern site of Newton, it is likely that they should rather be linked to earlier settlement activity in Ericstane to the west and Granton to the south. Certainly, in the latter case Granton may be chronologically earlier to Newton, and perhaps evolved out of the community responsible for the prehistoric settlement record in the vicinity. Therefore, it is unlikely that Newton represents an early medieval focal settlement.

Plumdon (Annan)

The earliest potential record for Plumdon in the parish of Annan is dated to 1210x12, when it appears as Plunton. This instance is the only medieval record known of this place-name, as all later references to a Plwmtoun in late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century records are associated with a different settlement in Kirkcudbrightshire. Based on its earliest spelling, Plumdon was perhaps derived from OE tūn ‘enclosed settlement, farm, village’. Thus, given its first appearance in the written records in the early thirteenth century, it may have been formed between c. AD 730 and AD 1210x12. However, as a newly founded settlement is unlikely to immediately appear in the written record, it was probably formed closer to the earlier date. The first element, plum-, is probably OE plūme ‘a plum’, or its ME derivative. Comparative place-names in England tend to appear in the written record between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, and if some time, perhaps even a century, is allowed between the naming of a place and its first appearance in writing, then perhaps Plumdon was a pre-1000 formation. Even if the place-name was created later, it is unlikely that the agriculturally rich land in the south of the parish of Annan was left unsettled in the early medieval period, and Plumdon seems a likely successor of such an early settlement landscape (fig. 26).

RCAHMS site nos. NT01SE 6 and 8.
CDS I, p. 95 (no. 546); Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 35; Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 37.
Nicolaisen, Place-Names, p. 35; RGS II, p. 336 (no. 1595); RGS III, p. 47 (no. 213).
Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, pp. 17 and 37.
Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 37; BT ‘plýme’, p. 776; MED VIII ‘ploume’, p. 1071.
Watts et al., English Place-Names, p. 475.
For the land capability of the parish of Annan, see the discussion in chapter 10.
8.14 Miscellaneous Celtic Place-names

Annan (Annan)

The town of Annan (fig. 26) was probably named after the river and appears in the written record from the thirteenth century onward. Its antiquity is evidenced by the appearance of the river-name Anava in the Ravenna Cosmography. Daphne Brooke has suggested that the original Brittonic form of the place-name is likely to have been *Anau, later changed to the Gaelic genitive Annan. Although not much comparative evidence exists for this place-name, it is reasonable to assume that the settlement may be one of the earliest permanent sites in the modern parish of Annan. This is supported by the Brittonic derivation of the place-name, as well as its association with the river-name in the Ravenna Cosmography, which, as has been stated in the case of Lochmaben, was compiled around AD 700 but is likely to have used sources from the second century AD. It should also be noted that Annan was the first designated centre of the Lordship of Annandale under the Brus family, and abandoned around 1150 in favour of Lochmaben.

Carrifran (Moffat)

The only mention of Carrifran in the pre-1700 written record dates to 1577. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a derivation of this name from Welsh, as he writes, although in this instance the language would probably rather be Brittonic, caer y fran ‘fort of the raven’. Alan James shares this interpretation, adding that this name may consist of the Brittonic elements cajr ‘enclosed, defensible site’ or carreg ‘rock, rocky place’ (can also be Gaelic carraig) and brān ‘raven, crow’ (also used as a personal name). However, James notes that in a southern Scottish context cajr may refer to enclosed or defensive farms, rather than forts. Place-names of the cajr type are likely to date to the period before the formation of Northumbria, or
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513 RRS II, p. 418 (no. 450) ecclesia de Anant AD c. 1204x1207; REG I, p. 105 (no. 123) Anant AD 1223; HMC (Drml), p. 41 (no. 72) Anand AD c. 1304, p. 47 (no. 87) Anand AD 1486x7, p. 60 (no. 120) Anande AD 1512, p. 293 (no. 229) Anan AD 1685; RGS III, p. 427 (no. 1919) Annand AD 1539.
514 James, Brittonic Language II, pp. 16-7.
516 Lowe and Brooke, Excavations at Hoddom, p. 204.
517 Rivet and Smith, Roman Britain, p. 193.
519 RGS IV, p. 749 (no. 2741) Corrifaine AD 1577.
520 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 97.
521 James, Brittonic Language II, pp. 43, 63-65, 67, 83.
522 James, Brittonic Language II, p. 63.
to the central Middle Ages, probably in the course of agricultural expansion into mountainous areas. James considers the latter case more likely, due to the absence of this naming element from the rest of Scotland, outside the Lothian Hills, Clydesdale and the Solway basin. If a Brittonic derivation of the place-name is accepted, it may originate from before the seventh century to the eleventh century. There is little evidence of early Anglian place-names in the uplands around Moffat, and any Anglian settlement activity which perhaps followed the period of Northumbrian domination from the seventh century onward is unlikely to have left major linguistic traces outside the lowland parishes (cf. Smallholm, parish of Lochmaben). The pre-Northumbrian place-name landscape in the parish of Moffat may therefore have remained more stable than that of the parishes of Lochmaben or Annan by comparison. A Gaelic derivation of this place-name may be equally likely, in which case the time frame can be established from the ninth to the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. However, it is worth considering that if the name specific, *brān*, was a personal name here, the place-name may have referred to ‘the fortified place or farm of Bran’, which may have been a small estate, or at least a substantial farm. While it is entirely possible that major farms, even of a Brittonic-speaking population, were unaffected by the decline of the Kingdom of Strathclyde after 1018, the formation of such an estate (if indeed it was one) is more likely in the period of south-ward expansion from Strathclyde in the tenth century. There are signs of possible Bronze-Age or later land use c. 160m west of modern Carrifran in the form of cairnfields, which may support the proposition that Carrifran was a site of continued interest to settlers (fig. 22).

**Dumbretton (Annan)**

This place-name first appears in the written documentation in 1296, when the Ragman Rolls of Edward I make mention of one “Robert de Dunbretan […] del counte de Dunfres”. It is probably derived from the Gaelic *dùn-bretann* ‘fortress of the Britons’, and would therefore be a place named by Gaelic outsiders or non-Britons to describe people who were perceived as being culturally or linguistically ‘British’. The formation of this place-name cannot be dated with any certainty, although in eastern Dumfriesshire such a name was most likely
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523 James, Brittonic Language II, p. 64.
524 On the disappearance of Gaelic in southern Scotland, esp. Strathclyde (by the fourteenth century) and Carrick (by the seventeenth century), see: Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 123 and 135.
525 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 43.
526 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 2; CDS II, p. 206 (no. 823) Dunbretan AD 1296. For other instances, see also: RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919) Dunbertane AD 1539; RGS VII, p. 254 (no. 683) Drumbr(r)itanerig AD 1612.
527 James, Brittonic Language II, p. 50; Watson, Celtic Place-Names, pp. 15 and 184.
formed in the tenth or eleventh centuries with the decline of the British kingdom of Strathclyde and the influx of Gaelic-speaking settlers under King Duncan of Scotia. It may even be of a later date, when the ‘culturally British’ population had become a minority, and therefore worthy of such a specific reference in the place-name record. Conversely, this place-name may suggest that this site had been settled before AD 1000, serving as a last cultural hub or stronghold of Brittonic-speaking people in this area. The archaeological record around Dumbretton is as sparse as other areas of the parish of Annan (fig. 25).

Dumcrieff (Moffat)

Dumcrieff is first recorded in writing in the sixteenth century. Its early spellings vary from Dumcreiff in 1541 to Drumcreif or Drumcreith in 1550. Johnson-Ferguson argues for a derivation from Gaelic dùn craoibhe ‘hill or fort of the tree’. The first element, Drum- or Dum- could reflect Gaelic dùn ‘fort, hill’ which may have replaced an earlier Brittonic dīn, but these varied spellings highlight the problem that this generic is often confused with Gaelic druim ‘a back, a ridge’, which may have followed an earlier Brittonic *druim. Johnson-Ferguson’s suggestion for the specific, Gaelic craobh ‘tree’ seems likely. The Gaelic etymology suggests a dating range from c. 900 to the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. Given that the generic, Gaelic dùn, may have been translated from an earlier place-name in Brittonic dīn, a formation of this place-name around or even before AD 1000 is possible. Even if the place-name is dated after 1000, Dumcrieff’s location at the confluence of Evan Water, Moffat Water and the river Annan, and the access point into Moffatdale, suggests that this site was strategically important and settled during the study period. Both the Roman fortlet at Bearholm and the Roman road running past it support this possibility (fig. 21).

The etymology of Dumcrieff deserves comparison with the farm of Aikrig (modern Oakrig) to its west. Both seem to describe the same landscape feature: a ridge of oaks or trees. It is possible that they formed a single settlement at some point, and that part of the settlement branched off and was re-founded as Aikrig in the later medieval or post-medieval period, when Gaelic may not have been a productive place-name language anymore. It should be noted,

528 Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 123-7 and 131-2; Jackson, ‘Britons in Southern Scotland’, p. 87.  
530 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 97.  
532 GD ‘craobh’, p. 264.
however, that the first written record of Aikrig refers to it as a wood, rather than a farm or settlement.\footnote{533}

\section*{Ericstane (Moffat)}

The place-name Ericstane is Gaelic, referring either to \textit{clach na h-éirce} (‘stone of atonement’) or \textit{clach an eireachta} (‘stone of the assembly’).\footnote{534} It appears in Barbour’s \textit{Bruce} as the latter.\footnote{535} Ericstane belongs to some of the earliest mentioned settlements in the parish, first appearing in the written records in the early fourteenth century.\footnote{536} If the Gaelic provenance is accepted, then it may be dated between c. 900 and c. 1250, whereby the \textit{terminus ante quem} accounts for the fact that a number of generations will have had to pass between the creation of a Gaelic place-name and the replacement of the hypothetical Gaelic first element, \textit{*clach} ‘stone’, with its northern ME or MSc equivalent \textit{stane} (recorded in 1315x21).\footnote{537} It is very likely that this place may refer to an important assembly site prior to Gaelic-speaking settlement. The area around modern Ericstane is dotted with a dense group of late prehistoric settlements, indicating that this was a site of considerable interest to local settling communities, supporting an early medieval date (fig. 20).\footnote{538}

\section*{Greskine (Moffat)}

Three pre-1700 entries of Greskine could be found, the first from 1508.\footnote{539} The historical spellings are \textit{Graskin} and \textit{Gresking}. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a derivation from Gaelic \textit{creas} and \textit{chinn}, which he translates as ‘straight head’.\footnote{540} However, \textit{creas} does not mean the adjective ‘straight’, but the maritime noun ‘strait or narrow’.\footnote{541} Similarly, Gaelic ‘head’ is \textit{ceann}, the pronounciation of which does not match the historical spellings, especially if we

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{533}{RGS XI, p. 110 (no. 230) AD 1662.}
\item \footnote{534}{Watson, \textit{Celtic Place-Names}, p. 182.}
\item \footnote{535}{Duncan, \textit{Barbour’s The Bruce}, bk. II, l. 148: “Toward the towne off Louchmabane, And a litill fra Aryk stane”.}
\item \footnote{536}{RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) \textit{Ayrikstan} AD 1315x21; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) \textit{Arikstane} AD 1611, p. 407 (no. 1113) \textit{Arikstane} AD 1614, p. 577 (no. 1600) \textit{Arikstane} AD 1617; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) \textit{Arikstaine} AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) \textit{Arikstane} AD 1629.}
\item \footnote{537}{RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34); GD ‘clach’, p. 200; DOST IX ‘stan(e’, pp. 474-5; MED XI ‘stōn, stan(e’, p. 777.}
\item \footnote{538}{RCAHMS site nos. NT01SE 3, NT01SE 5, NT01SE 6, NT01SE 7; RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, pp. 298, 299, 300 (nos. 615, 659, 725, 726).}
\item \footnote{539}{RSS I, p. 269 (no. 1778) \textit{Graskin} AD 1508; RGS II, p. 757 (no. 3522) \textit{Greskin} AD 1510; RGS VIII, p. 491 (no. 1459) \textit{Gresking} AD 1629.}
\item \footnote{540}{Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 98.}
\item \footnote{541}{GD ‘creas’, p. 268.}
\end{itemize}
accept that these entries were written by a non-Gaelic speaker.\textsuperscript{542} Another interpretation for the first element of Greskie may be Gaelic \textit{crasg} ‘cross, crossing-place’.\textsuperscript{543} The problem in this interpretation is the initial voiced consonant of the modern place-name, which does not align well with the unvoiced \textit{c}- in \textit{crasg}. It is possible, however, that the voicing was caused through eclipsis by a preceding word now lost, or by the adoption of the place-name by speakers of Scots, although neither interpretation can be made with confidence.\textsuperscript{544}

The second element may be the Gaelic locative suffix \textit{–in}, added to nouns and adjectives to form place-names.\textsuperscript{545} If the derivation from Gaelic \textit{crasg} + \textit{in} ‘a crossing-place’ is accepted, this may refer to the position of this farm on the bank of Evan Water and Mellingshaw Burn, although \textit{crasg} could also denote other crossing-places (such as of roads) in the landscape. A MSc derivation of the first element from \textit{gres/gras} ‘grass’ is possible but no appropriate MSc or English interpretation for the second element, \textit{-ine}, could be found.\textsuperscript{546} Another ME or MSc derivation may refer to the \textit{grescan} ‘grazing cain’ mentioned by G. W. S. Barrow as a render provided for the right of grazing evidenced in twelfth-century Angus.\textsuperscript{547} Although the nearby Malingshaw also contains a reference to legal arrangements (MSc \textit{maling} ‘rented land or tenant farm’), it is difficult to explain how a place-name would have come to be named after a feudal obligation.

If the Gaelic etymology is accepted, Greskie may have been formed between the ninth or tenth and fifteenth centuries. Although there is no record of any archaeological settlement indicators in its vicinity to show previous habitation, Greskie was one of the prominent farms in eighteenth-century estate maps of the parish.\textsuperscript{548} Furthermore, when compared to the settlement patterns along upper Annandale and Moffatdale, in which archaeological evidence is more visible, Greskie is situated at a location where early settlement activity is expected (fig. 19).

\textbf{Lochmaben (Lochmaben)}

Lochmaben first appears in the written record in the second half of the twelfth century and is well-recorded in the written documentation from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

\textsuperscript{542} GD ‘ceann’, p. 177.
\textsuperscript{543} James, Brittonic Language II, pp. 95f; GD ‘crasg’, p. 266.
\textsuperscript{544} Pers. Comm. Alan G. James.
\textsuperscript{545} James, Brittonic Language II, pp. 161-2; Ó Maolalaigh, ‘Place-Names as a Resource’, pp. 30-1.
\textsuperscript{546} MED IV ‘gras, also: gres’, pp. 300-2; DOST II ‘gras, grase; gres, grese’, pp. 696, 707.
\textsuperscript{547} Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, p. 41. Pers. Comm. Jake King.
\textsuperscript{548} NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7, RHP 10095.
onward. Late eighteenth-century sources claim that the name derives from the Scottish Gaelic for ‘Loch of the Maidens’ or ‘Loch of the Fair’, referring to a nunnery which was situated at this location following local tradition. The New Statistical Account of Scotland claims that the name of Lochmaben is traced back to Gaelic *Loch-ma’-ban*, meaning ‘the lake in the white plain’, “because the Castle loch, near which Lochmaben is built, exhibits a white appearance, when contrasted with the black surface of the ridge which bounds it on the west.”

None of these etymologies seem convincing, thus a different interpretation is suggested: the Ravenna Cosmography, a compilation of place-names dating to the late seventh century AD, mentions a place called *locus maponi* in its British section. It has been argued that this place-name may also refer to the Clochmabanestane, a granite erratic near Gretna. Whether *locus maponi* refers to the Clochmabanestane or Lochmaben depends almost entirely on how the *locus* element is interpreted. It has been argued that it is a technical term, recurring throughout the Cosmography and referring to tribal meeting places, or places of native-Roman interaction. However, the *cloch-* element in *Clochmabanestane* is derived from the Gaelic word for ‘stone’ (the –*stane* element being a possible OE or MSc redundant addition). Thus, the only link between *locus maponi* and the granite boulder is their common reference to the deity Maponos, a name which is well-represented on northern British Roman inscriptions. Rivet and Smith argue that the *locus* element may instead be derived from the Brittonic word *loc-* meaning ‘lake, pool’. Thus, ‘Lochmaben’ is linguistically more closely linked to *locus*
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549 EYC II, p. 4 (no. 651) Lochmaban AD 1142x1194; CPG, p. 340 (no. MCLXXVI) c. 1194x1211/2 and RRS II, p. 418 (no. 450) ecclesia de Lochmaban AD c. 1204x1207; RRS II, p. 179 (no. 80) Locmanaban AD 1165x1173; REG I, p. 72 (no. 83) Lochmaban AD 1165x1214, p. 83 (no. 96) lochmab AD 1202, p. 105 (no. 123) Loummaban AD 1223, p. 106 (no. 124) Loghmaban, Loganmban AD 1218x1230, p. 107 (no. 125) Locmaban AD 1218x1230; REG II, p. 619 (no. 546) Loghmaban AD c. 1140x1295; RHM II, p. 96 (no. 122) Louchmaban AD 1371x1390; HMC (Drml), p. 32 (no. 55) Lowghmaben AD 1374, p. 46 (no. 77) Loghmaban AD 1394, p. 47 (no. 87) Lochmaban AD 1486, p. 56 (no. 110) Louchmaban AD 1411, p. 62 (no. 125) Lochmaben AD 1562; CPB I, p. 183 (no. 317) Lowghmaben AD 1585; AFB I, p. 2 (no. 2) Lokmaban AD c. 1194x1214; LSMM II, p. 673 (Appendix, no. 9) Loghmaban AD c. 1256x1318; RGS I, p. 28 (no. 92) Lochmaban AD 1315x21.


553 Rivet and Smith, Roman Britain, pp. 212 and 395f. See also: RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 110.
maponi, as it contains a potential early British element referring to its surrounding lochs, as well as the reference to the British deity. Following this argument, Lochmaben was recognised as a place-name at the latest in the seventh century (when the Ravenna Cosmography was compiled), or even as early as the first century AD (when the military maps were created upon which the Cosmography is probably based). Therefore, Lochmaben may have been an early focal site of the local British tribe of the Selgovae, and although it is difficult to prove that it retained such a central position between the end of the Roman period and the early twelfth century when it re-emerges in the written record, its defendable position amidst various lochs, and the potential crannog site in the Castle Loch suggest that it remained a place of continued interest for settlers throughout several centuries (fig. 23).

Logan (Moffat/lost)

Logan first appears in the written records in the fifteenth century as Logane. Johnson-Ferguson interprets the place-name as Gaelic lagan ‘a hollow’ and there is little reason to doubt this derivation. The place-name Logan is very common and appears at least four times in the county of Dumfriesshire alone, in the parishes of Moffat, Langholm, Half-Morton and Wamphray. Although the settlement or farm in the parish of Moffat no longer exists, it is possible that it may have stood in the vicinity of Logan Knowe (NT 11118 03240). However, it should be noted that Logan Knowe, as it appears on the nineteenth-century OS County maps of Dumfriesshire, is situated on the location of Craigbeck Hill as depicted in a map from 1768. This eighteenth-century map, in turn, places Logan Hill closer to Croffhead, to the north of modern Wait Hill (which appears as Wet Hill in 1768). There are a number of possible explanations for this ‘wandering hill’ phenomenon. It is conceivable that neither hill name actually refers to the settlement or farm of the fifteenth century. However, this is unlikely as Gaelic was nearly extinct in that part of Scotland by the seventeenth century and would probably not have formed a new place-name, especially that of a hill, between 1768 and the early nineteenth-century, when the ‘hill name shift’ seems to have happened. Although another possibility is to see the cause of this problem in the less precise cartography of the eighteenth century.
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558 Frere, ‘North Britain between the Walls’, pp. 286f.
560 HMC (Drml), p. 56 (no. 110) Logane AD 1411, p. 60 (no. 120) Logane AD 1512.
562 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, pp. 53, 86, 99, 129.
563 NRS Ref. RHP37546.
564 NRS Ref. RHP37546; OS 1st Ed County Map 1:2500 (1861).
century, this may be doubted. While the plan in question exhibits some spatial distortions when compared to modern maps, it was drawn in order to outline the boundaries of lands belonging to the Duke of Queensberry, and land markers such as prominent farms, rivers and hills would, in all likelihood, have been noted with some care. The best explanation which can be offered here is that the original Logan hill was situated east of Crofthead farm, and throughout the decades following 1768, its name became more generally associated with the upland area on the southern bank of Moffat water between Craigbeck and Crofthead. If the hill name was indeed in some geographical sense connected to fifteenth-century Logan, the site of the farm may have been in close vicinity to the north or south of Crofthead.

It is possible that Logan was situated in close proximity to the remains of Cornal Tower, along Cornal Burn (fig. 21). Logane tenement appears in a charter from 1512 in association with Polcornare.\(^{565}\) Gaelic poll refers to a stream, which would also explain the connection between Polcornare and Cornal Burn.\(^{566}\) Secondly, in the parish of Moffat generally and in Moffatdale specifically, it is uncommon to have a cluster of late prehistoric settlements which are not in close proximity to a modern farm. Thus, the settlement remains located near Cornal Tower or further upstream on the northern bank of Cornal Burn may indicate that the medieval, and possibly early medieval, farm or settlement of Logan existed there before it was deserted, probably during or after the sixteenth century.

Regardless of its location, the Gaelic etymology would date this place-name to the period between the ninth and fifteenth centuries, and it is possible that minor Gaelic settlement activity may have taken place from c. AD 800 to AD 1000 under the rule of Northumbria or the Kings of Strathclyde.

**Moffat (Moffat)**

Moffat first appears in the written records in the twelfth century as moffet.\(^ {567}\) The origin of this place-name is remarkably absent from a number of discussions of Scottish place-names. Neither Johnson-Ferguson nor Watson explain Moffat in any detail, and its probable Celtic

\(^{565}\) HMC (Drml), p. 60 (no. 120) Logane AD 1512; RCAHMS site no. NT10SW 1.

\(^{566}\) GD ‘poll’, p. 731.

\(^{567}\) REG I, p. 64 (no. 72) and RRS II, p. 293 (no. 260) ecclesiam de moffet AD 1187x9; HMC (Drml), p. 40 (no. 69) Moffeth AD c. 1218; RRS V, pp. 631f (no. 387) apud ecclesiam parochiale de Moffet AD 1308x1314; RGS I, p. 10 (no. 37) villa de Moffet AD 1315x21; RGS II, p. 76 (no. 333) Meffat AD 1450, p. 232 (no. 1138) Moffet AD 1473; RRS VI, p. 524 (no. 513) Moffet AD 1341x46 or 1357x71; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) Moffett AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) Moffet AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) Moffett AD 1629.
origin precludes it from the surveys of May Williamson or Margaret Scott. One possible interpretation of its etymology appears as early as the 1790s in the *Old Statistical Account of Scotland*, in which the Rev. Alexander Brown, responsible for collecting information on the parish of Moffat, remarks that the “name is said to be Gaelic, and to signify Long-holm”. This interpretation, derived from Gaelic *magh* ‘plain’ and *fada* ‘long’ would be suitable for the geographical context of Moffat. While it is impossible to determine whether this place-name replaced an earlier Brittonic name or settlement, it is interesting that the Gaelic name was not superseded by later Anglian, English, Scandinavian or Scots names. Since many of the Germanic place-names in the parish of Moffat, such as Ruttonside, Breconside, Auldton and Frenchland, can be dated to the central Middle Ages at the earliest, it is possible that Moffat, along with other Gaelic place-names in the parish, form part of an earlier stratum created during or immediately after the Kingdom of Strathclyde ruled over Annandale, in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Although the Gaelic place-name would suggest that Moffat post-dates AD 900, it is likely to be the successor of an earlier, possibly British, settlement. The medieval documentation treats Moffat as a central location in this landscape in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it is situated in a strategic location with access to the valleys of Evandale, upper Annandale and Moffatdale. There is little archaeological evidence in the immediate vicinity of modern Moffat, but this is probably due to the expansion of the burgh. In areas where the town of Moffat gives way to the lands of Archbank, Frenchland and Auldton, the remains of late prehistoric settlements can be seen (fig. 18).

**Polmoody (Moffat)**

Polmoody appears in the written records for the first time in the fourteenth century as *Polbutthy*. The identification of *Polbutthy* with early modern and modern Polmoody is quite certain since the former is explicitly stated to be in Moffatdale. Nevertheless, the differences in these two forms raise questions about their etymology. It is possible that the change from initial *b*- to *m*- in the place-name specific, *-butthy/-moody*, between 1318 and 1520 reflects a phenomenon mostly seen in the Gaelic dialect of Ireland and Galloway, called eclipsis, in
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572 RRS V, pp. 420f.
which an initial consonant is “replaced or ‘eclipsed’ by phonologically related phonemes”, often occurring after the genitive plural article nan (Scottish Gaelic). A similar sound change is likely for medial -tth- and -d-.

Johnson-Ferguson, apparently only aware of the sixteenth-century mention of the place-name, provides the only etymological explanation, arguing for a derivation from Gaelic poll ‘stream’ and madadh ‘dog, wolf’. The poll element suits the modern location, near a number of small rivulets flowing into Moffat Water. The derivation of the specific, which is unlikely to originally have been madadh as discussed above, is difficult. Possible alternative interpretations include Gaelic bùthach ‘of a cottage’, buadhach ‘of power’, bothach ‘marsh, quagmire’ or bota ‘mound, bank’. Any of these elements could have been reasonably applied to a stream.

Although the place-name refers to a landscape feature, both the fourteenth- and early sixteenth-century records associate Polmoody with a farm or estate. It is impossible to say whether that was the case in the early medieval period. In the vicinity of the modern farmstead, a number of indicators of potential late prehistoric settlements have been identified (fig. 22). Based on the lack of written and archaeological evidence, no conclusive date can be assigned to the formation of this settlement, although it must have been created at least by the late fifteenth century to appear in the records in 1520. The Gaelic derivation would indicate a date no earlier than the ninth century, but based on the somewhat inconsistent archaeological evidence mentioned above, it is possible that there was late prehistoric settlement activity in this area. Therefore, perhaps an earlier Brittonic place-name was replaced by Gaelic Polbutthy in the tenth century.
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573 Ó Maolalaigh, ‘Place-Names as a Resource’, p. 23. For a detailed discussion of the phenomenon, see ibid., pp. 23-30.
577 RCAHMS nos. NT11SE 19, NT11SE 2; RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 291, 308 (no. 233 and 1147).
**Rivox (Moffat)**

Rivox first appears in the written record in the early fourteenth century. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a derivation from Gaelic \textit{riabhach} ‘brindled’. However, this identification is uncertain due to the historical spellings, which give both \textit{Rivox} and \textit{Ruffus}. A possible alternative may be a derivation from Gaelic \textit{ruighe} ‘slope’. The development of this place-name likely began as Gaelic *\textit{Na Ruigheachan} ‘the slopes’, whereby the -\textit{gh}- can be pronounced as the -\textit{f}- in Ruffus or -\textit{v}- in Rivox. The name may than have been re-interpreted by speakers of ME as containing the root *\textit{Ruigheach}, to which they added a ME plural -\textit{s}, for *\textit{Ruigheachs}, later appearing as \textit{Revwaus} in the earliest records. The consonant cluster of final -\textit{chs} may account for the later pronunciation and spelling as \textit{Revox}.

If correct, the Gaelic etymology can be used to date Rivox to the period between c. AD 900 and 1315. Assuming that the farm would have needed to be established for some time before the first written appearance in 1315x21, and considering that the earliest record was not specifically created for the purpose of recording a newly founded holding, Rivox may have been founded between 900 and 1200. This may perhaps be even earlier, considering that ME might have already changed the appearance of this place-name in the twelfth century. However, it is not clear on which side of the first millennium boundary Rivox was formed. As Rivox is one of the more prominent sites in the parish’s medieval and post-medieval records, a pre-1000 date for both the name and settlement of Rivox can be proposed. The rationale is that there are no particular features in the landscape or local geography which would explain the sudden emergence of a substantial farm or settlement unless it was of considerable age (fig. 19; picture 4). It is, of course, entirely possible that the settlement or farm was created in the course of the medieval warm period as part of an expansion of arable land. There are signs of cultivation terraces and possible clearance cairns around Rivox and Rivox moor, and
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578 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) \textit{Revwaus} AD 1315x21; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) \textit{Revox} AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) \textit{Renuox [vel Revox]} AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) \textit{Revox} AD 1629; RGS XI, p. 110 (no. 230) \textit{Rivox} AD 1662.

579 Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 100.

580 SCB, p. 192 (no. 203) \textit{Ruffus}, \textit{Ruffes} AD 1581: Johnson-Ferguson lists the name in his survey, but does not offer an etymology, cf. Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 100. There are viable reasons to believe that \textit{Ruffus} and \textit{Rivox} are identical settlements: The only document which we have for \textit{Ruffus} refers to John Halliday who is said to come from this place, and the persons mentioned before and after Halliday originate from Middlegill, only about 2km north-east of Rivox.

581 My gratitude goes to Dr. Jake King for pointing me to comparable place-names in Ross which appear as \textit{Ruvis} and \textit{Ruffis} from the fifteenth century onward, cf. W. J. Watson, \textit{Place-Names of Ross and Cromarty} (Inverness, 1904), p. 64.

582 This argument is further supported by the findings in chapters 9 and 10, suggesting that agricultural potential alone is unlikely to have reserved Rivox a place in the charter of 1315x21.
although these cannot be readily dated, the RCAHMS report on eastern Dumfriesshire suggests they could belong to the prehistoric or medieval periods.\footnote{RCAHMS site no. NT00NW 23; RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 43 and 290 (no. 153).}

8.15 Miscellaneous Germanic Place-names

**Blacklaw (Moffat)**

This place-name appears in the written records, starting in the fourteenth century, as *Blaclau*.\footnote{RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) *Blaclau* AD 1315x21; RSS I, p. 269 (no. 1778) *Blakelaw* AD 1508; RGS II, p. 757 (no. 3522) *Blaklaw* AD 1510; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) *Blaklaw* AD 1625, p. 491 (no. 1459) *Blaklawis* AD 1629.} The name is probably a formation of OE *hlāw* or MSc *law* ‘rounded hill’ and OE *blæc* or ME *blāk* ‘the colour black’.\footnote{Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, pp. 119 and 127; BT ‘blæc’, p. 107, ‘hlǣw’, p. 540; MED I ‘blak’, p. 947; MED V ‘loue, also: lauwe, lau’, p. 1251; DOST I ‘blak, blac(k’, p. 272; DOST III ‘law’, p. 601.} The name may originally just have referred to a hill, and later used to name a nearby farm or estate. Its first mention appears as “terras de […]"
Blacklaw. Even though Blacklaw may have already been a farm or settlement in the fourteenth century, it is unclear whether it referred to more than a natural feature. The farm of Blacklaw no longer exists, but eighteenth-century maps suggest that it was close to the remains of Blacklaw Tower (NT 05211 06754). About 500m north of the tower-house of Blacklaw, the traces of a potentially late prehistoric settlement have been identified by Blacklaw Burn (fig. 19). Although this may not mean that there was a continuity in settlement between the Iron Age and the fourteenth century, it is considered likely that this area has attracted human settlement periodically, if not continually, from the late prehistoric to the early medieval period.

**Bridgend (Moffat)**

Bridgend first appears in the written records in the sixteenth century as Brigend. The generic seems to be ME _end(e) _‘end, place at the end of’. The place-name specific, _Brig-, _is probably derived from northern ME or MSc _brig _‘bridge over a stream’. Modern Bridgend is situated on the eastern bank of the River Annan, and a bridge crosses the river about 100m north of Bridgend. One can assume that the place-name, and presumably the associated settlement, was created in response to the building of a bridge across the River Annan in the Middle Ages. However, the exact date of this construction project is unknown. There is a Bridgend in Lincolnshire which appears for the first time in the mid-thirteenth century, and some Scottish place-names containing ME or MSc _ brig(ge)_ appear as early as the twelfth century. Based on this comparative evidence, as well as the etymology of _Brigend, _it can roughly be dated to the ME or MSc periods, not much earlier than AD 1100. About 700m west of Bridgend the remains of two potentially late prehistoric settlements can be seen, but may be more closely related to early settlement activity at Gardenholm or Meikleholmside, as they lay on the western side of the River Annan (fig. 20).
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586 RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34).
587 NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 5; OS 1st Ed County Map 1:2500 (1861).
588 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 300 (no. 705).
589 RGS IV, p. 116 (no. 503) Brigend AD 1550, p. 121 (no. 533) Brigend AD 1550.
590 Williamson, Non-Celtic Place-Names, p. 199; MED III ‘ende’, pp. 112-5.
592 Watts et al., English Place-Names, p. 85; DOST I ‘brig, bryg’, pp. 350-1.
Cotts (lost)

Cotts is first attested in writing in a fourteenth century charter. Although Cotts appears appended to the name of Greenhill as *Grenhilcotis*, later sixteenth- and seventeenth-century charters show it as *Coittis*.\(^{593}\) It is very likely derived from OE or ME *cot* or MSc *cott* ‘hovel, cottage’.\(^{594}\) The place-name cannot be securely dated. Johnson-Ferguson mentions the place-name for the parish of Moffat in the form of *Cotts*, which can not be verified in any historical spellings. While this would suggest that he found it on the modern map, its location cannot be identified.\(^{595}\) Neither the OS six-inch maps which form the basis of Johnson-Ferguson’s survey, nor the OS name books yielded any results.\(^{596}\) Instead, perhaps Johnson-Ferguson found the historical form of *Coittis* in the records and ‘modernised’ it to *Cotts*. The problem remains that this place-name cannot be localised. It may be possible to approximate its original location based on modern maps and the context of *Coittis* in the charters in which it appears. The earliest references to *Coittis* mention it alongside Bridgend, north of Moffat: “2 marcat. in Coittis, 2 marcat. in Brigend”\(^{597}\) and “2 marcat. in Coittis, 20 sol. de Brigend”.\(^{598}\) Early seventeenth-century charters embed the place-name more firmly within the context of known place-names of the parish of Moffat: “Rex […] ad feudifirmam locavit et quitteclamavit […] mercatam in Moffett, terras de Revox, Mossop, Middilkill, Blaklaw, Grenehill, Coittis, Arikstane, Mekilholmesyde”\(^{599}\) and 14 years later: “Rex […] concessit Joanni Comiti de Annandaill […] mercatam in Moffett, terras de Renuox [vel Revox], Mossope, Middilkill, Blaklaw, Greinhill, Coittis, Arikstaine, Meikilholmeheid”.\(^{600}\) Unfortunately, these are only four documents, created within the period of about 80 years and, therefore, not necessarily representative. Nevertheless, the mention of place-names and farms, such as Revox, Mosshope, Middlegill, Greenhill, Bridgend and Ericstone, indicate that there was a farm or settlement *Coittis* nearby, or within, the parish of Moffat. Moreover, it was likely situated in the central or western part of that parish, where most of the other place-names from the charter context are clustered. With this background, it may be possible to argue that the modern names of Coatsgate (NT 06492 05212) and Coats Hill (NT 07353 04680) could be the remains of *Coittis*, fossilised as place-names in the landscape. Both sites are in close proximity to each

\(^{593}\) RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) *Grenhilcotis* AD 1315x21; RGS IV, p. 116 (no. 503) *Coittis* AD 1550, p. 121 (no. 533) *Coittis* AD 1550; RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) *Coittis* AD 1611; RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) *Coittis* AD 1625.

\(^{594}\) BT ‘cot’, p. 167; MED II ‘cot(e’, p. 635; DOST I ‘cot, cott’, p. 698.

\(^{595}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 97.

\(^{596}\) Ordnance Survey, *Object Name Books*, Dumfriesshire, books 38 and 39.

\(^{597}\) RGS IV, p. 116 (no. 503).

\(^{598}\) RGS IV, p. 121 (no. 533).

\(^{599}\) RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421).

\(^{600}\) RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826).
other, about 1.5km west of Moffat and just beyond the parish boundaries of Moffat (they are part of Kirkpatrick-Juxta parish). This location would roughly fit the distributional pattern suggested by the charters, although the question remains whether Coittis was originally part of the parish of Moffat, and if so, when and why the parish boundaries changed to exclude it. Unfortunately, this problem cannot be solved in the present discussion. There is evidence of a boundary change of the parish of Moffat in 1889, but it affected northern Evandale and not the lands on the western bank of the River Annan. Although the place-name may be of OE origin, the reference to hovels or cottages perhaps suggests an ancillary or dependent settlement of a later estate or manor. Therefore, it is probable that Cotts, even if it could be located, does not represent a permanent early medieval settlement.

**Craigieburn (Moffat)**

Craigieburn first appears in the written records in the sixteenth century as Cragoburn and Craigaburn. The first element, Craig- or Craigie- is possibly derived from Welsh craig ‘a rock’, but may also originate from Gaelic craig, ME crag ‘precipitous rock, cliff’ or the MSc adoption thereof, crag or craig. The second element is –burn, from OE burna or ME or MSc burn ‘a brook or stream’. The place-name may therefore refer to a ‘stream flowing in between rocky banks’. Since both its specific and generic elements may belong to the OE, ME or MSc linguistic periods, the place-name itself provides little evidence on the date of its creation. It is perhaps instructive that the modern farmstead of Craigieburn lies about 250m north of a prehistoric fort and settlement complex (fig. 21). This site has seen at least three phases of occupation, and it has been argued that the settlement superseding the fort indicates that the native fortifications were abandoned during the Roman period in the first to fourth centuries AD, although the dating evidence is far from clear. The presence of a possible native prehistoric fort suggests that this site was primarily defensive in nature, although some agricultural activity may have occurred to support the garrison. Around the beginning, or possibly middle, of the first millennium AD, the focus may have shifted to a farming settlement. The archaeology does not reveal whether this activity was extended into the study
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601 Hay Shennan, *Boundaries of Counties and Parishes in Scotland as settled by the Boundary Commissioners under the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1889* (Edinburgh, 1892), p. 337.
602 HMC (Jhn), p. 22 (no. 31) *Cragoburn* AD 1569, p. 23 (no. 35) *Craigaburn* AD 1571.
605 RCAHMS site no. NT10NW 6; RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 298 no. 618.
period, but it is likely that some sort of settlement activity will have taken place on or near the site of Craigieburn, which then received its modern name during the medieval or late medieval period, after c. AD 1100.

**Creca (Annan)**

Modern Creca is potentially identical with historical Cragkow, recorded in the sixteenth century.\(^{607}\) Although the record mentions both Cragkow and a mora de Grekane, the former is a more likely candidate to be Creca.\(^{608}\) Both place-names appear in the context of a boundary clause, which, based on the known names mentioned, seems to describe a boundary line from the north of the parish of Annan, between Warmanbie and Dumbretton, east via Ragilschawis (modern Raggetshaws) and then south towards the Solway, following in part Merebek (modern Muir Beck). Within this context, mora de Grekane appears south of Raggetshaws, whereas Cragkow is north and, therefore, more likely to be Creca. Similarly, the sixteenth-century text mentions the carne de Cragkow, and although the RCAHMS notes that no modern traces of this cairn remain, it is still marked on the nineteenth-century OS maps (fig. 25).\(^{609}\) Johnson-Ferguson, who quotes an earlier written record of Cragkow with identical spelling from 1469 (which could not be located for the present study) suggests a derivation from Brittonic krakio, which became W craig ‘a rock’.\(^{610}\) It seems as though this interpretation would only explain the first element, Crag-. In Alan James’ discussion of the Westmorland field names Carcowe and Cracoe, a derivation from hypothetical ON *kráka-haugr is proposed, which may have developed into northern ME *craike-howe ‘crows’ mound’.\(^{611}\) Given the environmental features of modern Creca, which is situated on a slight elevation or mound, this interpretation both aligns with the historical spelling and the modern (potentially also historical) location of the site. However, if the place-name was a ME formation, then a date before 1100 is unlikely. Even although a purely Scandinavian formation might date the place-name before AD 1000, there is little archaeological evidence to support this, and the earliest record of 1539 does not seem to refer to Creca in its own right, but rather to the carne de Cragkow, suggesting that this was not the site of a substantial farm or settlement.\(^{612}\)
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\(^{607}\) RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919) Cragkow AD 1539.  
\(^{608}\) RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).  
\(^{610}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 2.  
\(^{612}\) RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).
Elshieshields (Lochmaben)

Elshieshields (fig. 23) appears in the written documentation for the first time in the sixteenth century.\(^{613}\) According to May Williamson, the *Elshie-* may refer to Gaelic *ailech* ‘stony place’, or to a “common ModSc diminutive” for the name of Alexander.\(^{614}\) However, based on the earliest surviving spellings, the Gaelic derivation seems unlikely. The second place-name element is derived from MSc or ME *schele*, referring to a shieling used for accommodating either sheep or shepherds.\(^{615}\) The *terminus ante quem* for the formation of Elshieshields is AD 1569, as it first appears in the written record at that time.\(^{616}\) However, the time in which it was formed remains to be determined. If *Elshie-* goes back to Gaelic *ailech*, as Williamson argues, then the name may date back to the tenth or eleventh centuries, as Gaelic may have had a stronger presence in the study area starting in that century.\(^{617}\) More probably, the name may have been formed as a combination of the Scots diminutive for ‘Alexander’ and the Scots term *shiel*. This would establish the *terminus post quem* in the twelfth century, when the first instances of *shiel* place-names appear in the written record.\(^{618}\) Regardless of each scenario, it should be noted that the place-name of Elshieshields was not formed before AD 900, or possibly AD 1000, and that it is unlikely that this site would have been a permanent settlement even in the decades after it received its name due to the association of shielings with the practice of transhumance.\(^{619}\)

---


\(^{614}\) Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 181. I was unable to find Williamson’s *ailech* in the sense of ‘stony place’. It is possible that she meant *àillbhruach* ‘having steep or rocky banks’, cf. GD p. 13.

\(^{615}\) Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 177; MED X ‘shēle, schel(e’, p. 649; DOST VIII ‘schele, s(c)heıl(l’, pp. 287-8; ‘shiel’, in OED XV, p. 252.

\(^{616}\) HMC (Jhn), p. 22 (no. 31) *Elscheshields* AD 1569.

\(^{617}\) Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 130; Jackson, ‘Britons in Southern Scotland’, p. 87.


Halleaths (Lochmaben)

The settlement of Halleaths can be found in the written documentation of 1452 and 1625. Johnson-Ferguson interprets the name as originating from ON hali ‘a projecting tongue of land’ and ON hlatha ‘barn’. Geographically, this etymological explanation reflects the location of Halleaths: on top of a tongue of land reaching into the River Annan (fig. 23). Alternatively, the first element may describe the settlement’s position on a solid bank south of Halleaths Loch, which was drained in 1846. It is now shown on maps as Brumel Wood. There are indications that there was a temporary Roman camp, lodged between Castle Loch in the south and Halleaths Loch/Brumel Wood in the north, roughly where the farm of Innerfield can be seen today. With estimated dimensions of c. 518 m by c. 472 m, this camp would completely block the passage between the two lochs, as well as seriously infringe on the territory of a potential settlement located at modern Halleaths. Two interpretations can be offered. First, temporary Roman camps can often be found in open, cleared and, arguably, agricultural (arable or pastoral) landscape, as the camps were too large for the soldiers to clear land. Therefore, the camp could indicate early settlement on the site of or near to the camp. Such a scenario likely occurred at the Roman camp at Barnhill in upper Annandale which seems to have been built upon the site of a previous native settlement, although it may have been long deserted before the Roman activity. The Roman fort at Broomholm shows the reverse scenario, in which a native roundhouse was constructed on the site of the fort after it had been abandoned by the Romans.

Alternatively, if the local population was hostile to the Roman troops, or had other reasons for avoiding contact with the Roman forces, the camp near Halleaths would be too close to the potential native settlement at Halleaths for the two of them to have been occupied simultaneously. In this scenario, the camp might still be located in agricultural used land, but the land might belong to a different settlement from the one at Halleaths. The third- or fourth-century Roman camp at Kintore, Aberdeenshire, is an example of a Roman camp seemingly

620 HMC (Drml), p. 58 (no. 113) Hallathis AD 1452; RGS VIII, p. 299 (no. 826) Hallethies AD 1625.
623 The estimated outline of the Roman camp is based on Jones, Roman Camps, p. 263.
624 Prof. Dr. Ian Ralston, Pers. Comm. 2015; Jones, Roman Camps, pp. 87-91.
626 Peter Corser (RCAHMS), The archaeological sites and monuments of Ewesdale and Lower Eskdale, Annandale and Eskdale District, Dumfries and Galloway Region (Edinburgh, 1981), p. 15 (no. 70).
acting as deterrent to native settlement activity. None of these scenarios allow for the close co-existence of a Roman fort or camp with a nearby native settlement, and it may be suggested that Halleaths was a post-Roman settlement, probably founded, or re-named, during the Scandinavian settlement and immigration of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

**Hawmedo (Annan/lost)**

Hawmedo is first attested in the early sixteenth century as *Hawmedow*. Although not visible on recent OS maps, it may be identical with the *Hallmeadow* on the Plan of the New Inclosure Made Upon the Commonty of Annan of 1781, which is situated on the River Annan’s northern bank, flowing into the Solway Firth (fig. 26). The name elements are difficult to date. Haw may be OE *haga*, ME *haue* or MSc *haw* ‘a hawthorn berry’. The meaning of ‘enclosure, place fenced in’ is also attested in OE and ME. Alternatively, it may be derived from MSc *haw* ‘of bluish, leaden, dull colour’. Similarly, *medow* may be an OE, ME or MSc formation, adding to the difficulty of precise dating. The place-name may therefore date to the OE, ME and MSc linguistic periods with the varied meanings of ‘enclosed meadow’, ‘hawthorn meadow’ or ‘meadow of dull colour’, all of which may be applicable to its location. Although the earliest mention of 1517 lists *Hawmedow* along with the names of potential settlements, such as Howes and Barnkirk, the etymology and the mention on the eighteenth-century plan make it unlikely that the site was more than a hay meadow in the sixteenth century or earlier.

**Heck (Lochmaben)**

The earliest written reference to Heck (fig. 24) dates to 1597. The etymological origin of the place-name is uncertain. According to Edward Johnson-Ferguson and the *Dictionary of the Scots Language*, Heck or Hek was used during the OE and ME linguistic periods, referring to either a rack for fodder in a stable or a frame similar to a fishing weir or fish trap, obstructing
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629 NRS Ref. RHP 1.
634 RGS III, p. 30 (no. 145) *Hawmedow* AD 1517.
the movement of fish while not hindering the flow of water.\footnote{Hek, Heck', DOST III, p. 88; Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 89.} This may suggest proximity to Valison Burn, flowing to the west of the modern settlement. When assessing the comparative evidence in England, one comes across Great Heck (Northern Yorkshire) and Heckfield (Hampshire). Heckfield is derived from OE \textit{hēah + feld}, meaning ‘high open ground’.\footnote{Watts et al., \textit{English Place-Names}, p. 293.} The derivation of Heck in Dumfriesshire from the OE word for ‘high’ seems unlikely, as the name lacks any additional element which could be qualified by this adjective. It seems more likely that Heck (Dumfriesshire) is similar in etymological origin to Great Heck (Northern Yorkshire). The latter is derived from OE \textit{hæċċ} ‘hatch, gate’, which in its northern dialectal form can appear as \textit{heck}.\footnote{Watts et al., \textit{English Place-Names}, p. 293.} While this English place-name can be traced further back in time than its Scottish equivalent in the parish of Lochmaben, its written documentation does not pre-date AD 1100.\footnote{Watts et al., \textit{English Place-Names}, p. 293.} There is little evidence to suggest that the settlement of Heck pre-dated AD 1000, especially given its meagre documentary evidence. It has been argued above, however, that it may represent a re-settled or re-named successor settlement to the now lost \textit{Ouseby}.

**Hightae (Lochmaben)**

The place-name of Hightae can be traced to the early fourteenth century, and recurs in the written record several times during the following centuries.\footnote{CDS II, p. 426 (no. 1608) Heghetache AD 1303; CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) Haghtace AD 1360, p. 28 (no. 127) Hetytace AD 1366, p. 28f (no.128) Heghetage AD 1366, p. 49 (no. 223) Hetate AD 1374x5, p. 51 (no. 231) Hetate AD 1376; RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143) Heythate AD 1429x30.} Its first appearance dates to the occupation of Lochmaben under Edward I of England (1298-1307).\footnote{RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, pp. 203-5. See also: R. C. Reid, ‘Edward I.’s Pele at Lochmaben’, TDGNHAS, Ser. III, Vol. 31 (1954), pp. 58-73.} In these records, Hightae appears as one of the more ancient settlements, along with Lochmaben and Smallholm [Smalham], and there is nothing to suggest it was recently founded. Therefore, a pre-fourteenth-century existence for Hightae is therefore plausible. The records contain various spellings of Hightae, such as \textit{Haghtache} or \textit{Heythathe}. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a connection with MSc \textit{taith}, denoting a manured field.\footnote{Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 89. See also: ‘Tath(e’, DOST X, pp. 367-8.} The second element, \textit{hey-} or \textit{hagh-}, might be derived from the ME word for ‘high’.\footnote{Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, p. 255.} Hightae might thus refer to a high lying and regularly manured tract of land, similar in function perhaps to the infield in the Scottish infield-
outfield system. The modern village of Hightae is situated on a slightly elevated piece of land, aligning with the etymology (fig. 24; picture 5). While the modern form of the name has a MSc appearance, both naming elements have ME or ON roots. It is likely that the place-name referred to a regularly manured field in the eleventh or twelfth century, before becoming a settlement which preserved the old field name.

**Hollandbog (Annan)**

Hollandbog first appears in the written documentation as *Holingbog* in a boundary clause of 1539. The place-name is practically invisible on the more recent OS maps, but does appear as Hollangbog Well (NY 20941 71221) on the 1860s OS County map, about 750 m west of Dumbretton. Johnson-Ferguson suggests a derivation from OE *holegn* ‘holly’. The available historical spelling conforms to the MSc derivation of the OE term, namely *holing(e)* ‘holly’. The second element is *bog* ‘a bog, mire’, which seems to have been adopted from

![Picture 5: view of Hightae (from the east)]
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647 OS 1st Ed County Map 1:2500 (1861).
648 Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 2. For *Hollinhirst* in the parish of Canonbie, which may be derived from the same element, see: Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, p. 89; BT ‘holen’, p. 550.
649 DOST III ‘holin(e, hollyn(e’, p. 144.
Gaelic into MSc by the fourteenth century. While the name was unlikely formed before 1100, and perhaps later towards the end of the medieval period, it may be indicative of the quality of the ground. In the boundary clause of 1539, the context appears thus: “ad sublimitatem de Holingbog limitant. inter Dunbertane [Dumbretton] et Wrmanbe [Warmanbie]”. Just as described in this clause, Hollandbog Well can be seen on the nineteenth-century maps on an elevation (sublimitas) west of Dumbretton. It seems that the slope between Warmanbie and the hill top at Dumbretton was covered in bog land during the late medieval, and possibly earlier, periods. This is reflected on the land capability map of chapter 10.

Howes (Annan)

Howes appears for the first time in the written record in the sixteenth century, often in combination with the noun ‘mill’, as in Howismyll. Based on its earliest spellings, the name is probably a plural, with singular being ‘a *How’. Although Johnson-Ferguson identifies it as derived from OE hōh ‘projecting ridge of land’, the historical spellings suggest a connection with MSc how ‘hole, depression in the ground, low-lying area of some extent’. Given that modern Howes is situated in the south-west lowland of the parish of Annan, this etymology seems appropriate (fig. 26). MSc how is derived from OE holl and ME holl, but unless the place-name was ‘updated’ along with the general linguistic development, its current form suggests a formation within the Early or Middle Scots periods, not before AD 1000. The plural -is/-es may refer to ‘a group of hollows or depressions in the landscape’. An alternative interpretation may be ON haugr or ME howe ‘mound’, as discussed in the case of Creca above. However, if Creca’s etymology is correct, then the differences in landscape between Howes and Creca, as well as the varying spellings in the historical record, suggest that this is unlikely.

Outerford (Annan)

There is only one written instance of Outerford which was discovered before 1700, namely Ruterfoord on the Blaeu map of Annandale from the mid-seventeenth century. Although
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650 DOST I ‘bog’, p. 296; MED I ‘bog’, p. 1011.
651 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).
653 Johnson-Ferguson, Place-Names of Dumfriesshire, p. 2; BT ‘hōh’, p. 549; DOST III ‘how’, p. 168.
655 Smout et al., Blaeu, map 10.
Johnson-Ferguson lists the name, neither he nor Williamson offer any etymological interpretation.\textsuperscript{656} The difference between the modern place-name and the name on the seventeenth-century map may be due to the nationality of the map-maker, John Blaeu, rather than to a sudden change in pronunciation of the place-name.\textsuperscript{657} Currently, the name on the modern map is probably the most authentic spelling at our disposal with regard to the etymology. It may simply be a composite of English \textit{outer} and \textit{ford}, which appear in similar forms in ME and MSc contexts, although such an early formation of this name cannot be proven.\textsuperscript{658} The place-name may refer to the settlement’s position along Millside Burn. Because there is virtually no written evidence on this settlement or farm prior to AD 1700, and the archaeological information on its surroundings is equally meagre, it may be argued that Outerford was not a site of early medieval settlement (fig. 25).

**Priestdykes (Lochmaben)**

Priestdykes first appears as \textit{Preist-dikis} in 1508 and 1509.\textsuperscript{659} Williamson and Scott suggest a derivation from OE \textit{prēost} ‘priest’ and OE \textit{dīc} ‘ditch, dyke’.\textsuperscript{660} While an Anglian origin of this place-name is theoretically possible, such a claim would be difficult to maintain given the longevity of the two place-name elements in the ME and MSc lexicon.\textsuperscript{661} Comparative place-names containing \textit{Prest-} in Scotland are recorded as early as the twelfth century and Priestdykes may reflect such an early date.\textsuperscript{662} Williamson remarks upon the fact that many places ending in \textit{–dykes} tend to be found in close proximity to, and possibly referred to, prehistoric earthworks.\textsuperscript{663} In the case of Priestdykes, Williamson argues that this is probably Deil’s Dyke, a natural, probably glacial bank running roughly from the south end of modern Hightae Moss to a field c. 570m east of Braefoot.\textsuperscript{664} Due to the fact that this feature is almost 3km south-west of Priestdykes, it seems implausible that Priestdykes would have been named after it. Instead, the name may have originally referred to bank features along the River Annan,
or the boundary marker of a glebe, which would explain the reference to a priest. The place-name of Kirkhirst plantation, approximately 500m to the west of Priestdykes, may point in a similar direction. The question can, however, not be resolved satisfactorily.

Regarding the dating, the question arises as to which priests the place-name refers to. It may be associated with the function of nearby Lochmaben as parish church, recorded from the twelfth or early thirteenth century. Priestdykes may have been formed as part of the creation of formalised parishes and parish boundaries in Annandale under David I, and would therefore belong to the twelfth century at the earliest. Based upon the lack of Scottish Prest-place-names in records before the twelfth century, and that place-names ending in -dykes are only recorded in southern Scotland from the thirteenth century onward, Priestdykes unlikely gained its name before the ME linguistic period. There is little archaeological evidence to suggest that Priestdykes was settled prior to the formation of the name after AD 1100 (fig. 23).

**Rockhallhead (Lochmaben)**

Rockhall Mote first appears in the written records of the sixteenth century, although nearby Rockhall is attested as early as 1360. The first element seems to refer to OE hrōc ‘rook’, while the second element may be derived from Anglian OE halh, which was adopted in Middle and Modern Scots as haugh or hauch ‘a piece of (alluvial) level ground’. It is unclear when exactly the settlement was named. The elements hauch and its earlier form, halch, seem to appear in writing already in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries with the specialised meaning of ‘meadow by the river’ or ‘alluvial flat land’. Linguistically, the name could have been formed anywhere from the seventh or eighth centuries to the early modern period. If the halh element refers to a flat piece of land by a river, it may have been created in allusion to Rockhall Burn, the only water course in this area on modern maps. According to Margaret Gelling’s study of halh place-names across England, this place-name type may not only describe topographical, but also administrative features, such as a “piece of land projecting
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666 Scott, *Germanic Toponymicon*, pp. 426-7 and 540; DOST VI ‘prest(e, preist(e’, pp. 181-2; DOST II ‘dyke, dike’, p. 251.
667 CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) Rokelle AD 1360; CPB I, p. 422 (no. 793) moite of Rockell AD 1592; RGS III, p. 88 (no. 395) Rokkell AD 1526; RGS VII, p. 574 (no. 1591) Carthat AD 1617.
668 Williamson, *Non-Celtic Place-Names*, pp. 92-95; Scott, *Germanic Toponymicon*, pp. 159 and 162.
670 Gelling, *Place-Names*, pp. 100 and 110.
from, or detached from, the main area of its administrative unit”. Although the meaning of ‘land by the river’ seems to be more frequent in northern England, the alternative interpretation fits the position of Rockhall Mote and Rockhallhead within the parish of Lochmaben, although Rockhall itself notably remains beyond the parish boundaries (fig. 24). A brief field trip statement in the TDGNHAS from 1919 mentioned the theory that Rockhall used to be an Anglo-Saxon settlement or farm, but no further evidence is provided for this. The site of Rockhallhead, close to Rockhall Mote, is the possible site of a medieval chapel. A head carved from stone, now built into the wall of the Dumfries Burgh Museum, is dated to the late twelfth century and reputed to have once formed part of the chapel. It is tempting to see this hypothetical chapel in relation with the motte at Rockhall Mote, a possible Norman and, hence, potentially twelfth-century construction. Rockhall Chapel is accounted for in the written documentation of the early thirteenth century, although both the chapel and associated motte likely predate the thirteenth century. Aerial photography shows signs of early occupation on the site, which, along with the motte and the hypothetical chapel, may suggest that settlers continuously used this site. Unfortunately, due to the lack of archaeological and historical studies on this part of Dumfriesshire, the evidence does not stand on a firm foundation. However, when all hints are taken together, early medieval (or earlier) settlement activity at or near Rockhall Mote or Rockhallhead is possible.

**Seafield (Annan)**

The settlement of Seafield first appears on Blaeu’s map of Annandale during the mid-seventeenth century. The only Scottish relative of this name found is a Seefelde in Fife, which, if considered an instructive parallel, may confirm the etymological background of the Seafield in the parish of Annan. Much like Outerford, Seafield provides little in terms of written records, or a specifically datable etymology. The elements of sea, or see, and field are generic enough to have been formed at any time from the ME to Early Modern English or
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671 Gelling, *Place-Names*, p. 100.
672 Gelling, *Place-Names*, p. 108.
675 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 244 and 250.
676 RCAHMS site no. NY07NE 2; see also: RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 301.
677 Smout et al., *Blaeu*, map 10.
678 RGS II, p. 54 (no. 230) Seefelde AD 1440.
Early to Middle Scots periods.\textsuperscript{679} The place-name aligns with its location, situated quite closely to the Solway shore in the south of the parish of Annan (fig. 26).\textsuperscript{680} In Anglo-Saxon England, the generic -feld/-field was used for settlements already before the mid-eighth century, and could refer to open land, often pasture, or places where arable land use was encroaching on previous pastoral lands.\textsuperscript{681} The seventeenth-century documentary appearance of Seafield would imply that it was not a substantial farm or settlement during the medieval period, and was possibly turned from pastoral to arable field in the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries.

\textbf{Selcoth (Moffat)}

Selcoth first appears in the written record as Selcoutis or Selcouth in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{682} Johnson-Ferguson mentions the place-name and some later documentation, but does not propose an etymology.\textsuperscript{683} Williamson suggests a derivation from OE seld-cuð ‘little known’.\textsuperscript{684} While she argues that this may be due to its remote location, there is nothing to suggest that it was more remote than the settlements to its north and south along the valley of Moffat Water. The first element, Sel-, allows for a wide variety of hypothetical etymologies, such as OE sel, sæl ‘a hall’ or ME sel(l) ‘cell of a hermit’.\textsuperscript{685} However, Williamson’s interpretation is convincingly based on a set adjectival phrase in Anglo-Saxon literature, OE sel(d)cúþ ‘little known, strange, unfamiliar’, even though its use is predominantly recorded south of the river Humber.\textsuperscript{686} If the same term was in use in the Kingdoms of Bernicia or Northumbria, the place-name Selcoth may have referred to one of the more remote farms or estates within the Anglian landscape of Northumbrian-occupied Annandale. This farm on the southern bank of Moffat Water may have been profitable enough to attract early Anglian settlement in an upland area, while also not being as central as, for example, Moffat, the Gaelic origin of which demonstrates that any Anglian name is likely to have been superseded by a Gaelic stratum. Alternatively, Margaret Scott suggests a derivation from MSc selcouth ‘a marvel, a wonder’, and although possible, there is no contextual information to justify such a name.\textsuperscript{687} About

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{679} BT ’sǣ’, p. 808, ‘feld’, p. 274; MED X ‘sē’, pp. 254-6; MED III ‘fēld’, pp. 463f; DOST VIII ‘se, see, sey(e’), pp. 456-8; DOST II ‘feld(e, field’, p. 437.
  \item \textsuperscript{680} Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, p. 81.
  \item \textsuperscript{681} Gelling and Cole, \textit{Landscape of Place-Names}, pp. 269-72.
  \item \textsuperscript{682} RPC II, p. 48 Selcoutis AD 1569, p. 50 Selcouth AD 1569; RGS VIII, p. 491 (no. 1459) Selcouth AD 1629.
  \item \textsuperscript{683} Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names of Dumfriesshire}, p. 100.
  \item \textsuperscript{684} Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, p. 191.
  \item \textsuperscript{685} BT ’sæl’, p. 810; MED II ‘celle, also: sel(l)e’, pp. 113-4.
  \item \textsuperscript{686} BT ’selcūþ’, pp. 585-6.
  \item \textsuperscript{687} Scott, \textit{Germanic Toponymicon}, p. 553; DOST VIII ‘selcouth’, p. 516.
\end{itemize}
170m south-west of modern Selcoth, the remains of a possibly late prehistoric settlement have been identified, which may point to prehistoric and early medieval settlement activity on this site (fig. 22).

**Smallholm (Lochmaben)**

The current spelling of Smallholm is misleading, as the place-name is not a Scandinavian formation in *-holmr*. In its earliest documents it appears as *Smalham* or *Smalehame*, denoting that it belongs to the early Anglo-Saxon *hām* place-name type.\(^{688}\) It therefore consists of OE *smael hām* ‘small village or homestead’.\(^{689}\) Wilhelm Nicolaisen, in his extensive study of Scottish place-names, suggests that Smallholm in Dumfriesshire is an indicator of Anglian settlement in Cumbric territory, and may therefore date back to the seventh century AD.\(^{690}\) Within the landscape of the early medieval parish of Lochmaben, Smallholm may have had a significant role. Alan James has suggested that Anglian place-names in *-hām* may have referred to units of landholding or even estates, which would be particularly significant if an Anglian estate were created as close to the major Cumbric site of Lochmaben as the modern maps suggest.\(^{691}\) While there is no archaeological evidence for settlement activity in the vicinity of modern Smallholm, the place-name evidence for a settlement date before AD 1000 is strong (fig. 24).

**Spedlins (Lochmaben)**

The place-name of Spedlins, found in the far north of the parish, is recorded for the first time in the mid-sixteenth century.\(^{692}\) The etymological origin of this name is obscure.\(^{693}\) The only indicator of potential early settlement at, or near, this site is the record of a possible crannog discovered in Spedin’s Flow, north-west of Spedlins, in the mid-nineteenth century (fig. 23).\(^{694}\) The only reference for this is from a report in 1864. As the site is now afforested and there is no evident local knowledge, no detailed archaeological examination is possible.\(^{695}\) Approximately 650m to the north of Spedlins farm the remains of a late fifteenth-century tower
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\(^{688}\) CDS II, p. 426 (no. 1608) *Smalham* AD 1303; RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143) *Smalehame* AD 1429x30.

\(^{689}\) Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, p. 76.

\(^{690}\) Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, pp. 73-76.


\(^{692}\) RGS IV, p. 103 (no. 451) *Spadlinggis* AD 1550.

\(^{693}\) Johnson-Ferguson, *Place-Names of Dumfriesshire*, p. 90.


\(^{695}\) See notes on RCAHMS record, site no. NY08NE 7; RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 306.
house can be identified.\(^{696}\) However, rather than being indicative of the settlement’s age, the tower house may simply be a reflection of the strategic position along the River Annan, and need for fortification (or representation) in the face of the Border conflicts, or late medieval estate patterns.\(^{697}\) The early medieval origin of Spedlins, or settlement on its present site is therefore doubtful.

**Spittalridding (Annan)**

Spittalridding (fig. 25) is first traceable on Blaeu’s map of Annandale, where it appears as Spittelridding.\(^{698}\) Both Johnson-Ferguson and Williamson argue for a derivation from OE \textit{hryding} ‘a patch of cleared land’, with the first element, Spittal-, referring to a hospital.\(^{699}\) It is unclear when exactly ‘hospitals’ came to Scotland, although it is unlikely that this happened before they were introduced in England around the eleventh century; the first record of a site being called ‘hospital’ dates from the early twelfth century.\(^{700}\) The name specific, Spittal, suggests a date post-AD 1000, and the same may be argued for -ridding. If a parallel may be drawn between ON \textit{þveit} and OE \textit{hryding}, these place-names may indicate the clearing of previously marginal lands, which would suggest that Spittalridding was founded on a previously un-settled site.

**Woodcock Air (Annan)**

The wood of Woodcock Air to the north-west of the parish is attested in the written documentation from the fourteenth century.\(^{701}\) According to Johnson-Ferguson, its earliest forms \textit{Wodecokheir} and \textit{Wodcokkar} probably refer to the locally nesting animal, the woodcock, and ON \textit{ærgi} ‘shieling’, which in turn is derived from Gaelic \textit{airigh}.\(^{702}\) It is possible that Woodcock Air was the site of an early medieval shieling in the tenth or eleventh century.

\(^{696}\) RCAHMS site no. NY08NE 4; RCAHMS, \textit{Dumfriesshire}, p. 3.
\(^{698}\) Smout et al., \textit{Blaeu}, map 10; Williamson, \textit{Non-Celtic Place-Names}, p. 217.
\(^{701}\) CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) \textit{Wodecokheir} AD 1360; RSS I, p. 135 (no. 912) \textit{Wodcokkar} AD 1503, p. 151 (no. 1029) \textit{Wodcokkar} AD 1504, p. 274 (no. 1799) \textit{Wodcokkke} AD 1509, p. 362 (no. 2383) \textit{Wodcokkkare} AD 1512; RGS VII, p. 254 (no. 683) \textit{Wodecokhheir} AD 1612.
centuries. There is no evidence to suggest it ever referred to a permanent settlement, and the earliest reference to Wodecokheir clearly indicates that it was a park, rather than a settlement, in 1360 (fig. 25).
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703 For comparative airigh names in Galloway and the Isle of Man, see Oram, ‘Scandinavian Settlement’, pp. 133-4.
704 CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) AD 1360.
II. The APP Methodology
9. Agriculture and Population Estimates

The previous seven chapters of this thesis were concerned with a classical approach to settlement history: archaeological and written evidence, as well as the complex tapestry of place-names, were examined to establish the focal sites and chronologies of settlement activity. The discussion of multiple estates and parishes as basic units for the study of early medieval patterns of lordship has provided a framework for understanding settlements not as isolated habitats, but as the constituent parts of larger geographical entities in which they were connected economically, if not socially, to other farms and hamlets. What the traditional approach cannot achieve in Dumfriesshire, due to the lack of written documentation, is the reconstruction of what the interaction of the settlements may have looked like. Therefore, the second part of this thesis (chapters 9 to 11) is dedicated to the explanation of a new methodology, the APP or Agricultural Population Potential, designed to complement traditional archaeological and historical approaches through a combination of agrarian models and population estimates. Although the specific difficulties of the early medieval Dumfriesshire landscape have been the core incentive behind the creation of the APP methodology, the following chapters may also be understood as providing the template for similar approaches to other regions with limited written records.

In a predominantly agrarian society, the ability to feed a population based on arable and pastoral farming would have been a key factor determining the status and possible settlement density of a given area. It is suggested, therefore, that the calculation of the agricultural potential surrounding each of the early medieval settlements identified in the three parishes can provide new insights into the relationship between settlement activity, land use, and estates. These calculations are not claimed to be exhaustive nor conclusive. Rather, this approach hopes to provide an approximate, and in most cases, relative sense of the agricultural potential within different areas of each parish, based on the local resources. This analysis cannot take into account local differences in agricultural practice, nor the restrictions outside the sphere of soil types and climate, such as regulations introduced by the lord of the estate, parish-internal boundaries based on patterns of scattered landholding or even differences between farms or settlements which arise from the social status of their inhabitants. Thus, the following analysis will primarily take into account the maximum number of people who
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705 The case may be different, for example, in early medieval Ireland, where Matthew Stout has suggested that the holdings and farmsteads of the various ranks of freemen mentioned in old Irish law can be identified and distinguished archaeologically, see: Matthew Stout, ‘The early medieval farm’, in *Agriculture and Settlement*, ed. Murphy and Stout, pp. 15-17.
can, in theory, be sustainably fed based on the types of land (arable, meadows, pasture) within a given settlement’s catchment of land. This definition will be abbreviated as Agricultural Population Potential, or APP. The Agricultural Population Potential is, therefore, a gross value, standing in opposition to an unknown net population, as the actual extent of the population would depend on a number of non-agricultural demographic effects, such as warfare or local conflict, birth rates, sickness or epidemics amongst people and livestock, social status of different sites in the landscape, legal restrictions on mobility as well as family cohesion.

The most comprehensive attempts to estimate population density based on the agricultural potential of the landscape has, thus far, been achieved by the agronomists Marcel Mazoyer and Laurence Roudart in History of World Agriculture. In their survey of agricultural systems throughout preshistory and history, Mazoyer and Roudart pose a number of elemental questions when attempting to estimate the population number of a given landscape. Each of these questions will be analysed and compared to current knowledge of early medieval southern Scottish agriculture, in order to provide an appropriate estimate for the APP calculation in chapter 11.

9.1 Food Requirements per Person

The food requirement of people plays a vital role in any consideration of rural economy: after all, the principal aim of agriculture is to feed the population, or, on a more local scale, the family. Although this assumption is somewhat basic, the actual calculation or estimation of food requirements is fraught with imprecision. This may be the reason why Mazoyer and Roudart tend to speak of “cereal equivalents”, or an amount of food based on the equivalent caloric value to a given amount of cereals. The various factors affecting the requirements and provision in valuable nutrients are numerous and complex. For example, in the case of fourth-century BC Attica, Walter Scheidel and Peter Garnsey estimate that about 25-30 per cent of Athenian food was non-cereals. Thus, the extent of horticulture, hunting, fishing and similar means to procure food are difficult to accurately assess on a larger scale. However,
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707 Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, pp. 10 and 68f.
given that no precise information can be obtained on this matter for early medieval Dumfriesshire, the food requirement per person per year will be estimated at 200kg of cereal or cereal-equivalent. This value is suggested by Mazoyer and Roudart, and is close to the estimates of Scheidel and Garnsey as well as that of Robert Shiel.\footnote{Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, pp. 68f and 243; Scheidel and Garnsey, \textit{Food in Classical Antiquity}, p. 187; Robert Shiel, ‘Science and Practice: The Ecology of Manure in Historical Retrospect’, in \textit{Manure Matters. Historical, Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives}, ed. Richard Jones (Farnham, 2012), p. 20.} In order to estimate how much land needs to be cultivated to feed a given population, Mazoyer and Roudart operate on the basis that families contained five persons, since one agricultural worker would often have to support a number of children, elderly or others who either contributed to the agricultural work only to a limited extent, or not at all.\footnote{Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, pp. 68-9 and 243.} In order to feed a group of five people, based on the food requirements above, the agricultural worker or peasant would have to create a net yield of roughly 1000 kg of cereals or cereal-equivalent per year. Detailed evidence for cereal crop regimes in early medieval Annandale is scarce, but the discovery of the remains of an ard or scratch-plough (picture 6) dateable to approximately the first century BC near Lochmaben would suggest that fields were cultivated for grain later in the first millennium AD, too.\footnote{Rees, ‘Agricultural Tools’, pp. 73-6; Alexander J. Fenton, ‘Plough and Spade in Dumfries and Galloway’, TDGNHAS, Ser. III, Vol. 45 (1968), pp. 147-51, 147-83.} The excavations at the Anglian monastic site at Hoddom confirm this, as they revealed evidence for large-scale grain processing (primarily drying kilns) from the seventh and eighth centuries onward.\footnote{Lowe and Brooke, \textit{Excavations at Hoddom}, pp. 100-10, 145-7.} The primary crop seems to have been oats, rather than barley.\footnote{Lowe and Brooke, \textit{Excavations at Hoddom}, p. 110.}
As outlined above, Mazoyer’s and Roudart’s calculation focuses upon the number of people who can be supported on arable land. The landscape of upper Annandale, especially in the parish of Moffat, is dominated by large tracts of pasture with little or no viable arable land. Therefore, in order to avoid a biased estimate of APP for areas with different landscape and soil types, attention should be paid to the important role of livestock as a source for food. Similar to cereal farming, it is virtually impossible to produce exact estimates of how many people could be supported based on a solely pastoral economy, but approximations can be proposed. Robert Shiel, in his article on the importance and role of manure in agricultural systems, suggests that, given the same acreage, ten times more people could be fed on cereals and legumes planted on that land than if the land was used purely for livestock husbandry.\footnote{Shiel, ‘Science and Practice’, p. 14.} This is an important point, also emphasised in more general terms by Faith and Banham.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, pp. 75f.} At a later stage in Shiel’s discussion, he embarks on a theoretical experiment in order to emphasise the importance of manure, and, in doing so, he presents numbers which are reflected elsewhere in the literature on agriculture and population estimates. Shiel works on the basis that one bullock may take two years to grow to a weight of 400kg and that it would produce 60kg of nitrogen in its excretions, of which about 20kg could be meaningfully collected and applied to arable fields. This amount of manure would account for about 315kg of additional wheat, which, according to Shiel, “would feed nearly twice as many people as the meat from

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Ard beam discovered in the parish of Lochmaben (now kept in Dumfries Museum)}
\end{figure}
its [the bullock’s] body”. The article also indicates that Shiel assumes one person would require about 180kg of wheat per year as food, which is very similar to Mazoyer and Roudart’s estimate of 200kg. Thus, the 315kg of wheat from the bullock’s manure would amount to the food to nourish approximately one or two people. Of the bullock’s 400kg body weight, Shiel suggests that about 60 per cent (=240kg), would be edible carcass. Therefore, Shiel proposes that almost two entire bulls are required to sustain a maximum of two people who were consuming 315kg of wheat. As will be discussed, the amount of land required to graze two bulls ranges between two and eight times the amount of land required to grow enough wheat to feed up to two people. This ratio would be even more unfavourable towards the pastoral regime when taking into account that more than two head of cattle would be required in order to ensure the reproduction of the herd.

At the same time, it is important to remember that milk, cheese and other dairy-products would have also played a vital role (and been perhaps more crucial than meat) in people’s diets during the later Anglo-Saxon period. In his chapter on pastoral nomadism, David Grigg argues that nomad peoples in the Middle East and central Asia mostly rely on the milk of their herds, while meat is rarely eaten. He provides the estimate that nomad families in the Middle East would require 25-60 goats or 10-25 camels for subsistence. While parallels to such chronologically and geographically removed agricultural systems should not be over-emphasised, the point remains that a considerable herd is required to feed a small number of people solely on animal products.

Estimates from other geographically and chronologically closer areas, such as early medieval Ireland, reveal that legal texts expected an ócaire, a freeman of the lowest rank, to own one bull and seven cows, while the next highest rank, the bóaire, was expected to have twelve cows. Matthew Stout estimates the minimum amount of land available to the lowest freeman rank of the ócaire (one tír cumaille) at approximately 13.9ha. Assuming there was a strong focus on the consumption of meat, then the following can be argued: a cow would have its first calf at the age of three, and the offspring would require a further two years to grow to a weight of about 350kg; one bull or cow of that weight (with an edible carcass of 60 per cent of body weight = 210kg) would feed one person a year on meat, so that a family of
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717 Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, pp. 107-16.
718 Grigg, Agricultural Systems, pp. 113 and 115.
720 Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 18.
five would require five head of large livestock, or cattle, per year. Thus, in any given year, the family would require approximately 15-20 head of cattle in total. For the supply of meat, the family would require five cows (minimum two years of age) for the current year, and five cows (minimum one year of age) to be consumed the following year. In addition to the ten head of meat-cattle living and dying in a two-year-cycle, a minimum of five cows would be required for breeding, in order to reproduce five calves each year, and for milking. Given that not every cow will come into calf every year, and taking into account bulls, oxen used for traction and the possibility of animals lost to sickness, raids and similar factors, a reasonable estimate for cattle required would be about 20, with an additional five calves under one year. The focus of this estimate on the production of meat, rather than milk, may cause it to be somewhat inaccurate, but when compared to the 25-60 goats or 10-25 camels from the Middle Eastern ethnographic evidence, and taking into account the relative size and productivity of these animals, an estimate of 20 head of cattle (above one year of age) for a population solely dependent on pastoral products with only small-scale or no additional horticultural food-production may be accepted as a working hypothesis. In his analysis of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century stock inventories of upland farming communities in northern England and southern Scotland, Angus Winchester has calculated an average cattle herd size of c. 20 head. Of course, these estimates should not be transferred into an early medieval context untested. The farming systems studied by Winchester had a different cultural and economic background, as the focus seems to have been the breeding of livestock for sale rather than subsistence. The testators’ herds as listed in the inventories ranged widely from 14 and fewer head of cattle to 40 and more, and this is not even counting the often substantial numbers of sheep owned by the same people. Thus, methodological caveats abound. Nevertheless, the sixteenth-century livestock counts may be seen as broadly providing an upper limit to the cattle estimate calculated above, and they have the advantage over the Irish laws of being descriptive in nature, rather than normative. While this estimate is mostly focused on cattle, other types of smaller livestock would almost certainly have featured in the agricultural life in early medieval southern Scotland, such as goats and sheep. However, in these cases it is assumed that while smaller livestock might be less productive than cattle, they would also require
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721 Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 22. Regarding the age of early medieval cattle for calving, based on early medieval Irish and medieval Welsh documents, see Fergus Kelly, Early Irish Farming (Dublin, 1997), p. 37. With regard to the breed and weight of early medieval Irish cattle, Stout works on the basis that these were closest to the modern Kerry breed.
723 Winchester, Harvest of the Hills, pp. 18-20.
724 Winchester, Harvest of the Hills, pp. 18-21.
smaller amounts of grazing, thus leading to a roughly similar ratio of pasture per people fed on livestock.\textsuperscript{725}

In the early medieval Irish laws, a freeman, presumably including his family, is expected to live off what Matthew Stout calculated as about 13.9ha of land. If, as Stout suggested, about two thirds of this land were used as pasture for eight head of cattle and perhaps half that number in small livestock such as sheep or goats, and the remaining third were used as arable, then this supports the suggestion that a family with about ten head of cattle still has to rely to considerable extent on cereal crops or horticulture in order to secure their subsistence.\textsuperscript{726}

9.2 Climate

One of the primary factors to be considered within agriculture and agricultural developments is climate. This is already indicated by the often-cited remark on Ireland in the \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, in which Bede states that it “has a much milder climate, so that snow rarely lasts there for more than three days. Hay is never cut in summer for winter use nor are stables built for their beasts.”.\textsuperscript{727} Dendrochronology and the analysis of peat-deposits have extensively outlined the broad climatic developments in the first millennium AD, as discussed in chapter 2. However, due to the difficulty of obtaining reliable localised data, climate cannot be accurately reflected in the present estimates of agricultural productivity. Mazoyer and Roudart framed their calculations in broad categories such as hot (Mediterranean) temperate climate, northern cold temperate climate, and even colder climate in the extreme European north.\textsuperscript{728} From these categories, estimates based on the northern cold temperate climate have been applied to Dumfriesshire, as southern Scotland arguably does not qualify for the harsher climatic conditions in central and northern Scandinavia.

\textsuperscript{725} Mazoyer and Roudart work on the basis of livestock units, where one large livestock unit is equivalent to one head of cattle, which in turn equates about five to six head of small livestock, such as goats and sheep. Similarly, Grigg equates one head of cattle with seven sheep: Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, p. 243 and Grigg, \textit{Agricultural Systems}, p. 115.

\textsuperscript{726} Personal comment by Tom Collins of the Teagasc Institute in Ireland, in Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 18.

\textsuperscript{727} HE I, 1.

\textsuperscript{728} Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, pp. 243-4.
9.3 Land and Feed Requirements for Livestock

The above quote from Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* brings attention to another central aspect of early medieval agriculture, namely the question of how much livestock could be fed in the cold season of the year. In a system of year-round grazing, cattle and other livestock would spend little or no time in stables and, instead, be sustained by the available pasture, with the disadvantage that grass growth would decrease in autumn and winter, severely diminishing the available nutrients.\(^{729}\) This, in turn, demonstrates the importance of a system based on hay-making: while a herd could be fed on pasture throughout the year, the productivity of grass is lower during the winter months. In the absence of great amounts of other fodder crops, the low amounts of grazing available in winter would set the maximum for a livestock herd which could be sustained. If hay is harvested during the early summer months, dried and kept for winter, a large herd could still feed on the fast-growing grass in the summer and early autumn, and would survive on hay and the low-quality pasture during winter.\(^{730}\) Apart from increasing the number of cattle which can be brought through the winter, hay-making has the benefit that manure, the primary means of regenerating arable soils, could be collected more efficiently. Without stabling, the only way of distributing manure onto a fallow field would be to move cattle between pasture and fallow lands repeatedly on a daily basis. In this way, cattle would absorb biomass from the pasture, and distribute it on the fallow land, often at night “when much of the excretion occurs”.\(^{731}\) Significant quantities of manure/biomass would also be lost on the way or never leave the pasture.\(^{732}\) In a system where cattle are kept in stables during part or throughout the entire cold season, straw and similar absorbent materials could be used to more efficiently collect the manure, which, in turn, would be applied manually wherever needed.\(^{733}\)

The extent to which farming included stabling and hay-making, both of which are closely connected, is difficult to determine for southern Dumfriesshire. Apart from Bede’s aforementioned remark about Irish climate and limited hay-making, which seems to be


\(^{732}\) Robert Shiel suggests a loss of c. 33 per cent of the total manure produced by a bullock in a year if that bullock is kept in a stable for half the year. Mazoyer and Roudart similarly propose that one head of cattle can produce 15 tonnes of manure per year, and that in a system with stabling about 10 tonnes could effectively be collected and applied to the fallow: Shiel, ‘Science and Practice’, pp. 20-1; Mazoyer and Roudart, *World Agriculture*, pp. 243 and 282.

\(^{733}\) Shiel, ‘Science and Practice’, p. 19.
mirrored accurately in the contemporary Irish sources, very little local historical evidence exists. Instead, much hinges on the two determining factors of availability of the scythe and the nature of the landscape. The relevance of the scythe lies in its ability to speed up the process of cutting grass for hay, which would otherwise have been accomplished using the much smaller sickle, or indeed with bare hands. Fowler and Faith suggest that the scythe was available in first-millennium AD Britain, and there is archaeological evidence of scythes in southern England dating to the fourth century. However, while Fowler argues that the scythe and other iron tools were probably not uncommon in the first millennium AD, this may be a state of affairs restricted to areas in the formerly Roman zone of Britain. It is uncertain whether eastern Dumfriesshire was influenced enough by Roman farming technology and trade to share “to any appreciable degree in the ‘iron-tool farming economy’ of the second to fourth centuries AD”. It should be noted, however, that the effectiveness of tools such as the scythe may lie in its length, rather than in the materials used (such as bronze or iron).

Apart from the indirect evidence for hay-making, such as the implements used, there is some archaeological evidence for hay meadows in the first millennium AD. With specific relevance to Dumfriesshire, there is some tentative evidence for hay-making in the Iron Age and early historic period in the northern parts of the county, particularly in the parish of Eskdalemuir. This showcases another factor determining the use of a hay-making system: even if the available implements were not the limiting factor, the landscape may have been. The early medieval landscape of the three parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan would arguably not have included as much improved grassland for hay-making and pasture as today. As will be discussed in chapter 10, the eighteenth-century plans of the study area seldom mention meadows and, in the parish of Moffat, meadows tend to be on the same land as arable outfields. In all cases, the meadowlands are located on the low-lying banks of rivers or
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734 HE I, 1; Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 22. Brendan Riordan suggests that hay-making in Ireland was either introduced, or gained importance, in the twelfth century, with an important role being played by the Cistercian abbeys and granges: Riordan, ‘Dynamic Relationships’, p. 173.
736 Fowler, Farming, pp. 166 and 168.
737 Fowler, Farming, pp. 163-4.
738 Fowler, Farming, pp. 164, 168.
740 Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, pp. 124-5; Fowler, Farming, pp. 224, 285.
741 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 21 and 77.
streams. This is borne out by the archaeological evidence for early medieval meadowlands both in Dumfriesshire and southern England. Although the estate plans utilised for the land capability reconstruction demonstrate only a few examples of land dedicated solely to hay meadows, it is likely that large portions of the arable land lying along the rivers could be used as meadow land if the need arose.

With these considerations in mind, what were the practical differences for the amount of land required in order to feed a given number of cattle? According to Mazoyer and Roudart, in an agricultural system with limited capability to harvest hay (or, in other words, with year-round grazing), 8 hectares of pasture are needed for one head of large livestock in cold temperate climate. On the other hand, in a system where hay is harvested, one head of large livestock can survive in a cold temperate climate on 1.5 hectares of land, equally divided between hay meadows and pasture. This is 6.5 hectares less than the pasture land required without harvesting hay. The difference is explained by the fact that the generally harsh winter climate in the cold temperate zone affects the growth of grass negatively, leading to a greater land requirement in the winter months.

In his study on Irish farming practice based on the early Irish law codes between AD 600-900, Matthew Stout estimated a stocking rate of 0.58 to 0.67 head of cattle per hectare of land available, or 1.49 to 1.72 hectares per head of cattle, which can be roughly situated between the two extremes mentioned by Mazoyer and Roudart, albeit closer to a system based on hay-making. The early medieval Irish evidence does not demonstrate any signs of hay-making, and possibly the practice was only adopted widely after the Norman arrival. This may have partly been due to the mild winters in Ireland, and hay-making would have been discouraged by the generally wet summers. However, Stout posits that part of the pasture was preserved for winter grazing, the so-called ‘aftergrass’ or athlompaire, which was left to grow until winter, when it effectively functioned as ‘standing hay’, despite its low nutritional value.
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742 NRS Ref. RHP 81922, RHP 140401, RHP 83387 no. 5.
743 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 21, 77; Fowler, Farming, p. 285; Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, pp. 146, 153-4, 167.
748 Kelly, Early Irish Farming, pp. 46-8.
749 Kelly, Early Irish Farming, pp. 46-8.
750 Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 22.
9.4 Arable Lands and the Yield Ratio

Regarding the management of arable land, the key factor determining the number of people who could live off a given amount of land with cereal crops is the yield ratio, or the number of seeds harvested per seed sown. Such estimates are difficult to come by and suggested numbers can only provide rough trends, which often fail to acknowledge years with bad harvests and anthropogenic factors.

In their study of Hellenistic Greece, Scheidel and Garnsey estimate average gross yield figures of 625kg (wheat) to 770kg (barley) per hectare based on 130kg of seed sown (both barley and wheat). The net yield (after deducting next year’s seed) would be 495kg or 640kg per hectare, although these numbers probably represent the upper limits, as losses and other factors may reduce the net yield further. Mazoyer and Roudart operate on the basis of 500kg gross yield per hectare of cereal, with losses of 200kg for next year’s seed and other factors, and arrive at a net yield of 300kg per hectare, which may be more realistic for the colder and wetter climate of south-western Scotland as compared to ancient Greece. Mazoyer and Roudart do not specify the yield rate, but if approximately 150kg out of the 200kg deducted from the gross yield may be considered seed for the next year, this would produce a ratio of 3:1 (as compared to the ratios of 4.8:1 and 6:1 proposed by Scheidel and Garnsey). This estimate is reflected in the findings of yield-to-seed ratios calculated for Carolingian Europe, which are estimated around 2:1 or 3:1 for the ninth and tenth centuries. Based on a net yield of 300kg of cereal per hectare, and assuming that 1000kg of cereal-equivalent are required to feed a family of five, about 3.5 hectares of land would have had to be cultivated each year. While these are the numbers which will be used in the following estimates, it is important to note that experiments with ancient crop varieties at Butser Iron Age farm in Hampshire have produced gross yields ranging from about 1.4 tonnes per hectare (Einkorn / Triticum monococcum) to 2.5 tonnes per hectare (Emmer / Triticum dicoccum). These yields have been achieved without the application of fertilisers or any residues of previous land use.

751 Scheidel and Garnsey, Food in Classical Antiquity, p. 204.
752 Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, pp. 242-3. Regarding the effects of Scottish climate on crops, see: Peter McNeill and Hector MacQueen, eds., Atlas of Scottish History to 1707 (Edinburgh, 1996), pp. 17f; Joy Tivy, ed., The Organic Resources of Scotland. Their Nature and Evaluation (Edinburgh, 1973), pp. 16f; Coppock, Agricultural Geography, pp. 32-35. Modern land surveys seem to support the idea that, generally, eastern Dumfriesshire has temperatures which support good cereal growth, yet the wet climate tends to limit the extent of productive arable cultivation.
753 Scheidel and Garnsey, Food in Classical Antiquity, p. 204.
Nevertheless, their applicability to southern Scotland is restricted by a multitude of factors affecting agricultural land use, in particular regional climatic conditions as well as soil types. Butser farm is located approximately 480km south-east of the study area in Annandale and is situated on chalky parent materials, both of which would have a likely beneficial effect on length of growing season and plant nutrient uptake.

9.5 Regenerating the Land: Manure and Fallow

As Richard Jones eloquently expressed in his fittingly titled edited volume *Manure Matters*, an often overlooked but important factor of rural economy is the regeneration of soil after the growth of crops. Throughout agricultural history, the physical relationship between arable field and settlement was determined by the means available to maintain the quality of the soils. One key factor is the length of the fallow period. In a system of true shifting cultivation, fields are cultivated for several years until the crop yields decrease and a new field must be sought. In areas with tropical rain-forests, the depleted fields would have to be left to fallow for up to 25 years before the generated forest could again be cleared for cultivation. In such a system, large amounts of woodland are required for a small population to be supported sustainably. Thus, the availability of manure, and the means and rhythm of applying it to the fallow, is a key aspect of agricultural regimes.

Manure is not the only means of maintaining or regenerating the fertility and is often incorporated into a system of long fallow periods or the rotation of different crops. The latter ensures that, rather than using the same nutrients of the soil over and over again, thereby depleting them, different crops, such as legumes, which use different nutrients or even restore nutrients such as nitrogen, allow the soil time to recover. Although all the ingredients for a crop rotation, for example with legumes or vetch, existed since Antiquity and were even partly

used in Hellenistic Greece, the cultural, climatic and various unknown reasons seem to have led to a fairly late adoption of these methods in later medieval northern Europe.\footnote{Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, p. 318.} While crop rotation was certainly not practiced in a systematic manner in Anglo-Saxon England, it is less clear whether we should imagine Anglo-Saxon peasants having cultivated their fields in a two-field or three-field system.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, p. 44.}

It should be assumed that Anglo-Saxon agriculture did not follow rigid systems all across the land, but rather that some local and cultural variations existed from village to village or estate to estate.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, p. 72-3.} But in order to approximate the early medieval situation, and due to the lack of detailed written accounts, the choice here is very broadly between the two-course and three-course system. In the two-course system, half of all arable fields are left fallow, while the other half is used to grow cereal crops. In the three-course system, only one third of all arable is kept in fallow, while spring cereal, often barley, is grown on another portion and winter cereal, often wheat, on the last portion.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, p. 72; Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, pp. 231-3 and 273-5.} The implication is that, by using two thirds of the available land (rather than one half), the three-course system is more productive. However, this does not mean that the two systems are mutually exclusive in a given area and period. There is evidence of the systems existing simultaneously in medieval England.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, p. 72; H. S. A. Fox, ‘The Alleged Transformation from Two-field to Three-field Systems in Medieval England’, The Economic History Review, Vol. 39, No. 4 (1986), pp. 531-34.}

While there are arguments for the existence of the three-field system as early as the Carolingian period, the evidence seems to suggest that this was an exception, rather than a common occurrence.\footnote{Verhulst, ‘Agricultural Revolution’, pp. 23-4.} Sources attesting to the two- or three-field system in Anglo-Saxon England are rare, but there are hints that at least the two-field system existed in the early tenth century.\footnote{Faith and Banham, Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming, pp. 72-3.} H. S. A. Fox argues that the three-field system emerged in the English midlands in the last three centuries of the Saxon period.\footnote{Fox, ‘Three-field Systems’, pp. 545-48.} For the present calculation, the assumption will be that all arable fields were managed in a two-field or biennial system. This generalisation is due to the lack for three-field systems in early medieval England, and the fact that three-field systems tend to require regions which are ideally suited for cereal crop growing, both in terms of soil condition and climate. Mazoyer and Roudart highlight the intensive character of the three-field system by stressing the great amount of manure required to still maintain the soil’s fertility,
while Fox remarks that the earliest evidence for a transformation from two-field to three-field systems in the English countryside tends to come from areas with fertile clay soils.\textsuperscript{69} It will be argued here that the soil and climate conditions of early medieval Dumfriesshire were generally not favourable enough for cereal crops to allow for a general use of the three-field system.

In a system where cattle graze year-round, and manure is not collected in stables, but transferred to the arable by penning livestock on the arable field at night and moving them to the pasture for the day, one head of large livestock is required to manure one hectare of sown land.\textsuperscript{70} Mazoyer and Roudart assume that penning the animals on fields transfers only one third of the large livestock’s total manure production to the fallow. They estimate this would result in five out of 15 tons. Five tons of manure are required in a low-intensity system such as biennial rotation to manure one hectare of sown land.\textsuperscript{71} Thus, if 3.5 hectares needed to be manured, this would require 3-4 head of cattle, which, in turn, would need about 24 to 32 hectares of land. In a system based on hay-making and livestock stabling during winter months, 10 tons of manure, rather than just five tons, can be transferred onto the fallow. Thus, in this system, one head of cattle would suffice to manure two hectares of arable in a low-intensity two-field system.\textsuperscript{72} For the amount of 3.5 hectares, two head of large livestock would be required, which would feed on 3 hectares of land (1.5ha multiplied by two), composed in equal parts of meadow and pasture.

Despite the absence of documentary records for the region, the assumption is that peasants generally tried to cultivate their lands in a sustainable fashion, in order to avoid depleting the soil through over-cropping and under-manuring. However, evidence from early Irish laws suggests that, especially among members of the lower free classes, some might hold lands too limited for sustainable soil regeneration.\textsuperscript{73} These tenants may have been expected to work de facto in a system of shifting cultivation, moving to a different plot of land every few years.

\textsuperscript{70} Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, pp. 243-4.
\textsuperscript{71} This number starkly contrasts even the more traditional modern farming systems in Europe, such as Spain, where intensively cropped fields with a rotation between emmer, spelt, maize and potatoes are manured with 15-40 tonnes per hectare per year, see: Bogaard, ‘Middening and Manuring’, p. 34. Such differences can arise from various factors, however the type of crop and the soil composition of the area likely have the greatest impact.
\textsuperscript{72} Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, pp. 243-4 and 282.
\textsuperscript{73} Personal comment by Tom Collins of the Teagasc Institute in Ireland, in Stout, ‘Early Medieval Farm’, p. 18.
To summarise, the cereals harvested from 3.5ha of land will support a family of five each year. In a biennial or two-field system, this means that, at any given time, 3.5 hectares of arable have to be under crop, while another 3.5 hectares are in fallow. Thus, to feed a family of 5 people, 7 hectares of arable land are required in total.

9.6 Settlement Catchment

In order to assess the agricultural potential of different settlements within a given parish, it is necessary to divide the available lands between the settlements in question. The best way to do this would be to retrace early medieval territorial boundaries, ideally based on charter evidence. However, it can be argued that not enough evidence exists for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan to reliably reconstruct bounded units smaller than the parish. The earliest boundary clause pertaining to any of the three parishes dates from 1539, in the parish of Annan. Before 1539, all charters referring to lands in any of the three parishes usually assume that the boundaries of each farm or settlement were known. Field boundaries and patterns, rich sources of information which have shed much light on the medieval landscape of England, are significantly more problematic in large parts of Scotland. The Historic Landuse Assessment survey conducted by the RCAHMS has concluded that the majority of field boundaries in Dumfriesshire do not pre-date the eighteenth century and are almost certainly the product of the Agricultural Improvements.

The earliest boundaries surrounding the farms within Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan can be seen on the estate plans of the mid- and late eighteenth century (discussed in more detail below). However, this evidence is skewed because the plans do not survive, or were not created, for all farms or settlements. Thus, while farms such as Rivox, Mosshope, Middlegill and Bodesbeck in the parish of Moffat are clearly represented with their respective territory or farmlands, the lands around Corehead in upper Annandale are not detailed on any estate plan. A similar patchwork pattern of mapped and unmapped farms can be seen in the parishes of Lochmaben and Annan. This is unsurprising, given that a large part of the late eighteenth-century mapping effort was dependent on who
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774 RGS III, p. 428 (no. 1919).
777 NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 7, RHP 3567.
778 Compare, for example, the detailed information given on the lands of Broomhill or the Commontry of Heck in the parish of Lochmaben, with the lack of information on Templand in the north: cf. NRS Ref. RHP 83391, RHP 200.
owned the farms in question. Hence, the extant plans of lands belonging to the Marquis of Annandale dominate the mapped landscape of the parishes, both in frequency and level of detail. Utilising the eighteenth-century farm boundaries is perhaps permissible in the light of the scarcity of earlier evidence, but would presumably only result in a map of the estates of the Marquis of Annandale and Duke of Buccleuch, rather than reflecting the medieval or early medieval divisions, formal or informal, of the land.

The extent of LIDAR coverage for Annandale is too limited to use it for a reconstruction of potentially medieval boundary patterns, and thus a more theoretical approach using Thiessen polygons is proposed (figs. 30-32). Thiessen polygons, also known as Voronoi polygons, are a way to divide a given bounded area, which includes a group of points, into smaller areas each based around a single point. The boundaries around each point define an area which is closest to that point (as compared to all other points). Hence, the resulting polygons around each point are not equal in area, but vary in size depending on the number and proximity of nearby points. It might be argued that Thiessen polygons skew the comparison between different settlements because each settlement is allotted a different area of land before the agricultural potential is even calculated. However, Thiessen polygons are employed here for two reasons. First, there is no other method which does not arbitrarily divide up land among a number of settlements. Secondly, the correlation between polygon size and ‘population pressure’ on a given area, due to a high or low density of settlement, is likely to have been an important factor in early medieval settlement activity. It should be stressed at this point that it is not argued that Thiessen polygons represent the actual division of the early medieval landscape in each of the three study parishes. They are simply a theoretical tool used to assist the comparison of settlements in landscapes without consistent archaeological boundary evidence or charter boundary clauses.

It is useful to mention that the resulting Thiessen polygons for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan seem to respect practical considerations of farming activity. All polygons depict the distance between a settlement or farm and its farthest pertaining lands as less than approximately six kilometres, and, more importantly, the distance between a settlement and its farthest associated arable lands does not exceed three kilometres. These are important details, given that animals such as oxen or horses remained the main source of draught power well into the twentieth century and both their movement and ability to transport carts, ploughs, or manure would (along with the ability or willingness of their human owners)

779 NRS Ref. RHP 83387, RHP 83391, RHP 83392.
780 Special thanks go to Oscar Aldred of Historic Environment Scotland for the provision of LIDAR data.
affect the spatial setup of the agricultural landscape in relation to its associated farm or settlement.781

9.7 The Agricultural Population Potential (APP) Formula

By combining the various estimates mentioned in this chapter thus far, the following formulae can be used to determine the amount of people who can be supported on a given amount of land: arable land required to feed one person would be equal to 7ha/5, or 1.4ha. Regular pasture required to feed enough cattle to manure 1.4ha of arable would be 32ha/5, or 6.4ha. The combination of meadow land and regular pasture to feed enough cattle to manure 1.4ha of arable in a system of hay-making would be 3ha/5, or 0.6ha (of which 0.3ha can be regular pasture and 0.3ha are meadows or arable turned to meadows).

The raw quantities of land allocated to each settlement do not always reflect the maximum of agricultural potential. There can be cases where the amount of potential arable land surpasses the ability of the nearby meadows and pasture to provide enough cattle manure. In this scenario, it is argued that part of the arable land (often of better quality than the regular pasture and close to a stream or river) will be turned into meadows, and that an equal area of pasture land will be partitioned from the bulk of pasture to feed the cattle which survive on the more efficient meadows and hay-making regime. Although the early medieval farmer did not have access to high-precision mapping, GIS tools and complex mathematical formulae, it is assumed that an attempt would have been made to arrange the land use as efficiently as possible, not in the sense of a homo oeconomicus, but to ensure survival in a mostly subsistence-based agricultural system. Although it is difficult to assess whether the perfect mathematical balance was discovered by the early medieval peasant or lord in charge of the seasonal work cycle and land management, such a formula will be applied here in order to

781 This fact is intricately connected with, and found in, almost all agrarian regimes across historical and geographical boundaries: cf. Bogaard, ‘Middening and Manuring’, pp. 25-39; Michael Chisholm, Rural Settlement and Land Use. An Essay in Location (London, 1979, 3rd edition), pp. 33-41. The estate plans for Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan, as far as they can be geo-referenced accurately, confirm this picture, as seen on figs. 30-32. Hans-Ole Hansen has conducted experimental ard-ploughing using a pair of oxen and measured a moving speed of about 3.6 to 4.6 km/h for the animals. It should be noted that these oxen were inexperienced, and therefore walking faster than was feasible or sustainable during a long day’s work. Therefore, while Hansen’s experiment may reflect inaccurate timings for cultivation labour, it demonstrates the impact of the speed of beasts of burden upon distances between farms and their surroundings, cf. Hansen, ‘Experimental Ploughing’, p. 89.
gauge the maximum in terms of the Agricultural Population Potential of a given agricultural landscape.

In the underlying hierarchical model, **arable land** can fulfil the role of **meadows** and **pasture**, while **meadow** can only be **meadows** or **pasture** and **pasture** is restricted to the function of regular **pasture**. Therefore, the ultimate aim is to divide the available land so that the greatest-possible amount of arable land can remain under cultivation while still being sustainably manured by cattle fed on the pasture, meadows or arable-turned-meadows. Thus, in the event that a settlement which only had access to arable land and regular pasture, and whereby the arable lands were too extensive to be manured from its pasture, the optimum amount of arable and pastoral land which has to be turned into a meadowland system (consisting, as it were, of 50 per cent pasture and 50 per cent arable or meadows) must be investigated.

Pop (A) is the population supported on the arable land in such an optimum system. If a = hectares of arable and m = hectares of newly created meadows (out of 50 per cent arable and 50 per cent pasture), then the following is true:

\[
Pop\ (A) = \frac{a - \frac{m}{2}}{1.4}
\]

The hectares of pasture (= p) required to support the arable which feeds Pop (A) with manure is Pop (P), and is defined thus:

\[
Pop\ (P) = \frac{p - \frac{m}{2}}{6.4}
\]

The hectares of meadows (= m) required to support the arable which feeds Pop (A) with manure is Pop (M).

\[
Pop\ (M) = \frac{m}{0.6}
\]

Since the arable of Pop (A) requires the combined manure from the pasture and meadows of the settlement, the following must be true:

\[
\frac{a - \frac{m}{2}}{1.4} = \frac{p - \frac{m}{2}}{6.4} + \frac{m}{0.6}
\]
Thus, in order to achieve the ideal ratio of arable to meadows and pasture,

\[ m = 0.367 \times a - 0.08 \times p \]

The following example of a model settlement illustrates this point. A settlement has access to 8ha of arable land and 12ha of pasture. By applying the calculations for the population estimate (for the moment only to determine the APP solely based on the arable land), then the 8ha of arable could feed \( \frac{8ha}{1.4ha} = 5.71 \), or between 5 and 6 people. Pasture of 12ha managed in a system of year-round grazing and no hay-making can only support \( \frac{12ha}{8ha} = 1.5 \), or between one and two head of cattle. Because one head of cattle is only sufficient to manure one hectare of fallow in this system, and there are \( \frac{8ha}{2} = 4ha \) of fallow in this settlement (based on biennial rotation), the settlement lacks between three and four head of cattle. Simply put, the pasture is too small. It is assumed that the quality of those lands, which have been qualified as pasture on the land use map, is not sufficient to exploit them efficiently as meadow. Instead, an equal portion of land is partitioned from both the pasture and arable lands in order to form a micro-complex of land on which cattle are fed on a relatively small amount of pasture during the warm season, and on hay from an equal amount of meadow land in the cold season. The question remains, therefore, how much of the 8ha of arable, and of the 12ha of pasture, can be allocated to the use as meadows without reducing the arable land too much, which would diminish the cereal output. Based on the formula above, the optimum amount of mixed meadowland \( m \) would be:

\[ m = 0.367 \times 8 - 0.08 \times 12 = 1.976 \]

Half of these 1.976ha would be taken from the pasture, so that \( 12ha - 0.988ha = 11.012ha \) of the original pasture remain, whereas the other half would be subtracted from the arable lands to form the meadow portion, leaving 7.012ha of arable still under cultivation. This amount of arable can theoretically feed \( \frac{7.012ha}{1.4ha} = 5.01 \) people. The pasture and meadowland combined can feed enough cattle to manure \( \frac{1.976ha}{0.6ha} + \frac{11.012ha}{6.4ha} = 3.29 + 1.72 = 5.01 \) people. Hence, an optimal land use distribution has been achieved.

The above calculation is concerned with settlements whose original agricultural resources are limited to arable land (\( a \)) and pasture (\( p \)). The case is slightly more complicated when a settlement already has access to some meadowland (e.g. in the cases of Dumcrieff,
Frenchland and Moffat), and still cannot provide enough manure to sustainably support the arable lands. The difference to the example described above lies in the fact that a further part of the pasture, equal to the amount of land of the already available meadows, would be allocated from the pasture to complement the meadows, and that only then parts of the pasture and arable lands would be dedicated to further meadows, in case the original pasture and meadow lands were not sufficient for the provision of manure. In this circumstance, Pop (P) would be defined in the following way, with \( n = \) area of meadow land before further arable land was turned into meadows:

\[
P_{\text{pop}} (P) = \frac{p - \frac{m}{2} - \frac{n}{2}}{6.4}
\]

Thus, Pop (A) would need to be equal to the sum of Pop (P), Pop (M) and Pop (N):

\[
\frac{a - \frac{m}{2}}{1.4} = \frac{p - \frac{m}{2} - \frac{n}{2}}{6.4} + \frac{m}{0.6} + \frac{n}{0.6}
\]

Since \( a, p \) and \( n \) are the known variables in this equation, \( m \) must be:

\[
m = 0.367 \times a - 0.08 \times p - 0.816 \times n
\]

This is not to suggest that early medieval farmers would experience this process of optimisation. However, regarding the current investigation, it is necessary to determine the maximum APP value based on the available evidence.

For a full estimate of agricultural population potential per settlement, the possibility must be considered that people did not merely live on cereal grain, but also on animal products, such as milk or dairy products and meat. Thus, in the above calculations (focused chiefly on the cereal economy), the number of cattle which can be supported on the available pasture and meadows is used to determine an additional amount of people who could be sustained on animal products alone. It is assumed that regular pasture can support one head of cattle per 8ha of pasture in a system without the use of hay-making. Similarly, it is assumed that a system where an equal amount of meadows and pasture are available, one head of cattle can be fed on 1.5ha of land, whereby 0.75ha are pasture and 0.75ha are meadows. Once the number of cattle or large livestock which can be supported on a given amount of pasture and meadows are
determined, the population which can live off animal products alone is estimated at 20 head of cattle per family of five, or 4 head of cattle per person. It must be appreciated, however, that this is a theoretical calculation, because it is unlikely that four head of cattle would provide enough security in terms of reproduction, illness and similar factors to sustainably feed even a single person.
10. Capability of the Land

The APP formula proposed above requires a landscape upon which it can be applied. Thus, it is necessary to divide the study region within the three Annandale parishes into categories reflecting the calculation parameters of arable lands, meadows and pasture. These three categories should be understood as very broad guidelines, since a detailed study of soil composition, development and erosion is beyond the scope of the present work. While it may be tempting to apply modern soil capability surveys to this study, such as those created for Scotland by the MacAulay Institute, the changes in agricultural technology during the past 200 years alone would render this source very untrustworthy for early medieval circumstances. Modern farming machinery has become increasingly heavy, with adverse effects on the soil and its crop yields. Some areas are situated in remote places which cannot be reached by modern farm equipment (but by horses or oxen), while, conversely, other areas have only recently been turned into arable land through the agricultural and technological improvements since the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, such as artificial fertilisers and drainage.

In order to obtain meaningful estimates of the APP for an early medieval context, it is necessary to employ sources on land and soil capability before the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, this kind of material is not available for the early or even later medieval periods in Dumfriesshire. Instead, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century estate plans will be employed, in addition to William Roy’s Military Survey (1747-55), the RCAHMS Historical Land-use Assessment Map (2015) and the OS 1st Edition County Map Series (1:2500 [1853-1904] and 1:10560 [1846-99]).

As one of the central parts of the proposed APP methodology, a brief overview of the land-use reconstruction process will be given here, before providing details on some of the problems and caveats associated with the maps used. Quantum GIS (Geographical Information Systems) software (version 2.8.6) was employed to transcribe (or geo-reference) the lands shown on estate plans and William Roy’s map onto modern maps. For each block of fields of the same land type (for example arable) on the historical maps, a polygon was created on the modern map, roughly of the same area and shape. After a polygon was plotted, it received attributes, including an individual ID number, the types of maps used to geo-reference the polygon, and the land type it represents (as seen in Appendix III). Thus, each parish land-use
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783 Regarding the underlying assumptions of the soil capability survey for south-west Scotland, see: Bown and Shipley, *Soil and Land Capability*, pp. 131-5.
map essentially consists of groups of polygons in the categories ‘arable’, ‘meadows’ and ‘pasture’. As can readily be seen with the estate plans included in Appendix II, most of the eighteenth-century maps show considerable distortions in their projection, and cannot be easily transferred onto modern maps. However, land markers such as hills, rivers, farms and settlements depicted on the plans, as well as the field boundaries visible on the earliest OS maps (1861), were used to geo-reference the estate plans. The case is more complicated with William Roy’s map. As discussed in chapter 3, Roy’s Military Survey was created in the years from 1747-1755. Its primary purpose was of a military nature, rather than a precise representation of settlement.  

Thus, whenever the map shows cultivated lands (through hatching), these could only be approximately geo-referenced.

The inconsistent projections of the eighteenth-century maps and plans are not the only challenge. While the estate plans often provide clear indications as to the ownership of the land, very rarely is it noted whether the lands were used for arable or pastoral purposes. In some cases, the division of arable land and pasture was explicitly mentioned. In others, the difference in markings on the ground could be used to deduce which parts were probably used as arable, for example blocks of hatching to indicate ploughed furlongs. Sometimes, place-names and field-names, such as Rye Croft, may reflect the use of the land: *croft* denotes an enclosed parcel of land, often used as arable. Other terminology, such as ‘Butt’ may be equally elucidating: on one plan, a field close to Lochmaben Castle is entitled ‘Butts’, which may refer to an irregular parcel in an otherwise regular arable field, which fits the location and situation of the field in question. On some plans, both place-names and explicit mentions of land use fail the researcher. These are often maps of common lands or commonties, primarily denoting communal ownership rather than the type of land. However, judging by the contemporary developments in agricultural improvement and enclosure of the mid- and late eighteenth century, it can be assumed that most of the common lands refer to pastoral land, as the arable common runrig was slowly disappearing in the lowlands. Therefore, wherever it was not clear on the estate survey whether land was arable, either denoted by writing or by the characteristic long shape of ploughed fields, it is assumed that the common fields referred to
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785 See for example NRS Ref. RHP83392 nos. 1-4.
786 NRS Ref. RHP83391 no. 7.
788 NRS Ref. RHP81922; Adams, *Glossary*, p. 78.
pastoral land. This is also suggested by cross-referencing William Roy’s map with the various estate surveys.

One outstanding feature of both the lowland section of Roy’s Military Survey in Dumfriesshire and the eighteenth-century estate plans is the virtual non-existence of trees or woodland. With the exceptions of a few explicitly-mentioned plantations, the eighteenth-century cartographic evidence does not depict a heavily forested, or even lightly forested, landscape in the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan. It is possible that local surveyors were not interested in the extent of woodland, and therefore did not include it on the plans. However, this is unlikely given the economic function of the surveys: woodlands provide resources and would almost certainly be of interest to the landowner commissioning the estate surveys. The fact that Roy’s map of northern Scotland includes extensive ranges of forest and woodlands, and little to no woodland in the lowlands, is most likely due to the motivation and scale of his survey and the lack of extensive forests in areas like Dumfriesshire.

The question of the availability of trees and timber is not without consequence. Woodlands play a crucial part in the population estimates by Mazoyer and Roudart. They provide building materials, fuel and pasture, as well as the habitat for deer and wild boar, and thus hunting grounds for sport or the provision of meat. It is clear from the palaeoenvironmental evidence in chapter 2, as well as from the maps of the eighteenth century, that Mazoyer’s and Roudart’s model cannot be easily applied to the landscape of eastern Dumfriesshire. It can be assumed that, even in the absence of extensive woodland cover, the local population had access to other resources, such as stone for building and peat for fuel.

There is written evidence for the regulation of peat use in Scotland as early as the twelfth century. Methods of peat-cutting from that time are not recorded, but based upon modern ethnographic accounts from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, about 15,000 peats needed
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790 See, for example, the ‘planting’ near Polmoody Farm or the ‘plantation on the Gallowhill’ north of Moffat: NRS Ref. RHP 83387 nos. 1 and 3. For further mentions of plantings, and the sporadic appearance of woods, see: NRS Ref. RHP 83387 nos. 5 and 7.


792 Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, pp. 226 and 244.

793 Mazoyer and Roudart, World Agriculture, pp. 226 and 244.


to be cut to support a family with fuel for one year. John Sherar, whose calculations suggest a smaller required quantity, estimates that about 15,600 square feet of bog ground are needed to extract enough peat for one family per year. Translated into hectares, and assuming that one family consists of five people, then c. 0.14 hectares of bog-land would support the need for fuel for five people per year. According to Marcel Mazoyer’s estimate, about 24-times more woodland area would be required to support the same amount of people with fuel. However, it is at present difficult to come to reliable conclusions about the extent of peat-cutting (if any) undertaken in early medieval Dumfriesshire. Modern maps of Scotland emphasise the prevalence of blanket bogs in the Highland areas (as opposed to the lowlands), but Alexander Fenton points out that although about 10 per cent of Scotland’s land surface are currently peat-bog, this is the result of extensive use of peat over the past centuries. Some former peat-bogs are now crop fields or used for grazing. Thus, the availability of fuel and building materials is not included as a constraining factor in the APP calculation.

The transfer and geo-referencing of arable and pastoral fields from the eighteenth-century maps and estate plans onto the modern map is not an exact science. While the principles described above have been followed consistently, a certain degree of personal discretion is always involved and it should therefore be emphasised that the resulting land capability maps will only depict broad trends in the agricultural land use. In order to ensure a high degree of comparability between the three different parishes in question, this study followed a number of key principles. Woodlands and plantations were categorised as pasture. In part, this decision results from the uncertainties about woodland cover in early medieval Dumfriesshire, and the arguments (outlined in chapter 2) regarding the tree-less and open landscape particularly around Lochmaben and Annan pre-dating the first millennium AD. These findings are supported by the number of archaeological sites, both pre- and post-medieval, which can be seen covered by modern plantations, suggesting that modern forestry
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796 John Sherar, ‘On the Manner of Procuring Peat-Fuel in the Highlands of Scotland, with Illustrations of an Improved Method, Founded on Practical Experience’, The Quarterly Journal of Agriculture, Vol. XII (1842), pp. 143 and 149. Sherar does not explicitly assume a lower need of peats than the 15,000 pieces suggested in Grant’s writing, but Sherar estimates that 1 leet, or about 1500-1600 barrowfuls of peat are required for one family. He also estimates that one man “can cast and wheel out 200 barrowfuls in a day”, ibid. p. 149. Grant estimates that one man can cut about 1000 peats per day, which, if compared to Sherar’s figures, would give about 5 peats per barrow. If 1500-1600 barrowfuls support a family over a year, this would mean that, in Sherar’s estimation, these barrowfuls equal 7500-8000 peats, almost half of what Grant assumes. This demonstrates how far estimates can range and differ from each other, but for the sake of argument, Sherar’s estimate of required land mass will not be altered, and it is assumed that 15,600 square feet support one family per year.
interfered with previously inhabited or agriculturally used land. Similarly, based upon estate plans from the eighteenth century as well as the earliest OS maps, areas which are now heavily wooded (for example the uplands north of Moffat) used to be open grazing grounds, and, in parts, even arable fields. Furthermore, woodland was used as pasture for pigs, as well as cattle. Recent experiments on woodland grazing of cattle in Denmark suggest that woodland can sustain 1-1.3 cow(s) per hectare, which is very close to and in fact higher than the cattle stocking rates discussed in chapter 9.3. It should be stressed, however, that it is unclear how representative modern Danish woodlands are of medieval south-west Scotland. Similarly, the cattle in the experiment were put to woodland grazing only from October to January, and the year-round grazing underlying the assumptions above may be less effective as it does not give the woodland time to regenerate. Bearing these caveats in mind, however, the interpretation of woodlands on the early modern and later maps as being part of the pasture category is supported by this ratio.

At times, the field boundaries and the land use according to the eighteenth-century plans appear inconsistent with those depicted about 100 years later on the OS maps. This is to be expected due to the Agricultural Improvements in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In those cases, the precision achieved in geo-referencing was necessarily limited. Attempts have been made to follow natural boundaries, such as burns or rivers. For some farms, the estate plans provide details of the acreages of the different land uses (arable, moss, pasture etc.). In these cases, these acreages (Scots acres) have been used as a guideline for the geo-referencing process. The boundaries may still not reflect the original fields, but the overall extent of the land area should be approximately representative of eighteenth-century conditions. The basis for this calculation is the following translation of measurements: 1 Scots Acre = c. 1.26 Imperial Acres = 0.5099 hectare. The lands of Greenhill (parish Moffat) are a decent example for this process. Both Roy’s Military Survey and the estate plans of the Marquis of Annandale show arable lands there, even estimating them at c. 69 Scots acres. However, the 1861 OS map only shows a field boundary enclosing c. 8 acres. It is likely,
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798 Blacklaw Tower, RCAHMS Site no. NT00NE 3; Mellingshaw Tower, RCAHMS Site no. NT00NW 1; Auldton Hill Scooped Settlements, RCAHMS Sites no. NT00NE 13.1 and 13.2.
799 NRS Ref. RHP 10095 and RHP 83387 no. 5; OS 1st Ed County 1:2500.
therefore, that Greenhill’s arable lands extended far beyond what can be discerned as ‘field boundaries’ on the nineteenth-century maps, and may have included portions of land which is now under forestation.\textsuperscript{803} Therefore, for the present purposes, a polygon of c. 69 Scots acres in area was drawn around the modern location of Greenhill (fig. 30).

In some cases, it is not the depicted extent of arable or pastoral land that is problematic, but the categories of land listed on the eighteenth-century documents. For example, Raecleugh, also in the parish of Moffat, clearly contains arable lands based on William Roy’s military survey and two eighteenth-century plans, but a third map, NRS Ref. RHP 10151, notes the arable acreage for Raecleugh as nil.\textsuperscript{804} It should be noted that, when all the enclosed lands around Raecleugh farm along Evan Water as depicted on the OS 1:\textsuperscript{st} Ed County map (1:2500) are measured, they amount to 27 Scots acres, remarkably close to the 29.180 Scots acres allotted to Raecleugh under the heading of ‘Valley Ground’ in RHP 10151.\textsuperscript{805} Only two of the farms within this plan contain this land category, Raecleugh and Craickscaigs and, in each instance, no arable acreage is provided. It is possible, therefore, that ‘Valley Ground’ is a form of potential arable land. Similarly, the ‘Holmlands’ associated with the farm of Polmoody seem to be arable land, as confirmed on plans RHP10149 and RHP83387 no. 1, whereby Polmoody either entails 138 acres of Holm land or 138 acres of arable land, respectively.\textsuperscript{806} Plan RHP 10151 also depicts acreages for so-called ‘Stooly Bent’, which only appears for the farms of Auldhousehill and Meikleholmside. This reference is not entirely clear, but may refer to the heath rush, \textit{Juncus squarrosus}, and thus to acid soil and some form of pasture.\textsuperscript{807}

Although the RCAHMS HLA (Historic Land-use Assessment) map has been consulted for the present study, it is not always applicable in the process of reconstructing eighteenth-century land-use in detail. For example, arable lands are subsumed in the category of ‘Agriculture and Settlement’, presumably including improved pasture, as the only other agriculturally relevant category is ‘Moorland and Rough Grazing’. However, the rough grazing indicated on the HLA map has been used to validate the geo-referenced polygons from the eighteenth-century estate plans. Thus, the HLA map shows which parts of the landscape remained unimproved to the present day, and are therefore unlikely to have been arable or meadow lands in either the early modern or even early medieval periods. In the parish of Moffat, there are two minor cases where the arable lands of Greenhill and Bodesbeck (as

\textsuperscript{803} WRS, plate 29; NRS Ref. RHP 10095, RHP 83387 no. 5, RHP 10151; OS 1:\textsuperscript{st} Ed County 1:2500.

\textsuperscript{804} WRS, plate 29; NRS Ref. RHP 10095, RHP 83387 no. 5, RHP 10151.

\textsuperscript{805} OS 1:\textsuperscript{st} Ed County 1:2500; NRS Ref. RHP 10151.

\textsuperscript{806} NRS Ref. RHP 10149 and RHP 83387 no. 1.

determined based on the eighteenth-century plans) are now partially classified as modern rough grazing or moorland. For Greenhill, these minimal deviations are negligible for various reasons. Today’s partial return to moorland may have been caused by disuse. At any rate, if the acreage outlined in the estate plan of Greenhill is at all reliable, Greenhill’s original arable fields must have been much more extensive than what can now be gleaned from modern maps.\(^{808}\) This seems to be confirmed by Roy’s map. The plan of Bodesbeck (RHP3567) suggests that the lands HLA now surveyed as moorland or rough grazing on the southern bank of Moffat Water may well have been used as arable in the eighteenth century.\(^{809}\) However, the projection of RHP3567 is not particularly exact, and hence in this instance part of its arable was modified on the land-use reconstruction map (fig. 30) to avoid areas considered as rough grazing/moorland by HLA. A similar principle has been applied to the assessment of arable land in the parish of Annan, where minor deviations in the Newbie arable and the arable north of Gullielands were corrected using the HLA assessment of rough grazing and moorlands.

The amount of available estate plans does not fully cover the entire study area. Areas which are not included in the eighteenth-century estate plans have been reconstructed using field boundaries as depicted in the first edition OS County Map (1861), in connection with William Roy’s military survey to distinguish arable fields (indicated by hatching) from pasture (noted as woodland, plantations, moss or the lack of hatching). Whenever Roy’s survey contradicts the estate plans (for example it marks much more arable lands in central Moffat, where the other plans mark a mixture of arable and pasture), the estate plans take precedence. Although Roy’s map might well represent the full potential of the land, it is less easily georeferenced. The estate plans are considered more geographically and agriculturally reliable. A third category of land type included, in addition to arable and pasture, are meadows. Meadows or meadowlands are virtually invisible in most of the historical maps used for this reconstruction. In a few instances, particularly around Moffat and south of Lochmaben, the plans specifically mention meadows, either when providing the categories of land use or as a place-name, such as Castle Mains Meadow.\(^{810}\) The limited representation of meadows on the maps may be explained by the fact that many arable lands, often situated along the rivers of the parishes, had a double function as meadowland and outfields.\(^{811}\) Thus, the plans of the farms of Meikleholmside and Ericstane in the parish of Moffat each contain lands classified

\(^{808}\) NRS Ref. RHP10151.
\(^{809}\) NRS Ref. RHP3567.
\(^{810}\) NRS Ref. RHP 81922, RHP 140401. Castle Mains Meadow was probably located to the south of modern Parkend or Christies Park Meadow and Ward Meadow along the western bank of Valison Burn (parish of Lochmaben).
\(^{811}\) For a discussion on the history and nature of the Scottish infield-outfield system, see Dodgshon, ‘Infield-Outfield’, pp. 1-23.
as ‘arable and meadow’ or ‘outfield and meadow’. For the purposes of the current investigation, arable fields which may also have been used as meadows are considered arable fields in their entirety if the non-meadow pasture is sufficient to support the arable fields with manure.

There are a number of reasons why the use of eighteenth-century estate plans for the reconstruction of an early medieval landscape is problematic, such as the agricultural expansions of the twelfth century and later, the effects of climate change, over-use as well as drainage (through rig-and-furrow ploughing), soil erosion and nutrient depletion, and the early application of lime. These factors likely had both beneficial and detrimental effects on the quality of the land for agricultural purposes during the approximately 800 years which separate the study period from the eighteenth-century plans. Furthermore, the increasing importance of local and national markets and fairs is likely to have affected the distribution of arable to pastoral lands which are visible on the relevant estate plans. Therefore, these plans and maps are certainly biased regarding the soil capability of the parishes in question. With that said, the Old Statistical Account (1791-99) entry for the parish of Moffat claims that “[there] is a weekly market in Moffat, which is supplied from the lower parts of the country. It is thought, however, that the whole grain produced in the parish, would not do more than supply the inns in the village.” The broad division of land into the three categories of arable, meadow and pasture land is equally a potential source for scewing the picture, as moss and moorlands, rough pasture, improved or at least managed pasture, permanent as well as temporary arable lands, indicate that a given piece of land was not necessarily a one trick pony and much more versatile than can be mapped.

Furthermore, there is a risk that eighteenth-century plans show a landscape which has already been affected by improvement measures such as liming (used to decrease the acidity of soils). There is evidence, however, that this process affected eastern Dumfriesshire only fairly late, from the 1770s or 1790s, and the Old Statistical Account for the parish of Moffat in the 1790s remarks on the relatively recent adoption of liming. In addition to the influence of markets and soil quality, climate will have affected the picture painted by the estate plans.
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812 NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 5, RHP 83387 no. 6.
813 Whyte, Agriculture and Society, pp. 204-8; RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 13-16.
814 Whyte, Agriculture and Society, pp. 178-92.
815 Charles Withers notes that agrarian maps during the Improvement era often did not depict what was there, but rather what was possible once the landscape had been improved: cf. Withers, ‘Mapping in the Age of Enlightenment’, pp. 42-3.
816 OSAS II, p. 286.
817 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 33; OSAS II, p. 286.
As discussed in chapter 2, the eighteenth-century still saw some of the lingering effects of the ‘Little Ice Age’ of the previous three centuries, in particular the cold winters. Relatively-speaking, the early medieval period from c. AD 600 to 1000 had a generally much drier, warmer climate. This is one of the theoretical problems which cannot but be mentioned, as there is little available evidence to even the comparison between the early medieval and early modern periods, although the advances in agricultural techniques by the eighteenth-century may in part have been matched by the harsh climatic conditions. Without more precise data, however, such an equation remains hypothetical at best.

Yet, despite all those caveats, it is maintained here that using the estate and commony plans to reconstruct the land quality of pre-modern Dumfriesshire with its surroundings is a useful exercise. Perhaps the very fact that alternative routes are non-existent is not the strongest point in favour of this approach, but is certainly essential to acknowledge. Even after the twelfth century, the density of charters, and the quality of their contents, does not permit a more detailed reconstruction of agricultural land capability than any based on the eighteenth-century maps. While the extant estate plans do not cover the entire area of the three discussed parishes, and may therefore be a source of geographical bias, it is notable that in those areas which they cover, clear patterns emerge in the way land is used depending on its altitude or vicinity to river runs. This may, at least in part, redeem the fact that the evidence is patchy.
III. Synthesis
11. Analysis

The analysis of the archaeological data and place-names of Dumfriesshire in chapters 2 to 8 has already given a rough insight into the diverse layers of information which can be dissected in the early medieval landscape. Furthermore, the introduction of the APP methodology adds the additional layer of agricultural land use and potential population extent to this investigation. Hence, the following synthesis is aimed at bringing these two strands of the thesis together to form a comprehensive interpretation of the evidence.

11.1 General Observations

The emphasis with the APP methodology is on the calculation of upper population limits. It is, therefore, a theoretical tool designed to aid the comparison of settlements, rather than to establish actual population estimates. Nevertheless, it may be instructive to compare the APP results with the earliest eighteenth-century census records of the three Annandale parishes under investigation.

The parish ministers in charge of the first census records gave an estimate of 1612 people in the parish of Moffat in 1755, and 1600 in the 1790s. For the town and burgh of Lochmaben, the Old Statistical Account estimates approximately 700 inhabitants, for a parish total of between 2150 and 3000 in the 1790s, as compared to a total of 1395 in 1755. For the parish of Annan, the “Friend to Statistical Inquiries” for whom no name is given, provides an estimate of 2500 inhabitants in the whole parish in the last decade of the eighteenth-century, while the previous account from 1755 gives an estimate of 1498. The combined Agricultural Population Potential for all polygons within the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan are 1332, 1093 and 1137, respectively. If both the 1755 and 1790s census are taken into account, the deviation between APP estimates and eighteenth-century census figures is
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818 OSAS II, p. 293. These numbers are confirmed in the NSAS IV, p. 114. The census of 1755 was organised at the behest of the British government and organised by the Rev. Alexander Webster. Each parish minister received a schedule of queries and was asked to enumerate their parishioners: cf. James Gray Kyd, ed., Scottish Population Statistics including Webster’s Analysis of Population 1755 (Edinburgh, 1975), pp. xiii – xv.
819 OSAS VII, pp. 235 and 243. The OSAS and NSAS present conflicting numbers for the 1790s estimate. While the OSAS presents the rough estimate of “about 3000” “souls in the parish”, the NSAS of 1834-45 gives a population of 2150 in 1792 and 2053 in 1801, see OSAS VII, p. 243 and NSAS IV, p. 388.
820 OSAS XIX, p. 447.
821 OSAS XIX, p. 448; NSAS IV, p. 527.
counts lies between 268 and 1907.\textsuperscript{822} It should be noted that, while the APP estimate is supposed to give a maximum population, the APP values lie consistently below the population counts of the eighteenth-century. While not too great a precision should be ascribed to these values, due to the limited nature of the sources, the differences between estimates and census records may also be explained by the improvements in agricultural practice between the early medieval and early modern periods, as well as by the increased role of the markets in the later periods. It is perhaps noteworthy that the deviation resulting from the comparison of APP values with census records does not exceed the 2,000-mark. Given that the methodology was constructed solely with the input of agrarian-based population estimates, a greater gap between theory and reality may have been expected.

A similar case in favour of the APP formula can be found in the seventeenth century. The barony court book and rental book of John Johnstoune of Elshieshields records that this proprietor had a total of 773 sheep being grazed in the Lowther hills near Greskine and Mellingshaw in 1671.\textsuperscript{823} The exact extent of Johnstoune’s lands is unclear, but if the polygon representing the territory of Greskine is used as a basis of calculation, the pastoral lands are estimated to support roughly 87 head of cattle. In terms of feed requirements, one head of cattle is usually considered the equivalent of about five to seven sheep.\textsuperscript{824} Thus, a multiplication of 87 by these numbers would give between 435 and 609 sheep which could be supported in the area around Greskine and Mellingshaw, with the latter value being particularly close to the recorded herd in 1671. It must be noted, however, that a methodologically sound comparison of the APP estimates with seventeenth-century records would require a detailed study of the individual proprietors’ contexts and that this is not within the scope of the present dissertation.

A comparison of the total Agricultural Population Potentials for each of the studied parish areas provides numbers ranging from 1093 (Lochmaben) to 1137 (Annan) and 1332 (Moffat). Considering their different area sizes (Moffat: c. 17472ha, Lochmaben: c. 4596ha, Annan: c. 4417ha), the estimated upper limit for each parish’s population based on subsistence agriculture is remarkably close. This may not be mere coincidence. Looking at the establishment of Anglo-Norman dominion in Ireland, Wales and Scotland during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the common denominator is the sub-division of land into knight’s

\textsuperscript{822} Moffat: 1600-1332=268; Lochmaben: 3000-1093=1907.
\textsuperscript{823} Winchester, \textit{Harvest of the Hills}, p. 21. The document which Winchester referred to, NRS Ref. CS96/2256, has been consulted. However, as it came to my attention only late in the writing process, I was unable to conduct a more detailed analysis.
\textsuperscript{824} Mazoyer and Roudart, \textit{World Agriculture}, p. 243 and Grigg, \textit{Agricultural Systems}, p. 115.
fees.\textsuperscript{825} Depending on the quality of the land, these areas could vary in size.\textsuperscript{826} In a charter of AD 1165\textsuperscript{x}1173, William I of Scots granted and confirmed the lands of Annandale to Robert de Brus, for the service of ten knights: “per servicium .x. militum”.\textsuperscript{827} The possible connection between this clause and the ten mottes and motte-and-bailey castles which can still be seen located along the River Annan has been pointed out elsewhere.\textsuperscript{828} If these timber castles may indeed be seen as representative of Anglo-Norman lordship and territories, then it is notable that both Moffat and Annan each only have one certain instance of such a fortification, in both cases situated close to the River Annan and to the modern towns, which presumably represent the medieval villages (fig. 12). Lochmaben is an exception, as the parish contains the remains of two motte-and-bailey castles, one south of Lochmaben itself, and one north of Rockhallhead. The motte-and-bailey castle of Rockhall Mote is likely to originally have belonged to a different territorial arrangement and only later included in the ‘pan-handle’ of the parish of Lochmaben.\textsuperscript{829} Geographically, Rockhall Mote is separated from Annandale by an upland ridge to its north-east, now containing the Rammerseals Woodland Estate, and the RCAHMS report suggests that it was positioned thus as a control point observing Nithsdale, rather than Annandale: the focus may therefore have been west-facing, rather than east-facing.\textsuperscript{830} Cutting, as it were, the APP of Rockhallhead away from the parish of Lochmaben, the remaining total would be 954, which would leave Lochmaben still with a lower, but comparable, Agricultural Population Potential to the units of Annan and Moffat. It is possible, therefore, that the parishes as they appear on modern maps were territorial units of roughly comparable agricultural potential, although some of these boundaries were clearly modified at least from the advent of Anglo-Norman lordship onward, as in the case of the south-western appendage of the parish of Lochmaben.

The APP values for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan invite speculation as to the relative significance of hillforts and similar fortifications in the vicinity. Based on the findings of experimental earthworks carried out at Overton Down in 1960, James Dyer has suggested that it would have taken 100 men c. 219 days to complete the 8.9ha hillfort at Ravensburgh Castle (Hertfortshire), assuming an eight-hour work day.\textsuperscript{831} These estimates are

\textsuperscript{826} Murphy and Stout, ‘Farming and Settlement’, p. xxii.
\textsuperscript{827} RRS II, p. 179 (no. 80) AD 1165\textsuperscript{x}1173.
\textsuperscript{828} RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 188-92.
\textsuperscript{829} RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 244; see also discussion of patterns in parish of Lochmaben below.
\textsuperscript{830} RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{831} Dyer, Hillforts of England and Wales, pp. 23-4.
based on the length of the defensive enclosure, which amounts to 1214m. The fort of Woody Castle in the parish of Lochmaben takes in about 1.5ha of land, with a circumference of c. 434m, or roughly one third of the site at Ravensburgh Castle. Based on Dyer’s calculations, the construction of the Woody Castle defensive earthworks would have taken 100 men c. 73 days. The parish of Lochmaben could have supported a population of c. 1093, although the actual population is likely to have been lower. Working on the basis of an optimistic estimation of 1000 people, the construction of the fortification at Woody Castle would still have required a tenth of the local population to work for more than two full months, not counting the men and women required to fulfill the agricultural tasks, depending on the season. Assuming that only local men were used for the construction of large earthworks, the labour force may have been even more restricted. Based on the total population estimated at 1000, approximately 500 people would have been male, and out of these perhaps 300 to 400 were of the right age and fit for work. While calculations of this nature are necessarily based on a number of uncertain assumptions, they give a good idea of the scale and the relevance of fortified sites in the landscape.

It should be noted that any findings based on the three parishes discussed below may not be generally applicable to Dumfriesshire as a whole. Annandale has been an important gateway from southern Scotland and England into central and northern Scotland as early as the first half of the first millennium AD, as the course of the Roman road attests. Thus, it is unlikely that the territorial arrangements and the settlement patterns of any parish to the eastern or western bank of the River Annan has been unaffected by this strategic factor. While the Roman road to the north cuts through the parish boundaries of Moffat in between the catchments of Evan Water and the Annan, it touches the eastern boundaries of the parish of Lochmaben and the north-eastern corner of the parish of Annan. This, in addition to all other factors, such as agricultural potential, place-names and geological relief, have to be taken into account if the early medieval settlement patterns of Annandale will be identified and understood.

11.2 Patterns in the Parish of Moffat

Turning from the general observations to the specific situation of each parish, the settlement patterns and agricultural potential of the parish of Moffat will first receive attention. The

832 Regarding the size and uncertain date of Woody Castle, see RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 136-7.
The landscape around Moffat may be broadly divided into three valleys: Evandale to the west, upper Annandale at the centre, and Moffatdale to the east. Adding up the Agricultural Population Potential of all settlements or farms for each valley, Evandale has an APP total of 206, Annandale a total of 674 (counting Dumcrieff and Breconside as part of Annandale) and Moffatdale a total of 452. Even if Dumcrieff and Breconside were assumed as part of Moffatdale instead of Annandale, the values for Annandale and Moffatdale would be 562 and 564, respectively (fig. 33). This heavy bias in favour of the central and eastern parts of the parish is reflected in the archaeological record, both with regard to late prehistoric settlement activity and medieval or post-medieval farmsteads. While distribution maps of archaeological sites may at times show a skewed picture, for example due to the different factors affecting the identification of sites, such as construction projects and agricultural activity, there are a number of circumstances which argue against such a bias in the evidence in the present case. First, the calculation of the APP is independent of any archaeological evidence, and primarily based on late eighteenth-century land use assessment (see chapter 10). The estate plans clearly show the existence of farms and pasture as well as limited arable land use in Evandale (fig. 33). The imbalance in the Agricultural Population Potential, primarily influenced by the lack of arable lands in the eastern part of the parish, reflects the limited amount of fertile alluvial deposits along Evan Water. Since the present calculation method for the APP works on the basis of arable farming as being the more efficient option compared to pastoral farming, Evandale must necessarily appear as a marginal landscape in the parish. It may not be a coincidence that the valley slopes to the east and west of Evan Water have yielded virtually no records of late prehistoric, and only very little evidence of medieval and post-medieval settlement, especially considering that this was not a landscape disturbed by intensive farming. Of course, these conclusions should be made with some reservations. Some of the patterns described above, especially the lack of prehistoric settlement along upper Evan Water, may be due to the specific ecological history of that part of the parish. Large parts of Evandale are now under commercial forestation (fig. 37). Furthermore, part of the archaeological record may have become disturbed during the construction of the Caledonian railway track which first can be seen on the earliest OS County Map of Dumfriesshire. That being said, it is

833 RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 22. Regarding the particular importance and fertility of alluvial plains, see: RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 13; Grigg, Agricultural Systems, pp. 62 and 159.
834 Forestry Commission Copyright: Contains, or is based on, information supplied by the Forestry Commission. © Crown copyright and database right 2016 Ordnance Survey [100021242]. The drainage ploughing used in afforestation has a high potential for disturbing archaeological contexts: cf. Jackson, Forestry and archaeology, pp. 1-2.
835 OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500.
unlikely that these developments would have had such a complete and destructive impact on the prehistoric and historic archaeological record.

The average APP per place-name in the parish of Moffat is 53.28 (1332/25). The settlements with a APP above average are: Ericstane, Granton, Meikleholmside, Moffat, Frenchland, Dumcrieff, Selcoth, Capplegill, Carrifran and Polmoody. Of these, five contain Gaelic or Brittonic elements, and five are of Germanic origin. Ericstane was counted as a Gaelic place-name, although it contains the later added MSc -stane. By contrast, settlements with values below average are predominantly Germanic formations: Harthope, Greenhill, Mosshope, Middlegill, Blacklaw, Archbank, Auldton, Craigieburn, Breconside, Crofthead and Bodesbeck. The possible Gaelic exceptions are Corehead (originally Corr), Greskine, Rivox and Logan. Since few of the Germanic names can be brought into association with Anglian settlement beyond any doubt, they are generally expected to represent renaming after AD 1000, most likely receiving their names later than the Gaelic settlements. As a general pattern, therefore, it may be suggested that there is a correlation between later place-names and lower agricultural potential. A possible explanation may be that areas of high economic (rural and otherwise) significance tend to attract more conservative settlement and power structures, while areas with lower Agricultural Population Potential may have shifted ownership more frequently, being more open to linguistic and cultural impact and change and creating transitional landscapes. It is theoretically possible to argue not just for the late change of place-names in areas of low APP, but in fact for very late settlement activity. However, given the dense clusters of late prehistoric settlement remains around some of the settlements with low APP values, such an argument would have to maintain that the parish of Moffat, or parts of it, were deserted between the early first millennium AD and the re-naming and, supposedly, re-founding of settlements in the medieval period after AD 1000 or even 1100, as indicated by most of the Germanic place-names mentioned above. There are, of course, clear exceptions to this pattern. One of the arguably latest place-names, Frenchland, which has a naming terminus post quem of AD 1100 also belongs to the settlement areas with the highest agricultural potential.

The comparatively low agricultural potential of Evandale may be connected to a phenomenon specific to the west of the parish of Moffat, first appearing in the written documentation in the fourteenth century. In a charter to David Lindsay, Robert I King of Scots grants his “militem dilectum”836 Lindsay “omnes terras de le Revwaus, Meshope, Midilkeuille,
Blaclau, Grenhilcotis, Ayrikstan et de Mikylholmesyde”.\textsuperscript{837} About 200 years later, the same unit of lands appears in an agreement between James IV and Robert Maxwell of Park: “4 mercate terrarum in Greskyn et Malingschaw, 3 merc. de Roukanside, 3 merc. de Auldhousshill, 5 merc. de Blaklaw, et 5 merc. de Mekleholmside”.\textsuperscript{838} The fractured nature of the lands in this transaction is due to its specific circumstances. King James IV kept these lands until payment of debts by their respective landholders, and in 1510 the king transferred both the lands, and the right to repayment, to Robert Maxwell, son of John Maxwell, ‘Stewart’ of Annandale.\textsuperscript{839} One century later, King James VI granted his follower Archibald Primrose “mercatam in Moffett, terras de Revox, Mossop, Middilkil, Blaklaw, Grenehill, Coittis, Arikstane, Mekilholmesyde et Glasteriskingland, cum lie scheillis, pratis, moris, marresiis”.\textsuperscript{840} A decade after that grant, the king transfers the “baroniam de Arikstane”, as it is then known, to John, Lord of Annandale, including the previously mentioned unit of “terras de Reuox [vel Revox], Mossoppe, Middilkill, Blaklaw, Greinhill, Coittis, Arikstaine, Meikilholmeheid et Glasteriskingland”.\textsuperscript{841} With the exception of the early sixteenth-century charter, then, the lands of Evandale and western Annandale are repeatedly granted as one unit without any specified fraction of merklands, and they appear in the charters throughout several centuries in an almost formulaic manner. If it is accepted that none of the relevant charters are forgeries - and there seems to be no indicator that that was the case – this group of Evandale and western Annandale farms may represent an estate unit pre-dating our first written evidence for these place-names. This hypothesis may explain the shape of the western appendage of the Moffat parish boundaries. Furthermore, Granton, Newton and Corehead, all farms in close proximity to Ericstane and Meikleholmside, are suspiciously absent from these charters, even though they are attested later in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{842} It is unlikely that this has to do with them being physically founded later. Rather, the territorial unit of which farms such as Ericstane, Rivox and Greenhill were part may have had its eastern boundary along the River Annan, thereby excluding Granton, Newton and Corehead. Another obvious exclusion in this collection of farms is Harthope, which is attested first in the early sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{843} The reason seems to be that the north-western part of the parish of Moffat lay in the sheriffdom of Lanark rather than that of Dumfries until the nineteenth century, and is recorded as belonging

\textsuperscript{837} RGS I, p. 10 (no. 34) AD 1315x21. See also: RRS V, Index no. 148: A. A. M. Duncan suggests that the earliest possible date could be November 1314, rather than 1315.
\textsuperscript{838} RGS II, p. 757 (no. 3522) AD 1510.
\textsuperscript{840} RGS VII, p. 155 (no. 421) AD 1611.
\textsuperscript{841} RGS VIII, p. 298 (no. 826) AD 1625.
\textsuperscript{842} RHM II, p. 31 (no. 41) \textit{[terras] de Grantton de Newton et del corr} AD c. 1320x1369.
\textsuperscript{843} HMC (Jhn), p. 14 (no. 12) AD 1519.
to the barony of Crawfurdmuire in 1662.\textsuperscript{844} It is not certain whether this conflict of parish and county boundaries dates back to the sixteenth-century or earlier, but the minister Alexander Brown, writing for the Statistical Account of the 1790s remarked that “[the] principal part of the parish of Moffat lies in the stewartry of Annandale, now united to the shire of Dumfries. Two farms only belong to the shire of Lanark, and remain under the civil jurisdiction of that county.”\textsuperscript{845} These farms appear to have been Harthope and Raecleugh, although no written record of the latter could be found pre-dating the eighteenth-century.\textsuperscript{846} Given the relatively low Agricultural Population Potential of the farms in Evandale, and the fact that their combined APP is almost identical to the sum of Ericstane and Meikleholmside, it is tempting to think that this large territorial unit or barony was conceived as an effort to combine the marginal farms in Evandale with the lands of higher agricultural potential in upper Annandale. This model may mirror to some extent Glanville Jones’ upland and lowland \textit{maenors} in Wales, whereby part of a multiple estate would include fertile arable lands, while the other part consisted of large tracts of upland pasture.\textsuperscript{847} Whether or not this territorial unit has its roots in the centuries before AD 1000 is difficult to establish, as the evidence is too scarce to understand the complex network of cause and effect in the settlement landscape and archaeological record. Furthermore, any findings will inevitably be biased by the lack of archaeological evidence in Evandale, as discussed above. Yet, Angus Winchester has pointed out that several Anglo-Norman baronies in Cumbria show traces of earlier territorial units.\textsuperscript{848} Furthermore, it is notable that the reconstructed boundaries of the \textit{baronia de Arikstane} are surrounded by a number of late prehistoric forts to the east and south (fig. 2). It is impossible to tell whether these forts were contemporaneous, and whether their function was to guard or control. Indeed, their purpose may have been more to do with the Roman road, or an earlier travel route it represents, running along the slopes west of Meikleholmside and Ericstane. Still, the possibility must be considered that the group of farms in Evandale and upper Annandale are representative of a bounded unit or territory which pre-dates their first mention in the charters, possibly by several centuries.

Apart from the possible estate unit in the western part of the parish of Moffat, the charter evidence does not give grounds for similar units in the rest of the parish. However, based on the distribution of settlements and their agricultural potential, certain focal points

\textsuperscript{845} OSAS II, p. 285. The county boundaries of Dumfriesshire were only changed in 1889 to include the farms of Harthope and Raecleugh, see Shennan, \textit{Boundaries of Counties and Parishes}, p. 337.
\textsuperscript{846} This county boundary is still visible on the early OS maps: OS 1\textsuperscript{st} Ed. County Map 1:2500.
\textsuperscript{847} Jones, ‘\textit{Model Framework}’, p. 252; Winchester, ‘\textit{Multiple Estate}’, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{848} Winchester, ‘\textit{Multiple Estate}’, p. 90.
may be identified. If Ericstane and Meikleholmside were assigned to the *baronia de Arikstane*, this would leave the pairing of Corehead and Granton in the north of the parish, about 3km away from the nearest cluster of settlements. Granton may have belonged to the Scandinavian expansion of the tenth or eleventh centuries, while Corehead could have been one of the Gaelic-speaking ancillary formations dated to around the same time and mentioned by Nicolaisen.\(^{849}\) This hierarchy, with Corehead lying in dependence to Granton would certainly hold true in terms of their compared agricultural potential. Unfortunately, conclusive evidence is lacking.

By far the area with the highest settlement density is the cluster of settlements or farms around Moffat in the central and southern parts of the parish. In terms of agricultural potential, it may be suggestive that Moffat, the settlement with the second-highest APP value, is surrounded by a half-circle of three settlements with lower values. A similar relationship as that between Granton and Corehead may be suggested, even though the place-name evidence in this instance is inverted: Moffat as a Gaelic place-name is surrounded by three potentially central or late medieval name formations: Archbank, Auldton and Frenchland. Dumcrieff and Breconside are likely to belong to this unit of settlements, primarily because of their distribution along the eastern bank of the Annan River, and because they do not fit into the overall settlement pattern of Moffatdale as described below. The motte-and-bailey castle at Auldton has been ascribed directly to the Brus family and may have been their base of operations in the territory around Moffat, making the cluster of settlements around Moffat and south of it a likely candidate for an Anglo-Norman centre upon which other areas of the parish, such as the barony of Ericstane, Granton and the farm groups of Moffatdale were dependent (fig. 3).\(^{850}\)

The third group of settlements which should be mentioned are the farms along Moffat Water. These farms or settlements are arranged on either side of the river in intervals of 1.5 to about 3km. No potential dependence can be identified, and instead most farms in Moffatdale simply seem to be arranged in a manner which grants them the best access to the fertile river banks while at the same time maintaining the availability of a predominantly pastoral hinterland. Three pairings of farms can be spotted: Craigieburn – Crofthead, Capplegill – Bodesbeck and Polmoodie – Carrifran (fig. 27). These pairings are interesting for two reasons. First, they are organised in linguistically consistent groups. Craigieburn and Crofthead (first mentioned as Croftheid in the sixteenth-century) are most likely MSc formations. Capplegill

---

\(^{849}\) Nicolaisen, *Place-Names*, pp. 125 and 127.

\(^{850}\) RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, pp. 192, 194, 196, 199.
and Bodesbeck may be Scandinavian or MSc in origin, while Polmoodie and Carrifran are Gaelic. Assigning these place-names with specific linguistic origins is problematic, as discussed in the relevant sections of chapter 8. However, once understood as groups, a clearer pattern emerges. Taking the linguistic groupings as a working hypothesis, it can be surmised that each farm within a pairing received its linguistic imprint from the same community or lord which named the other part of the pairing, arguing towards an understanding of these groups as units, potentially even of an economic nature. In addition to this, the second notable pattern is that each pairing consists of one place-name referring to an elevated position or a slope (Crofthead, Capplegill, Carrifran) and one place-name referring to a water stream (Craigieburn, Bodesbeck, Polmoodie). It is possible that these pairings were originally one settlement, later split into two. This scenario seems unlikely, however, in comparison with other medieval township splittings, resulting in pairings such as North and South Carthat, or Upper and Nether Roxburgh. Furthermore, with the exception of Polmoodie and Carrifran, there is evidence of late prehistoric settlement activity near all the other farms, suggesting that both sides of Moffat Water attracted human habitation (fig. 2).

The topographic features of the surrounding landscape alone do not account for this neat repetitive pattern of \textit{elevation + water stream} place-names. If these formations were not a coincidence, it is possible that all six place-names were coined during the same period. It seems implausible, for example, that Gaelic-speaking settlers named two farms Polmoodie and Carrifran, and that this pattern was carried over by their southern, either Danish- or Middle Scots-speaking neighbours a century or two later. There is very little reason why that should happen. Instead, the place-names and, by association, the relative positioning of each farm within its pairing is reminiscent of an arrangement connected with different types of land use. In each pairing, the place-name referring to a stream or pool is located closest to Moffat Water. Likewise, the APP values between the farms in each pairing show marked differences, ranging from 22 to 37, suggesting that, even if the type of land use did not differ, each farm pairing had an agriculturally stronger and a weaker farm. If these pairings were associated with different types of land use or a different quality of land, it may be that the naming of the six settlements or farms in question happened during a concerted effort, perhaps directed by the authority of the land owner or lord of the estate. Taking this assumption as a working hypothesis, the place-names must have formed before 1318, as this is when Polmoodie is first attested, and after c. AD 1100, since Craigieburn and Crofthead suggest the influence of

\footnote{Note, however, that the \textit{-head} in Crofthead may refer to the headland of an arable field instead of, or in addition to, the reference to its elevated position: cf. chapter 8.}

\footnote{Dodgshon, ‘Infield-Outfield’, p. 13. See also the section on Carthat in chapter 8.}
northern ME or MSc. While it is possible that the place-name formation was the communal effort of an at least bi-lingual community, the dating range between c. 1100 and 1300 may point to this development having been overseen by an Anglo-Norman landlord, perhaps one of the ten knights for whose service Robert de Brus held Annandale in the second half of the twelfth century. The families of Franciscus and de Henevile received lands near Moffat in the thirteenth century, but there is little indication that their holdings extended into Moffatdale, and the arrangement of farms in the eastern part of the parish may have been forced by the Brus family, which held the lands around Moffat in demesne at least in the fourteenth century. It is possible that the group of farms in Moffatdale were given as a whole unit and originally belonged to a separate estate or territorial division from the valleys of upper Annandale and Evandale, but this must remain speculation. If, as suggested above in the case of the barony of Ericstance, prehistoric forts indicate the boundaries of territories, rather than their centres, the fort at Craigieburn may have had a guarding function at the lower end of Moffatdale, controlling access to the farms to the north (figs. 2 and 21). A similar function may be possible for Carrifran on the northern end of the valley, if the name is interpreted as ‘fort or defended farm of the raven’.

Within the Moffatdale settlement pattern, Selcoth is a clear exception on several accounts: it does not refer to an elevation or shape of the landscape, nor is it paired with another farm or settlement. Even its linguistic stratum may be of older date than other place-names in Moffatdale. In chapter 8, the theory was proposed that Selcoth may represent early Anglian settlement activity in northern Dumfriesshire. While this cannot be proven beyond any doubt, due to the lack of evidence, its singular situation compared to its neighbours may point in a similar direction. It is possible to see Selcoth as a relic of the period before AD 1100 and before the increasing influence of Anglo-Norman families. The lack of a ‘complementary’ settlement or farm for Selcoth on the opposite bank of Moffat Water may, however, also be due to the nature of the landscape in that area: the steep slopes to the north-west of Selcoth may not have been suitable for permanent settlement (picture 7).

---

853 Cf. chapter 8.
854 RRS II, p. 179 (no. 80) AD 1165x1173.
855 CDS I, p. 124 (nos. 705 and 706) c. AD 1218; RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, p. 199.
856 Cf. chapter 8.
Another settlement which should be factored in when discussing Moffatdale is Logan. Although lost on the modern map, the settlement has been included here, and its location has been reconstructed on what little evidence was available in the written documentation and on eighteenth-century maps. Logan seems somewhat out of place in the settlement landscape of Moffatdale, as it does not obviously belong to any of the farm pairings discussed above, nor does it have a substantial Agricultural Population Potential when compared to the single farms of Dumcrieff and Selcoth. The latter is in part due to the methodology employed in the present study. Given that Logan was deserted by the eighteenth century, the estate plans used here to reconstruct the quality of land probably omitted the lands which would have been used as arable if Logan were still settled. Had this arable land been included, the APP estimate could have been increased substantially, at least to the same level as Crofthead. It is uncertain in what relation Logan would have stood to the farm pairings mentioned above. It may have been

---

857 Cf. chapter 8.
an individual farm or group of farms, comparable to Selcoth, but given the lack of information on its location and purpose, no conclusive case can be made for this suggestion.

Judging by the distribution of late prehistoric forts in the parish, the pattern of pre-Norman lordship may have been on a much smaller scale than the Norman units centred on motte-and-bailey castles. The area of what came to be known as the barony of Ericstane is, as mentioned above, characterised by a lack of prehistoric or early historic settlement and fortification evidence. Its boundaries, however, are outlined by prehistoric forts and, to the east, by the Roman road traversing upper Annandale. The prehistoric fort and settlement complex to the north-east of Moffat, and in close proximity to the later Brus motte-and-bailey, may have been used to guard the area to the north, south and east of Moffat. The northern part of the parish contains the remains of three prehistoric forts or defended settlements clustered together, although it is unclear whether these were contemporaneous or successive expressions of the same need to control the upper Annandale valley (fig. 2). Last but not least, the only surviving late prehistoric fort in Moffatdale is situated at its southern opening, near the modern location of Craigieburn.

As discussed in chapter 2, the extraction of inferences about the early medieval landscape of Dumfriesshire based on poorly dated, or often un-dated, late prehistoric forts and settlements is hazardous at best. Nevertheless, the synthesis of the different landscape types of the parish of Moffat, consisting of Evandale, Annandale and Moffatdale, along with the distinctive agricultural potential and settlement patterns, prehistoric and medieval, in each of them, does suggest that, before the arrival of King David I’s Anglo-Norman retainers, the territorial landscape around Moffat may have been much more fragmented than is suggested by the parish boundaries. This is not to say that the parish boundaries had no relevance for that territorial arrangement, as they seem to respect the role of the three major rivers, Evan Water, Annan and Moffat Water, either as catchment area (Evandale and Moffatdale) or as boundary (River Annan). The outer boundaries mostly run along the crests of the hills and ridges surrounding these valleys, which becomes particularly obvious in the case of the almost square-shaped extension which the boundary describes to the south-east of Selcoth, neatly following the hill-tops of Smidhope Hill, Capel Fell, Wind Fell, Loch Fell, West Knowe and Croft Head. Within this territory, the prehistoric evidence suggests four sub-divisions (Evandale or the later barony of Ericstane, the area around Granton, the area around Moffat and Moffatdale). Certainly from the arrival of the Brus family in the early twelfth century onward the subdivisions may have been united into a single territory controlled from the motte-and-bailey between Auldton and Moffat, but the settlement and place-name patterns within
each part of the parish have retained their distinctiveness. There seems to be no correlation between the density of fortification and the agricultural potential in the parish of Moffat. Rather, a large amount of activity was concentrated along the course of the River Annan, possibly in connection with the Roman road. Thus, the simplistic view of the correlation between a high status settlement and its having access to a high amount of agricultural resources cannot be upheld.

11.3 Patterns in the Parish of Lochmaben

Since the overall APP for the parish of Lochmaben is estimated at 1093, and nine place-names have been identified as settlement foci, the average APP is 121. The only settlements above this number are Lochmaben, Ouseby (if located at Heck), Smallholm and Rockhallhead. Due to the increased settlement density to the north, Esbie, Templand, Gotterbie, Broomhill and Halleaths all have APP values significantly lower than the average, as their individual shares of the land are more restricted (fig. 34). It is possible that the four place-names above the APP average represent early medieval sub-divisions of the parish territory. In the case of Lochmaben this is a distinct possibility based on a variety of factors. First, the place-name itself, as discussed in chapter 8, is likely to pre-date all other place-names in the parish. This in itself is no certain indicator of a high status, but the continued relevance of Lochmaben is shown by its establishment as the centre of the Brus Lordship of Annandale, and as the site and name of the parish church.

Making any safe arguments about the status and role of Ouseby in the settlement landscape of the parish is rendered difficult by the fact that the place-name refers to a lost settlement. If, however, the theory brought forward in chapter 8 is correct, and Ouseby was roughly situated at the location now settled by Heck, then this settlement site would fill a gap between the two early place-names of Lochmaben and Smallholm (fig. 31).\(^{858}\) Certainly by the early fourteenth century Ouseby was considered a vill worthy of comparison with both Lochmaben and Smallholm, and charters describing the lands and duties pertaining to Ouseby give the impression of it having been a sizeable estate, or part thereof.\(^ {859}\) Even in the period after Ouseby may have been deserted in the second half of the fourteenth century, its ‘echo’ in the landscape seemed to have been substantial enough for continued references to the field

\(^{858}\) Christoph Otte, ‘The Place-Names of Lochmaben – Reconstructing the Settlement Landscape of Early Medieval Dumfriesshire, c. AD 600-1000’, TDGNHAS, (forthcoming).

\(^{859}\) See discussion of Ouseby in chapter 8 and CDS II, p. 426 (no. 1608); CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47).
of Usby or Usebyfeld in the later fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{860} It has been suggested by Gillian Fellows-Jensen in her studies of Scandinavian place-names in northern England that complete or partial Scandinavian place-names may be hiding a layer of Anglo-Saxon or Anglian estates or estate units.\textsuperscript{861} The unfortunate lack of early written evidence in Dumfriesshire means that such a theory can neither be fully proven nor disproven, but, coupled with what is known about Ouseby in the early fourteenth century, taking into account the early nature of its place-name, and adding to this the fact that Ouseby, if located correctly, has the highest APP value in the parish of Lochmaben, it is very likely that it may have formed a small estate or sub-division in the parish territory of Lochmaben by the eleventh century and possibly earlier.

Smallholm is, after Lochmaben, possibly one of the oldest place-names of the parish. Alan James has suggested that Anglian place-names ending in \textit{-hām} may point to early units of landholding or estates, as evidenced by the large proportion of \textit{hām} place-names in southern Scotland which have become the heads of \textit{scīras} and later became medieval parishes.\textsuperscript{862} Smallholm may be another example of this theory, albeit James notes the caveat that the main estate settlement “may not always have been at or near the place that preserves \textit{-ham} in its present-day name”.\textsuperscript{863} Smallholm certainly was mentioned as a vill in the fourteenth century along with the vills of Ouseby and Lochmaben, both of which have been established as likely candidates of estate units above.\textsuperscript{864} Its name specific, \textit{Small-}, begs the question of what it was small compared to.\textsuperscript{865} This problem cannot be answered in a conclusive manner, especially since it is not known whether the original reference was to the size of the landholding or estate, or to its status or dependency. If the possibility is entertained, however, that a larger estate unit existed in the vicinity at some point between the seventh and ninth centuries when Smallholm was likely to have been founded, or at least named, then an estate with Lochmaben at its centre may be a likely candidate.

Judging primarily by the linguistic landscape of the parish of Lochmaben, it is noticable that almost all early place-names are Scandinavian formations, and three out of these contain the element \textit{bý}. In the case of Esbie the very fact that it appears in the written record as early as the first quarter of the twelfth century may also suggest that it belongs to a possibly  

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{860} CDS IV, p. 50 (no. 223) AD 1374x5; RGS II, p. 30 (no. 143) AD 1429x30.
\item \textsuperscript{861} Fellows-Jensen, ‘Scandinavians in Dumfriesshire’, pp. 77-8.
\item \textsuperscript{862} James, ‘Scotland’s \textit{-HAM} Names’, p. 104.
\item \textsuperscript{863} James, ‘Scotland’s \textit{-HAM} Names’, p. 104.
\item \textsuperscript{864} CDS IV, p. 11 (no. 47) AD 1360.
\item \textsuperscript{865} My gratitude goes to Dr Alan James for his helpful suggestions concerning the place-name of Smallholm.
\end{footnotes}
pre-1000 settlement pattern. In the case of Gotterbie the evidence is less clear, and much depends on whether the personal name preserved in *Gotter-* is argued to have been originally ON, or ME. Accepting, as a working hypothesis, that Gotterbie belonged to the same wave of settlement or re-settlement as Esbie and Ouseby, it is suggested that they formed dependent settlements or farms with an estate centre at Lochmaben. In this scenario, it is likely that the lands around Lochmaben were given to a group Scandinavian settlers or lords, perhaps even called *Guðfrøðr* (Gotterbie) or *Ulf* (Ouseby). In addition to the three *-bý* place-names, Halleaths, with its reference to ON *hlatha* ‘barn’ may have been a central place for the storage of grain or livestock within this estate.

This hierarchical relationship between Lochmaben and the northern and eastern parts of the parish seems to be reflected in the archaeological record. The late prehistoric fort at Woodycastle north-west of Lochmaben may, if contemporary, be seen in juxtaposition to the defended settlement east of modern Templand (fig. 23). Likewise, in the Anglo-Norman landscape of the parish, the moated site in Gotterbie Moor may have been a dependent sub-feu under the motte-and-bailey castle at Lochmaben (fig. 23). It is unclear, however, how the prehistoric fort at Greenhillhead, north of Greenhill, fits into this picture (fig. 24). There are no remaining forts for the area around Smallholm, and two scenarios are possible: first, much like in the case of the barony of Ericstane (parish Moffat), the prehistoric fort at Greenhillhead, rather than being at the centre of the Smallholm unit of land, may just have marked the northern boundary of that territory. Secondly, the prehistoric fort now known as Range Castle may either have been associated with the land unit later known as Smallholm, or it may have been another demarcation of its boundaries, as is the possibility with the fort at Greenhillhead. Arguing along similar lines, the fort at Woodycastle may have marked the northern boundary of the territory pertaining to Lochmaben, as opposed to the, possibly dependent, territory to the north, around modern Esbie, Templand and Gotterbie. If the broad division of the parish of Lochmaben into a large Lochmaben estate, and a smaller Smallholm estate, is correct, the lands around Templand may originally have belonged to Esbie, while Broomhill may have been part of the centre at Lochmaben, or of Gotterbie, creating a group of Scandinavian place-names with Lochmaben at their centre. In this hypothesis, Templand would signify a part of this estate which was partitioned of and granted to the Knights Templar, while the *-hill* element in Broomhill could be taken as an indicator that a landscape feature, such as a prominent elevation, may have been used to refer to a larger farm or village once the earlier estate had been fragmented. Thus, if the parish boundaries are accepted as representing,
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866 RCAHMS, *Dumfriesshire*, p. 208.
at least in part, an early medieval territorial unit, the relative old age of Lochmaben and Smallholm, along with the aforementioned archaeological evidence, suggest that this territory consisted of two sub-units. The northern part of this bi-partite territory may have been further fragmented into *appendicia* which, in the tenth century, were granted *en bloc* to Scandinavian incomers.

The possibility that the lands around Rockhallhead may have only been added to this unit once the parish boundaries had been created in the twelfth century or later, has been addressed briefly with regard to the motte-and-bailey castle at Rockhallhead. A likely scenario is that, if there was a territorial boundary, it would have run along the crest of the upland ridge to the north-east of Rockhallhead. This behaviour of parish boundaries can also be observed in the upland parishes of Moffat, Tundergarth, Middlebie and Ewes. In terms of the APP value, the territory around Rockhallhead would be somewhat lower than that of the other estate units, such as Smallholm or Ouseby, by about 20-25 per cent (fig. 34). It is possible, therefore, that Rockhallhead represents the centre of a small, self-contained territorial unit which was added to the parish and estates of Lochmaben in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries under Anglo-Norman influence. This unit may have included parts of the parish of Mouswald, which contains the place-names of Rockhall, Rockhall Moor and Rockhall Mains, suggesting an estate.

The distinct character of Rockhallhead, and its possibly earlier independence from the parish of Lochmaben, is supported by the place-name record: the three *þveit* place-names of the parish all occur in close proximity to, or directly in, the south-western upland area. When comparing the locations of *þveit* place-names in Lochmaben with the outline of the parish boundaries, it is noticeable that the western boundary, which for the most part follows natural features, has two bulbous extensions towards the south-west, in each case surrounding a *þveit* place-name settlement (fig. 16). Given the chronological evidence for this place-name type, the following scenario seems likely: places of the *þveit* type were created anew in a settlement wave during the late tenth, eleventh or even twelfth century. This suggests that the relevant areas had to be cleared for agricultural purposes, possibly due to population or other pressures in the already settled zones and it may be inferred that there were no pre-existing settlements prior to the foundation of the *þveit* settlements. The only part where the boundaries of the parish of Lochmaben parish deviate from the rule of following natural landmarks is the south-west corner, reaching across the upland ridge and taking in both Carthat and Rockhall Mote.
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as well as the *pveit* names of Hartwood and Thorniethwaite. If *pveit* place-names may be dated to the tenth or eleventh centuries, and therefore pre-date the generally accepted systematic creation of parishes in the twelfth and later centuries, one may argue that the south-west portion of the parish of Lochmaben was super-imposed during the tenth or eleventh centuries onto a pre-existing boundary in order to take in the presumably newly founded *pveit* places but leaving the traditional route of following natural features. Thus, the south-western appendage surrounding the motte at Rockhallhead may have been a separate land unit before AD 1000. Similarly, the remainder of the Lochmaben parish boundaries may be of an older date than the twelfth century, given that they were probably in place in the eleventh century to be modified. This land unit need not have been a parish boundary originally, but may have been imbued with this function during the establishment of parishes under David I or his successors.

The area of the parish of Lochmaben extending west from a hypothetical line drawn from Lochmaben to Hightae was largely marked as common lands in the estate plans of the eighteenth century. The co-occurrence of *pveit* place-names, commonties and the artificial-looking quality of the western parish boundaries may not be a coincidence. Barrow has pointed out that the ‘shire moor’ was an “essential ingredient in the composition of a […] shire”, both in England and in Scotland. Already in 1926 J. E. A. Jolliffe argued for the central role of the common waste in the shire or, as Jones later called it, multiple estate. The principal idea was that, while each vill had access to its own arable and pastoral resources, a group of vills would share a common waste, often used for pasture, on the level of the shire, rather than that of the single manor. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, at least in northern England, a process of fragmentation seems to have started amongst these shire moors. Parts of the waste were taken out of the total common by local lords and granted to ecclesiastical foundations or turned into separate townships. Whereas precise boundaries were not needed in an intercommoning system, they became more necessary once pressure on the grazing lands and resulting disputes increased. It is possible that a similar process played a role in the formation of the artificial-looking boundaries on and across the upland ridge after the clearing of the uplands as evidenced by the *pveit* place-names. The parish of Lochmaben may have shared
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868 NRS Ref. RHP 218.
869 Barrow, *Kingdom of the Scots*, p. 44.
intercomming rights to Thorniethwaite Moor, Carthat Moor and Bellridding Moor, the latter now being part of the parish of Torthorwald, and that this common waste was broken up in the course of the medieval period. Here, a further investigation into the neighbouring parishes around Lochmaben may grant more detailed insights.

11.4 Patterns in the Parish of Annan

Unlike the parish boundaries of Lochmaben, which use the Annan as their eastern demarcation line, the parish of Annan embraces the undulating hills to the east and west of the river. Its northern boundaries take in the hills of Woodcock Air to the north-west and the hill of Dumbretton to the north-east, while to the south it bounds on the Solway Firth (figs. 16 - 17). In the gap between the two northern elevations, the boundaries follow the River Annan and the Butcherbeck Burn. The eastern and western boundaries do not follow any natural boundaries, but seem to have been influenced by other factors.

The average APP of the potentially early medieval settlements in the parish is 142. The majority of the place-names are of Germanic, and specifically Scandinavian origin (including four by place-names), but there are two examples of Celtic place-names, one of Brittonic derivation (Annan), and one of Gaelic derivation (Dumbretton) (fig. 35). There is very little doubt that Annan functioned as the focal settlement in this part of Dumfriesshire: its Brittonic name suggests a formation in the first millennium AD, and possibly earlier, and may be derived from, or, less likely, have influenced the naming of the river which dominates and shapes its surrounding landscape. It was selected as the original centre of the Lordship of Annandale, which is still shown by the remains of the motte-and-bailey at Annan, and its name was applied to and co-terminus with the parish from the medieval period onward. With this context, is it unsurprising that the APP of Annan, 228, is almost twice as high as the parish average and 36 points higher than that of the next highest value of Plumdon.

The only other Celtic place-name is Dumbretton, or Drumbretton. As discussed in chapter 8, this place-name was likely coined by Gaelic speakers referring to a community of people being perceived as linguistically or culturally ‘British’. The most likely period when this could have happened is the eleventh century, when Gaelic-speaking settlers may have been increasingly coming in under King Duncan of Scotia and the Kingdom of Strathclyde.
had collapsed after the death of King Owein.\textsuperscript{873} This explanation has two advantages: it accounts for the fact that it was considered viable in the political climate around Dumbretton to specifically name a hill or fort after a ‘British’ minority. Secondly, it describes a general development in which Gaelic-speaking settlers may have been coming in large enough numbers to create such a lasting place-name. Of course, there are problems, too. Unless the defeat of King Owein meant the killing or re-localisation of an entire British population, the reference to the British at Dumbretton may have not singled the local community out as British, but rather as ostentatiously so, for example by adherence to certain traditions or naming practices amongst families. After all, even settlements such as Plumdon may have been mostly occupied by British natives under an Anglian or Scandinavian elite. Daphne Brooke’s suggestion that Annan itself is in fact an earlier Brittonic place-name in the Gaelic genitive case indicates that the early medieval parish contained an influential Gaelic-speaking minority leaving a strong impact at least on the local non-Germanic place-names.\textsuperscript{874} The close proximity of Dumbretton to the Roman road from Carlisle to Lockerbie is unlikely to be a coincidence (fig. 25). It may have been the strategic location of this hill guarding this central route from northern England into the southern uplands which may account for the particular resilience of the British presence to the north-east of the parish of Annan.

The archaeological record in the parish of Annan is very sparse compared to the upland parishes. With the exception of a possible defended settlement near Hayknowes, no late prehistoric fortifications can be found within parish boundaries. Of course, there is a strong possibility that many traces of prehistoric and medieval settlement were eradicated by intensive farming and the expansion of the town of Annan, and it is conceivable that particularly the urban area of Annan itself may hide the traces of a major fortification based on the importance of the site. The general pattern of the surviving fortifications is that they surround the parish boundaries, rather than lie in their midst (fig. 6). This behaviour is mirrored by the prehistoric forts in the parishes of Lochmaben and Moffat, especially with regard to the barony of Ericstane discussed earlier this chapter (figs. 2 and 4). By contrast, the motte-and-bailey castle is situated at the very centre of the parish, again, mirrored by the case studies of Lochmaben and Moffat (figs. 3, 5 and 7).

Compared to the parishes of Moffat and Lochmaben, the parish of Annan features a very regular distribution of land amongst the selected settlements. The only exceptions are the lands around Brydekirk and Dumbretton to the north of the parish, which take in almost twice

\textsuperscript{873} Nicolaisen, \textit{Place-Names}, pp. 131-2; Jackson, ‘Britons in Southern Scotland’, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{874} Lowe and Brooke, \textit{Excavations at Hoddom}, p. 204.
as much land as the individual polygons to the south (fig. 35). It should be stressed, again, that the Thiessen polygons in this case may represent both settlement density as well as the possibility that settlements with few competing neighbours may have taken in more land. The fact that it should be Dumbretton and Brydekirk which break the overall pattern is not surprising, given that they fill out the upland areas of the parish, with the two prominent elevations of Woodcock Air and the hill of Dumbretton farm. In fact, the place-name of Woodcock Air itself may be of significance in this context, referring, as it probably does, to a shieling site. On the other hand, most of the smaller polygons to the south still have a greater APP than those of Brydekirk and Dumbretton.

An understanding of the potential territorial boundaries within the parish is tied to the question of whether the churches of Brydekirk and Annan were part of different parishes prior to the mid-thirteenth century. While Brydekirk seems to have been a chapelry as part of the parish of Annan at some point after 1218 or 1223, it seems to have been separate from the church of Annan prior to that date. Unfortunately, the boundaries of Brydekirk cannot be traced anymore. There is a reference to the boundary of Brydekirk in a charter of 1637, suggesting that the boundary ran across, rather than along, the River Annan somewhere between Brydekirk and the mouth of the river, but both the chronological distance of said charter to the early medieval period, and the lack of detail in the boundary clause, render a reconstruction of the boundaries around Brydekirk difficult. None of the charters pertaining to the parish of Annan before 1218 or 1223 give any details as to how the settlements near Annan related to either the parish of Annan or the parish or chapelry of Brydekirk.

Whatever the original boundaries of the parish or territory of Brydekirk, they are unlikely to have been extensive compared to those of Annan, which was the focus of frequent
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875 Cf. discussion of Woodcock Air in chapter 8.
876 Cowan, Parishes of Medieval Scotland, pp. 7 and 23; RCAHMS, Dumfriesshire, pp. 249-50; Crowe, 'Brydekirk', p. 33.
877 Cowan, Parishes of Medieval Scotland, pp. 7 and 23.
878 In the translation of John Anderson the clause goes as follows: “Instrument of Sasine […] infetling John Earl of Annandale […] in the following lands: […] also the whole fishings for salmon and other fish in the water of Annan between the boundary of Brydekirk and the mouth of the river”: CLC I, p. 527 (no. 2222) AD 1637.
879 CDS I, p. 107 (no. 606) Weremundebi AD 1194x1214, p. 124 (no. 705) Weremundebi AD c. 1218; HMC (Drml), p. 39 (no. 67) Millebi AD 1194x1214. A quit-claim of land by Roger, son of William Franciscus, to Robert de Brus lord of Annandale around 1218 arranges the exchange of “duas bouatas terr[a]e […] in teritorio de Anand versus Weremundebi”, see CDS I, p. 124 (no. 705) and National Archives, DL 25/86. The term “teritorio” may simply refer to the extent of the town of Annan. Alternatively, however, it may have to do with a boundary within the parish. Warmanbie lies approximately half-way between Annan and Brydekirk and would be a suitable marker between territories. Much is hinged on the interpretation of “teritorium” and definitive conclusions cannot be drawn yet.
disputes between the canons and bishops of Glasgow.\textsuperscript{880} It may have occupied the lands west of the Annan from Woodcock Air in the north to Milnby in the south, perhaps reaching as far west as the modern parish boundaries, but this is just a hypothesis based on natural boundaries. While the extent of the independent nature of Brydekirk is uncertain, the remainder of the parish presents a picture similar to that of Lochmaben: the Brittonic and Gaelicised place-name of Annan is surrounded by Scandinavian place-names ending in -bý (fig. 29). While Warmanbie may refer to the name of its original landholder (\textit{Vermundr}), Milnby and Bomby suggest that these settlements had specialised functions within the greater settlement constellation: Milnby may have been the primary site for the processing of grain, while Bomby, if it did not refer to the personal name \textit{Bóni}, may have been a settlement housing serfs or bondmen, or a farm worked by them.\textsuperscript{881} Certainly, this would explain the remarkably low APP for Bomby based on the Thiessen polygons. It is possible that Annan was the caput of an estate consisting of the dependent settlements of Milnby, Bomby and Warmanbie. The Scandinavian naming influence clearly extended all the way north to Brydekirk, although whether this was also the case for the boundaries of the estate unit is uncertain. Brydekirk may have been a sub-division similar to Milnby and Warmanbie. While the chronological relation between Newbie and the rest of the Scandinavian settlements remains debatable, given its place-name specific \textit{New-}, it is unlikely based on the agricultural potential that the territory around Newbie was not settled by the tenth century when the other \textit{bý} place-names are likely to have formed. It is possible that the lands of Newbie were not part of the potential Annan estate complex before the tenth century, and that the expansion of said estate into the south-west of the later parish of Annan was the occasion for the formation, or (re-)naming, of a new farm: Newbie. David Rollason has argued that the head vill of a Northumbrian soke or shire often had an OE place-name while the dependent vills or settlements had adopted ON place-names. A similar pattern may have existed in Dumfriesshire, with the exception that shire centres retained their ancient Brittonic names, such as Lochmaben and Annan.\textsuperscript{882}

By contrast, Plumdon may have been an Anglian foundation. If it indeed is identical with the \textit{Planton} mentioned in 1210x12, there may be more reason to believe that this \textit{tūn} place-name was formed before the influence of Scandinavian and later Anglo-Norman incomers, especially given that its name specific is not a Scandinavian, or Anglo-Norman, personal name, as in the case of \textit{tūn} hybrid names in Yorkshire.\textsuperscript{883} Plumdon certainly occupies

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{880} Cowan, \textit{Parishes of Medieval Scotland}, p. 7.
  \item \textsuperscript{881} Cf. the discussion of the place-names in chapter 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{882} Rollason, \textit{Northumbria}, pp. 232-3.
  \item \textsuperscript{883} CDS I, p. 95 (no. 546); Fellows-Jensen, ‘Settlement in Yorkshire’, pp. 172-5.
\end{itemize}
an area of high agricultural potential only matched by that of Annan and may have remained independent of its northern neighbour throughout the period of Scandinavian settlement activity (fig. 35). By the same logic, Dumbretton may have retained a certain degree of independence from Annan by token of its proximity to the Roman transport route and the resilience of British culture, if the Gaelic place-name is interpreted correctly. It is equally likely, however, that Dumbretton, as the only other strong indicator of a British population or British landholding, belonged to the larger Annan territory prior to the Scandinavian settlement influx and functioned as extensive grazing area for the entire estate complex.

The place-name landscape of the parishes of Lochmaben and Annan is a complex one as shown in chapter 8. The very fact that it is mostly the Scandinavian place-names which lend themselves to more precise dating and classification demonstrates the dangers of a cyclical argument. If most of the place-names dated to the early medieval period are Scandinavian place-names, it is tempting to see the workings of influential Anglo-Danish lords from northern England sweeping across the Solway plains, setting up little estate pockets in the wake of a collapsed British kingdom. Such a view would certainly be too simplistic and raise at least as many questions as it would answer. Nevertheless, in discussing the place-names of each parish, special care has been taken to distinguish earlier from later formations. While later formations may not reflect newly founded settlements, but rather a re-naming of earlier settled sites, they may still point to settlements of lower status compared to sites displaying a more conservative nature in place-name terms.

The role of common pasture as boundary zones has been observed in the case of the parish of Lochmaben above. A similar pattern emerges in the parish of Annan. The early nineteenth-century plan of the Commonty of Annan shows that the common grazing broadly defined the eastern boundary of the parish. Beyond this boundary, the plan records the commonties of Creca and Dornock.884 Again, it is tempting to see these commonties as a former shire moor or common waste before the establishment of clearly defined boundaries. The shape of the parish boundaries to the east and west look artificial compared to those in the north and south, which are defined by natural features. More evidence is available in the western part of the parish. A charter dating to sometime between AD 1271 and 1318 contains the boundary clause for part of the common pasture of Neuby (Newbie).885 Many of the points of reference mentioned in this clause are obscure and cannot be identified on the modern map, but where this is possible it suggests that the common lands cross the modern boundaries of

884 NRS Ref. RHP 631.
885 HMC (Drml), p. 40 (no. 71) AD 1271x1318.
the parish into the parish of Cummertrees.\textsuperscript{886} It does not seem to be a coincidence that this
commonty co-occurs with place-names such as \textit{Brakansweit} and \textit{Langesweit Moss} and
\textit{Batemanridding}, all referring to cleared lands.\textsuperscript{887} This would further underline that place-
names in -\textit{pveit} represent areas which were taken into regular land use, such as pasture or even
cultivation, relatively late, possibly after AD 1000. The names reflect clearing of the land
probably in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, and by the fourteenth century evidence becomes
stronger that these lands were considered larger common lands, probably in the process of
being partitioned, as described by Jolliffe in Northumbria.\textsuperscript{888}

\textsuperscript{886} The clause mentions, for example, Brakanepheit: cf. discussion of \textit{Brakanepheit} in chapter 8.
\textsuperscript{887} Batemanridding and Langesweit have not been discussed in chapter 8 as they did not belong into
the parish of Annan. For an interpretation of their place-names, see: Johnson-Ferguson, \textit{Place-Names
\textsuperscript{888} Jolliffe, ‘Northumbrian Instutions’, pp. 12-3.
12. Conclusion

The road to a better understanding of the early medieval territorial organisation of Dumfriesshire is strewn with uncertainties and caveats. As outlined in the preceding chapters, detailed contemporary written evidence is non-existent and the archaeological record is largely confined to the uplands, and even then most of the early settlement remains are not dated, or insufficiently so. With the present state of the evidence, it would be impossible to reconstruct the evolution of the settlement landscape in the 400-year study period from c. AD 600 to 1000. The patterns of late prehistoric and late medieval and post-medieval settlements and farms indicate, however, that a certain degree of continuity may have existed throughout the first millennium AD, even though the exact location of settlements may have changed on a case-by-case basis due to hardship or practices of shifting agriculture. Before this background, it must be assumed that the various linguistic strata of the place-names in Dumfriesshire represent re-naming, rather than a new foundation of settlements and communities from scratch. This certainly does not provide much room for narratives of migration, conquest and displacement, but it provides a useful framework for comparing the settlements with each other, as well as the value of their ecological environment.

With the exception of place-names in -þveit, Scandinavian place-names are unlikely to indicate the colonisation of pockets of uninhabited land. By comparison, Brittonic names such as Lochmaben and Annan may represent settlements which were linguistically and culturally, if not politically, more conservative, and the place-name of Dumbretton could be interpreted as referring to a population which was perceived as even ostentatiously British by Gaelic-speaking incomers. Gillian Fellows-Jensen has argued for the wholesale adoption of Anglo-Saxon estates in northern England by Scandinavian immigrants. It is likely that a similar development took place in Annandale in the tenth and eleventh centuries, although the Scandinavian and Scots place-names effectively prevent the modern scholar from catching a glimpse of the preceding linguistic strata which would indicate either native British or Anglian influences. If the place-names of Smallholm, Selcoth and Plumdon are correctly interpreted as signs of a thin ruling layer of an Anglian elite, established between the mid-seventh and eighth centuries, then it is perhaps a sign of the relative importance of these settlements or estates that they did not succumb to Scandinavian influence, at least in linguistic terms.

While archaeology and place-name evidence are useful sources in the establishment and interpretation of early medieval settlement patterns, the emphasis in the preceding chapters has been on the assessment of each settlement’s rural resources. Chapters
9 and 10 introduced a new methodology to measure sites of interest with regard to their Agricultural Population Potential, or APP, and the resulting numbers have proven useful in making sense of the settlement and estate landscape of Dumfriesshire. In the discussion of the parish of Moffat, it has been suggested that the high number of possibly Scandinavian or MSc place-names amongst the settlements with APP values below the parish-average indicate sites of transitional lordship or landholding. Most of these place-names are comparatively young formations, and their low APP may have been the reason why they were more likely to be granted to different lords, and possibly re-named, than areas with richer resources.

Using APP values and prehistoric fortifications as indicators of relative status and self-sufficiency, some patterns of the nature which G. W. S. Barrow identified in south-eastern Scotland seem also to emerge in Dumfriesshire. This is not to argue that south-western Scotland was a landscape of early medieval multiple estates or shires, since little is known about the legal framework and the renders to the lord which appear in the written documentation elsewhere. However, traces of a reasonably stable territorial pattern throughout the first millennium AD can be found. The parish boundaries of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan seem to reflect divisions of estates pre-dating the creation of formalised parishes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The appearance of prehistoric forts along the boundaries of the hypothetical early territories is reminiscent of the caer or hillfort identified as a central ingredient to Glanville Jones’ multiple estate.889

The barony of Ericstane as well as the possible estates centred around Lochmaben, Smallholm and Rockhallhead suggest that at least some of the parish-sized territories contained sub-divisions prior to the creation of Anglo-Norman lordships in the twelfth century. Especially in the parishes of Lochmaben and Annan, these sub-divisions seem to have been granted to or taken over en bloc by Anglo-Scandinavian incomers in the tenth century, while place-names of Brittonic and possible Anglian origin may indicate areas of substantial status and holdings, capable of preserving parts of the pre-Scandinavian estates.

A notable difference can be observed between the lowland parishes of Lochmaben and Annan on the one side, and the upland parish of Moffat on the other. Thus, both Lochmaben and Annan contain traces of earlier common shire wastes, co-occurring in areas of relatively late agricultural expansion, judging by the distribution of þveit place-names. Similarly, each of the lowland parishes is centred around a settlement with a Brittonic place-name of likely pre-Anglian date, and contains a cluster of Scandinavian place-names surrounding that focal

site. Furthermore, hints of agricultural specialisation can be seen in the place-names such as Halleaths (referring to a barn), Bomby (possibly referring to bondmen) and Milnby (‘mill farm’). It is tempting to interpret these patterns as indicative of larger estate units with specialised settlements. Unfortunately, the written documentation does nothing to prove or disprove such a theory, and while it is likely that Scandinavian incomers would have settled in Dumfriesshire and established landholdings as a consistent group, the possibility remains that place-names such as Esbie and Gotterbie were formed a century apart.

In terms of early place-names, the parish of Moffat provides the least ‘neat’ patterns of the three case studies. This does not mean, however, that it is devoid of any noteworthy traces of landholding. Based on the APP values, the barony of Ericstane in the western appendage of the parish may represent a pre-Anglo-Norman territorial unit designed to balance the more pastoral landscape of Evandale with the larger tracts of potential arable fields in upper Annandale. A similar pattern of complementary farming units may be visible in the farm and place-name pairings of Moffatdale, although the evidence is too slim to make more sense of them.

The calculation of APP values has provided a useful tool to either draw out patterns which are invisible due to the lack of written evidence, or to reinforce observations which have already been suggested based on the distribution of archaeological sites, such as the role of prehistoric forts in the territorial division of the landscape. The methodology behind the Agricultural Population Potential is tied in with a host of caveats about the reconstruction of early medieval soil capabilities based on eighteenth-century estate plans, or the simplistic undertones of a division of the lands into clear-cut categories of arable, pastoral and meadow lands. Yet, the APP values of each parish compare favourably with the census records of 1755. Furthermore, the general assumption that the parish size was originally based on population numbers, which in turn would depend largely on the agricultural potential of the surrounding landscape, seems to be confirmed when comparing the total APP results for the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan. Thus, there is considerable scope for the future application of this methodology to other parts of Dumfriesshire, or indeed to any study of early medieval settlement patterns and estate landscapes.

A possible analogy may exist between specialised appendicia such as Milnby or Halleaths and Berwick place-names, which refer to outlying dependencies and are often associated with arable farming, especially of barley (bere-): Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots, p. 23; Nicolaisen, Place-Names, pp. 78, 81.
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IV. Appendix I: Maps and Figures
Figure 1: parishes of Dumfriesshire - Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan are highlighted in grey.
Figure 2: Late prehistoric archaeology in the parish of Moffat
Figure 3: medieval/post-medieval archaeology in the parish of Moffat
Figure 4: late prehistoric archaeology in the parish of Lochmaben
Figure 5: medieval/post-medieval archaeology in the parish of Lochmaben
Figure 6: late prehistoric archaeology in the parish of Annan
Figure 7: medieval/post-medieval archaeology in the parish of Annan
Figure 8: parish Moffat - visibility of archaeological sites
Figure 9: parish Lochmaben - visibility of archaeological sites
Figure 10: parish Annan - visibility of archaeological sites
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© Crown Copyright and Database Right 2016. Ordnance Survey (Digimap Licence). Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0 (HLA 2015)
Figure 11: motte-and-bailey castles and the Annandale Roman road
Figure 12: motte-and-bailey castles and medieval churches
Figure 13: number of place-names recorded before AD 1700 (based on Johnson-Ferguson, Place-names of Dumfriesshire)
Figure 14: distribution of Scandinavian place-names in -bý, -gil(l) and -þveit
Figure 15: parish Moffat - investigated place-names
Figure 16: parish Lochmaben - investigated place-names
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Figure 17: parish Annan - investigated place-names
Figure 20: place-names in the parish of Moffat (north)
Figure 21: lower Moffatdale place-names
Figure 22: upper Moffatdale place-names
Figure 23: place-names in the parish of Lochmaben (north)
Figure 24: place-names in the parish of Lochmaben (south)
Figure 25: place-names in the parish of Annan (north)
Figure 26: place-names in the parish of Annan (south)
Figure 27: parish Moffat - early medieval settlement foci
Figure 28: parish Lochmaben - early medieval settlement foci
Figure 29: parish Annan - early medieval settlement foci
Figure 30: parish Moffat - landuse reconstruction
Figure 32: parish Annan - landuse reconstruction
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Figure 33: parish Moffat - Agricultural Population Potential
Figure 34: parish Lochmaben - Agricultural Population Potential

© Crown Copyright and Database Right 2016. Ordnance Survey (Digimap Licence)
Figure 36: Gullielands - arable lands and pasture
Figure 37: National Forest Estate in the parish of Moffat
V. Appendix II: Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Estate Plans

This appendix contains images of all the estate plans used for the reconstruction of pre-industrial soil capability outlined in chapter 10. For a full list of the consulted plans (including those which ultimately provided little information for present purposes), see the bibliography. Although NRS Ref. RHP 140401 and RHP 13490 were important for the landuse reconstruction of the parish of Lochmaben, the physical copies were too fragile and too large, respectively, to be reproduced in the appendix. They can be consulted in the maps and plans collection of the National Records of Scotland (Thomas Thomson House, Edinburgh).
Parish of Moffat

NRS Ref. RHP 3567: Plan of the Farm of Bodesbeck [c. 1800]
NRS Ref. RHP 10054: Plan of Farms lying in the Parishes Johnstone and Kirkpatrick-Juxta [c. 1790]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 10095: Plan of that Part of the Annandale Estate lying to the west of Moffat Parish [1767] (western half)

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 37546: Plan of Craigbeck or Crofthead in the Parish of Moffat belonging to the Grace the Duke of Queensberry etc. [1768] (eastern half)

By permission of the Duke of Buccleuch.
NRS Ref. RHP 37546: Plan of Craigbeck or Crofthead in the Parish of Moffat belonging to the Grace the Duke of Queensberry etc. [1768] (western half)

By permission of the Duke of Buccleuch.
By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 2: Plan of the Farm of Capplegill and Carrifran [1759 – c. 1778]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 83387 no. 7: Plan of the Farms of Rivox, Mossop and Middlegill [1759 – c. 1778]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RH 8387 no. 6: Plan of the Fifteen Merkland and Town of Moffat (1759 – c. 1780)

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
Parish of Lochmaben

NRS Ref. RHP 5: Plan of Broomhills Common, divided conform to the Commissioner’s Interlocutor 17th May 1766 [1766]
NRS Ref. RHP 200: Map of Heck Bog [1742]
NRS Ref. RHP 218: Map of Part of the South Common of Lochmaben [1734]
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NRS Ref: RHP 8391 No. 7: Plan of the Farm of Broomhill (1779 – C. 1778)

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
Parish of Annan

NRS Ref. RHP 1: Plan of the new inclosure made upon the commonty of Annan [May 1781] (eastern half)
NRS Ref. RHP 1: Plan of the new inclosure made upon the commonty of Annan [May 1781] (western half)
NRS Ref. RHP 631: Plan of the Commonty of Annan and Sketch of the dominant tenements on the South and West Side [1801]
NRS Ref. RHP 37801: Plan of Newbie [1788]

By permission of the Duke of Buccleuch.
By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 83392 no. 2: Plan of Croftheads [1759 – c. 1772]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 83392 no. 3: Plan of Howes and Millfield [1759 – c. 1772]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 83392 no. 4: Plan of Millby, Redgatehead and Mill Land [1759 – c. 1772]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
NRS Ref. RHP 85762: Plan of the Marquis of Annandale's Outfield lands of Annan [undated, but probably late eighteenth century]

By permission of the Earl of Annandale.
VI. Appendix III: Reconstructed Agricultural Potential

The following maps indicate the geo-referenced extent of arable lands, pastures and meadows in the parishes of Moffat, Lochmaben and Annan during the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth centuries. The sources used for the land classification are William Roy’s military survey of lowland Scotland, estate plans stored in the maps section of the National Records of Scotland (Thomas Thomson House), as well as the 1861 Ordnance Survey 1st Edition County Map of Dumfriesshire (scale 1:2500). William Roy’s survey provides the most comprehensive coverage of land and indicates arable lands through hatching. Where available, the estate plans took precedence over all other mapped agricultural information. Finally, the field boundaries on the 1861 OS map were used as a framework for the geo-referencing process of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century maps, due to the often inconsistent projections of the latter.

Estate plans were transcribed onto the modern map plan-by-plan and land-use by land-use. Thus, for example, when geo-referencing plan RHP 3567 of the farm of Bodesbeck, a separate polygon was created for its pasture to the east (Moffat, ID no. 66, see table below), the arable to the west (Moffat, ID no. 67, see table below) and the pasture to the south-west (Moffat, ID no. 68, see table below). For the pasture of Polmoodie (north of Bodesbeck), a separate polygon was created (Moffat, ID no. 71). Depending on the extent of the different types of land-use mapped for each farm, the polygon clusters can become too dense for their ID number to show on the map. For example, the polygon with ID no. 15 in the parish of Moffat is barely visible on the overview map and the number is not shown at all. Therefore, areas with particularly small polygons are depicted separately to allow for closer study.
Parish of Moffat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>id</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Area (in m²)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>9817026</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>40207</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>6107308</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7, RHP10150; WRS</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>7213522</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RCAHMS nos. NT01SW 17-8</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>16234</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>79405</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>24000</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7, RHP10095; WRS</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>4134536</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>2495252</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>158478</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 7</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>152825</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>58848</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>2337819</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>133109</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>142222</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>3183185</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>204132</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>36989</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>4945783</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Area (ac.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>88702</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>1557178</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>798135</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>1568934</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>260675</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>37310</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1861</td>
<td>2596105</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>36984</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP10095, RHP83387 no. 5, RHP10027</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1767, 1778, 1861</td>
<td>508663</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>34939</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>15274174</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>277517</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>344004</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>129063</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>955817</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 4</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>648863</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 4</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>3053235</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 4</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>1575170</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>162660</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRS Ref.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>299670</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>301801</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>41402</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>184717</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>502223</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>298745</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>209081</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>263815</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>266465</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>326673</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>RHP83387</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>106549</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1832743</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>RHP10054</td>
<td>c. 1790, 1861</td>
<td>479651</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>82000</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>31705</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>RHP10054</td>
<td>c. 1790, 1861</td>
<td>354826</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>RHP10054</td>
<td>c. 1790, 1861</td>
<td>85974</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>156988</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>97347</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>3541714</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>238988</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>RHP37546</td>
<td>1768, 1861</td>
<td>851981</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37546</td>
<td>1768, 1861</td>
<td>12980544</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37546</td>
<td>1768, 1861</td>
<td>588670</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>144450</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>7472278</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>402694</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP3567</td>
<td>c. 1800, 1861</td>
<td>6446380</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP3567</td>
<td>c. 1800, 1861</td>
<td>344848</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>RCAHMS HLA; RHP3567</td>
<td>c. 1800, 1861, 2015</td>
<td>98270</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>351546</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 1</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>319005</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 1</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>18785910</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>18049902</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>384554</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>122909</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>12978879</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>395476</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>261659</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83387 no. 4</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>8785003</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detail: Evandale
Detail: northern parish
## Parish of Lochmaben

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>id</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Area (in m²)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>194289</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>225605</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37739</td>
<td>1856, 1861</td>
<td>98931</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37739</td>
<td>1856, 1861</td>
<td>40498</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>106438</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>3760873</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1037901</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WRS; NRS Ref. RHP83391 and RHP5</td>
<td>1752-55, 1759-[c. 1778], 1766, 1861</td>
<td>718861</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>28737</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>23817</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>197143</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>159473</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83391</td>
<td>1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>137034</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83391; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>1001025</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83391; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1759-[c. 1778], 1861</td>
<td>198150</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP5; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1766, 1861</td>
<td>747165</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>307552</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>3558218</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>424031</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>RCAHMS HLA</td>
<td>1861, 2015</td>
<td>69946</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1786, 1861</td>
<td>1394184</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP5256-7</td>
<td>1801-2, 1861</td>
<td>51459</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>160932</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1786, 1861</td>
<td>281646</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490</td>
<td>1786, 1861</td>
<td>108493</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490</td>
<td>1786, 1861</td>
<td>166064</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1786, 1861</td>
<td>221804</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490; WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1786, 1861</td>
<td>265855</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>OS 1st Ed. County Map 1:2500</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>125011</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP13490</td>
<td>1786, 1861</td>
<td>523105</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>971276</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>638371</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>151387</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP200; WRS</td>
<td>1742, 1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1223310</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Area Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>407131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>RCAHMS HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1861, 2015</td>
<td>67949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1742, 1861</td>
<td>1017776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>16603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP81922</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791, 1861</td>
<td>38026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>25142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP81922</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791, 1861</td>
<td>444123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>78132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP81922</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791, 1861</td>
<td>53427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>167009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>402938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>231677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>118140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>80269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>357422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>RCAHMS HLA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1861, 2015</td>
<td>11315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP218;RHP13490;RHP4087;WRS</td>
<td>1734, 1752-55, 1762, 1786, 1861</td>
<td>8806440</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>150031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>2164029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP115/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1812, 1861</td>
<td>1024087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP115/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1812, 1861</td>
<td>1970315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>169496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>RHP140401;RHP81922;WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1789, 1791, 1861</td>
<td>214298</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP140401</td>
<td></td>
<td>1789, 1861</td>
<td>149088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP140401</td>
<td></td>
<td>1789, 1861</td>
<td>2384913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>112206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP4086-7;WRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1752-55, 1762, 1861</td>
<td>721664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP4087</td>
<td></td>
<td>1762, 1861</td>
<td>1831905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detail: southern parish
## Parish of Annan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>id</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Area (in m²)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801</td>
<td>1788, 1861</td>
<td>47258</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801</td>
<td>1788, 1861</td>
<td>70185</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801</td>
<td>1788, 1861</td>
<td>1883949</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801</td>
<td>1788, 1861</td>
<td>48679</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801</td>
<td>1788, 1861</td>
<td>453519</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP3788392 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>56557</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no.2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>231320</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>223637</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>24767</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 3</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>620134</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 3</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>65281</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>135294</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 2</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>32460</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>559694</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 3</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>66571</td>
<td>Loch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>195238</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP378392 no. 4</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>470515</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>9086637</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>147884</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>223292</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1767535</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>2489897</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>8004027</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1083710</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>252406</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP631</td>
<td>1801, 1861</td>
<td>6433024</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP630</td>
<td>1801, 1861</td>
<td>2225836</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>517952</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>257193</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP630</td>
<td>1801, 1861</td>
<td>282569</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP631, RHP1</td>
<td>1781, 1801, 1861</td>
<td>934857</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>403215</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>135988</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP83392 no. 1</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1861</td>
<td>309333</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP1, RHP83392 no. 1</td>
<td>1759-[1772], 1781, 1861</td>
<td>262007</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>1446510</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>110144</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WRS</td>
<td>1752-55, 1861</td>
<td>399688</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>109174</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>86335</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>43933</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP85762</td>
<td>late 18th century, 1861</td>
<td>160527</td>
<td>Arable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>NRS Ref. RHP37801, RHP1</td>
<td>1781, 1788, 1861</td>
<td>453040</td>
<td>Meadow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detail: southern parish