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SOURCES AND APPROACHES

A vast wealth of resources is available to support the study of the medieval period in Argyll. Various bodies have been dedicated to publishing related historic records to the estates and land owning families (e.g. Black Book of Taymouth – Innes 1855, Book of Islay – Smith 1895, The Book of the Thanes of Cawdor – Innes 1869, Highland Papers – MacPhail 1914-34, Argyll Sasines – Campbell 1933, Acts of the Lords of the Isles – Munro & Munro 1986, Campbell Letters – Dawson 1997, etc). The recent opening up of access to the archive of the Argyll estates at Inverary is a huge bonus (which will allow testing of some of the information released but unreferenced through Campbell of Airds). The quality of the information to be extracted from these archives is perhaps best demonstrated by academic studies of particular lordships, such as the Campbells (Boardman 2000, 2003, 2005, 2006) or MacDonald South (Kingston 2004), or genealogical history (Sellar 1971, 1973, 2000). A number of excellent clan based histories have also produced an excellent body of information (e.g. MacLean-Bristol 1995, 1999, MacTaggart 2004 and West Highland Notes & Queries). As a compliment to this more document-based history a considerable number of oral and traditional histories have been recorded and published, either in book form (e.g Dewar 1964, etc.) or as booklets produced by community groups either interested in local history or family histories (e.g. Wright 1989, Whittaker 1993, Rentoul & Dalton 2009, Clare nd, Higham nd). Argyll has a long pedigree of local scholars who have drawn together some excellent studies (e.g. Beveridge 1903, Grieve 1923, MacEacherna 1976, MacDonald & Murdoch 1997) and it is tradition which continues (e.g. Lamont 1966, 1968, Campbell 1977, Storrie 1981, Byrne 1997, 2010, Pallister 2007, Hay 2010). Despite early interest in Argyll place-names, more thorough analyses have only recently begun to pick up pace (e.g. MacNiven forthcoming).

This localised approach to associated historical disciplines has bled into archaeological studies, throughout the twentieth century a number of local heritage societies pioneered the celebration and study of areas of Argyll: Cowal, Kintyre, Mid Argyll and Lorn. Their journals and publications (Kist, Historic Argyll, Campbell 1984, Rennie 1993, Hood nd) are a wealth of information and in-depth studies. Antiquarian interest in Argyll was also high, and various monuments, types of sites or areas attracted a range of interests, some of which were specifically medieval (e.g. Whyte 1873, 1875, Drummond 1881), while others only captured this in passing (Christison 1904). Campbell & Sandeman’s (1964) valuable survey is unusual in its comprehensiveness and needs to be recognised alongside the results of wider research campaigns primarily concerned with prehistoric occupation, such as Fairhurst’s. The results of this work supported one of the most comprehensive archaeological surveys of any region in Scotland – the survey of Argyll by the Royal Commission of the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (1971, 1975, 1980, 1982, 1984, 1988, 1992) and the spin off compendia, such as Steer and Barrowman’s Late Medieval Monumental Sculpture in the West Highlands (1977) or Argyll Castles in the Care of Historic Scotland (1997), the introduction to which is invaluable. Unfortunately, against the weight and depth of this survey subsequent archaeological survey has been slow to follow. Perhaps the only extensive work in medieval archaeology throughout the 1980s and 1990s has been David Caldwell’s work in Finlaggan (the full report of which remains unpublished, although smaller articles and reports are available – Caldwell 1990,
1993, 1998, Caldwell & Ewart 1993) and the surrounding hills (Caldwell et al 2000). Argyll’s castles have continued to attract interest (e.g. Simpson 1958, 1966, 1967, 1991, Millar 1963, 1966, Turner & Dunbar 1970, Dunbar & Duncan 1971, Turner 1998) and conservation at Historic Scotland’s properties has also resulted in some excavation (e.g. Ewart & Triscott 1996, Lewis 1996). However, this is beginning to change with the surveys of the Kilmartin Museum, Ellis, Regan and others identifying the extent of sites still to be identified across the Argyll landscape. The success of these later surveys has begun to inspire local museums and community group surveys (one of the most comprehensive being by the Ross of Mull Historical Centre) and investigations of particular sites (Hidden Heritage Arrochar and Baliscate). Region wide academic analysis has also borne fruit, with PhDs by Holley 2000 (also see Holley & Ralston 1995), James (2009), Thomas (2009), to name but a few. Argyll’s place in wider, regional (often incorporated alongside wider west coast and or Highland studies) or national examinations should not be ignored or discounted (Cruden 1960, Duncan & Dunbar 1957, Cowan & Easson 1976, Dunbar 1981, Tabraham 1986, 1988, 1997, McDonald 1997, Fawcett 2002, 2011, Stell 2006).

These studies provide a sound basis for future research and opportunities for the benefits provided by taking a multi-discipline approach.

SECULAR SEIGNIORIAL BUILDING

Due to their monumental construction and positioning, as much as being the product of the lordly aspirations of the leading kindreds and the creation of localised lordships, these are perhaps the best surviving and most obvious features of the medieval landscape in Argyll. They include re-occupied or continuous use of prehistoric duns, hillforts and crannogs, newly constructed sites such as mottes, castles, towers and island sites.

There is also another grouping of sites which may date to this period, but may equally belong to another period altogether: ringworks. The most upstanding examples are in Islay, Dun Nosebridge and Dun Guaidhre. They resemble, but are not identical to, some of the large bailey earthworks surrounding in Galloway, such as the Motte of Urr, but they lack the motte. They are perhaps closer to Scandinavian ringworks, Manx promontory forts or Norse longphorts in Ireland, but are multivalate, inland and generally sited on hilltops. Whilst their date remains unclear it is entirely possible that these reflect a local interpretation or earth and timber castles in the early establishment of the Kingdom of the Isles or the power of the MacSorleys. Earthworks at Dunollie (Alcock & Alcock 1987) and Dunstaffnage (Breen et al 2010), both containing late thirteenth-century material but which may be earlier could also sit within this grouping. An additional possible example may be the ringwork shown in aerial photographs at Kilchoman Bay, Islay.

Mottes are arguably a product of an Anglo-Norman form or approach to lordship, being adopted both by colonising communities in England and Ireland and by native kinship groups in Scotland as part of a pan-European package informing how land should be held and exploited and how lordship should be expressed. There seems to be some correlation with knights-fees, but the relationship is not clear, nor does it appear to be absolute (e.g. see Tabraham 1988). Scottish examples tend to consist of simple towers on mounds and lack the large baileys or enclosed or defended infrastructure necessary to house large military retinues that are common in England and Ireland. Only a handful of mottes exist in Argyll, restricted to Cowal and the upper stretches of the Clyde, with one example in the Mull of Kintyre. Those on the Clyde could potentially be attributed to the
early influence of direct Scottish central authority. Those in Cowal are, however, probably more likely to be a product of local lords positively assimilating themselves into Scottish society, just as the Lamonts came to be stewards to the Stewarts in the 1200s. The Cowal mottes tend to be located at the base of valleys, presumably close to the best arable land and to control routeways.

It is tempting to see these mottes as setting a precedent for the masonry castles to come. Castle Sween is widely accepted, but on the basis of very little hard evidence, as being one of the oldest masonry castles in Scotland, if not the earliest masonry castle not built one of the main royal households. Indeed, throughout the 1200s there appears to have been a spate of early masonry castle construction throughout the west coast, including Argyll. Many historians have seen these as being built by local lords under royal patronage as a bulwark against the wild west (e.g. Grant 1988). This perhaps fits well for a good number of enclosure castles, built by lords who had a substantial mainland base and were heavily ingratiating themselves with affairs of Scottish Kings and, at the same time extracting themselves out of the influence of the Kings of Norway, Man and the Isles and/or the MacSorleys. Castle Sween seems to have been erected in conjunction with the MacSweens gaining the Scottish king’s confirmation of their estates. Likewise, the MacDougall castles at Dunstaffnage and Duart appear at the same time as they courted the Scottish king and attempted to extricate themselves from Norway.

Further west, hall houses seem to have been more common. In Argyll Aros best reflects this expression of western lords’ independence and equality of status with royal magnates further east. Skipness or Fincharn, in mainland Argyll, however, demonstrate that they were not solely a western phenomenon. Other forms of the hall house can be found throughout Scotland, but again they tend to be restricted to the very high echelons of court society. They can also be found in Ireland, providing an alternative source of inspiration for Gaelic lords. The earlier examples are relatively simple in form, showing no evidence for vaulting and containing a first floor entrance. The hall house form of castle is certainly different from the enclosures mentioned above, but is this simply just a different type of building or does it reveal something different about the messages these lords were keen to convey? If we interpret these, as has been common, as fortified or monumentalised halls, rather than ‘castles’, then there would seem to be keen emphasis on display and the bringing together of disparate communities for these activities, such as feasting and judicial assembly. However, such activities are equally likely to have taken place in free-standing or lean-to buildings within the enclosure castles. The insertion of masonry hall ranges at a later stage, though, may suggest that there was perhaps some recognition that enclosure castles did not provide a suitable venue for some lords.

It remains unclear where accommodation was provided in many early castles, Irish sources would suggest that this was mainly located outside the main castle and that the main chambers were only utilised for display and defence (Loeber 2001) and the number of outbuildings surrounding Hebridean castles would support a similar situation in Argyll (Raven 2005). Outwith Argyll, at Dun donald, the addition of chambers was only an afterthought (Ewart & Pringle 2004), and the development of the towerhouse, with internal chambers above the hall, would also seem to verify that the provision if accommodation within the castle itself was a later requirement.

The understanding of castles in the Lordship of the Isles and Scotland’s Gaelic seaboard remains very much in the dark, and this confusion extends to their dating. There are a few glimpses from the
documentary record, a handful of charters, some poems and other written histories, often written long after the event. Yet it is difficult to directly relate the documents with the castles themselves, either in form or to phasing in the remains of the masonry. Some have tried to identify characteristics in building styles with particular dates (for example see Caldwell & Ruckley 2005), others have tried to rely on comparisons between more ornate features, such as moulding. However, this is problematic at the best of time and interpretation becomes even more complicated when dealing with a culture keen to emphasise their earlier antecedents and cultural distinctiveness and therefore all too ready to adopt already old forms of architecture. Simplicity and antiquated window forms do not therefore necessarily indicate backwardness but can represent a deliberately chosen conservatism, reflecting agency and choice. Dating consequently represents a key issue for castle studies in Argyll and beyond.

One linking feature shared by most early enclosure castles and hall houses is their locations, which tend to be coastal and focussed on good harbours – this may reveal the importance of fisheries and the contribution of the payment of portage and for permission by foreign fishermen to exploit a lord’s fisheries to the economies of the west coast lordships. The main exceptions are those castles on Loch Awe, which remained both a main thoroughfare and boundary between lordships for most of the middle ages. What these have in common, however, is that they are on nodal points, where Gael met incomer, lords met vassals, and that it was here that lords needed to impress their credentials and most required to exploit the architectural grammar that castles offered.

Cairnburgh Castle, in the Treshnish Isles, Dun Chonnnuill, in the Garvellachs, and perhaps Clag Castle, Jura, however, depart from this, being remote from any settlement or landing and in the case of the first two almost entirely out at sea: all can only be interpreted as being primarily concerned with monitoring sea routes. In the case of Cairnburgh it is perhaps telling that despite being perceived as being important enough to get mentioned in Hakon’s Saga and regularly mentioned in charters, neither it, nor Dun Chonnuill, really conforms to the castle model, mostly relying on cliffs and stretches of masonry covering the main approaches for defence, and are often interpreted as being relatively early.

Across Western Argyll from the twelfth century onwards reoccupied prehistoric fortifications – brochs, duns and crannogs – became an increasing feature of medieval landscapes. The excavated examples reveal a range of forms of reoccupation, from the post-built houses that fill the entirety of walled interior of Dun Fhinn in Kintyre (Fairhurst 1939), to the scattered huts built throughout the enclosures of Kildonan, Kintyre (Fairhurst 1956), and MacEwen’s Castle, Cowal (Marshall 1983). To this we might add the more substantial buildings outside Tirefour broch in Lismore (Stoddart forthcoming). Further east it is possible that there was more continuous occupation of such monuments. In Perthshire and Galloway, for instance, there is evidence for their continued use throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries (see Raven 2005 for a fuller discussion).

The reuse of sites that would have been seen as old and predating the Norse incursions should be seen in the context of medieval kindreds who were increasingly emphasising their native and Gaelic origins through manipulation of their genealogical pedigrees. This was further emphasised by associating many of these sites with founding figures in clan pedigrees. Dun Mhuirich in Knapdale, was named after one of the founding figures in the genealogies of the leading families in the area, including the MacSweens (see Sellar 1971 and Meek 1998). It is unclear whether ‘Muirich’ ever lived
at the site or later associations with the dun as their ancestral seat were fictitious. Nevertheless, it was occupied in the later Middle Ages (Regan 2012, 2013) and the continued use of the placename, directly linking it to a key ancestral figure, is surely significant, as is the deliberate visual relationship between it and Castle Sween, itself named after another eponymous figure in the same genealogies. The association of both sites with the same stretch of seaway and with good harbours is also revealing. The MacSweens continued the practice of using pre-existing fortifications as they established themselves in Ireland, after their eviction from Scotland, prior to a later phase of castle building (Breen & Raven forthcoming). Even where the nomenclature is not so evident the ancestral connections of some clans with prehistoric fortifications lasted throughout the medieval period. The Campbells seem to have associated themselves, their core origins and heartland directly with a fortified island in Loch Avich, Caisteal na Nighinn Ruaidhe. Likewise, the MacDonald and MacDougall occupation of the Dalriadic capitals of Dunaverty and Dunsatffange were intended to demonstrate their inheritance of the early kingdoms with links to Ireland.

Those sites chosen for reoccupation predominantly reveal a concern with monitoring and seaborne traffic and controlling harbours. The number of these sites that then became the focus for later castles is also surely significant.

Lesser kindreds continued to occupy duns and crannogs throughout the later middle ages and into the seventeenth century. Many of these are located inland and show an association with local resources, arable, woodland, fishing, routeways, grazing and hunting forests. Their lack of fortification may also reveal a willingness to express connections with their tenants and clansmen, rather than the need to impress them with architecture. The longevity of occupation remains unclear and the picture may be skewed by the nature of the documentary and map based evidence we have to date their occupation, which tends to be much later in origin.

Finlaggan provides an interesting glass through which to view the broad spectrum and development of west coast and Argyll fortifications. The first phase of medieval use appears to have been the construction of a masonry castle built over the remains of a prehistoric dun on a small island at the end of a larger island. At a later date the castle seems to have become redundant, it was then demolished and replaced with a much larger complex of buildings spread across both islands (see Caldwell 1993, 1998, Caldwell & Ewart 1993). This complex included dwelling houses and service buildings but also a large, well built masonry hall on the larger island. The smaller island was retained for assembly or lordly councils, housed in a series of rather diminutive huts. Whilst no longer a castle it housed all the same functions, but with all the units usually arranged within one castle structure, instead distributed in separate disarticulated buildings. Unlike most castles of the time it is not sited on the coast but inland, on the main glen dividing Islay, but surrounded by wide pastures and hunting grounds. This may have allowed the inhabitants to display their cattle wealth but, also, the degree of separation from the sea would have encouraged a sense of transition, for those whose journeys had begun with a boat journey outwith Islay. The change in symbology embedded in the transition from a masonry castle to a less enclosed island complex may reveal much about the changing nature of MacSorley and later MacDonald lordship, from one more feudally orientated to one more embracing a Gaelic world view.

This arrangement (inland, with a number of related islands, and associated with some form assembly or judiciary function) is one reflected throughout Argyll and the Isles. For instance, see the
relationship between the castle on Eilean Tighe Bhain and the nearby complex of structures on Eilean a Bharain, on Loch Tromlee.

The changes at Finlaggan were taking place at the same time as many Argyll lords were beginning to adopt a new architectural form: the tower. Towerhouses became increasingly common throughout Scotland and Ireland from the late fourteenth century onwards, initially as the main residences of the main lords, then, from the sixteenth century, more commonly at the centre of sub and lesser lordships. They were inserted into and onto earlier structures, such as Dunstaffnage, Castle Sween and Duart, the result of extensive remodelling, such as at Innis Chonnel, and many appear to have been built on virgin sites, such as at Carrick and Moy. They comprise a varied collection, widely differing in size, complexity and the nature of internal features. The origins of the towerhouse have been the subject of much debate. In Argyll, some, were clearly inspired by Irish traditions, if not built by Irish masons. As the MacDougalls re-established themselves they built their new castle at Dunollie using wicker centring. Wicker centring is relatively common in Irish towerhouses and increasingly taken to be indicative of a date in the first half of the 1400s (Rory Sherlock pers. Comm.). However, the influences for most fourteenth and fifteenth-century towerhouses are not so clear cut.

Scottish towerhouses have not been subject to the same intensive study in terms of architectural and spatial analysis as their Irish siblings, and such a study is long overdue. Whether built anew or on sites with a pedigree, the predominating focus continued to be coastal. It is probably no coincidence that this secondary phase of castle building coincided with increasing foreign exploitation of west coast fisheries, and it is likely that the wealth this exploitation produced helped contribute to the wider Gaelic renaissance in this period (see Raven 2005). However, the tension between royal patronage and burgeoning independence also continued. For instance, the MacLeans established new castles as they emerged from the shadow of the Lordship of the Isles and many of the older castles remained under direct royal ownership, albeit operated by a constable belonging to the main local lordship, as at Dunstaffnage, Dunoon and Tarbert.

Caldwell (pers. comm.) has recently suggested the early use of artillery fortifications through Argyll, notable by the MacDonald South at Dunyvaig and other sites in Islay and Colonsay and the MacLeans at Breachacha, reflecting an early adoption of artillery in the Irish Wars, and perhaps fuelled by guns recovered from the Spanish Armada.

Elsewhere, the later sixteenth century witnessed more gentile approaches to towerhouse building, more familiar with Lowland Scottish styles and, in some cases, perhaps demonstrating protestant identities. This is probably most demonstrable at the decorative Carnassarie Castle, built by the new Protestant Bishop of the Isles, under Campbell patronage. Despite the renaissance mouldings, resembling more polite houses in Stirlingshire, their place in the Gaelic world was emphasised through inscriptions and also through the siting of the towerhouse alongside an earlier dun. However, its domesticity may be overstated. It sat on the main pass into Mid-Argyll and was the focus of activity during reprisals against the Campbells throughout the 1600s. Likewise, Gylen Castle, Kerrera, built by the heirs to the then protestant MacDougall lordship shows an understanding of the grammar of polite landscapes and manipulated approaches. From the sea the seaward face appears stern and unadorned, but once landed the visitor would climb up and perambulate around the hillside until the castle’s, previously obscured, gentile opposite face was
revealed, exhibiting an oriel window and sculptures of ladies and gentlemen adorned in the most up
to date fashions. These details are much more similar to the towerhouses of Ayrshire than its
Argyllshire neighbours.

The polite and gentile form of towerhouse became increasingly common from this period onwards,
and many, such as Duntrune and Kilmartin would be not be incongruous anywhere else in Scotland
(also see Dalglish 2005).

Argyll also possesses a number of lesser known smaller towers, which may be very simple diminutive
towerhouses or represent something quite different. Some appear to be the centres of much
smaller lordships, such as Island Muller or Dun Ara on Mull, others are less clear, such as Caol
Chaorann, Torran, built near a good landing on Loch Awe and just below a potentially reoccupied
dun with a name linking it to a position in medieval lordship, Dun Toisseach.

The individualism expressed across four centuries of castle building in Argyll may preclude against
the usefulness of dividing them into broad categories – the differences between each example of
hall house are almost as broad as between them and contemporary enclosure castles. This is a
subject that would bear considerable further analysis.

THE CHURCH

Whilst the early church is fundamental to Argyll’s identity, subsequent developments have attracted
surprisingly little interest. For instance, the landscape is peppered with small rectangular unicameral
chapels, often stone-built and contained in small rectangular or rectangular enclosures, yet very few
can be dated and it is therefore difficult to place them accurately in time or understand how they
inform us about spiritual and pastoral care for their patrons or the communities they served. Those
with a ‘kil’ or ‘cille’ placename associated with them are often taken to be very early, but the
ubiquity of this prefix in places where Norse incursions appear to have obliterated pre-existing placenames suggests that many could be much later in origin, either being Norse or post-Norse foundations or sites. The potential for them to have retained associations with earlier churches
throughout the Norse period should not be discounted, the presence of earlier sculpture suggesting
continued recognition of Christian activity at some older sites. Further east there may have been
less disruption of use. Many of these sites, however, could equally only immediately pre-date the
foundation of the parish system and the twelfth-century reforms that swept the church throughout
Europe and found a particular expression in Argyll in the shift away from the western ‘Celtic’ church,
centred on Argyll and Ireland, to a more Latinised church (see Cowan 1974, 1978, Barrell 2003).
Comparison with other areas suggests that these churches were potentially the product of two
competing systems. In some areas they appear to have been founded by monasteries in an attempt
to deliver and spread pastoral care, in others local lords seem to have founded churches, either to
deliver their own pastoral needs or show concern for their vassals’ spiritual needs.

Disentangling these sites from ones that leave similar remains built to mark and provide devotional
opportunities at crossing and landing places, holy wells, places associated with holy events of places
remains problematic, however. In many cases they also remained in use once the parish system had
become established, either due to continued spiritual attributions, or because they served remote
and disparate communities. Many also served as the focus for burial until relatively recently.
Notwithstanding that many of churches may have originally been timber, Argyll appears to boast some of the earliest lime bonded masonry churches in Scotland – exhibited in a number of rather plain unicameral, relatively large twelfth-century churches seemingly built by Somerled and his immediate descendants. These appear to precede a phase of more widespread church building most characterised by lancet windows, often in pairs at the eastern gable wall, and sockets for rood screens. The majority of these are relatively plain but there are a small number of highly ornate churches within this group. Killean is perhaps the best exemplar of this group, patronised by the Lords of the Isles as they extended their hold over Kintyre. Dunstaffnage may also fall into this category but it is not clear if this was a parish church. Throughout the western seaboard chapels were often built close to but not directly connected to castles, which may suggest something about how Gaelic lords perceived their connections to the church, but it may also betray earlier origins as the relationship between chapels and high status farmsteads and reoccupied duns has some pedigree. A small number of churches exhibit sculptural embellishments, such as sheela-na-gigs, the significance of which, in a Scottish context remains poorly understood. Dunstaffnage aside, this group of churches tend to be seen as a part of a phase of parish formation, but without harder dating evidence this can only be an assumption, especially as architectural conservatism can hinder dating through comparison.

It can be no coincidence that the founding of a monastery at Saddell by Somerled coincided with the extension of his power in Kintyre. Following Somerled’s lead and the break with the western tradition at Iona, he and his descendants began an almost unprecedented programme of founding and building reformed monasteries, often with ties to the sees of Paisley and Furness, rather than Nidaros. As the MacDougals attempted to establish their own dominance and refocus the Kingdom of the Isles inwards and towards Scotland the establishment and later embellishment of Ardcathann was surely a deliberate ploy to take the focus away from Iona. It is perhaps in this context that we could also view the creation of the Bishopric of Argyll and the Cathedral at Lismore, but this is far from certain. The difficulties it suffered throughout the rest of the Middle Ages perhaps reflects the diminution of MacDougall power and the continued association with the MacDougalls leading to a lack of willingness of other lords to act as patron. The continued lack of political unity in Argyll may have also contributed.

Ecclesiastical patronage does not appear to have been a significant feature of Campbell lordship in mainland Argyll (Boardman’s 2005 denotes, instead, a focus on castles). Like most of the lords of central Argyll and Cowal they seem instead to have been largely content with less architecturally embellished sites, such as Inishail in Loch Awe. Larger churches in eastern and mid-Argyll, like Kilneaur, Kilfinan and others, mostly appear to be both relatively early and under the patronage of kindreds other than the Campbells. Campbell policy seems to have extended to monasteries, although they may have been influential in the attempts by Scottish kings to relocate the bishopric of Argyll to Saddell. The only exception to this is the collegiate church in Kilmun, which is late and exceptional in many ways, reflecting a rejection of West Highland aesthetics in favour of Gothic norms.

The enlargement of churches and the refurbishment or building of new monasteries was a feature of the MacDonald Lordship of the Isles through the fourteenth and into the early fifteenth centuries, such as the extension of Killean and the new building programmes at Iona and Oronsay. However, with the collapse of the Lordship building at churches and monasteries sharply declined. The lack of
construction activity in Argyll may also be a product of the drop in revenues and paucity of the parishes which are well documented from the late 1400s through to the Reformation.

An interesting feature of Argyll and Hebridean church building is the strong connections between Irish and Scottish masons. Similarities in style and features, along with Irish names inscribed at Oronsay, have led some to suggest that these masons came directly from Ireland (although see Caldwell 2015) but this would not account for the hybrid nature of Hebridean masonry, so the nature of masonry there is likely to be more nuanced.

Studies of early Christianity have emphasised how deeply embedded the church was throughout the landscape. It remains less clear, however, how these were perceived, understood and exploited by the later church. For instance, pre-existing crosses and boundaries were adopted by later churches, but we are unsure if these were used to mediate new messages or if the crosses being erected in later periods complimented these patterns or were establishing new ones. Later folk tradition has often been uncritically used as an indicator of continuity but this should be tested. On the other hand the wear on the cross base at Kilchoman, Islay, suggest prolonged use of ballaun stones.

Almost every parish church graveyard in Argyll boasts at least a few examples of Late Medieval West Highland Sculpture. The most common motifs used are perhaps the warrior figures, often buckling on their war gear, or holding spears, but they are also often shown mounted, or represented through seigniorial imagery: swords, galleys, hunting, etc. (also McDonald 1995 for other imagery adopted by Hebridean lords). Alongside warriors clergy, women and corpses were also depicted. These figures were often surrounded by scrollwork, mythical beasts, angels, tools, crosses and much more. This is an art form that is distinctive to the Gaelic Scottish west coast and highlands, but the extent to which it may have taken its lead from European imagery is generally unacknowledged. Steer & Barrowman’s (1977) seminal study, built on a number of earlier regional studies (Whyte 1873, 1875, Lamont 1968), drew together the corpus of examples then known and tried to make sense of how they may have been created and identify patterns in the imagery used. Recently, Caldwell and his colleagues (2010, 2015) has begun to reappraise their conclusions, suggesting that instead of schools of carving based in a limited number of localities, usually centred on monasteries, there were peripatetic groups of carvers exploiting quarries local to whoever was employing them. He has also begun to think about patterns of patronage, their dating, the meaning of the weaponry, arms and armour represented, the choreography of the figures and the iconography of much of the symbols used, but, despite their prevalence and the fact that they are such emotive exemplars of Gaelic culture, there remains much to be understood about this corpus.

ADMINISTRATION

While Innes (1851) and Cowan (1961, 1967, 1978) pulled together evidence for most medieval Argyll parishes, their date of foundation remains vague. The relationship of parishes to early administrative districts and the establishment of control and taxation by centralising powers, possibly linked to the creation of kingdoms and the development of proto-states, renders understanding the date and process of their creation and mapping parish boundaries a crucial issue. It would also assist in providing a picture of the structures that underpinned society. There is also a relationship with fortifications and churches that remains obscure (see Raven 2005). In the Isles, and particularly Islay, there appear to a number of additional land units that may have predated and probably underpinned the parish unit. These include pennylands, ouncelands and other units that
may represent some form of proto-parish structure (MacKerral 1944, Lamont 1981, Easson 1987) MacNiven forthcoming), but these configurations are different from where similar units appear throughout the Kingdom of Man and the Isles. Placename and documentary evidence suggests these units may be most densely concentrated on the Isles, Lorn and Kintyre, those areas most under the MacSorley influence, but there are occurrences elsewhere in Argyll and only in-depth study reveal any patterns and what this might indicate.

A small number of individual examples of assembly sites in Argyll are known but they have not been studied in detail as sites, nor has how they fit into wider structures of governance. This is all the more curious as the documentary evidence surviving for Finlaggan means that it has been particularly well looked at (e.g. Caldwell 2003) and serves as an exemplar for many others. Evidence for medieval feasting supports documentary evidence for the continuity of assembly at Dunadd (Lane & Campbell 2000). Other sites, usually mounds or stones, have been identified through placename evidence, linked to names for assembly, such as Eireachd or Mód (of which there is a small concentration in Cowal and a recently discovered group in Mull – Whyte 2015), or to Gaelic titles for lawyers, judges or courts (O’Grady 2008, James 2009). The subject would benefit from closer study.

It is also possible that some of the Argyll coastline was subject to a rudimentary system of coastal monitoring. Similar systems were well established in Man from the twelfth century, the traces of which are cliff-top promontory forts, with earthworks containing houses and stands for bonfires or beacons (Johnson 2002). A number of placenames containing aingeal, faire or freachadain, amongst others, suggest the potential for something similar in Argyll. By the sixteenth century there are records of MacDonalds using bonfires to send signals across the seas between Ulster and Islay. Dun Athad, in Islay, has often been interpreted as belonging to this period, but the cliff top peninsula setting, with a large rectangular structure sitting behind a large earthwork is strikingly similar to some of the earlier Manx examples noted above.

THE WIDER LANDSCAPE

Medieval settlement remains elusive throughout Scotland and the situation is no different in Argyll. Few of the strategies developed to address this situation, such as concentrating on the area around later settlements, have borne fruit. With the exception of the few buildings associated with duns and castles very little has been identified that can be dated with any certainty from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. A number of circular post built structures associated with charcoal burning activity at Dunloskin Wood, Cowal, have been dated to between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries (Rennie 1984, 1997, nd). Whilst some have recently suggested the domestic use has been misidentified, recent excavations in Lochaber have confirmed this interpretation (Ellis forthcoming a). Their shape and location suggests they may not be representative of normal houses, and may be seasonal charcoal burners’ huts, similar to the shielings on Jura that accompanied Pennant’s eighteenth-century itinerary (1774). The only other domestic building dating to the thirteenth century are the recently excavated sub-rectangular building at Kilchoman (Ellis 2015). Of similar date is the kiln-barn at Balsicate (Ellis forthcoming b), suggesting grain processing might have been more intensified than would otherwise be indicated by what appears to be an absence of contemporary mills.
Those sixteenth-century houses that have been closely dated are often unusual in their siting: Gunna (James 1998a, 1998b) sits in a hard to reach tidal island while those at Finlaggan (Caldwell & Ewart 1993) relate to what is effectively a closing off and obliteration of the MacDonald lordly use of the site. They do, however, conform to a style of house that the other contemporary examples, excavated in mid-Argyll by James (2004, 2009) (others have been excavated in Lewis, North Uist, Skye and Perthshire – see Raven 2005), also follow: being relatively small and insubstantial, sub-rectangular in plan, mostly with a central hearth, although some have end hearths, and often largely turf built or wicker walled. There is often an assumption they also utilised crucks. However, crucks elsewhere only seem to have become common from the fifteenth centuries onwards. It is curious that similarly formed buildings identified through survey in Islay (Caldwell et al. 2000) and mid-Argyll (James 2009 and Regan) tend to be more upland in setting than associated with later low-lying arable fields. Although they often sit within or alongside small areas of rig and furrow, this may suggest a number of possibilities, none of which are necessarily mutually exclusive: a greater concern with pastoral resources, displacement through war (recent work has certainly suggested this is the case in Colonsay in the early seventeenth century – Breen & Raven 2012) or a reaction to environmental stress (Raven 2005). A widespread programme of excavation would test the date, function and environment of similarly shaped buildings. Environmental work may also help to answer if any of these scenarios has any validity and compliment more large scale survey and excavation. This would also help answer questions about the extent of woodland and the importance of woodland exploitation for charcoal manufacture and galley building to the Argyll economy. Field walking in the more fertile fields of Kintyre also noted but did not record concentrations and spreads of imported medieval wares (Cummings pers. comm.). Revisiting these fields along with analysis of the context of middens containing medieval pottery in Coll (Crawford 1997) may provide opportunities for investigations into lower lying settlement.

Recent excavations at Baliscate, Mull, may also help rewrite the settlement history of Argyll. Baliscate also continued to be used into this period, the early medieval chapel was reused by a building similar to but slightly larger than those buildings outlined above. It has a large quantity of pottery associated with it (Ellis forthcoming b), which may suggest a domestic use rather than a later chapel. However, the post-excavation analysis of Baliscate has the potential to re-write Hebridean settlement history. The dating of the hand-made pottery produced throughout the Kingdom of the Isles and potentially Ulster and Man has proved particularly hard to date and interpret. Diagnostic features rely on vessel form and decoration which are often all but undecipherable but on a small number of sherds within an assemblage and poorly dated (Raven 2005). Many pottery specialists had even begun to lazily attribute all historic hand-made Hebridean wares from the tenth to nineteenth centuries to the meaningless cover-all term: ‘craggan-ware’. Some form on consensus was, nevertheless, beginning to appear in the way of typologies and very broad contextual dating (see Campbell 2003, Raven 2005). However, carbon dating analysis at Baliscate has revealed that pottery of a form that has previously been dated to the later Middle Ages dates, instead, to the thirteenth centuries (Hall forthcoming). This calls for a substantial reanalysis of medieval hand-made pottery throughout the western seaboard. Added to this should be a study why so many of these sites also contain imported continental wares.

The upland location of many of these medieval houses could also suggest that many sites which have been identified as shielings, simply because they are upland sites, may represent medieval houses. The similarity of their remains could be revealing and also say something about the
transient, transhumant and/or seasonal nature of medieval settlement and land use. Shellings are poorly understood as a rule, as archaeologists use the classification to cover a diverse range of structures, almost any upland building, and land uses, and the subject tends to be dismissed.
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