Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Early ecclesiastical sites in the northern isles and Isle of Man: An archaeological field survey

Christopher Lowe

How to cite:

Lowe, Christopher (1988) Early ecclesiastical sites in the northern isles and Isle of Man: An archaeological field survey. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1361/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL SITES

IN THE

NORTHERN ISLES

AND

ISLE OF MAN:

AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL

FIELD SURVEY

(2 VOLUMES)

VOLUME 1: TEXT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Thesis presented by Christopher Edmund Lowe for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Durham.

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

November 1987

18.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

TEXT IN ORIGINAL IS CLOSE TO THE EDGE OF THE PAGE

VOLUME 1

CONTENTS: VOLUME 1 - TEXT

	Page
Contents: Volume 1 Text	i
Contents: List of Appendices	vi
Contents: List of Tables	vii
Contents: Volume 2 Gazetteer & Illustrations	ix
Contents: List of Figures	x
Contents: List of Plates	xiii
Acknowledgements	xviii
Dedication	xix
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
Theme: Organization & Scope	1
Content of Study: An Outline	2
Periodization	10
Manx Crosses: A Note on the Standard Reference System	11
Dates of Composition	11
CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EARLY CHURCH IN THE NORTHERN ISLES & ISLE OF MAN	
(i) Introduction	12
(ii) The pre-Norse Church in the Northern Isles & Man	13
(iii) The Norse Church in the Northern Isles & Man	26
(iv) Conclusions & Summary	36
Translations of Quotations used in Chapter 2	38
CHAPTER 3: HISTORICAL & ARCHAEOLOGICAL MODELS	
(i) General Introduction	43
(ii) Historical Models: Introduction	43
(iii) Historical Models: The Isle of Man	44
(iv) Historical Models: Orkney & Shetland	51
(v) Archaeological Models	53
(vi) Conclusions & Summary	55
CHAPTER 4: A REVIEW OF HISTORICAL, STYLISTIC & ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATING METHODS AND THEIR PRIOR APPLICATION TO THE MANX & NORTHERN ISLES CHAPELS	
(i) Introduction	57
(ii) Historical Dating & the Evidence of Orkneyinga Saga	57
(a) Christchurch, Birsay / St. Peter's chapel, Brough of Birsay	58
(b) St. Nicholas' church, Orphir	66

(c) St. Magnus´ church, Egilsay 69
(d) Tammaskirk, Rendall 75

(iii) Stylistic Dating 77

(iv) Archaeological Dating 81

Orkney
(a) St. Peter´s chapel, Brough of Birsay 82
(b) St. Magnus´ church, Birsay 83
(c) Saevar Howe, Birsay 84
(d) Chapel: Brough of Deerness 85
(e) Chapel: Newark, Deerness 88
(f) Sandside, Graemsay 88
(g) Tammaskirk, Rendall 88
(h) Chapel: Eynhallow 89
(i) St. Mary´s church, Skaill, Rousay 90

Shetland
(a) Chapel: St. Ninian´s Isle, Dunrossness 91

Isle of Man
(a) Keeill Woirrey, Kerroodhoo, Patrick 92
(b) Sulbrick keeill, Santon 93
(c) St. Patrick´s chapel, Jurby 93
(d) North keeill, parish church, Maughold 93
(e) Ballameanagh keeill, Lezayre 93
(f) Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma, German 94
(g) Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold 94
(h) Sulby keeill, Onchan 94
(i) Keeill Woirrey, Cornadale, Maughold 95
(j) Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory 95
(k) Cronk yn Howe, Lezayre 96
(l) Ronaldsway II (Airport Site), Malew 97
(m) Keeill Vael, Druidale, Michael 99

(v) Conclusions & Summary 100

CHAPTER 5: SITE MORPHOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF CHAPEL FORM & SITE LAYOUT

Introduction 102

Part 1: Manx, Orcadian & Shetland Chapels: An Analysis of their Structural & Formal Characteristics

(i) Manx keeills

(a) Size, Form & Construction 102
(b) Entrances 105
(c) Windows 107
(d) Flooring 108
(e) Roofing 109
(f) Altars 110

(g) Altar Frontals 118
(h) Altar Mensae 119
(i) Miscellaneous internal fixtures and fittings 122
(j) Summary & Context 123

(ii) Orkney & Shetland chapels

(a) Size, Form & Construction 124
(b) Entrances 127
(c) Windows 129
(d) Flooring & Roofing 130
(e) Altars 131
(f) Altar Frontal 132
(g) Altar Mensa 133
(h) Miscellaneous internal fixtures and fittings 134
(i) Summary & Context 137

Part 2: Metrology & Proportional Theory

(i) Introduction 138
(ii) Aage Roussell's Metrological Analysis of Orcadian Chapels 138
(iii) Harold Leask- 3:2, 2:1 & other proportional theories 141
(iv) Geometric Proportions: Root 2 & Vesica Piscis 149
(v) A Metrological Survey of Ecclesiastical Structures in the Northern Isles & Man 151
(vi) Conclusions & Summary 153

Part 3: Ecclesiastical Enclosures & Associated Funerary Structures

(i) Introduction 154
(ii) Ecclesiastical Enclosure Forms: Isle of Man 156
(iii) Ecclesiastical Enclosure Forms: Orkney and Shetland 159
(iv) Associated Funerary Structures 160

(a) Specially-marked Graves 160
Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory 161
Skyhill keeill, Lezayre 162
Ronaldsway II (Airport Site), Malew 165

(b) Slab Shrines 168
Colli Ness, Sanday, Orkney 169
Keeill Killane, Lonan, Man 169
Ballachrink I, Marown, Man 170
Ballaqueeney, Rushen, Man 171
Greeba Mill, German, Man 171

(c) Corner-post Shrines 171

(d) Leachta 172
St. Patrick's Chair, Marown, Man 173
Brough of Birsay, Orkney 173

(v) Conclusions & Summary 174

Notes for Chapter 5 175

CHAPTER 6: CHAPELS & LAND DIVISIONS: AN ANALYSIS OF LOCATION

Introduction 177

(i) Land Divisions in the Isle of Man, Orkney & Shetland

(a) Isle of Man: Quarterland & Treen 178
(b) Orkney: Tunship & Urisland 191
(c) Shetland: Tunship & Scattald 198
(d) Summary 202

(ii) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man: A Review and Critique of the work of C.J.S Marstrander 203

(iii) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man: An Analysis of Boundary Association 219

(iv) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man: The Origins and Significance of Boundary Association

(a) Introduction 222
(b) A Review of Comparative Material 223
(c) Theoretical Model 229

(v) Boundary Association: The Evidence from Orkney

(a) Introduction 236
(b) Westray & Papay 237
(c) Orphir parish 240
(d) South Ronaldsay 241

(vi) Boundary Association: The Evidence from Shetland

(a) Introduction 243
(b) Unst 243
(c) Fetlar 245

(vii) Preliminary Assessment: Orkney & Shetland 246

Notes for Chapter 6 248

CHAPTER 7: THE DEVELOPMENT OF ECCLESIASTICAL SITES IN THE NORTHERN ISLES & ISLE OF MAN: ASPECTS OF CONTINUITY

(i) General Introduction 253

(ii) Ecclesiastical Sites and their Spatial Association with pre-Christian Burial Grounds 254

(iii) Associated Christian & pre-Christian Burial Grounds in the Isle of Man

(a) Introduction 256
(b) Mounded Keeill sites 257

Ballahimmin, German 259
Corrody, Lezayre 263
Keeill Woirrey, Cornaa, Maughold 265
Keeill Vreeshy, Marown 266
Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold 266

(c) Non-Mounded Keeill Sites 271

(iv) Boundary Association & its possible relevance to potential multiperiod funerary sites on Man 273

(v) The Northern Isles: Introduction 276

(vi) Associated Christian & pre-Christian Burial Grounds in Orkney 276

(vii) Associated Christian & pre-Christian Burial Grounds in Shetland 280

(viii) The Boundary Association of Christian & pre-Christian Burial Grounds in Orkney and Shetland 285

(ix) The Association of Ecclesiastical & Iron Age Settlements

(a) Introduction 287
(b) The Identification of Late Iron Age Settlements in Orkney & Shetland: A Brief Review 290

Broch of Burrian, N.Ronaldsay, Orkney 292
Skaill, Deerness, Orkney 294
Jarlshof, Dunrossness, Shetland 295

Comments 298

(x) The Association of Ecclesiastical & possible Late Iron Age Sites in Orkney 298

(a) Lochside Promontory Sites: `St. Tredwell Type' 300
(b) Coastal Promontory Sites: `Peterkirk Type' 305

VOLUME 1

(c) Coastal Sites; Non-promontory `St. Boniface Type´ 305
(d) Inland & Lochside Sites; Non-promontory 309

(xi) The Association of Ecclesiastical & possible Late Iron Age Sites in Shetland 313

(a) Association Certain

Housabister, Nesting & Burravoe, Yell 313
St.Mary´s church,Culbinsbrough, Bressay 314

(b) Association Possible

Chapel Knowe, Lunna, Nesting 318
Hillswick, Northmavine 322
Orbister, Northmavine 323
St. Ninian´s chapel, Papil, Yell 324
Kirkaby, Unst 327
St. John´s church, Norwick, Unst 327

(xii) The Association of Ecclesiastical & possible Late Iron Age Sites in the Isle of Man 328

Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory 328
Ronaldsway II (Airport Site), Malew 329
Miscellaneous Sites 330

(xiii) Observations & Conclusions 331

Notes for Chapter 7 333

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION & PROSPECT 335

****

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: A Corpus of Manx Keeill sites 341

APPENDIX 2: A List of Excavated Chapel Sites & Cemeteries in the Isle of Man and the Northern Isles 346

APPENDIX 3: Peregrinatio pro Christo & the `Northern Desert´ 349

APPENDIX 4: The `Papar´ & the `Papa´ Place-Names: An Orcadian View 351

VOLUME 1

APPENDIX 5: Kirbister, Kirkaby & Kirk Place-Names 355

APPENDIX 6: A Note on Quartz Pebbles & their Association with Ecclesiastical Sites 361

****

TABLES

TABLE 1: Ecclesiastical Sites & Orkneyinga Saga 366

TABLE 2: Wall Types, Wall Widths & Entrance Position: Manx Keeills 368

TABLE 3: Manx Altar Settings 370

TABLE 4: Manx Altar Frontals 371

TABLE 5: Manx Altar Mensae 371

TABLE 6: Entrance Types: Orkney & Shetland Chapels 372

TABLE 7: Orcadian & Shetland Altars 372

TABLE 8: Metrological Analysis of Selected Orcadian Chapels 373

TABLE 9: Proportional Analysis of Manx Keeills 374

TABLE 10: Proportional Analysis of Unicameral Chapels in Orkney and Shetland 376

TABLE 11: Enclosure Types & Area: Isle of Man 377

TABLE 12: Enclosure Types & Area: Orkney & Shetland 378

TABLE 13: Rental Information 1511-1515: Marown parish 379

TABLE 14: Rental Information 1511-1515: Santon parish 379

TABLE 15: Rental Information 1511-1515: Average rent paid per treen in different parishes 380

TABLE 16: Analysis of Abbeyland Boundary Tracts (Part 1) 381

TABLE 17: Analysis of Abbeyland Boundary Tracts (Part 2) 381

TABLE 18: Rental Information 1511-1515: Alia Treens 382

TABLE 19: Rental Information 1511-1515: Beg-Moar Type Treens 382

TABLE 20: Rental Information 1511-1515: Alia & Beg-Moar Type treens 383

VOLUME 1

TABLE 21: Rental Information 1511-1515: Renn Treens 383

TABLE 22: Rental Information 1511-1515: Small Treens 384

TABLE 23: Rental Information 1511-1515: Eary Treens 384

TABLE 24: Summary of Average Proportional Rents 385

TABLE 25: A Provisional List of Manx Keeill Sites with possible pre-Christian Funerary Associations 386

TABLE 26: A Provisional List of Ecclesiastical Sites in Orkney with possible Iron Age Associations 387

TABLE 27: A Provisional List of Ecclesiastical Sites in Shetland with possible Iron Age Associations 389

TABLE 28: Percentage Summary of Chapel Sites in Spatial Association with possible pre-Christian Funerary and Iron Age Domestic Settlement Sites 389

****

ABBREVIATIONS 390

****

BIBLIOGRAPHY 392

****

The contents of Volume 2, including all plates & figures, are listed overleaf

VOLUME 2

CONTENTS: VOLUME 2- THE SITES´ GAZETTEER

		Page
Contents		ix
List of Figures		x
List of Plates		xiii
Part 1: Notes on the Identification of Ecclesiastical Sites		1
Part 2: Notes on Survey Method		14
Part 3: Note on Gazetteer Format		15
Part 4: Sites´ Gazetteer		
	Isle of Man	
MAROWN	1: ST. RONAN´S CHURCH	18
MAROWN	2: ST. TRINIAN´S CHAPEL	23
MAROWN	3: RHYNE KEEILL SITE	29
MAROWN	4: KEEILL VREESHY, BALLAYEMMY	32
MAROWN	5: KEEILL PHERICK, BALLAFREER	39
MAROWN	6: CABBAL DRUIAGHT, GLENLOUGH	46
MAROWN	7: BALLAQUINNEY MOAR KEEILL	50
MAROWN	8: KEEILL LINGAN, BALLINGAN	57
MAROWN	9: BALLACHRINK (I) KEEILL SITE	64
MAROWN	10: BALLACHRINK (II)KEEILL SITE	68
SANTON	1: ST. SANCTAIN´S CHURCH	70
SANTON	2: GLENTRAUGH LINTEL GRAVE CEMETERY	71
SANTON	3: BALLAFURT KEEILL SITE	74
SANTON	4: BALNAHOW KEEILL SITE	75
SANTON	5: BALLACREGGA KEEILL SITE	77
SANTON	6: BALLAVALE KEEILL SITE	79
SANTON	7: BALLAVARTIN KEEILL SITE	80
SANTON	8: SULBRICK KEEILL	81
SANTON	9: CRONK NY MERRIU LINTEL GRAVE SITE	85
	Orkney	
WESTRAY	1: LADY KIRK, PIEROWALL	87
WESTRAY	2: NOUP CHAPEL SITE	88
WESTRAY	3: NOLTLAND CASTLE CEMETERY SITE	90
WESTRAY	4: CURQUOY/KIRKHOUSE/SAINTEAR CHAPEL SITE	91
WESTRAY	5: CROSSKIRK, TUQUOY	93
WESTRAY	6: KIRBIST CHAPEL SITE	100
WESTRAY	7: CLEAT CHAPEL SITE	103
WESTRAY	8: OLD KIRKHOUSE/MOUND OF SKELWICK CHAPEL SITE	106
WESTRAY	9: BU OF RAPNESS CHAPEL SITE	109
WESTRAY	10: PETERKIRK, RUSLAND	110
WESTRAY	11: ST. BONIFACE CHURCH (PAPA WESTRAY)	122
WESTRAY	12: KIRK OF HOWE (PAPA WESTRAY)	127
WESTRAY	13: VIA CHAPEL SITE (PAPA WESTRAY)	130
WESTRAY	14: ST. TREDWELL´S CHAPEL (PAPA WESTRAY)	131
WESTRAY	15: HOLM OF AIKERNESS CHAPEL SITE	155

VOLUME 2

Page

Shetland

UNST 1: ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, NORWICK 159
UNST 2: BARTLE'S KIRK, NORWICK 162
UNST 3: CROSSKIRK, CLIBBERSWICK 167
UNST 4: THE KIRK, BURRAFIRTH 174
UNST 5: ST. MARY'S CHURCH, BOTHEN 176
UNST 6: ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, BALIASTA 178
UNST 7: KIRKAMOOL, CLIFF 179
UNST 8: KIRKHOULL, BALTASOUND 180
UNST 9: ST. SUNNIVA'S CHAPEL, BALTA 180
UNST 10: ST. OLAF'S CHURCH, LUNDAWICK 182
UNST 11: GLETNA KIRK, UYEASOUND 191
UNST 12: KIRK, GUNNISTER 196
UNST 13: KIRKHOULL, GUNNISTER 197
UNST 14: KIRKABY, WESTING 197
UNST 15: KIRKAMIRES, UNDERHOULL 207
UNST 16: KIRK, UNDERHOULL 208
UNST 17: KIRK KNOWE, WESTING 208
UNST 18: KIRK OF MILLYSKARA, SANDWICK 210
UNST 19: ST. JOHN'S CHAPEL, COLVADALE 213
UNST 20: ST. MARY'S CHAPEL, FRAMGORD 215
UNST 21: UYEA CHAPEL 222

FIGURES

SURVEY ILLUSTRATIONS

ISLE OF MAN

Figure 1: Keeill Pherick, Ballafreer (MAROWN 5) 226
Figure 2a: Keeill Vreeshy, Ballayemmy (MAROWN 4) 227
Figure 2b: Cabbal Druiaght, Glenlogh (MAROWN 6) 227
Figure 3: Ballaquinney Moar keeill (MAROWN 7) 228
Figure 4: Keeill Lingan, Ballingan (MAROWN 8) 229
Figure 5a: Sulbrick keeill (SANTON 8) 230
Figure 5b: Ballacregga enclosure (SANTON 5) 230
Figure 6: Keeill Woirrey, Cornadale, Maughold 231
Figure 7: Principal features at Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold: from aerial photograph (see Plate 16) 232
Figure 8: Corrody keeill, Lezayre 233
Figure 9: Skyhill keeill, Lezayre 234
Figure 10: Keeill Woirrey, Glen Moar, Patrick 235
Figure 11: Lag ny Keeilley, Patrick 236

ORKNEY

Figure 12: Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5) 237
Figure 13: Domestic settlement near Kirbist (WESTRAY 6) 238
Figure 14: Old Kirkhouse / Mound of Skelwick (WESTRAY 8) 239
Figure 15: Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10) 240

VOLUME 2

		Page
Figure 16:	Structure in eroded cliff-section near Peterkirk (see Plate 33b)	241
Figure 17:	St. Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 14)	242
Figure 18:	Marykirk, Grimeston, Harray	243
Figure 19:	Marykirk ?broch, Grimeston, Harray	244
Figure 20:	Lyking chapel & Stackrue broch, Sandwick	245
Figure 21:	Peterkirk, Evie	246
Figure 22:	Houseby chapel, Birsay	247
SHETLAND		
Figure 23:	Irvine´s 1863 plan of St. John´s church, Norwick (UNST 1): after MacGibbon & Ross 1896,fig.117	248
Figure 24:	Stone setting near Bartleskirk (UNST 2)	249
Figure 25:	Crosskirk, Clibberswick (UNST 3)	250
Figure 26:	`The Kirk´, Burrafirth (UNST 4)	251
Figure 27:	St. Mary´s church, Bothen (UNST 5)	252
Figure 28:	St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10)	253
Figure 29:	Detail of early S window: St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10)	254
Figure 30:	`The Lundawick Fish´: gouged design on window lintel at St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10)	255
Figure 31:	Gletna Kirk, Uyeasound (UNST 11)	256
Figure 32:	Kirkaby, Westing (UNST 14)	257
Figure 33:	Irvine´s 1863 plan of Kirkaby (UNST 14): after MacGibbon & Ross 1896,fig.115	258
Figure 34:	Colvadale chapel (UNST 19)	259
Figure 35:	Irvine´s 1863 plan of Colvadale chapel (UNST 19): after MacGibbon & Ross 1896, fig.116	260
Figure 36:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20)	261
Figure 37:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20): exterior elevations	262
Figure 38:	Dryden´s 1855 plan of Uyea chapel (UNST 21): after MacGibbon & Ross 1896, fig.118	263
Figure 39:	St. Mary´s church, Culbinsbrough, Bressay	264
DISTRIBUTION & LOCATION MAPS		
Figure 40:	Keeill & Treen: Rushen sheading	265
Figure 41:	Keeill & Treen: Glenfaba sheading	266
Figure 42:	Keeill & Treen: Michael sheading	267
Figure 43:	Keeill & Treen: Ayre sheading	268
Figure 44:	Keeill & Treen: Garff sheading	269
Figure 45:	Keeill & Treen: Middle sheading	270
Figure 46:	Manx alia & beg-moar type treens	271
Figure 47:	Keeill distribution, Isle of Man; according to boundary status (terms explained in Chapter 6 Note 4)	272

VOLUME 2

		Page
Figure 48:	Land Divisions in Westray & Papa Westray (after MacKenzie 1750)	273
Figure 49:	Land Divisions in Westray & Papa Westray (after Aberdeen 1770): numbers refer to WESTRAY sites in gazetteer	274
Figure 50:	Chapels & Land Divisions in South Ronaldsay: reconstruction of urisland districts (I-X) based on rental and early cartographical evidence	275
Figure 51:	Chapels & Land Divisions in Orphir parish: reconstruction of urisland districts based on rental and early cartographical evidence	276
Figure 52:	Chapels & Scattald Divisions: Unst (numbers refer to UNST sites in gazetteer)	277
Figure 53:	Chapels & Scattald Divisions: Fetlar	278
GRAPHS: Index		279
Figure 54:	Dimensional data for Manx keeills	280
Figure 55:	Dimensional data for unicameral chapels in Orkney & Shetland	281
Figure 56:	Dimensional data for non-unicameral chapels in Orkney & Shetland	282
Figure 57:	Orientation of selected Manx keeills	283
MISCELLANEOUS ILLUSTRATIONS		
Figure 58:	Oliver's 1868 drawings of `cabbals', `keeills' and `treen churches'	284
Index to figures 59-61, 63-65 & 67-68		285
Figure 59:	Comparative schematic plans of Manx keeills: part 1	287
Figure 60:	Comparative schematic plans of Manx keeills: part 2	288
Figure 61:	Comparative schematic plans of Manx keeills: part 3	289
Figure 62:	Schematic plan of St. Patrick's church (primary phase), St. Patrick's Isle, Peel, IOM (after Radford in Cubbon 1982,fig.16.7)	290
Figure 63:	Comparative schematic plans of Orkney chapels: part 1	291
Figure 64:	Comparative schematic plans of Orkney chapels: part 2	292
Figure 65:	Comparative schematic plans of Orkney chapels: part 3	293
Figure 66:	Comparative schematic plans of Orkney chapels: part 4	294
Figure 67:	Comparative schematic plans of Shetland chapels: part 1	295

VOLUME 2

		Page
Figure 68:	Comparative schematic plans of Shetland chapels: part 2	296
Figure 69:	Comparative schematic plans & elevations of Manx altar forms	297
Figure 70:	Provisional typology of Manx altar forms	298
Figure 71:	Schematic reconstruction of EW section across Ballahimmin keeill, German, IOM (after Kermode 1910,12-16)	299
Figure 72:	Isometric reconstruction of special graves -leachta- at Ronaldsway cemetery, Malew, IOM (after Cubbon 1935b & Neely 1940)	300
Figure 73:	Isometric reconstruction of ground plan of Tammaskirk, Rendall, Orkney (after Clouston 1932b)	301
Figure 74:	A theoretical model for the development of keeill and treen in the Isle of Man	302
PLATES:	Scales used: 2 m ranging rods & 20 cm `small scale´	
Plate 1:	Aerial view of St. Trinian´s chapel (MAROWN 2) facing NE	303
Plate 2a:	Keeill Vreeshy (MAROWN 4) facing N	304
Plate 2b:	St. Patrick´s Chair, Marown, facing SE	304
Plate 3a:	Keeill Pherick (MAROWN 5) facing SE	305
Plate 3b:	? water-stoup & ? quern at MAROWN 5	305
Plate 4a:	Altar: Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) facing E	306
Plate 4b:	Altar: Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7) facing SE	306
Plate 5a:	Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7): detail of keeill entrance facing W	307
Plate 5b:	Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7): detail of W sector of enclosure facing N	307
Plate 6a:	Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7):detail of N sector of enclosure & ditch facing E	308
Plate 6b:	Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7): detail of section through enclosure bank facing W	308
Plate 7a:	Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8) facing E	309
Plate 7b:	Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8): detail of enclosure bank facing N	309
Plate 8a:	Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8): detail of entrance facing S	310
Plate 8b:	Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8): quernstone	310
Plate 9a:	Ballachrink I (MAROWN 9): fieldwall on course of earlier ecclesiastical enclosure ? , facing N	311
Plate 9b:	enclosure at Ballacregga (SANTON 5) facing NE	311
Plate 10:	Aerial view of Sulbrick keeill (SANTON 8) facing E	312
Plate 11a:	Sulbrick keeill (SANTON 8) facing E	313
Plate 11b:	Carved stone at Sulbrick keeill (SANTON 8)	313

VOLUME 2

		Page
Plate 12a:	Ballahimmin keeill & mound, German: general location view facing E	314
Plate 12b:	Skyhill keeill & mound, Lezayre, facing SE	314
Plate 13a:	Corrody keeill & ?barrow, Lezayre, facing NW	315
Plate 13b:	Keeill Woirrey, Cornadale, Maughold: general location view facing S	315
Plate 14:	Aerial view of land-divisions & Keeill Woirrey (centre), Cornadale, Maughold facing W	316
Plate 15a:	Keeill Woirrey, Cornadale, Maughold facing E	317
Plate 15b:	Multiple stone setting W of keeill facing SE	317
Plate 16:	Aerial view of Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold facing S	318
Plate 17a:	Keeill Woirrey, Glen Moar, Patrick, with surrounding embankment facing N	319
Plate 17b:	detail of section through E wall of Keeill Woirrey: altar pillar and site of ?relic cavity visible	319
Plate 18:	Aerial view of Lag ny Keeilley, Patrick facing E	320
Plate 19a:	Lag ny Keeilley: general location view facing S: secondary enclosure in foreground .	321
Plate 19b:	Lag ny Keeilley facing W	321
Plate 20a:	Lag ny Keeilley: revetted bank in SW part of site facing S	322
Plate 20b:	Lag ny Keeilley: stone with D-shaped hollow	322
Plate 21:	Aerial view of Ladykirk, Pierowall (WESTRAY 1) facing SW	323
Plate 22:	Aerial view of Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5) facing S	324
Plate 23a:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): facing E	325
Plate 23b:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): facing NW with detail of barrel vault over chancel	325
Plate 24a:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): chancel arch facing E	326
Plate 24b:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): detail of exterior S wall face, facing N	326
Plate 25a:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): detail of butt-joint in S wall, facing S	327
Plate 25b:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): detail of butt-joint in N wall, facing N	327
Plate 26a:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): detail of N interior wall-face, facing N	328
Plate 26b:	Crosskirk, Tuquoy (WESTRAY 5): detail of secondary S entrance, facing S	328
Plate 27:	Aerial view of domestic settlement & field system near Kirbist (WESTRAY 6) facing S	329
Plate 28a:	Kirbist (WESTRAY 6): general view of site facing W, with part of field enclosure visible to E	330

VOLUME 2

		Page
Plate 28b:	Kirbist (WESTRAY 6): domestic settlement facing SE with Knowe of Burristae in centre ground	330
Plate 29:	Aerial view of Cleat chapel site & burial ground (WESTRAY 7) facing SE	331
Plate 30:	Aerial view of Mound of Skelwick (WESTRAY 8) facing W	332
Plate 31:	Aerial view of Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10) facing SE	333
Plate 32a:	Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10): exposed walls of putative chapel facing NE	334
Plate 32b:	Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10): stone feature facing NW	334
Plate 33a:	Features in eroded cliff-section near Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10): stone & earth bank facing NE	335
Plate 33b:	Features in eroded cliff-section near Peterkirk, Rusland (WESTRAY 10): stony mound facing NE	335
Plate 34:	Aerial view of Kirk of Howe, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 12) facing W	336
Plate 35a:	Aerial view of St. Boniface´ church facing E	337
Plate 35b:	St. Boniface´ church facing SW	337
Plate 36a:	Munkerhoose: eroded cliff-section W of St. Boniface´ church, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 11), facing NE	338
Plate 36b:	Binnaskirk: `farm-mound´ N of St. Boniface´ church, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 11), facing N	338
Plate 37:	Cross-inscribed stone from St. Boniface´ church, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 11)	339
Plate 38a:	Hogback: St. Boniface´ church, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 11), facing W	340
Plate 38b:	St. Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 14), facing N with Traill´s 1879 spoil heaps in foreground	340
Plate 39:	Aerial view of St. Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 14) facing NE	341
Plate 40:	St.Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray (WESTRAY 14) facing NW	342
Plate 41a:	St.Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray facing W: detail of modified external NE corner	343
Plate 41b:	St.Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray: battered wall with external bank facing SW	343
Plate 42a:	St.Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray: cell (Feature B) facing S	344
Plate 42b:	St.Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray cell (Feature C) facing S	344
Plate 43:	Aerial view of Holm of Aikerness (WESTRAY 15) facing NW	345
Plate 44a:	Holm of Aikerness (WESTRAY 15) kelp-burners´ hut / sheep shelter facing W	346

VOLUME 2

		Page
Plate 44b:	Holm of Aikerness (WESTRAY 15) possible wall-line facing W	346
Plate 45a:	Peterkirk, Evie: general view of site facing NW	347
Plate 45b:	Peterkirk, Evie: detail of blocked chancel entrance facing SE	347
Plate 46a:	St.Mary´s chapel, Wyre: detail of nave entrance facing NW	348
Plate 46b:	St.Mary´s chapel, Wyre: detail of nave interior facing SE: possible wall-bench along S wall	348
Plate 47a:	Lyking chapel, Sandwick, facing NW: enclosure in centre ground; Stackrue broch on horizon	349
Plate 47b:	Tammaskirk, Rendall facing N, from broch	349
Plate 48a:	Chapel site, Loch of Wasdale, Firth facing W	350
Plate 48b:	Kirk of Kirkgoe, Birsay, facing S	350
Plate 49a:	St. Mary´s chapel, Isbister, Rendall, facing S	351
Plate 49b:	Houseby chapel, Birsay, facing E	351
Plate 50a:	St. John´s church, Norwick (UNST 1), facing NW	352
Plate 50b:	`Bartle´s Kirk´, Norwick (UNST 2), facing N	352
Plate 51a:	Crosskirk, Clibberswick (UNST 3), facing SW: enclosure in foreground	353
Plate 51b:	`The Kirk´, Burrafirth Links (UNST 4), facing SE	353
Plate 52a:	St. Mary´s church, Bothen (UNST 5) facing NW	354
Plate 52b:	St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10) facing NE, with detail of early enclosure to S	354
Plate 53a:	St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10): facing E	355
Plate 53b:	Feature N of St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10) facing NE	355
Plate 54a:	St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10): exterior view of blocked S entrance, facing N	356
Plate 54b:	St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10): detail of butt-joint in S wall, facing S	356
Plate 55a:	Stone cross at St. Olaf´s church, Lundawick (UNST 10)	357
Plate 55b:	Gletna Kirk (UNST 11) facing E	357
Plate 56a:	Circular (? field) enclosure near Gletna Kirk (UNST 11) facing N	358
Plate 56b:	Kirkaby chapel (UNST 14) facing E: foundation of bench visible against N wall of nave; enclosure bank visible in foreground	358
Plate 57a:	Kirkaby chapel (UNST 14) facing W	359
Plate 57b:	Kirkaby chapel (UNST 14): detail of sub-circular structure facing NE	359

VOLUME 2

		Page
Plate 58a:	Kirkaby chapel (UNST 14): S wall facing N	360
Plate 58b:	Colvadale chapel (UNST 19) facing W	360
Plate 59a:	Colvadale chapel (UNST 19): detail of NW sector of enclosure facing NE	361
Plate 59b:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20), facing SE with "The Priest´s Hoose" in foreground	361
Plate 60a:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20) facing E	362
Plate 60b:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20): detail of interior SW corner of chapel facing SW	362
Plate 61a:	Stone cross at St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20)	363
Plate 61b:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20) detail of possible butt-joint in S interior wall-face, facing S	363
Plate 62a:	St. Mary´s chapel, Framgord (UNST 20): detail of butt-joint near W end of exterior N wall-face, facing S	364
Plate 62b:	St.Mary´s church, Culbinsbrough, Bressay: broch & kirkyard wall facing NE	364
Plate 63a:	St.Mary´s church, Culbinsbrough, Bressay facing E	365
Plate 63b:	St.Mary´s church, Culbinsbrough, Bressay: detail of early enclosure facing NW	365
Plate 64a:	Kirk Knowe, Lunna, Nesting: enclosure & chapel facing NE	366
Plate 64b:	Kirk Knowe, Lunna, Nesting: chapel facing E	366
Plate 65a:	Eroded cliff-section near St.Ninian´s chapel, Papil, Yell: midden deposits	367
Plate 65b:	Eroded cliff-section near St.Ninian´s chapel, Papil, Yell: structural remains-? chapel	367

All photographs in this study were taken by the author: the author is also responsible for the survey plans and for the production of all the illustrations in this study with the exception of figures 23, 33, 35, 38 (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,figs.115-118) and figure 58 (Oliver 1868).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements are due to:

Christopher Morris, my supervisor, for his guidance, understanding and, not least, his patience over these many years.

Jane Lowe, my wife, who has not only been equally patient, but who also assisted in a practical way, with the Manx and Orcadian fieldwork.

Norman Emery, for his assistance with the Unst survey and for unwittingly teaching me the finer points of plane-tabling.

Michael Rains, for his knowledge of computers which saved me from many a long month of re-word-processing.

Dr. Ross Trench-Jellicoe, for his friendship, help and practical advice over the years.

Trevor Woods, for transforming my line-drawings and photographs into something presentable.

Dr. Raymond Lamb, Orkney Archaeologist, and Brian Smith, Shetland Archivist, for their help and advice.

I should also like to express my gratitude to the Department of Education & Science for awarding me a Major State Studentship and for funding my seasons of fieldwork in Orkney, Shetland and Man.

Thanks must also go out to the curators and staff of the libraries and museums in Edinburgh, Kirkwall, Lerwick and Douglas: a particular thank-you is due to the Inter-Library Loans Section in the University Library, Durham.

Finally, I wish to thank the many people, the crofters and country-people, of the Northern Isles and Man for their friendship and hospitality and for their enthusiasm in allowing me the privilege of working with their heritage.

Langley Park, Durham

11 August 1987

This work is dedicated to

Jane

who has lived with it for so long

and to

Jamie

who was spared !

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Early Ecclesiastical Sites in the Northern Isles & Isle of Man-
An Archaeological Field Survey: CHRISTOPHER EDMUND LOWE

Abstract: This is a study of the small local chapels and burial grounds which are found throughout Man, Orkney and Shetland and an investigation into their relationship to the land divisions of these islands. It is a study which attempts to look at these sites within the context of their contemporary landscape.

The historical evidence for the early Church in the Northern Isles and Man is introduced in Chapter 2 and interpretative accounts, based on that evidence, are considered in Chapter 3. The basic problem of chronology is then considered in Chapter 4 which sets out and examines historical, stylistic and archaeological criteria for the dating of sites. In essence, Chapters 2-4 provide an account of the current state of knowledge regarding the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels.

Archaeological evidence is introduced in Chapter 5. This chapter, together with the survey of sites in Man and the Northern Isles (Volume 2), provide the necessary background material for the analytical work in Chapters 6 & 7.

The association of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels with the land divisions is considered in Chapter 6 and a theoretical model for the development of the Manx land system and for the association of keeill and treen is presented. This model is based partly upon this study's analysis of boundary association, a phenomenon which, it is suggested, may be indicative of Early Christian ecclesiastical organization. This model is also tested against the Northern Isles' data. Aspects of continuity are considered in Chapter 7 and conclusions and topics for future research are presented in Chapter 8.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Theme: Organization & Scope

The small district chapels which are found throughout the Northern Isles and Isle of Man, and in particular their relationship to the land-divisions of those islands form the subject of this comparative study. These are the `early ecclesiastical sites´ which are referred to in the title: the term `early´ in this context means pre-parochial. This work is not concerned with a study of monastic sites or with the stack-sites, possibly the sites of eremitic monastic establishments, which lie off the coasts of Orkney and Shetland. That subject has been dealt with at some length by Dr. Raymond Lamb (1973a; 1973b). Periodization and this study´s use of terms such as `Early Christian´, `Medieval´ and `Late Medieval´ are explained below (pp.10-11).

The thesis is divided up into six major chapters, together with a gazetteer of sites in Volume 2. Each chapter is intended to form a whole, yet each is linked to those that precede and succeed it. For example, Chapters 2, 3 and 4 introduce themes and data which are taken up and then gradually `refined´. The historical evidence in Chapter 2, for example, thus provides the basic data for discussing the historical models in Chapter 3 which then forms the back-drop for this study´s review of historical dating methods in the first part of Chapter 4. Chapters 2 - 4 also provide the background for the archaeological material which is considered in later sections of this study. This integrated approach is pursued throughout this work.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are basically `introductory chapters´. Chapter 5, together with the sites´ gazetteer in Volume 2, form the middle part of this thesis. These are almost wholly `data chapters´ in which archaeological material is introduced, analysed, and then discussed. Chapters 6 and 7 are basically `analytical chapters´, which again are concerned with archaeological material. Chapter 8 summarizes the implications of this study and suggests areas and topics for future research. Related subjects are considered in a series of Appendices. All references to sites in the gazetteer (Volume 2) are introduced with the label MAROWN (n), SANTON (n), WESTRAY (n) or UNST (n).

Content of Study: An Outline

The historical evidence for the early Church in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man, in the pre-Norse and Norse periods, is reviewed in Chapter 2. The documentation is of a variable quality. Even so, this study emphasizes the fact that the early ecclesiastical history of the Northern Isles is better documented than that of Man for the same period. None of the Manx evidence, for example, is demonstrably earlier than the 12th century. Much of the Northern Isles´ evidence, on the other hand, is contained in contemporary or near contemporary accounts. In this context, particular attention is given to Dicuil´s Liber de mensura and it is demonstrated that works of modern synthesis have invariably conflated the textual evidence of Dicuil´s Book VII.14 and VII.15. This study´s new analysis of these sections suggests that eremitical groups or individuals may have been established in Orkney and Shetland in the late 8th and early 9th centuries.

The traditional accounts for the general conversion of Man and the Northern Isles stress a 5th century and a late 10th century context, based on the careers, respectively, of St. Patrick, and Earl Sigurdr and King Olafr Tryggvason. This material is introduced in Chapter 2 and the implications of this for the dating of Manx and Northern Isles' chapel sites are considered in Chapter 3. The early Church in Man, for example, has been referred to a 5th century origin and a classification scheme for the Manx sites has been developed by some writers on the premise that the entire chronological period under review is represented in the visible archaeological record. In the Northern Isles, on the other hand, the historical evidence, particularly the evidence of Orkneyinga Saga, has been employed as a terminus post quem for the dating of Orcadian and Shetland chapel sites. Both these views are criticized and it is suggested that the Northern Isles' evidence, in particular, has prejudiced the case for the district chapels, the urisland chapels, as a pre-11th century and possibly as a pre-Norse phenomenon. In short, it is suggested that the surviving historical evidence for the Church in Man and the Northern Isles is only of a most general kind and that it provides only a basic framework for our understanding of the archaeological material.

The first part of Chapter 4 considers the few examples in Orkney where extant buildings have been dated very closely on the basis of the historical record. It is suggested that this might help in showing the kinds of ground-plan, door and entrance forms which were employed in buildings of certain periods and the assigned dates, if upheld, might then assist in the dating of

less well preserved sites. There are, however, few examples where this can be done. Moreover, it is shown that the closely dated churches in Orkney, each of which is associated with the earl or the bishop, are each in some way exotic and are hardly therefore representative of the lesser chapels in the islands.

The second part of Chapter 4 considers the problem of dating buildings by style, form or construction method. Dietrichson and Meyer's criteria for distinguishing pre-Norse and Norse foundations are introduced and criticized, as are other scholars' opinions as to the significance of drystone construction or buildings with short plan proportions. In conclusion, it is suggested that plan form is less an indicator of date, but rather is connected, in an unquantifiable way, with the question of function. This section also forms an introduction to Part 2 of Chapter 5 where proportional theories are considered in some detail in connexion with the corpus of Manx and Northern Isles' chapels.

The final section in Chapter 4 looks at the archaeological evidence for the dating of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels. Most of this is concerned with the relative dating of structures and their associated cemeteries. Artefactual evidence, which can be difficult to date and whose exact provenance is often unknown, is not therefore considered in this context. Several of the extant buildings, for example, are shown to postdate earlier cemeteries. The wall matrices of others retain evidence for earlier structures. This evidence has not previously been gathered together in this way and it provides a useful body of

information regarding the current state of the archaeological evidence for the dating of ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Isles and Man.

The purpose of Chapter 4 is thus to bring together all the available historical and archaeological evidence for the absolute or relative dating of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels. The Manx evidence suggests quite clearly that several of the extant keeills postdate their associated cemeteries but their absolute dating remains problematical. It is clear too that the dating of sites in Orkney, and particularly in Shetland, where there have been few excavations, is also fraught with difficulties. There are thus few guidelines for the dating of ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Isles and Man.

Chapter 5 is divided into three main sections. The first section presents data regarding the structural and formal characteristics of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels. The material is compared with each other and with other ecclesiastical buildings in the British Isles. A particularly detailed study is also made of the corpus of Manx altars, altar frontals and mensae. This material, which has not previously been brought together, almost certainly represents the largest corpus of altar fittings from any single region of the British Isles and an interesting form of relic altar is identified.

Part 1 of Chapter 5 thus provides the basic data for Part 2 which considers metrological and proportional theories of construction. This subject was briefly introduced in Chapter 4. However, detailed examination has been left to this chapter since it was considered necessary that the basic dimensional data for

the Manx and Northern Isles' sites be presented beforehand. This material is considered in terms of Aage Roussell's work on different foot measurements, Harold Leask's work on 3:2 and other building ratios, as well as other proportional theories. It was difficult, however, to generalize satisfactorily about the significance of this subject and indeed its application to the Manx and Northern Isles' material is considered questionable.

Ecclesiastical enclosure forms are considered in Part 3 of Chapter 5. The Manx material, together with a selected sample of data from Orkney and Shetland, is examined in a quantitative way and the small size of the sites is stressed. This quantitative approach, to the chapels as well as to the enclosures themselves, has not previously been adopted in earlier works on the Manx and Northern Isles' material. Curvilinear and rectilinear enclosure forms, and the debate which has ensued as to their significance, are also considered in this section. The influence of topography on form is also examined.

Other structures, aside from chapels, which are associated with chapel sites are also considered in this same section. The basic idea was to bring together all the references in the study area to examples of `special graves', slab- and corner-post shrines and leachta. This was done in view of Professor Thomas' ideas regarding the development of sites. It will be seen that the material assembled in this study represents very much a provisional corpus and it is one for which the archaeological evidence is often tenuous indeed. The stone from Greeba Mill, for example, may be part of a slab-shrine and it is somewhat

heartening that Dr. Ross Trench-Jellicoe's recent study of the Manx sculpture should have arrived at a similar conclusion. The other examples, however, are only vague possibilities. The evidence for the `special graves', on the other hand, is slightly better founded, although none of the examples has previously been recognized in this context. Meanwhile, the large cist-like structures from the 1930's excavations at Ronaldsway are interpreted by this study as leachta. These would be the only excavated examples known, aside from a rather poor and largely unpublished reference to one on the Brough of Birsay.

Chapter 5 thus concentrates on some of the ideas which form the basis of Charles Thomas' developed cemeteries model. This should be particularly apparent in Part 3 of this chapter. The earlier sections, although concerned primarily with the question of the size, appearance and mode of construction of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels, are also concerned indirectly with the same problem.

Chapter 6, which is divided up into seven parts, examines the relationship of the chapels to the land-divisions. The different land units in the islands are introduced and the means for their cartographical representaion are explained in Part 1. This same section also contains a detailed textual analysis of a 13th century boundary tract, the Limites seu divisiones terrarum monachorum de Russyn. The preliminary results of this study's work on this document suggest that the physical enclosure of the Manx estates may have occurred much earlier than has previously been thought.

Chapter 6 Part 2 considers the relationship of keeill and treen in the Isle of Man. Carl Marstrander's work on this subject is reviewed and although his general proposition that keeills and treens are linked is accepted, this study, nonetheless, suggests that the processes involved were far more complex and more dynamic than Marstrander allowed. This study, for example, proposes that a basic relative sequence in the formation of certain treens may be postulated on the basis of the rental, toponymic and topographical evidence. The Manx evidence is then considered from the point of view of an expanding land system which, over time, may have taken in sites, which originally may have had no association at all with settled or cultivated areas. This study would thus question the extent to which the Manx keeills necessarily form a homogenous group, a point which has been largely assumed by earlier writers on the subject.

Chapter 6 Part 3 considers the association of the Manx keeills with the treen boundaries. This was first noted by the present writer in an earlier work on the sites in Kirk Michael parish. Around half of all the Manx keeill sites are shown to have been located in close proximity to the treen boundaries and it is suggested that this association is significant. Comparative material from Ireland and elsewhere is considered in Part 4 and it is suggested that the association of ecclesiastical sites with boundaries may have been a feature of Early Christian organization. A theoretical model for the development of the Church in Man, based upon the ideas of boundary association and an expanding land system, is also presented in this section.

This theoretical Manx model, which might be regarded as a chronological tool, is then tested against the data from selected parishes and islands in Orkney and Shetland. The results of this are interpreted and then discussed in Chapter 6 Parts 5-7.

Aspects of continuity in the development of ecclesiastical sites are considered in Chapter 7. The chapter is divided up into 13 major sections. The Manx and Northern Isles' evidence for the association of ecclesiastical and pre-Christian funerary sites is first examined in some detail in Parts 1-8. This material is also looked at in conjunction with this study's ideas of boundary association. Conclusions, however, are necessarily tentative since much of the Manx and Northern Isles' data for the association of pre-Christian and Christian funerary sites is of a most unsatisfactory kind and interpretation is difficult. Nevertheless, it would seem that there are few examples of this phenomenon in Orkney and Shetland. Several examples are known from Man but the numbers are perhaps fewer than might have been thought. The significance of this association is also considered.

Chapter 7 Parts 9-12 examine the association of ecclesiastical sites with domestic Late Iron Age settlements. This phenomenon has been proposed by Dr. Lamb as a potentially important element in the continuity of ecclesiastical sites in the Early Christian and medieval periods. In essence, this model could be considered as an alternative to Thomas' developed cemetery model. The archaeological evidence for the association of ecclesiastical and Late Iron Age sites is thus brought

together for the first time in this study and discussed in some detail. The results of this are considered in Chapter 7 Part 13.

The final chapter, Chapter 8, summarizes the results of this study's work and indicates areas for future research.

Periodization

The term `Early Christian' is used in this work as a short-hand for denoting the period 5th - 9th centuries. This is synonymous with the term `early medieval' and is intended to encompass the period from the end of Roman Britain down to the period of the Viking raids and settlements. In parts of this study, particularly in sections which deal with Orkney and Shetland, this period might also be represented to some extent by the terms `Pictish' or `Late Iron Age'.

The term `medieval' is employed in this study in a special sense of referring to the period 10th - 13th centuries, whilst the 14th and 15th centuries are considered as the `Late Medieval' period. These are quite arbitrary divisions and are used only as a kind of chronological shorthand. The term `Post Medieval' is understood by this study to be synonymous with the historians' `Early Modern' period, that is to say the 16th and 17th centuries. `Modern' is to be understood as a reference to the 18th, 19th or 20th centuries.

In some instances, ethnic or cultural labels may be used in a chronological sense. The term `Pictish', for example, has been considered above. Other examples include `Viking' which, in both Man and the Northern Isles, is intended to cover the period 9th - 11th centuries, and the term `Late Norse'. This, in line with Bigelow's (1984a,69-141) work on the identification of Late Norse

artefacts and building forms, is intended to refer to the period 12th - 15th centuries.

Manx Crosses: A Note on the Standard Reference System

References to the corpus of Manx crosses are provided using a generally accepted numerical format such as, for example, 29(34). The first number in the sequence is the Manx Museum catalogue number. The second number, in brackets, refers to Kermode's number sequence in his 1907 work Manx Crosses. Stones found since 1907 will not, of course, have a second number, such as for example, 5(-).

Dates of Composition

Work on this study began in October 1981. The basic outline of this study and its content was worked out over the period 1981/82. The majority of the fieldwork which is reported in this work was undertaken in 1982 and 1983 and was written up in a first draft over the Winters of 1982/83 and 1983/84. Chapters 2-5, together with a redraft of the completed gazetteer and the introductory survey notes in Volume 2, were written in 1983 and 1984. Chapters 6 and 7 were written in 1985 and 1986. The writing of Chapters 1 and 8, together with minor re-drafts and editing, was undertaken in 1987.

The writer's commitment to the Kebister (Shetland) Project since Easter 1985 has necessarily delayed the production of this thesis. This has also meant that the bibliography is only up to date as far as 1985. There are, however, one or two instances where later works have been cited.

CHAPTER 2

A REVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE EARLY CHURCH IN THE NORTHERN ISLES AND ISLE OF MAN

(i) Introduction

This chapter examines the historical evidence for the development of the Church in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man, from the introduction of Christianity into these islands down to the 12th and 13th centuries, by which time a regular parochial system of ecclesiastical organization had been established. A purely historical study of the Early Christian Church in these islands in this period is, however, impaired by the very paucity of the surviving documentary evidence. This has several implications for any assessment of the archaeological data and some of these are examined in Chapter 3.

The historical sources which relate to the early, pre-Norse, Church in these islands amount to two or three Saint's Lives, a geographical treatise and a late Scandinavian history. The history of the later, Norse, Church is somewhat better recorded and sources as diverse as Icelandic saga material, histories, chronicles, charters and other miscellaneous records all bear some relevance to this issue. A continuous historical narrative for the development of the Church in the Northern Isles and Man cannot, however, be constructed on the basis of these documents. This evidence is now examined. Translations of quotations used are supplied in a note at the end of the chapter (pp.38-42).

(ii) The pre-Norse Church in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man

This section examines the historical evidence for the origins and development of the Church in these islands in the period prior to the Viking settlement.

The earliest ecclesiastical references to the northern isles of Britain are of Irish origin. Dr. Radford (1983,14) has recently drawn attention to a passage from the Life of St. Ailbe, an early 6th century bishop of Emly who,

> "volens fugere homines...ad insulam Tile in occiano positam navigare decrevit, ut ibi viveret Deo secrete solus"
>
> Vita Sancti Albei cap.xli: Plummer 1910,61

Radford (1983,14) has identified Thule with Shetland and has claimed this as "the first Christian reference to the northern isles of Britain." The date of this Life, however, is uncertain. Plummer (1910,xc), in his discussion of Irish Saints' Lives, has, for example, remarked that none, in their present form, is very ancient. The period of the Norman settlement in Ireland in the 12th century and the reform of the monasteries has been suggested as a likely context for their compilation (Plummer 1910,xc). It is, however, conceded that such works may have incorporated other, perhaps much earlier material. We have no means of assessing, therefore, the historicity of Ailbe's voyage "ad insulam Tile".

The earliest Christian source which refers directly and unequivocably to the Northern Isles is found in Adamnan's Vita Sancti Columbae, a Latin Life which was probably composed at Iona in the period 688 X 692 (Anderson & Anderson 1961,96). In the second book of this Life, a section which is concerned with

illustrating the saint's `miracles of power' and `prophetic foreknowledge', we are reintroduced to Cormac ua Liathain, `a soldier of Christ' and to the events behind his second attempt to find `a desert place in the ocean' (herimum in ociano). At the same time as Cormac was travelling in the northern seas, we are told that Columba, in the presence of an Orcadian sub-king or `regulus', requested the help and favour of the Pictish king, Brude mac Maelchon, informing him that:

> "`Aliqui ex nostris nuper emigraverunt, desertum in pilago intransmeabili invenire obtantes. Qui si forte post longos circuitus Orcadas devenerint insulas, huic regulo cuius obsedes in manu tua sunt deligenter commenda, ne aliquid adversi intra terminos eius contra eos fiat.' Hoc vero sanctus ita dicebat quia in spiritu praecognovit quod post aliquot menses idem Cormaccus esset ad Orcadas venturus. Quod ita postea evenit. Et propter supradictam sancti viri commendationem de morte in Orcadibus liberatus est vicina"
>
> Vita Sancti Columbae II 42

This event is usually attributed to the period around the last quarter of the 6th century (Wainwright 1962a,112: Radford 1983,14) and whilst it is not specifically stated, it is, nevertheless, implied that Orkney was still pagan at that time. Wainwright (1962a,112) considered it likely that ecclesiastical missions would have quickly followed upon this visit and he has suggested that the general conversion of the Northern Isles is likely to have been effected before the end of the 6th century. This seems, however, to be a decidedly optimistic estimate and one that is difficult to substantiate in the absence of other, confirmatory, evidence.

Adamnan's Life of Columba is clearly an important source for the early ecclesiastical history of the Northern Isles, if only by virtue of the fact that it represents the earliest direct allusion to this region. The Life provides our earliest historically derived context for the general introduction of Christianity in the Northern Isles.

It is perhaps significant that a single common theme should link those Irish sources which impinge upon the early ecclesiastical history of the Northern Isles. These sources each reflect the idea of peregrinatio, the ascetic ideal of withdrawal from the world (Appendix 3). It is reflected in the Life of St. Ailbe and appears clearly in Adamnan's Life of St. Columba in the voyages of Cormac and Baitán. It is also apparent in a third important early Irish source, Dicuil's Liber de mensura orbis terrae.

Dicuil was an Irish monk, writing on the continent in the first quarter of the 9th century. The Liber de mensura was written, according to Dicuil himself, in 825 (Book IX.13: Tierney 1967,102-103). This established date serves as an important chronological marker to the events described within the text of that work.

The Liber de mensura is divided into nine books, the seventh of which contains a compendium of information on certain islands. In Book VII.6 Dicuil refers to those islands which lay off the coast of his own country, Ireland, and he goes on to note that many others were to be found along the coasts of Britain. Some, he knew, lay to the south and west of Britain, although he was well aware that most were situated off the north and north-west

coasts. His sources for this information are clearly stated:

> "In aliquibus ipsarum habitavi, alias intravi, alias tantum vidi, alias legit."
>
> Liber de mensura orbis terrae VII.6

This section, as Tierney (1967,114) has rightly pointed out, is among the most original part of Dicuil's work. It must be considered all the more unfortunate, therefore, that Dicuil does not specify which islands he had lived in and which he had only visited, seen or read about. Although Tierney (1967,114) and Zimmer (1891,288) understood him to be referring to the Hebrides and Orkney as among his places of sojourn, nevertheless, the ambiguity of Dicuil's statement should at least be realized. The sentence, "in aliquibus ipsarum habitavi", could, after all, refer as much to those islands to the south and west of Britain as to the Hebridean and Orcadian groups. It may even, of course, have referred to those islands off the coast of Ireland. This problem of identification cannot be settled. The importance of of this section of Dicuil's work lies less in the specific, than in the general evidence that it provides for the concept of seaborne Christian activity in the North Atlantic province.

Neither Orkney nor Shetland is directly referred to by name by Dicuil. The Northern Isles, however, would appear to have acted as jumping-off points for the ecclesiastical settlement of a group of islands which have been identified with Faroe. These islands were known to be two days and nights sail north of the northern islands of Britain. The `devout priest', who was to be Dicuil's informant on this matter, managed to land on one of these, sailing thence in a two-benched boat:

"Sunt aliae insulae multae in septentrionali Brittaniae oceano quae a septrionalibus Brittaniae insulis duorum dierum ac noctium recta navigatione plenis velis assiduo feliciter vento adiri quaeunt. Aliquis presbyter religiosus mihi retulit quod in duobus aestiuis diebus et una intercedente nocte navigans in duorum navicula transtrorum in unam illam introivit."

Liber de mensura orbis terrae VII.14

A further group of islands is also referred to in a subsequent section :

> "Illae insulae sunt aliae parvulae, fere cunctae simul angustis distantes fretis; in quibus in centum ferme annis heremitae ex nostra Scottia navigantes habitaverunt. Sed sicut a principio mundi desertae semper fuerunt ita nunc causa latronum Normannorum vacuae anchoritis plenae innumerabilibus ovibus ac diversis generibus multis nimis marinarum avium. Numquam eas insulas in libris auctorum memoratas invenimus."

Liber de mensura orbis terrae VII.15

The identification of these island groups has given rise to much academic discussion (Zimmer 1891,289: Wainwright 1962b,131: Dahl 1970,62: Lamb 1973a,186: Radford 1983,14). This problem of identification, however, is compounded by the fact that Dicuil, whilst appearing to describe the same island group in each section, nevertheless refers to those in Book VII.15 as "another set of small islands" (my emphasis).

It is fairly clear that Faroe is to be identified with those islands referred to in Book VII.15, where, Dicuil tells us, a group of Irish hermits had been established since at least the second quarter of the 8th century. This identification is based primarily upon the evidence of the prior deserted nature of those islands. Dicuil´s remark concerning the many sheep on the

islands, when taken in conjunction with the derivation of the place-name `Faroe´ from the Old Norse Faereyjar, meaning `Sheep Islands´, is also suggestive of this identification.

The islands to which Dicuil refers in Book VII.14 have also been identified with Faroe and works of modern synthesis have invariably conflated the textual evidence of Books VII.14 and VII.15 (Wainwright 1962b,131: Radford 1983,14). This identification cannot, however, be upheld on the basis of the documentary evidence and if this is accepted then Shetland, as Lamb (1973a,186) has suggested, may well have been intended for those islands which were visited by Dicuil´s `presbyter religiosus´. These islands were reached from another set of islands which lay to the south and if Shetland is to be identified with the former, then Orkney suggests itself as the latter insular group. Lamb (1973a,186) has, however, pointed out that the voyage from Orkney to Shetland would scarcely merit the 48 hour passage recorded by Dicuil. This does not, however, seem to be a particularly excessive estimate and it should be remarked, after all, that Dicuil´s informant is said to have completed the journey within two days and the single intervening night. It is suggested, therefore, that Book VII.14 of Dicuil´s Liber de mensura orbis terrae may refer, albeit perhaps obliquely, to the establishment of eremitical groups or individuals on Orkney and Shetland in the late 8th and early 9th centuries.

Dicuil's account is, to a certain extent, confirmed by a much later, Scandinavian record, the Historia Norvegiae. This work survives only in a single manuscript in the Panmure Codex and is thought to have been transcribed in Orkney in the mid 15th century. The original document is generally considered, on the basis of internal evidence, to have been compiled in c.1200 (Steinnes 1948,2-7). The Historia records that prior to the Viking settlement, Orkney was inhabited by two groups of people whom it knew as `Peti' and `Papae' (ON.papi, monk, hermit, priest). Both groups were believed to have been deprived of their land by Scandinavian pirates in the time of Harald Finehair. The papae were identified by their white robes, and on account of their dress and books were regarded by the Historia (Storm 1880,89) as "Africani....judaismo adhaerentes". This is a very curious description and one which may reflect an unorthodoxy and perhaps some connexion with the Celtic Church. Interpretation, however, is difficult. The papae are generally identified as Irish - Scottish anchorites (Bowen 1972,91: MacDonald 1977,107,109: Marcus 1980,22). The evidence of the place-name element papa is not, however, wholly favourable to this interpretation. This is discussed elsewhere (Appendix 4).

The earliest ecclesiastical references to the Northern Isles are of Irish origin and insofar as any reference is made to these northern island groups, the context suggested thereby is set firmly in the anchorite or eremitical tradition of the Early Christian Church. A very different state of affairs is suggested by the earliest documentary evidence for the development of the Church on the Isle of Man.

The early ecclesiastical history of the Isle of Man is poorly documented and such evidence as has survived is comparatively late. None in fact is earlier than the 12th century and much is considerably later. The 12th century Life of St. Patrick by Jocelin of Furness does, however, require that some assessment be made of the earlier Vita Sancti Patrici by the Irish monk, Muirchu. This late 7th century Life, however, hardly merits comparison, for what it may tell us of the Early Church in Man with either Adamnan's Vita Sancti Columbae or Dicuil's Liber de mensura orbis terrae and what those sources may tell us of the Early Church in the Northern Isles. If it is difficult to establish an ecclesiastical historical framework for Orkney and Shetland on the basis of these latter two sources, although an eremitical context may be suggested, it is nonetheless infinitely more difficult to construct a viable historical outline for Man on the basis of a document which, in all likelihood, did not even originally refer to the island. The relationship of these Patrician texts is examined below (pp.21-23).

Traditionally, the Isle of Man owes its conversion to St. Patrick. This view is expressed in the 16th century Traditionary Ballad and is still to be found in popular accounts of the island (Cubbon 1952). This same tradition is also encountered in the `Bishops List', a document now appended to the 13th century Cronica regum mannie et insularum, and may ultimately be traced to a Life of St. Patrick which was written in c.1185 by Jocelin, a Cistercian monk at Furness abbey. This late 12th century Life represents the earliest documentary

account to identify St. Patrick with the introduction of Christianity to Man. A 5th century historical context would therefore be suggested and the type of organizational hierarchy thus implied would be one of sub-Roman origin. An uncritical acceptance of this model may have several implications for the archaeological data. Some of these are explored in Chapter 3.

In Jocelin's Life of St. Patrick we are told that:

> "Renavigas Hibernia ad insulas maris covertendas divertit e quibus Euboniam, id est, Manniam, tunc quidem Brittaniae subiectam salutari praedicatione, ac signorum exhibitione ad Christum convertit."
>
> Vita Sancti Patricii Iocelini monarchi de Furnesio cap. XCII

and later in the same chapter we read of St. Patrick's appointment of Germanus as the island's first bishop:

> "Quedam discipulorum S. Patricii virum sanctum et sapientem, Germanum nominatum, in Episcopum promotum, illius gentis Ecclesiae novellae regentem praepsuit, et in quodam promotorio, quod adhuc insula Patricii dicitur, et Episcopale sedem posuit."
>
> Vita Sancti Patricii Iocelini monarchi de Furnesio cap. XCII

This information, which is concerned with establishing a direct association between St. Patrick and Man, and with relating Germanus' episcopal appointment, is not to be found in any other Patrician document. Certain parts of Jocelin's Life are, however, recorded in the earlier Life of St. Patrick by Muirchu.

The tale of the `cruel tyrant', whom Muirchu knew as Macuil Maccugreccae and who was known to Jocelin as Maguil or Machaldus is common to both accounts. The `cruel tyrant' and his companions were ultimately converted by St. Patrick and as a

penance Macuil agreed to be shackled and set adrift in 'a hide boat (Muirchu's Vita Sancti Patrici,cap.XXIII: Jocelin cap.CLII). Muirchu tells us that Macuil sailed south from near `Magh Inis' and both accounts agree on his being cast up on a certain island called Evonia or Eubonia:

> "Invenitque ibi duos viros valde mirabiles, in fide et doctrina fulgentes, qui primi docerunt verbum Dei et babtismum in Evonia, et conversi sunt homines insolae in doctrina eorum ad fidem catholicam, quorum nomina sunt Conindri et Rumili....ad regulam eorum corpus et anima exercuit, et totum vitae tempus exegit apud istos duos sanctos episcopos usque dum successor eorum in episcopatu effectus est. Hic est Maccuil diMane episcopus et antestes Arddae Huimnon."
>
> Muirchu's Vita Sancti Patrici cap. XXIII

Jocelin's account is similar. It differs, however, insofar as he is forced to accommodate Germanus into the episcopal succession. Jocelin is compelled not only to identify Eubonia with the Isle of Man but also to establish a Patrician context for the appointment of Conindrius and Romulus:

> "(Machaldus)....ac eo gubernante ad insulam Euboniam, quae Mannia dicitur, applacuit. Erant enim ibi duo Episcopi Sancti Connidrius et Romulus vocati, quos ipse Patricius consecraverat et illuc destinaverat, ad populum Insulae illius regendum et erudiendum in fide Christi post obitum Sancti Germani primi eiusdem Insulae Episcopi."
>
> Vita Sancti Patricii Iocelini monarchi de Furnesio cap. CLII

Jocelin's account continues with the story of Machaldus' succession to the episcopate after the deaths of Conindrius and Romulus and goes on to relate an important account of the cemetery at Maughold.

Jocelin's account of St. Patrick and the Isle of Man appears to draw upon three very different sources. The information concerning the cemetery at Maughold (Megaw 1950) appears to have been based on a contemporary report and may even represent a first-hand knowledge of the site. The central part of Jocelin's account, concerning the story of Maguil / Machaldus, is clearly derived from Muirchui's Life. It is equally clear that Jocelin's additions and alterations to this section, based on information that was probably derived from an early version of the Traditionary Ballad (see below pp.24-25), were necessitated by the need to accommodate therein his earlier references to St. Patrick's appointment of Germanus as the first bishop on the island. It should be noted that Muirchu believed that Conindrius and Romulus were the first to preach on Evonia. Jocelin, therefore, had little choice but to give the weight of Patrician authority not only to Germanus' appointment but also to those of Conindrius and Romulus.

The fundamental problem which is raised by Jocelin's account concerns his dual identification of Macuil with Machaldus and Eubonia with the Isle of Man.

J.B Bury (1905,267) has dismissed the story of Macuil as a pagan folk tale which was originally unconnected with the Patrician cycle. It may also be significant, as Basil Megaw (1950,176) has pointed out, that the names Macuil and Machaldus do not appear to be philogically related. The identification of Muirchu's Evonia with Man is also suspect and, indeed, one text of Muirchu's Life, the Novara 77 MS, simply refers to Macuil's adopted island as "a certain island" ("in quandam insulam":

Bieler 1950,199). The identification therefore is uncertain. Indeed, Megaw (1950,176) has commented that Evonia appears to have been an expression for an indefinite geographical area, with a concomitant sense of referring to a `Celtic Otherworld´. In short, Jocelin´s account of St. Patrick and the Isle of Man appears to be largely syncretistic and as such this late 12th century document can hardly be taken as evidence for 5th century Christianity on Man.

The 16th century Manx Traditionary Ballad repeats much of the information concerning St. Patrick that is to be found in Jocelin´s Life. The relationship of these texts and a third postulated account, the so-called `Manx episcopal legend´, has been examined by Megaw (1964,188-190). This latter document is believed to have been the source which was used by both Jocelin and the compiler of the Ballad. Interestingly, Megaw (1964,190) has suggested that the `Manx episcopal legend´ may well have been devised as a result of Jocelin´s request for Manx materials for his Life of St. Patrick.

The Traditionary Ballad is a late document, founded in part on Jocelin´s Life and/or on the postulated `episcopal legend´. It contains a certain amount of unique information, which, if Megaw is right, may have been contained in the `legend´. Its account of St. German, to whom it accredits the establishment of a kind of `proto-parochial´ form of ecclesiastical organization, is particularly interesting:

"Ayns dagh treen Balley ren eh unnane
Da´n Sleih shen-ayn dy heet dy ghuee"

Manx Traditionary Ballad cap.XIV: Thomson 1961,536

Meanwhile, the establishment of a regular parochial system, is identified as the work of St. German´s successor, St. Maughold:

"Ny Cabballyn doardee Karmane noo
Da´n Sleih shen-ayn dy heet dy ghuee
Hug Maughold shiartanse jeu ayns Unnane
As myr shen ren eh Skeeraghyn cooie"

Manx Traditionary Ballad cap. XVIII: Thomson 1961,539

These traditional accounts and particularly the first, which undoubtedly reflects the relationship of keeill and treen, are unique to this ballad. The association of keeill and treen is discussed in detail in Chapter 6.

The pre-Norse Church in Man is not recorded historically in contemporary accounts. Nevertheless, it is clear that certain oral ecclesiastical traditions were circulating on the island in the 13th century and were available to the principal compiler of the Cronica. It is quite possible that these may have derived from or, alternatively, been based on the postulated `Manx episcopal legend´. It is, however, clear that such popular accounts were not included in the Cronica on account, we are told, of their doubtful historicity. The Cronica acknowledges the existence of neither Germanus, nor Conindrius, nor Romulus. Rather, it repeats the traditional account of "blessed Patrick, who it is said, was the first to preach the catholic faith to the Manxmen." (Cronica, f.50v). The monastic chronicler considered it `sufficient´ to begin this version of the Manx episcopal succession in c.1050 with Bishop Roolwer:

> "Sufficit dicimus quia qui vel quales ante ipsum episcopi extiterint penitus ignoramus, quia nec scriptum invenimus nec certa relatione seniorum didicimus."
>
> Cronica regum mannie et insularum f.50v. (my emphasis)

An historical study of the pre-Norse Church in Man is impaired, both then as now, by the lack of documentary evidence.

There are great differences in quality between those sources which describe the Early Church in the Northern Isles and those which purport to describe the origins and development of the Early Church in Man. The essential difference lies in the fact that whilst the evidence for the former appears to be historically founded, that for the latter is almost certainly contrived and based rather on traditional belief.

(iii) The Norse Church in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man

The traditional account of the conversion of the Northern Isles is recorded in a number of Icelandic sources. In Orkneyinga Saga, the enforced conversion of Earl Sigurdr at the hands of Olafr Tryggvason, King of Norway, at Osmundwall in c.995 is recorded thus:

> "Óláfr lét kalla jarl á skip sitt ok kvask vildu tala við hann; ok er þeir fundusk, maelti Óláfr til hans: `Þat er minn vili, at þú látir skírask ok allt þat fólk, er þér þjónar, ella skalt þú deyja hér þegar í stað, en ek mun fara með eld ok usla yfir allar Eyjar.´ En er jarl sá, hversu hann var við kominn, gaf hann allt sitt mál í konungs vald."
>
> Orkneyinga Saga cap.XII

A substantially similar account is to be found in Snorre Sturlason´s Heimskringla (Olafs Saga Tryggvasonar cap.XLVII). A slightly different and more informative version, however, has

been preserved in the Flateyiarbók version of Olafs Saga Tryggvasonar. This records the tradition that on his departure from Orkney, Olaf left behind a number of priests:

> "Því naest sigldi Ólafr konungr burt af Orkneyjum, en setti þar eftir presta at siða fólkit ok kenna þeim heilög fraeði."
>
> Flateyiarbók I,187

Some additional information with regard to the traditional account of the conversion of the Northern Isles is also preserved in Brennu-Njals Saga (cap.C) where it is said that Shetland and Faroe too were also converted at this time.

These late 12th, 13th and 14th century Icelandic sources are of dubious historical value, at least with regard to the introduction and establishment of Christianity in the Northern Isles. These records, it seems, have preserved a traditional, as opposed to an historical, account of the conversion. As Wainwright (1962b,159) has remarked: "it is more than doubtful if the encounter at Osmundwall can be taken to mark the introduction of Christianity to the Scandinavians of the Northern Isles." However, the saga accounts are preceded by sources of a more substantive nature.

The later ecclesiastical history of Orkney is, relatively speaking, well documented and a virtually continuous historical narrative for much of the 11th and 12th centuries may be constructed from sources of German, English, Papal and Icelandic origin.

Adam of Bremen's Gesta hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum, written in c.1072 X 1076 and later revised in c.1076 X 1085 (Tschan 1959,xvi), is an invaluable and virtually contemporary

record for the development of the Church in Orkney for the period c.1035-c.1072. The Church at Hamburg-Bremen under Archbishop Adalbert (1042-1072) had become, Adam tells us, "like Rome, known far and wide and was devoutly sought from all parts of the world" (Gesta III,23). There is an undoubted propagandist element in Adam's Gesta. Nevertheless, we are told that legates with requests for priests came from Iceland, Greenland and Orkney (Gesta III,23) and this may possibly be reflected in the Orkneyinga Saga (cap.XXXI) account of Earl Thorfinn's journey to Rome via Denmark and Germany in c.1050. Barbara Crawford (1983,103) has recently drawn attention to this episode and has remarked on the possibility that Earl Thorfinn may have been the legate referred to by Adam. There is thus the suggestion that the evidence of Orkneyinga Saga may corroborate that of Adam's Gesta. Nevertheless there are certain inconsistencies in this latter work, not least among which must be counted that which accredits the conversion of Orkney to the policies and influence of Adalbert and the Church of Hamburg-Bremen (Gesta III,72). This notion is advanced in spite of the fact that elsewhere (Gesta IV,34), Orkney is reputed to have been administered prior to 1042 by a series of English and Scottish bishops. Very little indeed is known about these early 11th, and possibly pre-11th century bishops. Only one of them is known to us by name. This is Heinricus, a treasurer to king Cnut in England, whose appointment to the Orcadian see can be attributed, on the basis of his association with Cnut, to the period prior to 1035 (Gesta IV,8). This appointment is suggestive of Cnut's wide-

ranging power over the northern world at that time and as Crawford (1983,105-106) has also suggested, Heinricus is almost certain to have been a York appointee. York candidates are known from later in the century (see below p.30). They are preceded, however, by three appointees from Hamburg-Bremen. These appointments would apparently date to the period c.1050-1072, that is between the time of Earl Thorfinn's continental journey and the date of Archbishop Adalbert's death:

> "Praeterea Thurolfum quendam posuit ad Orchadas. Illuc etiam misit Iohannem in Scotia ordinatum et alium quendam Adalbertum, cognominem suum."
>
> Gesta hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum III,77

The appointment of Thurolf or Turolf is also recorded in a subsequent section:

> "Ad easdem insulas Orchadas, quamvis prius ab Anglorum et Scothorum episcopis regerentur, noster primas iussu papae ordinavit Turolfum episcopum in civitatem Blasconam, qui omnium curas ageret."
>
> Gesta hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum IV,34

and it is tempting to equate this record with the passage from Orkneyinga Saga which records the establishment by Earl Thorfinn of the first bishop's seat at Birsay:

> "Hann sat jafnan í Byrgisheraði ok lét þar gera Kristskirkju, dýrligt musteri; þar var fyrst settr byskupsstóll í Orkneyjum."
>
> Orkneyinga Saga cap.XXXI

An ecclesiastical history of sorts, for the period c.1035-c.1072 may be gleaned from Adam of Bremen's Gesta but after this date we must turn to those records which emanated from the archepiscopal chancery at York. The northern English see of York had claimed authority over all episcopal appointments in Scotland

and Crawford (1983,105) has even suggested that "Yórk had probably appointed bishops in Orkney long before the Viking Age". Adam of Bremen, at any rate, tells us that Scottish and English bishops had been appointed to the islands prior to 1042 (Gesta IV,34) and Bishop Heinricus is thought to have been among these early York appointees. A further series of York appointments is evident from 1073. In that year in a letter from Archbishop Thomas of York to Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury (Haddan & Stubbs 1873,II,i,162), we are told that the Orkney earl, Earl Paul Thorfinsson, had sent a certain Radulv or Ralph to be consecrated by the northern English metropolitan. In c.1101, Gerard, Archbishop of York, had consecrated Roger, a monk of Whitby, as bishop for Orkney (Haddan & Stubbs 1873,II,i,167). This event is also recorded in Papal documents (Brøgger 1929,165), whilst a third appointee, Ralph Novell was elected by "the men of the Orkneys" at York in 1109 X 1114 and consecrated by Archbishop Thomas II (Haddan & Stubbs 1873,II,i,190). This appointment was confirmed by Pope Calixtus II in 1119 (Haddan & Stubbs 1873,II,i,196) in a letter in which the Norwegian kings Eystein and Sigurd were requested to defend the bishop of Orkney and to ensure his possession of the bishopric. This matter had obviously not been resolved when Pope Honorius, in 1125, felt it necessary to call upon the king of Norway to protect Ralph against a certain intruder (Haddan & Stubbs 1873,II,i,212). This intruder in the see is almost certainly to be identified with Bishop William the Old, the man who is generally remembered in northern secular and ecclesiastical

tradition as the first bishop in Orkney (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LII: Taylor 1938,213: Crawford 1983,108).

This late evidence from the archepiscopal chancery at York, in describing characters and events which can be confirmed by contemporary papal accounts, is an important and much underrated source for the history of the early bishopric in Orkney. It has often been assumed that these York appointments were merely nominal. Crawford (1983,106-108), however, has suggested that these York appointments were established in opposition to a series of rival appointments from Hamburg-Bremen and elsewhere. Furthermore, she has suggested that this ecclesiastical rivalry may have been connected with the interests of the political factions which existed in Orkney in the late 11th and early 12th centuries. The political crisis which was exacerbated by the rival claims of the cousins Hakon Paulsson and Magnus Erlendsson and which culminated in the murder of the latter in c.1117 (Orkneyinga Saga, cap.XLVI-L) may be reflected, albeit in a less dramatic way, in the rivalry which was to exist as a result of the contemporary appointments of bishops Roger and Ralph Novell (c.1102-c.1109 and c.1109 X 1114-1125) and Bishop William the Old (c.1102-1168).

These ecclesiastical disputes are nowhere related in Orkneyinga Saga. We are told that Earl Thorfinn "built and dedicated to Christ a fine minster, the seat of the first bishop of Orkney" (cap.XXXI). This event may be dated to the mid 11th century but we are also told elsewhere that William, appointed in c.1102, was the first bishop in Orkney:

> "Í þenna tíma var Vilhjálmr byskup í Orkneyjum; hann var þar fyrstr byskup. Þá var byskupsstóll at Kristskirkju í Byrgisherað."
>
> Orkneyinga Saga cap.LII

The basic inconsistency, which this textual juxtaposition makes clear, has not previously been considered. The first quotation may, of course, contain an anachronism, but, if not, it may reflect the saga writer's preoccupation with establishing a thoroughly Norse milieu for Orcadian events.

An outline framework of the later ecclesiastical history of Orkney in the 11th and 12th centuries may be constructed on the basis of a variety of historical sources. Historical evidence becomes more extensive and, moreover, it becomes corroborative. Adam of Bremen's Gesta acts as supporting evidence to certain sections of Orkneyinga Saga, which is itself, elsewhere, supported by papal archive records. These records, in turn, agree well with the evidence from the archepiscopal chancery at York.

The later, Norse, Church in the Isle of Man is known to us primarily through the documentary evidence of the Cronica regum mannie et insularum. This work may be largely attributed to the latter half of the 13th century (Broderick 1979,introduction). The `Bishops' List', which is contained therein, forms an important source for the later Church history of the island. It not only provides a coherent succession of named characters from the mid 11th century, with additions, down to 1376, but it also alludes indirectly to the development of the Church in terms of its internal organization, for which corroborative evidence can be found within the main body of the Cronica itself.

The establishment of a diocesan framework of organization and the spread of Roman forms of ritual and administration are generally accredited to the comparatively long and stable reign of Olafr Godredsson (1102 X 1113-1153). The establishment of such an organization is clearly reflected in the Cronica's account of bishop Reginald, "a Norwegian by birth" who, we are told, "was the first to receive the thirds of the churches of Man from their incumbents, so that from that time on they could be free from all episcopal demands" (Cronica f.50v.). Reginald's appointment would probably date to the third or fourth decade of the 12th century.

Olafr Godredsson, in spite of his "domestic vices", was nevertheless considered to be "devout and enthusiastic in matters of religion" (Cronica sa.1134 f.35v.). Olafr certainly granted lands and privileges to the Church of the Isles, Ecclesia Insularum or Ecclesia Sodorensis, the latter title being the Latin form of the Norse name for Man and the Hebrides, the Suðreyjar or `Southern Isles'. In 1134 Olafr provided for the foundation of an abbey at Rushen (Cronica sa.1134 f.35v.). The Cistercian house of St. Mary's at Furness not only supplied the actual incumbents for this foundation but was also intimately involved with overseeing the Manx episcopal electoral procedure. These rights were conferred by Olafr Godredsson in the foundation charter of 1134:

"commisi et imperpetuum concessi ecclesie Sancte Marie de Furnesio, propter loci confinium immo pro bona vita inhabitantium ipsius, episcopalis electionis dignitatem sed et totius juris mei Christianitatis observantiam, salva semper sedis apostolice reverentia."

Coucher Book of Furness Abbey II,iii,708

One purpose of this action was to ensure:

"...ut in regno meo Christiana religio a suo potius episcopo in unum conservatur quam sub advenis et tanquam mercennariis, sua quippe et non Domini querentibus, divisa desoletur."

Coucher Book of Furness Abbey II,iii,708

The Manx kings, like the earls of Orkney, clearly considered control of the episcopal succession to be an important issue. This is made especially clear in 1247 when, after the death of Bishop Simon, a certain Laurence, with the approval of "the entire chapter of Man", immediately set out for Norway to present himself to King Harald Olafsson and the archbishop of Nidaros-Trondheim, "by whom he had to be consecrated" (Cronica sa.1247 f.46v.). The Manx king, however, declined to agree to his appointment on account of some electoral irregularity. The bishop-elect would have to return to Man and be elected in the king´s presence by the entire clergy and people:

"Quo mortuo communi consilio et assensu totius mannensis capituli laurentius quidam qui tunc archidiaconus fuit in mannia in episcopatum electus est. Qui statim ad norwegiam profectus est, ut se haraldo regi et nidrosensi archiepiscopo a quo consecrari debuerat presentaret. Sed haraldus propter quasdam litteras que contra illum de mannia transmisse fuerant, nullatenus electioni eius assensum prebere voluit donec iterum cum ipso rediret ad manniam et ipso presente ab omni clero et populo eligeretur."

Cronica regum mannie et insularum f.46v.

The king, the bishop-elect and the entire crew were, however, drowned when they were ship-wrecked off the coast of Shetland.

The Manx Church, like that in Orkney and Shetland, formed, from 1154, part of the Norwegian archdiocese of Nidaros-Trondheim. This ecclesiastical connexion was to last down to the 15th century in spite of the political secession of the kingdom of Man and the Isles to Scotland after the Treaty of Perth in 1266. Episcopal appointments could, however, be ratified on occasions by the metropolitan authorities of York and even Dublin. In a letter of 1244, Pope Innocent IV directed the archbishop of York to consecrate any suitable candidate presented by the monks of Furness on account of the fact the "the Church of Nidaros is very remote from the Church of Man and separated from it by a most dangerous sea" (Manx Society XXIII,19). Earlier in 1219, Pope Honorius III had instructed the consecration of the new bishop to be undertaken by the archbishop of Dublin, whom he called "metropolitanum loci" (Manx Society XXIII,11). These measures seem to have been undertaken solely as a matter of convenience. There is no evidence of a political or ecclesiastical rivalry such as permeated Orcadian society and the development of the Church there in the late 11th and early 12th centuries.

An outline framework of the later ecclesiastical history of the Church in the Isle of Man from the mid 11th century onwards may be constructed from a variety of historical sources. These records clearly describe a Church which was episcopally governed and diocesanly organized.

(iv) Conclusions & Summary

It is perhaps surprising that the early ecclesiastical history of the Northern Isles should be better documented than that of the Isle of Man for the same period. In part, this may be due to the differential survival of historical documentation. Nevertheless, the imbalance which exists in the historical record with regard to the Early Church in the Northern Isles, on the one hand, and that in Man on the other, may be due to other factors. This imbalance, for example, is not only reflected in the relative quantity and quality of that evidence, but also, and perhaps significantly, in the geographical range of that material. Sources of Irish, German, Scandinavian, Icelandic and papal origin all impinge to some extent upon the early ecclesiastical history of the Northern Isles. The provenance of these sources reflects those areas which, at different times, had some interest in and influence on the development of the northern Church. The Manx material, on the other hand, is markedly less cosmopolitan. It might be inferred, therefore, that the Northern Isles were more centrally-placed within the mainstream of European politics at this time. The Isle of Man, on the contrary, would appear to have been of a peripheral concern within an overall European context. This is an interesting paradox and one that would not have been expected on a priori geographical grounds.

The later Church in both the Northern Isles and Man was ordered on the Roman model. This is made explicit in the case of the Manx Church and there this process of reform may be attributed to the first half of the 12th century. The

establishment of a parochial system of ecclesiastical organization in Orkney is not referred to in the historical record. It is assumed, however, to be a feature of the late 12th or early 13th century (Clouston 1932a,155-156).

The relationship of the later, Norse, Church to the earlier, pre-Norse, Church in these islands is not referred to in the historical record. There are significant caesurae in the northern documentary record for the 7th, much of the 8th and 9th, and the 10th centuries. In Man the position is even more critical with a complete absence of historical documentation for the period before the mid 11th century.

The evidence of Jocelin and the Traditionary Ballad may provide an historical context for the early development of the Church in Man. These works, however, reflect the events of the 12th, rather than those of the 5th century. The establishment of St. Patrick as the central figure of the Manx ecclesiastical tradition should rather be seen as an attempt to assert a most ancient authority for the contemporary ecclesiastical reforms of the 12th century. The evidence of Adamnan and Dicuil may also provide an historical context for the early development of the Church in the Northern Isles. An eremitical context would seem to be implied by those sources. The archaeological sites which may represent an expression of this activity have been examined by Raymond Lamb (1973a; 1973b; 1976) and are not considered in this study. The relationship of these eremitical monastic sites to the early chapels is uncertain.

The documentary evidence does not, in short, adequately reflect the archaeological data with which this present study is concerned. In the next chapter this study examines the work of some earlier writers who have attempted to combine the archaeological keeill and chapel data with the historical evidence. The chronological implications of these approaches are also examined.

Translations of Quotations in Chapter 2:

The Life of St. Ailbe cap. xli

"...wishing to flee from men...he resolved to sail to the island of Thule set in the ocean, that he might live alone with God."

Radford 1983,14 (p.13 above)

The Life of St. Columba II,42

"`Some of our people have recently gone out desiring to find a desert place in the sea that cannot be crossed. Earnestly charge this king, whose hostages are in your hand, that, if after long wanderings our people chance to land in the islands of the Orcades, nothing untoward shall happen to them within his territories.' The saint spoke thus because he foreknew in the spirit that after some months this Cormac would come to the Orcades. And it did afterwards so happen. And because of the aforesaid communication of the holy man, Cormac was delivered from imminent death in the Orcades."

Anderson & Anderson 1961,441,443 (p.14 above)

The Book on the Measurement of the Earth VII.6

"Among these I have lived in some, and have visited others; some I have only glimpsed, while others I have read about."

Tierney 1967,73 (p.16 above)

The Book on the Measurement of the Earth VII.14

"There are many other islands in the ocean to the north of Britain which can be reached from the northern islands of Britain in a direct voyage of two days and nights with sails filled with a continuously favourable wind. A devout priest told me that in two summer days and the intervening night he sailed in a two-benched boat and entered one of them."

Tierney 1967,75 (p.17 above)

The Book on the Measurement of the Earth VII.15

"There is another set of small islands, nearly all separated by narrow stretches of water; in these for nearly a hundred years hermits sailing from our country, Ireland, have lived. But just as they were always deserted from the beginning of the world, so now because of the Northman pirates they are emptied of anchorites and filled with countless sheep and many diverse kinds of sea-birds. I have never found these islands mentioned in the authorities."

Tierney 1967,77 (p.17 above)

Jocelin's Life of St. Patrick cap. XCII

"Returning to Hibernia, he (Patrick) touched at the islands of the sea, one whereof, Eubonia, that is Mannia, at that time subject unto Britain, he by his miracles and by his teaching converted unto Christ."

Swift 1809,129 (p.21 above)

Jocelin's Life of St.Patrick cap.XCII

"And the Saint placed as Bishop over the new Church of this nation, a wise and holy man named Germanus; who placed his Episcopal Seat in a certain promontory unto this day called Saint Patrick's Island, for that the Saint had there some time abided."

Swift 1809,130 (p.21 above)

Muirchu's Life of St.Patrick cap.XXIII

"There he found two admirable men, shining lights in faith and doctrine, who had been the first to preach the word of God and baptism in Evonia, and by their teaching the inhabitants of that island had been converted to the catholic faith. The names of the two men are Conindrius and Rumilus.....he (Macuil) trained his body and soul according to their rule, and spent all the (remaining) time of his life there with those two holy bishops until he became their successor in the episcopate. This is Macc Cuil, bishop of Mane and prelate of Arde Huimnonn."

Bieler 1979,107 (p.22 above)

[NB. An alternative translation of part of the last text is given by Hood (1978,94). The last line of this extract is translated as: "This man is Macuil dimane, bishop and prelate of Ardd Huimnonn", leaving both dimane and Ardd Huimnonn untranslated.]

Jocelin's Life of St. Patrick cap.CLII

"(Machaldus)...was borne...unto the island Eubonia, which is called Mannia. And there were two bishops named Conindrius and Romulus, whom St. Patrick himself had consecrated and appointed to rule over the people of that island and to instruct them in the faith of Christ after the death of Germanus, the first bishop."

Swift 1809,204 (p.22 above)

Manx Traditionary Ballad cap.XIV

"In every treen and townland he (St. German) built one for those people to come to pray"

Thomson 1961,536 (p.25 above)

Manx Traditionary Ballad cap.XVIII

"The chapels which St. German instituted for that people to come to pray, Maughold put some of them into one, and thus he made proper parishes."

Thomson 1961,539 (p.25 above)

Chronicles of the Kings of Man and the Isles

"We say sufficient because we are very ignorant of who or what sort of bishops there were before him (Roolwer), and because we have no record, nor can we learn for sure from what our elders tell us."

Broderick 1979, f.50v. (p.26 above)

Orkneyinga Saga cap.XII

"Olaf invited the Earl on to his ship, and said that he wished to talk with him. And when they met, Olaf spoke to him as follows: `It is my will that thou have thyself baptized and all those under thee, else thou shalt die on the spot and I shall bear fire and flame through all the Isles.´ When the Earl found himself in this dilemma, he left his decision entirely in Olaf´s hands."

Taylor 1938,149 (p.26 above)

Flateyiarbók I,187

"Then King Olaf sailed out from the Orkneys but placed there behind him priests to instruct the people and to teach them holy lore."

Anderson 1922,509 (p.27 above)

History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen III,77

"Besides he appointed a certain Turolf to the Orkneys. Thither also he sent John, who had been consecrated in Scotland, and a certain other who bore his own name, Adalbert."

Tschan 1959,183 (p.29 above)

History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen IV,34

"For these same Orkney Islands, although they had previously been ruled by English and Scottish bishops, our primate on the pope´s orders consecrated Throlf bishop for the city of Birsay, and he was to have the cure of all."

Tschan 1959,216 (p.29 above)

Orkneyinga Saga cap.XXXI

"He (Thorfinn) lived usually in Birsay, and had Christ's Kirk built there, a magnificent church. The Episcopal seat in the Orkneys was first established there."

Taylor 1938,189 (p.29 above)

Orkneyinga Saga cap.LII

"At that time William was Bishop of the Orkneys. He was the first Bishop there. The Episcopal seat was then at Christ's Kirk in Birsay."

Taylor 1938,213 (p.32 above)

Charter of Olaf, King of the Isles: 1134

"I have committed and granted the Church of St. Mary of Furness, on account of the proximity of the place, yea, and for the excellent life of the inhabitants, the honour of the said episcopal election, and the observance of my whole Christian law, saving always the reverence due to the Apostolic See."

"...that the Christian religion in my kingdom shall be preserved entire under its own bishop, rather than be rendered desolate under strangers and as it were mercenaries who seek their own and not the Lord's advantage."

Manx Society VII,1-3 (p.34 above)

Chronicles of the Kings of Man and the Isles

"After his death a certain Laurence, who was then archdeacon in Man, was elected into the episcopate by common agreement and by the approval of the entire chapter of Man. He straightway set out for Norway to present himself to king Harald and the Archbishop of Nidaros, by whom he had to be consecrated. But Harald declined to agree to his appointment because of a letter against him, which had been sent across from Man, until he should return to Man with him and be elected in his presence by the entire clergy and people."

Broderick 1979, f.46v. (p.34 above)

CHAPTER 3:

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL MODELS

(i) General Introduction

The historical evidence for the Early Church in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man has been reviewed above in Chapter 2. Sections (iii) and (iv) of this present chapter seek to examine the various ways in which that evidence has been previously applied to the archaeological data. Section (v) introduces an archaeological approach towards the study of the Early Church in these islands. Conclusions and summary follow in Section (vi).

(ii) Historical Models: Introduction

The historical evidence has generally been applied to the archaeological data in one of two ways. The principal concern of all writers, nonetheless, has been with the question of chronology and with its application to archaeological data. Some writers, such as Oliver (1868) and Oswald (1860), have each attempted to organize and grade the archaeological material chronologically. Others, such as Cunliffe-Shaw (1966), Marstrander (1937), Clouston (1932a) and Marwick (1951) have been more concerned with the question of ecclesiastical organization and with the attribution of a chronological horizon to that organization. In both types of approach, evidence has been extrapolated from the historical record and applied, at times uncritically, to the archaeological data. These different approaches are now reviewed.

(iii) Historical Models: The Isle of Man

Oliver (1868) attempted to establish a classification of the Manx ecclesiastical archaeological data in accordance with an historical framework which was perceived to encompass the period from the 5th through to the 12th century. He distinguished three principal structural groups. These were the cabbal of the 5th century, the keeill, which he believed was introduced towards the middle of the 6th century, and the treen church of the late 8th century. A fourth group, which was represented solely by the site at Lag ny Keeilley in Patrick, he rather curiously termed `the mortuary chapel´. No date is ascribed to this fourth class of monument, although the fact that he referred to the tradition of the site as "the burial ground of the Danish kings" (Oliver 1868,89-90) may imply that he saw the `mortuary chapel´ as a later, perhaps 10th or 11th century, ecclesiological phenomenon. This classification is now reviewed.

Oliver (1868,81-83) suggested that the churches of the 5th century were known as cabbals. They are supposed to have been earthen structures, quadrangular in form and of very small dimensions, rarely exceeding 12´ (3.65 m) in length and 9´ (2.75 m) in breadth. The walls were low, apparently never exceeding 5´ (1.50 m) in height, pyramidal in form, very wide at base and were constructed to carry a low-pitched roof of turf or heather. The entrance is said to have been located towards the south end of the west gable and to have had neither jambs nor lintels. The doorway also acted as the only source of light to the interior, the floor of which was sunk 12"-18" (0.30-0.45 m) below the exterior ground level. The cabbal is said to have

usually been sited on a low truncated hillock of artificial formation, known as `the chapel mound´, and to have been enclosed by a sod fence. The cabbal is supposed to have been located on the eastern perimeter of this enclosure. There was, however, no attached burial ground since, Oliver (1868,82) tells us, "the Manx did not in the fifth century inter in consecrated ground". Oliver´s (1868,pl.opp.81) line drawing of `The Manx Cabbal of the Fifth Century´ has been reproduced here as fig.58a.

The keeill is supposed to have been an altogether "better class of building" which was introduced around the middle of the 6th century (Oliver 1868,83-84). Two types were distinguished by Oliver: one in which the construction was wholly of stone, the other where the building method employed was one of turf and stone. The keeills are said to have been larger than the cabbals, measuring 15´-20´ (4.55-6.10 m) in length and 12´ (3.65 m) in breadth. The structure sometimes carried a slate roof. It was provided with windows and was entered through the south wall. The keeill, like the cabbal, was supposedly situated upon an artificially raised mound, but unlike the former it was also provided with a burial ground. Oliver´s (1868,pl.opp.83) perspective illustration of `The Keeill of the Sixth Century´ is reproduced here as fig.58b.

The treen church, supposedly "introduced towards the close of the eighth century", was an "entirely different class of building, intermediate between the keeills and the churches of the middle ages" (Oliver 1868,87-89). The site at Ballakilley in Malew formed the type-site for Oliver´s discussion of this class

of monument. Oliver's (1868,pl.opp.87) illustration is reproduced here as fig.58c. The treen churches are said to have differed from their predecessors in both form and construction. A primitive cement, described as a "tenacious plastic clay", was used to bind the stonework. The entrance now carried a door which was suspended from inclined monolithic jambs. There were more windows, the roof was high pitched and the west gable was surmounted by a bell-turret. The treen church is supposed to have been of a similar length to the keeills but of a narrower width. Unlike both its predecessors, the so-called treen church was not sited upon a mound.

Oliver's tripartite classification system has been dealt with at some length because it is considered important that his method, his descriptions and his use of historical and archaeological data should be clearly understood. There is, for example, no justification for the nomenclature that he employs in this classification and certainly none to suggest that a chronological significance may be applied to the terms cabbal, keeill or treen church. His descriptions of the monuments are equally problematical. Furthermore, the implicit suggestion that a chronological significance may be assigned to the specific association of certain structural features is nowhere substantiated. There is no supportive evidence, with reference to the cabbal, for his remarks regarding either wall height, angle of roof-pitch, the lack of windows or the specific location and type of the entrance way. His remarks on 5th century Manx burial customs are equally speculative. Similarly, a 5th century turf-built chapel is as archaeologically unattested on Man as it

is anywhere else in the British Isles. Certain features of Oliver's cabbal are, of course, known archaeologically. The small size, the sunken floor, the elevated location and the curvilinear enclosure can be readily identified at some ecclesiastical sites on Man as well as elsewhere (see Chapter 5). There is, however, nothing to suggest that such features are necessarily either as early as Oliver believed, or that they are to be found in a specific association with those other attributes which Oliver ascribes to his model. Oliver's 5th century Manx cabbal is, in short, largely a fiction.

Similar criticisms must also be levelled against Oliver's descriptions of the keeill and treen church. For example, one hestitates to accept inclined monolithic jambs as a feature of the so-called treen church. Oliver's drawing of the Ballakilley keeill, his type-site for this class of monument, shows the building, on the contrary, to have had its entrance-way formed of random coursed rubble (fig.58c). Certain features such as the dimensions, the construction type, locational aspects and even the rudimentary bell-turret can each be identified. The chronological significance which he imparts to these features and their association is, however, dubious and as specific models which attempt to define the structure types of the 5th, 6th and 8th centuries they clearly fail. They fail because there is no evidence to suggest either that the structures are as old as Oliver believed, or that the association of structural features can be graded chronologically.

Oswald was also struck by the apparent great antiquity of the keeills. He saw them as "good specimens of the civilization, and of the primitive establishments of the first Christians in this country, and the miserable nature of their architecture" (1860,76). The site at Lag ny Keeilley, he could dismiss out of hand as "an aboriginal structure" (Oswald 1860,77).

Kermode's thoughts on the chronology of the keeills are difficult to gauge. In a paper written in 1907 he concluded that "It is not to be implied that they are all of equal date. All I say at present is that they are earlier than the eleventh century" (Kermode 1915b,426). This was probably to be Kermode's most cautious statement on the subject. By 1912, four years after the establishment of the Manx Archaeological Survey, it is clear that Kermode envisaged a far more restricted chronological framework for the keeills. He assigned the introduction of Christianity, on the basis of tradition and early dedications, to a period not later than the late 5th or early 6th centuries and this, he felt, was compatible with the material evidence of the keeills. He admitted that "their ruinous condition and absolute simplicity of their structure...make it impossible...to give their age with certainty" (Kermode 1915f,585). Nevertheless, the idea that the keeills could be referred to this early chronological horizon was, for Kermode, confirmed by the series of sepulchral monuments found in connexion with the keeills or their sites which, he believed, could be dated to the period 5th-11th century (Kermode 1915f,585). In 1914 he advocated a late 7th-14th century chronological scheme (Kermode & Herdman 1914,82). In 1935 he is posthumously reported, by Archdeacon

Kewley, to have concluded that the keeills may have been "the actual remains of those primitive oratories" of the earliest Christians (Kermode 1935,Foreword) and this, in many ways, appears to reflect the stance he had taken in 1912.

The manner in which these early commentators sought to impart a chronological value to the archaeological data is clearly unsatisfactory. Admittedly, it is difficult to combine historical and archaeological evidence but, at the same time, there is no logical reason for assuming that the entire historical period with which one is working is necessarily represented in the visible archaeological record. This is the basic and mistaken assumption which would seem to have been made by these early commentators. Equally unsatisfactory, for much the same reasons, are the attempts of those who have sought to elucidate aspects of Church organization on the basis of the historical and archaeological evidence.

The work of Marstrander (1937) was ultimately based upon Kermode's study of the keeills and the corpus of Manx sculpture (see Bibliography). Oliver's (1868) work also provided a ready-made classification of that data. Marstrander believed he was able to date the structures and thus differentiate between keeills of, what he called, `pre-Norwegian' and `Norwegian' date. This was done on the basis of the sculptural evidence, using the dates as ascribed by Kermode (1907). Marstrander was able to propose therefore that:

"In all keeills which can be shown to be of pre-Norwegian date, the breadth is at least half of the length. All keeills of these dimensions may be presumed to be older than the Viking Age. In fact, the 15 undatable keeills of these dimensions exhibit exactly the same primitive structure as the datable ones."

C.J.S Marstrander 1937,416 (my emphasis)

Marstrander went on to consider the relationship of keeill and treen. This relationship is ascribed, on the basis of the 16th century Traditionary Ballad, to the work of St. German. The relationship of keeill and treen is discussed in detail in Chapter 6. Meanwhile, Marstrander, in part influenced by the early dating sheme which he had adopted, concluded however, that there could be "no doubt that, from the first period of the Christian Church in the Isle of Man, every treen possessed at any rate one keeill" (1937,420). This point is not elaborated upon but nevertheless it would seem to imply Marstrander's acceptance of the Ballad tradition and, with it, a 5th century context for the keeills. This was certainly the case with Oliver (1868,79) who described the formation of the treens as "one of the earliest attempts at a parochial system in Britain."

This view of the keeills as elements in a parochial form of ecclesiastical organization has also been suggested by Cunliffe-Shaw (1966). He reviewed and accepted the evidence for the foundation of an episcopal organization on Man in the 5th century and ascribed the "systematic development of land chapels" to the period prior to the mid 6th century (Cunliffe-Shaw 1966,15). A similar view was also held by Moore (1900,69), although he conceded that a monastic context for the keeills was also possible. In his view it was Columba's Church of Iona which

"clearly...had the most enduring influence upon the Isle of Man." (Moore 1900,71).

The work of previous scholars and their attempts to combine the archaeological and historical evidence seem unconvincing. In part, this problem stems from the fact that so much of the Manx historical evidence is late. Attempts, therefore, to classify the Manx material with reference to a 5th century Patrician context and to portray the development of the structures and organization of the Manx Church therefrom are likely to be poorly founded.

(iv) Historical Models: Orkney and Shetland

Olafr Tryggvason and the Osmundwall incident are to the Northern Isles in many ways what St. Patrick is to the Isle of Man. Just as the Early Christian archaeology of Man has been seen to begin with Patrick, the ecclesiastical archaeology of the north, meanwhile, has been referred to the period after the turn of the first millenium. Both, of course, could be interpreted as traditional foundation or origin accounts. It can be suggested, therefore, that Earl Sigurdr´s meeting with the Norwegian king, his enforced conversion and his pledge to introduce Christianity to the earldom, have been stressed, perhaps unduly, by those scholars who have looked at the development of the Early Church in the Northern Isles.

In 1932 Clouston was able to state quite categorically that it was not until the turn of the first millenium that "Christianity swept like a tidal wave over the lands of the north" (Clouston 1932a,142). In 1918 he had been even more

specific, remarking that "we know that Christianity was only introduced there in the year 1000" (Clouston 1918a,226: my emphasis). Hugh Marwick also adopted this view, referring the small district or urisland chapels to the period subsequent to the official conversion and prior to the establishment of the parochial form of ecclesiastical organization:

> "those old urisland chapels may thus be regarded as representing the first great burst of church building fervour after the general adoption of Christianity by the Norse settlers in Orkney in the eleventh century"
>
> H. Marwick 1951,113

A subsequent idea has followed on from this and been proposed by both Clouston (1918a,229) and Marwick (1951,113). This is the idea that the systematic distribution of the chapels on the basis of the urisland district necessarily reflected that there had been some form of governing directive from the Orkney earl. This theme has recently been revived by Dr. Cant who has suggested:

> "It was probably at the direction of the earls that the first local churches or chapels were built under Norwegian auspices."
>
> R.G Cant 1972,2

These three writers each firmly assign the development of the urisland chapel to a post-11th century Norse context. It is not suggested that the historical and archaeological evidence for the pre-Norse Church in Orkney and Shetland was unknown to these writers. This evidence, in fact, is ably rehearsed (Marwick 1951,104-112: Cant 1975,7-8). It is, however, suggested that insufficient critical consideration has been given to the case of the urisland chapel as a pre-11th century and possibly as a pre-Norse phenomenon.

In the case of the Northern Isles, the historical evidence has been interpreted in such a way as to provide a terminus post quem for the archaeological evidence. In so doing, this necessarily requires that the urisland chapel be seen as a purely Norse phenomenon.

(v) Archaeological Models

An archaeological approach towards the study of the Early Church in the north and west of Britain exists in the form of Professor Charles Thomas' (1971a) developed cemeteries model. The term `developed cemetery', a concept which Thomas (1973a,9) has also termed the `accessible hermitage', has become accepted into the archaeological literature. The term reflects the process whereby an unenclosed or enclosed cemetery, which Thomas (1971a,50) has argued was the "primary field monument of Insular Christianity", was subsequently developed. This development could be expressed by the addition of `special graves', leachta, internal divisions, a chapel and often "small dwellings or living cells for the isolated brethren who appear to have staffed such...places of worship" (Thomas 1971a,67-68). The type-sites which display this process are Church Island, County Kerry (O'Kelly 1958), Ardwall Isle in Kirkcudbright (Thomas 1967a) and now Reask, also in County Kerry (Fanning 1981a). Some examples have been quoted from the Isle of Man (Thomas 1971a,41-42,56,71,82) and it has been suggested that "The Western Isles, Orkney and probably Shetland too, could between them give us many additional instances" (Thomas 1971a,84).

Two facets of the cemetery, in particular, are discussed and frequently commented upon (Thomas 1971a,48-90). One is the frequency with which the cemetery enclosure assumes a curvilinear form. The second concerns the extent to which such cemeteries are "imposed upon, and are often spatially coterminous with, pre-Christian burial grounds" (Thomas 1971a,53). It is with these primary aspects that the archaeological fieldworker is most likely to be concerned. The general identification of developed cemetery sites should thus be possible through fieldwork alone. These factors are examined in detail in Chapter 7.

Interpretative aspects of the developed cemeteries model are less easily assessed. The historical context into which it is placed and the service the chapels are deemed to have provided may only be postulated. Thomas would seem to favour a monastic context with the developed cemetery as a subordinate unit within a monastic paruchia. This, however, should not preclude their having had some missionary or pastoral function. Indeed, Thomas (1971a,90) has suggested that, in many ways, the developed cemetery was "the Early Christian equivalent of the later parish church."

Developed cemeteries may have originated in a number of ways. In some cases, a cemetery may have developed around a hermitage, if it was in any way accessible. In other cases, perhaps in most, "some solitary brethren, fired with missionary zeal, might attach themselves to an existing cemetery" (Thomas 1971a,79). In terms of chronology, the developed cemetery may be understood to span the period from the introduction of Christianity through to the 12th century in those instances where the site became the

focal point of the parish. The central phases of this sequence may be represented by the replacement, in some cases, of a timber by a stone church and the general sophistication of the site by those developments outlined above. An alternative model, which has suggested that ecclesiastical sites may have developed on the sites of Late Iron Age domestic settlements (Lamb 1979,2), is considered in some detail in Chapter 7.

(vi) Summary and Conclusion

Different approaches to the study of the Early Christian archaeology of the north and west of Britain have been reviewed in this chapter. It has been suggested that some writers have been uncritical in their interpretation of the historical evidence and its application to the archaeological material and their conclusions have thus been less than wholly satisfactory. In part, this may be due, of course, to the fact that such historical evidence as has survived is only of a general kind. It provides only a very basic framework for our understanding of the archaeological material. Certain historical constraints do, of course, exist and these should be recognized. The Manx keeills, like the district chapels of Orkney and Shetland which are accompanied by cemeteries, should be pre-parochial and thus, for each of these three areas, the 12th or 13th century should represent a terminus ante quem for the construction and presumably the use of these chapels. The chronological position of the chapels within this very broad time-span is, however, more difficult to assess. The early Church in Man, however, has been

referred to a 5th century origin and a classification scheme for the keeills has been based upon this premise. In Orkney and Shetland, the archaeological evidence has scarcely been considered at all, although the urisland chapel is assumed to have been a feature of the 11th century. But again this has been done purely on the basis of the historical record. It is suggested that in both Man and the Northern Isles the traditional origin accounts as related by Jocelin of Furness and the author of Orkneyinga Saga have been accredited a significance which is inimicable, and possibly irrelevant, to our understanding of the origins and development of the district chapels of these islands.

The archaeological evidence from Man and the Northern Isles is examined below in Chapter 5 and in Volume 2. The developed cemeteries model and alternative hypotheses are examined with reference to that material in Chapter 7. The following chapter reviews briefly those few instances where a specific historical date or period can be ascribed to extant structures.

CHAPTER 4:

A REVIEW OF HISTORICAL, STYLISTIC & ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATING METHODS AND THEIR PRIOR APPLICATION TO MANX & NORTHERN ISLES' DATA

(i) Introduction

In the preceding chapter, in an attempt to review the chronological horizons to which the early ecclesiastical sites of the Northern Isles and Isle of Man have been attributed, the chapels have been considered largely as a single class of monument. This material is now refined further and individual sites and the dates which have been assigned to them will be examined. This chapter, in effect, attempts to bring together all the available historical and archaeological evidence for the absolute or relative dating of these sites. There is also a brief review of the chronological arguments which have sometimes been inferred on the basis of a site's layout and form. This particular subject, however, is considered in more depth in Chapter 5.

(ii) Historical Dating & the Evidence of Orkneyinga Saga

A number of ecclesiastical sites are referred to in Orkneyinga Saga. This composition is dated to the early 13th century and an internal chronology of primary, secondary and conjectural dates for episodes in the saga has been established (Taylor 1938,23-25,131). These references may be summarized in a tabular form (Table 1).

Five of the sites which are either mentioned directly or alluded to in Orkneyinga Saga have been identified with extant or known structures. St. Magnus cathedral, however, may be

discounted, as it lies outside the scope of this study, as indeed may St. Olaf's chapel, also in Kirkwall, which was rebuilt in the 16th century (RCAMS 1946,ii,141-142,No.400). The sites of Christchurch, Birsay, St. Nicholas' church at Orphir and St. Magnus church on Egilsay, and the dates assigned them on both saga and architectural evidence are now considered. A fourth example of a case in which saga evidence has been employed to justify an historical attribution is also examined. This is the site of Tammaskirk in Rendall, which has been suggested as the work of Sveinn Asleifarson (Clouston 1932b,15-16). It is appropriate, however, to begin with the site of Christchurch at Birsay since, aside from an obscure reference to a church on Papa Westray in 1046 (Taylor 1938,367: Table 1), this is the earliest foundation which is recorded in Orkneyinga Saga.

(a) Christchurch, Birsay / St. Peter's chapel, Brough of Birsay

A magnificent church (dýrligt musteri), known as Christchurch, was built by Earl Thorfinn Sigurdarson upon his return from Rome. This event is normally dated to c.1050. Christchurch is often considered as the first church to have been erected by the Scandinavians in Orkney (Radford 1962a,177). This might be understood from the saga account of the later establishment of the bishop's seat at Birsay, or from the church's dedication to Christ. This type of dedication was invariably applied to the principal churches in the newly converted Norse lands. The foundation of Christchurch in Dublin by Sihtric Silkenbeard and the dedications of churches to Christ at Nidaros and Bergen by Olaf Kyrri in the 11th century (MacKinley 1910) may be cited as examples. The location and

identification of Thorfinn´s church, however, is in some dispute.

The problem essentially revolves around the interpretation of the historical evidence. The crucial passages in Orkneying Saga (caps.XXXI & LII: see above p.42) inform us that Thorfinn usually resided in the district of Birsay (í Byrgisheradi), and that Christchurch, the episcopal seat, was also established there. Raymond Lamb has aptly summed up the implication of these passages:

> "The saga account enables us fix the location of the earl´s and bishop´s palaces in relation to Christchurch - if we accept that the Brough chapel is Christchurch, it follows that the palaces were on the Brough too. And if we locate Christchurch elsewhere, the historical basis, by which the Brough is identified as a `princely´ and episcopal centre, collapses."
>
> R.G Lamb 1974,201

Christchurch is traditionally located at the site of St. Magnus church, the present parish church of Birsay (Lamb 1974,201), which stands a little to the SW of the ruined 16th century Earl´s Palace. There are good 18th and 19th century antiquarian accounts which testify to the antiquity of the St. Magnus church site and may prompt its identification as the site of Thorfinn´s Christchurch. In 1773, the Rev. George Low could remark of the St. Magnus site:

> "The old church lately pulled down was a neat cross with arches...The foundations of vast buildings are yet to be traced under the minister´s and other gardens strongly built of stone and run lime with the numerous cut free stones proper for gates &c, yet seen, evidence that these buildings were not intended for ordinary purposes. Add to this the reigning tradition of this being the Bishop´s Palace; all these I say put together, where there is no written evidence will amount almost to a proof

> that Birsa was the seat of Thorfinn's Bishoprick."
>
> H. Marwick 1924,51

Meanwhile, Joseph Anderson's record of the St. Magnus site has noted that:

> "There are remains of an older church...beside it, which are still known as the Christ's Kirk, and Mr. George Petrie, who has made a ground-plan of the structure (of which only part of the foundations remains), has ascertained that it had an apse at the east end."
>
> J.Anderson 1873,xcv-xcvi

John Tudor also noted that "to the E of the church are traces of another one" and that nearby "are the remains of old buildings, which, local tradition says, formed the old episcopal palace" (1883,314). There is thus a considerable amount of local tradition which would identify the site of the present parish church of St. Magnus as that of Thorfinn's Christchurch. If this evidence is admitted, then, as Lamb (1974,201) has remarked, the earl's and bishop's palaces must also have been there. However, an alternative location for the Christchurch site has also been proposed.

As a result of their excavations in the 1950's, Cruden (1958;1965) and Radford (1959;1962a;1983) proposed that Thorfinn's Christchurch could be identified with the remains of a small chapel on the Brough of Birsay. The Rev. J.M Neale would seem to have been the first to consider this possibility, although the idea, he felt, could not ultimately be substantiated:

> "St. Peter´s Chapel, on a rock...called the Brough of Birsa, is now only remembered as having been a celebrated pilgrimage. This would lead one to think that here the remains of S.Magnus had been deposited; but history is so decided that he was buried at Christ Church, and tradition so clear that the island chapel is S.Peter´s, that the idea cannot be maintained."
>
> J.M Neale 1848,114

Cruden and Radford´s suggestion that the Brough chapel was Christchurch was thus "a novel claim", as Lamb (1983a,40) has rightly remarked.

In Cruden and Radford´s scheme the Brough chapel has been identified as Thorfinn´s Christchurch, the buildings to the N as the Bishop´s Palace, and those to the E as the Earl´s Palace. The excavations of the 1950´s are not yet published. Even so, it seems clear that there is little hard evidence which would necessarily support this interpretation of the Brough site. Radford´s (1959,9) note on the identification of the church on the Brough of Birsay, for example, is concerned only with the dedication name of that structure.

Radford (1959,9) has suggested that the received Petrine dedication may have been contained within a formula such as `dedicated to Christ in the name of St. Peter´. Radford (1959,9) has then suggested that, in later centuries, "the looser phrase dedicated to St. Peter would become normal". This may well be a valid suggestion, but as Lamb (1983a,42) has pointed out, we must set this against the Magnus dedication for the parish church:

> "The saga explicitly tells us that Magnus was first venerated as a saint, and his relics resorted to, while his remains were interred in Christchurch. So popular was the cult which spontaneously arose, that it is obvious how a

> church which housed his relics, whatever its proper dedication, would become known by his name."
>
> R.G Lamb 1983a,42

Cruden and Radford´s case also rests in part upon an analogy which seeks to compare the remains on the Brough with those of the undoubted episcopal seat at Gardar in Greenland (Nørlund & Roussell 1930). The buildings at Gardar, like those on the Brough, consist of a church, a dwelling and a farm. However, as Lamb has pointed out:

> "how does one distinguish archaeologically between a farm and a church which are a monastery, and a farm and a church which are just a farm and a parish church ? ....with so little known about monasteries in the North Atlantic region, we cannot claim that the Brough of Birsay was an episcopal centre, on account of its resemblance to the Gardar layout."
>
> R.G.Lamb 1974,203

Lamb would thus support the earlier identification (RCAMS 1946,ii,1-4,No.1) of the remains on the Brough of Birsay as those of a Norse monastic settlement. This present study finds Lamb´s arguments convincing and would thus agree ir locating Thorfinn´s Christchurch at the site of St. Magnus church.

This section now continues with a brief review of St. Peter´s chapel on the Brough of Birsay and draws attention, in particular, to Cruden and Radford´s use of saga and architectural evidence for their dating of that structure.

The chapel on the Brough of Birsay comprises a nave and chancel structure with a semi-circular and stilted E apse. Provision was also made for a W tower or porch, which was

apparently never completed (RCAMS 1946,ii,1-5,No.1). The masonry is of mortared and irregularly coursed rubble construction. The original entrance is located in the centre of the W gable and has been constructed without checks for a door frame. A double-splayed window is situated in the N wall of the chancel and two semi-circular altar recesses have been added within the NE and SE interior angles of the nave. Prior to Radford's excavations in the 1950's these features had been interpreted as the bases of a staircase to an upper floor (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,138: Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,20). The chapel is situated inside a rectilinear stone-built enclosure and lies to the S of a group of buildings which have been described in both monastic (RCAMS 1946,ii,3-4: Lamb 1974;1983a) and episcopal terms (Cruden 1958: Radford 1959).

Various dates have been suggested for the chapel. Sir Henry Dryden dated it to c.1100 (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,140-141), although essentially this was based on negative evidence. The absence of any record of the chapel's foundation in Orkneyinga Saga suggested to Dryden that the building was unlikely to have been the work of Earl Thorfinn (died c.1065), whose foundation of Christchurch, of course, was mentioned. Similarly, the fact that the chapel had not been dedicated to Orkney's first martyr, St. Magnus, was taken to indicate that the Brough chapel was built either before Magnus' death in c.1117 or his canonization in c.1135. These dates were taken as Dryden's termini post and ante quem although the reasoning is quite inadequate. It would be erroneous, for example, to suggest that

churches built in Orkney after 1117 or 1135 would necessarily have received Magnus dedications. Nonetheless, Dryden proposed that St. Peter´s chapel on the Brough of Birsay had been founded by Thorfinn´s second son, Earl Erlend in c.1100.

The attribution to Earl Erlend was also proposed by Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,19-20). They also remarked, however, that on stylistic grounds the chapel could be assigned to the period 1066 X 1166. This was suggested on the basis of the E apsidal termination, which was viewed as a Continental Norman introduction, and on the basis of a formal comparison with early Norwegian stone churches (Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,20). The RCAMS (1946,ii,3) also concluded that the chapel could be dated by style to "about the middle of the 12th century", and the absence of door checks was remarked upon as a feature "found elsewhere in post-Conquest work". The fact, however, that this feature may also be found in Irish and pre-Conquest Saxon architecture (RCAMS 1946,i,42) has been left unnoted in this context. Unrebated entrances are also remarked upon by Dryden in his accounts of the chapels on the Brough of Deerness, on Wyre and at Linton on Shapinsay (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,103-104,113,123).

A very different and much earlier chronological scheme was proposed by Cruden (1958) and Radford (1959;1962a;1983) who identified St. Peter´s chapel as Thorfinn´s Christchurch and therefore accordingly dated it to c.1050. An attempt to substantiate this claim was subsequently made by what can only be described as an extremely tenuous and inherently circular argument, in which the extant architectural and formal details

were assigned to the 11th rather than the 12th century. The masonry of the chapel, for example, was likened to that in the nearby `11th century' `Earl's Palace' (Radford 1962a,176) although, again, this date would seem to depend entirely upon the postulated association of the site with Earl Thorfinn. Similarly, the attempt to identify the graves of Thorfinn and Magnus, prior to the latter's translation to Kirkwall (Cruden 1958,60: Radford 1962a,177), is based upon circumstantial evidence and is equally unconvincing.

It should also be noted that both Cruden's and Radford's accounts are inconsistent in part, and their analysis of and comments upon the question of checked entrances illustrates well the way in which the archaeological and architectural evidence have been largely prejudged by their historical interpretation of the site. Radford (1962a,176), for example, remarked upon the absence of door checks in the original W entrance to the chapel, but made no comment upon the similarly constructed N entrance, which he associated with the 12th century range of buildings to the N. Cruden, meanwhile, did not specifically refer to these features in the chapel, but he did make the comment, in connexion with the N range, that "door openings lacking rebates suggest a date in the 12th century or at least soon after 1200" (Cruden 1958,159). Cruden, however, does not seem to have been surprised by the fact that the chapel, assigned by him to the 11th century, should have been provided with 12th or even 13th century type door openings.

St. Peter's chapel on the Brough of Birsay illustrates well the problems involved in the dating of Northern Isles chapels. It is among the most upstanding of the ecclesiastical monuments of Orkney and has preserved much of its form and fittings. Doubt and disagreement, however, as to its date of construction and the dating of certain of its architectural details, have persisted. This present survey would not venture to offer any definitive statement regarding the dating of the Brough chapel, other than to say that it could be accommodated within a broad 12th or 13th century historical context.

(b) St. Nicholas' Church, Orphir

The identification and dating of a second church recorded in Orkneyinga Saga have proved less contentious. This is the site of the old parish church of Orphir, dedicated to St. Nicholas (Johnston 1904,184), which seems to have been featured in the saga account of the killing of Sveinn Breastrope during the Yuletide festivities in 1135 (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXVI). This building is described there as a magnificent church (kirkja dyrlig) and is said to have stood outside the S door of the earl's drinking hall. Part of what is believed to have been this latter building was excavated in the 19th century (RCAMS 1946,ii,175,No.485). A diagramatic plan of the hall and church, based on archaeological and saga evidence, has been presented by both Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,fig.43) and Taylor (1938,385).

The old church at Orphir is of an unusual and rare design. The church is circular on plan with an E apse, ceiled with a half barrel vault. The apse is entered through a semi-circular arch and is lit by a narrow round arched window. The window is

double-splayed and is rebated towards its centre for a window case. The walls are of mortared rubble construction, randomly coursed and levelled up by means of smaller stones. Numerous race-bonds are detectable in the fabric and a single put-log hole can be traced in the SE sector of the circular nave.

There is little controversy as to the dating of this church. It is generally accepted that this church, like the handful of other round churches known from the British Isles, was modelled on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. Meanwhile, the necessary historical context for the introduction of such a design may be found in the 12th century Crusades (Radford 1962a,181-182). It has not been generally realized that this may also be reflected in the dedication of this church to St. Nicholas, who is grouped among MacKinley's (1914) class of `Eastern Saints'. The cult of St. Nicholas, a saint who was popular with sea-farers, was spread to Northern Europe, particularly after 1084 when his relics were brought from Myra to the Adriatic port of Bari in Italy by Levantine traders (MacKinley 1914,428). This important port had fallen to the Normans in 1071 and was much exploited by the Crusading armies in the 12th century since it was conveniently placed for the sea-crossing to Dyrrachium (Durazzo in modern day Albania: Dyrakksborg of Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXXXIX), which lay at the W end of the Via Egnatia, the route connecting Constantinople with the Adriatic (Obolensky 1971,18,25).

Two of Orkney's earls, Earl Haakon Paulsson in c.1120 and Earl Rognvald Kolsson in c.1152, are known to have visited the

Holy Land at the time of the Crusades. It would seem reasonable to consider one or other of these earls as the building's founder, given the evidence of its plan and dedication and the fact that the church was erected on an earldom estate. The journey of Earl Haakon Paulsson to Rome and on to Jerusalem, perhaps in expiation for his killing of Earl Magnus, has been recorded in Orkneyinga Saga:

> "in that voyage he went on to Jerusalem, visited the holy relics there, and bathed in the river Jordan, as was the custom of pilgrims"
>
> Orkneyinga Saga cap.LII: Taylor 1938,213

Earl Haakon died in c.1122 or 1123 and the journey to the Holy Land is said to have been undertaken some years after Magnus' death in c.1117. Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,21) have therefore assigned St. Nicholas church to the period 1118 X 1122. Radford (1962a,181-182), more cautiously, has proposed a date within the period 1100 x 1136. In this scheme, Radford has recognized the First Crusade, preached by Pope Urban II in 1095, and the saga reference to the church, using Dasent's 1894 translation and chronological scheme, as his termini post and ante quem. A similar estimate, 1090 X 1137, was also one of two schemes proposed by Dryden (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,145). In the same work, however, Dryden also allowed that the church could have been built in the period 1090 X 1160. This estimate was proposed with reference to the saga account of Earl Rognvald's expedition to the Holy Land in 1151-1153 (Orkneyinga Saga cap. LXXXVI-LXXXIX), although it necessarily disregards the saga account of the church in 1135. However, as Radford (1962a,182) has also pointed out, the 1135 saga reference could well be

anachronistic.

The RCAMS (1946,ii,174,No.483) account gives only a vague indication as to the date of this structure, although it appears to accept the 1135 saga reference as a terminus ante quem. A lower terminus was suggested on the basis of the form of the E window. The position of the window case, set back from the outer wall face, together with its double-splay, was said to suggest a date from the second half of the 11th century (RCAMS 1946,ii,174). Somewhat confusingly, however, the church is also dated, in a second scheme, like Dryden's, to the period 1090 x 1160 (RCAMS 1946,i,43).

The dating of St. Nicholas' church has proved less contentious than, for example, the dating of the chapel on the Brough of Birsay. In part, this is due to the fact that there are no compelling reasons for disregarding the evidence of Orkneyinga Saga and its detailed description of the site. In part, this is due also to the building's exotic form. For these reasons this present survey would accept the saga accounts of Earl Haakon's journey to the Holy Land in c.1120 and the Yuletide celebrations of 1135 as terminus post and ante quem statements for the building of this church.

(c) St. Magnus church, Egilsay

St. Magnus church on Egilsay is the sole surviving example from Orkney and Shetland of a group of medieval towered churches. An 18th century drawing of the old church at Stenness shows it to have had a semi-circular W tower (Anderson 1879,xxiii-xxv), traces of which were found during excavation in the 1920's

(Clouston 1929,68-69). Meanwhile, Low's (1774 (1978),54) drawing of the old Deerness parish church depicts a structure with a twin-towered W end. This building was demolished in 1796, although the remains of the tower bases are said to have been uncovered during grave-digging in c.1900 (Spence 1904,314). In Shetland, three towered churches have been recorded although, unfortunately, no trace of them now survives. These were at Ireland in Dunrossness (Sibbald 1711,15: RCAMS 1946,iii,45, No.1186: Cant 1975,42,fn 74), St. Lawrence's church at Papil on West Burra (Sibbald 1711,26: RCAMS 1946,iii,74-75,No.1266) and St. Magnus church at Tingwall (Edmonston 1809,124: RCAMS 1946,iii,125,No.1525).

St. Magnus church on Egilsay comprises a nave and square-ended chancel structure with a conjoined round W tower. Two entrances are located opposite each other towards the W end of the nave. Both are checked and feature round-headed arches, the soffits of which have been set back at the face of the jambs so as to accommodate the temporary centering which was used in their construction. The original windows are round-headed and single-splayed. The later windows in the S wall are flat-headed. The chancel opens directly from the nave and is ceiled with a barrel-vault, over which there is an upper chamber entered by a narrow round-arched doorway at first floor level. The round tower has entrances in the W gable of the church at both ground and first floor level. The masonry of the church throughout is of mortared rubble construction. This is arranged in random courses and incorporates a large number of stones set edge-ways. Many put-log holes are evident in the fabric.

Various dates have been attributed to this structure. In part, the problem once again is one of identification and of interpreting the evidence of Orkneyinga Saga. The problems involved in the dating of architectural forms and influences are also evident.

St. Magnus church on Egilsay is not directly referred to by name in Orkneyinga Saga. Munch (1860) and others, however, have identified it with the church in which Earl Magnus sheltered and had Mass sung on the night before his assassination and which, on the following morning, was ransacked by Earl Haakon (Orkneyinga Saga cap.XLVIII & XLIX). Munch believed that the church could be dated to the pre-Norse period and, noting its resemblance to a number of Irish churches, which he felt could be assigned to the 7th and 8th centuries, he was "compelled to suppose it to have been erected at that time by Irish priests or Papas" (Munch 1860). Daniel Wilson (1851), influenced by the then accepted dating of the series of Irish Round Towers, also supposed that the church on Egilsay had been the work of Irish Christians prior to 876, the traditional date of Harald Harfagra's western voyage (Orkneyinga Saga cap.IV). The island name, Egilsay, has also been brought into this argument. Munch (1860) supposed that the name had been derived from the Gaelic word eaglais (Latin: ecclesia). This interpretation had also been assumed by the 16th century writer, `Jo. Ben': "Egilschay, quasi dicas ecclesiae insularum (the Kirk-Isle)" (Mitchell & Clark 1908,306). Meanwhile, Hugh Marwick (1952a,71), although suggesting that the place-name may refer to the personal

name, Egil, has nonetheless concluded that "the origin;of the name...must still be deemed an open question".

The many different views regarding the dating of this church and the evidence upon which those views had been based were examined in some detail by Dryden (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,127,131-135). On the basis of the building's architectural style, Dryden argued that the church was unlikely to be later than the beginning of the 12th century. Meanwhile, on historical grounds, he argued that the church was unlikely to have been constructed in the period between the Norse settlement of the islands, traditionally associated with the date 876, and the conversion of the Scandinavians to Christianity in c.1000. On historical and architectural grounds, Dryden therefore argued that the church could be assigned, in theory, to either the 9th or the 11th century (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,132,135).

The church displays several features which Dryden considered to be indicative of Irish influence. Among these, Dryden listed the lowness of the chancel and the chamber over it, the first floor entrance from the nave to the W tower, the style of the windows which have been constructed without an exterior chamfer, and the character of the masonry. The W tower was largely disregarded by Dryden in this context, its form rather being likened to the round towered Saxo-Norman churches of East Anglia (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,134). As to the date of this church, Dryden, after remarking that the use of checked entrances was antithetical to an early date, concluded that St. Magnus church had been "built after the traditional Irish form....soon after the reconversion of the islands to Christianity in 998"

(MacGibbon & Ross 1896,135).

The RCAMS inventory assigns the church no more specifically than to the 12th century, although after Earl Magnus' martyrdom in c.1117. No comment is made regarding any Irish influence on the church's construction and the W tower is again compared with East Anglian examples of Saxo-Norman date (RCAMS 1946,i,44).

The question of Irish influence on St. Magnus church has been revived by Radford (1962a,182-184; 1983,27), who has compared the building with Trinity Church at Glendalough. This latter building has been assigned to the 11th century or a little earlier by Leask (1955,i,76-77). Radford has dated St. Magnus church to the early 12th century and, in postulating the connexion with Magnus' martyrdom, has accepted the date of c.1117 as his terminus post quem for this building's construction. A terminus ante quem in c.1135 is implied by Radford (1983,27) and the building is attributed to the work of Bishop William, who at that time was apparently resident on the island (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXVI).

Much of the circumstantial evidence employed by Radford, such as the notices of Magnus' death in c.1117 and Bishop William's presence on the island in 1135, had also been previously noted by Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,28) who ventured to propose a date within the period 1135 X 1138 for the construction of this church. The lower limit was suggested on the basis of the dedication to St. Magnus, whose cult was only officially recognized after c.1135 (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LVII). The upper terminus was suggested on the basis of the fact that the building

had not been stylistically influenced by the work at Kirkwall cathedral, begun in 1137. In view of the known connexion between the island of Egilsay and Bishop William, who clearly would have been associated with the building of the cathedral in Kirkwall, Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,24) argued that the Egilsay church would have certainly displayed some influence of the cathedral's Norman style if it had been built after 1137 or 1138. Similarly, although the question of a re-dedication of an earlier Celtic church was considered, it was soon dismissed by Dietrichson and Meyer on account of both the Norse style of the building and in view of the notion that the erection of so grand a church would have been inconceivable before the island had acquired an ecclesiastical importance as the site of St. Magnus' death. Dietrichson and Meyer's criteria for distinguishing churches of Celtic and Norse origin are examined below (pp.77-78).

Further circumstantial evidence can also be employed to sustain the 1135 X 1138 dating of St. Magnus church and, in particular, the relationship of the bishop to the two rival earls, Paul and Rognvald, has been stressed by Dietrichson and Meyer. The ecclesiastical and political rivalry between Bishop William and the appointees from York (see above pp.30-31) may also explain William's reasons for wanting to build a church to Magnus on Egilsay. This has been examined in detail by Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,24-27). Finally, Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,28) have stressed the close association of the bishop with Egilsay in the years 1135-1138. For example, it was on Egilsay, after Mass, that Bishop William received Sveinn Asleifarson after his flight from Orphir at Christmas in 1135

(Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXVI). It was to Egilsay that Sigurd of Westness sent his men to inform the bishop of Earl Paul's disappearance in the summer of 1136 (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXXVI). Finally, it was on Egilsay that Bishop William entertained Bishop John of Atholl over the New Year period in 1138/1139 (Orkneyinga Saga cap.LXXVII). As Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,28) have pointed out, "during these years we do not find him anywhere else; but afterwards we never find him on the island again." They conclude therefore that the bishop's frequent stays on Egilsay during the years 1135/1136 - 1138/1139 were occasioned by his superintendance of the building of St. Magnus church.

(d) Tammaskirk, Rendall

The site of Tammaskirk in Rendall was partially excavated by Clouston in 1931. His excavations uncovered the remains of a church of nave and chancel design which, on formal grounds, he assigned to the 12th century (Clouston 1932b,13-14). The site was interpreted as that of a fortified church. This was based on the church's location at the perimeter of the churchyard and on the demonstrable thickness of the chancel walls, which, he believed, had supported an E tower (Clouston 1932b,12-13). The heavier masonry of the chancel was, however, interpreted by the RCAMS (1946,ii,73,No.258) in terms only of its having carried a vaulted ceiling. Clearly, the above-ground reconstruction of buildings is never easy and either interpretation might be valid. However, in this context it is probably worth pointing out that the walls of the vaulted chancel at Crosskirk (WESTRAY 5) were not appreciably wider than those of the nave and in fact were

frequently narrower.

The site of Tammaskirk is not mentioned in Orkneyinga Saga. Clouston, however, attempted to associate the site with the career of Sveinn Asleifarson of Gairsay. This was based on a number of circumstantial factors, amongst which may be listed the question of the site's location. Tammaskirk is situated on the N fringe of an Iron Age settlement (RCAMS 1946,ii,80,No.270), whilst the present Hall of Rendall, which Clouston assumed to be associated with the church, lies 320 m SW of the church. The distance between church and hall could have been lessened considerably, Clouston (1932b,15) argued, if the church had been built on the S fringe of the settlement mound. Purely on this basis Clouston concluded that the church had been built prior to the establishment of the hall at Rendall. The site's location was also to be explained, Clouston (1932b,16) suggested, by the notion that it would have been only from the tower of a church thus located that Sveinn could have commanded a view across the Sound to his hall on Gairsay. This was "carefully tested" by Clouston (1932b,16), who found that "the curve of the shore keeps Langskaill (on Gairsay) hidden by the mound for some considerable distance". The criteria which Clouston employed to reconstruct the height of the postulated tower are not known. Clouston did not, however, realize that this second observation contradicted much of what he had formerly said, since the acceptance of these quasi-strategic factors would make irrelevant the question of the hall's location and date of foundation. Clouston's remarks, however, are entirely speculative, as indeed are his attempts to date the foundation of the hall at Rendall.

Clouston (1932b,16) has dated the establishment of a hall at Rendall to 1172, the year after Sveinn's death in Dublin, when his sons divided Sveinn's Gairsay inheritance and erected partitions in the great hall at Langskaill (Orkneyinga Saga cap.CVIII). There is, however, no suggestion in the saga that one or other son became established at Rendall. In fact, the partitioning of the Gairsay hall would clearly militate against this idea. Rendall is mentioned twice in Orkneyinga Saga (cap.XCIV & XCV) and only on the latter occasion in 1154 in association with Sveinn Asleifarson, when he went there to meet Margad Grimsson.

The Rendall and Gairsay estates are certainly linked at a later period, in the 15th and early 16th centuries (Clouston 1932b,16). The attempt, however, to push this back to the 12th century and to link the career of Sveinn Asleifarson with the construction of Tammaskirk is clearly unsatisfactory and illustrates well the way in which the evidence of Orkneyinga Saga has sometimes been used to provide an historical attribution to an archaeological site.

(iii) Stylistic Dating

Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,10) listed five features to be found on ecclesiastical sites which they considered to be indicative of Celtic, pre-Norse foundations. Celtic churches, they suggested, were single chambered buildings of dry-stone construction with, generally, only an E window and a W entrance. Furthermore, it was suggested that Celtic churches could be identified by the presence of coadjacent `beehive houses' and by

dedications to Celtic saints. Inclined window or door jambs and externally unchamfered single-splayed windows were considered to be indicative of churches of pre-Norse date or of churches exposed to Celtic influence. On the basis of these criteria, Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,10-11) were able to identify six extant chapels which they considered to be early, pre-Norse foundations. These were the chapels on the Brough of Deerness, at Halcro in South Ronaldsay, St. Tredwell's on Papa Westray, the chapel at the Head of Holland, an earlier chapel on the Brough of Birsay and one on the small island of Corn Holm. A further ten sites were also proposed but not individually listed (Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,11). On the other hand, true round arches, semi-circular apses, a rood-loft, the nave and chancel design, mortared masonry and dedications to Norse saints were all considered to be indicative of churches of Norse date. Circular towers were also considered in this latter category, in view of their late appearance in Ireland. This subject has been most recently reviewed by Hare & Hamlin (1986,139-143).

Dietrichson and Meyer attempted to discriminate sites chronologically on the basis of form alone. A number of inconsistencies are apparent. It is not explained, for example, why a single chambered dry-stone church with a W door and an E window should necessarily be indicative of, in their phrase, `Celtic date', rather than Celtic influence. After all, Celtic influence had been conceded by them with regard to the question of window and door forms. Equally, the Egilsay round tower could be considered as much a Celtic form as any of the features which they considered to be indicative of `Celtic date'.

The question of date and form was also briefly examined by the RCAMS (1946,i,42) who, however, clearly differentiated the two. The techniques employed in the construction of the early chapels of Orkney and Shetland were considered to be essentially indicative of Celtic workmanship:

> "Thus chancels are provided with an upper chamber; jambs are inclined; arches are built with a keystone; the reveal of the arch is set back beyond the face of the respond to provide a rest for the constructional centering; and openings are built without rebates. All these features belong to the Irish tradition, although the last two are also found in the pre-Conquest architecture of England."
>
> RCAMS 1946,i,42

The RCAMS (1946,i,42) were unable to identify churches of pre-Norse date, although a number of sites were referred to where later churches were felt to probably occupy the sites of more primitive Celtic structures. St. Tredwell's chapel on Papa Westray (RCAMS 1946,ii,180,No.521: WESTRAY 14) and the chapels on the Brough of Deerness (RCAMS 1946,ii,240-241,No.621) and Auskerry (RCAMS 1946,ii,337,No.1001) were considered in this group.

Attempts, however, have been made in the Northern Isles to identify not only the sites but also the structures of the Early Celtic Church. Dietrichson and Meyer's views on this subject have been considered above. One prominent site which has been considered in this context is the Brough of Deerness. The small stone chapel there is of a unicameral design with a W entrance and an E window. The masonry is said to have been clay bonded and mortar pointed (RCAMS 1946,ii,241). The chapel lies within a small rectilinear yard, towards the SE of a group of sub-

rectangular buildings (Morris 1977,fig.4; forthcoming a: also see below pp.86-87). The rectilinear yard has been assigned by Radford (1962a,180), on formal grounds, to the Norse period (see below pp.154-155). It has been implied, however, on the basis of Irish analogies, that the chapel is unlikely to be much later than the 8th century (Radford 1962a,167). This was suggested on the basis of the construction technique which Radford has described as archaic and which he has claimed was also featured at Whithorn (Radford 1949,106-119) and at St. Ninian's Point chapel on Bute (Aitken 1955). It should be realized, however, that Radford's dating of these sites is equally problematical. Recent excavations of the Brough of Deerness chapel, in fact, have suggested that the building is much later than Radford believed (Morris forthcoming a: see below p.87). It may also be noted that the construction technique of clay bonding and mortar pointing, archaic though it may well be, is nevertheless found in both the 12th century work at Eynhallow chapel (RCAMS 1946,ii,231,No.613) and in the even later, possibly 16th century, parish church on Rousay (Lowe 1984).

The small single cell chapel, such as is found on the Brough of Deerness and elsewhere in the Northern Isles, may be considered typologically earlier than chapels of nave and chancel design, which in turn may be considered to precede chapels with appended W towers or E apses. The dating of structures by plan form, however, is a notoriously difficult business, since form must be related, in some unquantifiable way, with function. The recently published plans of the churches and chapels of the

Western Isles (RCAMS 1971,fig.7; 1975,fig.6; 1980,fig.6), for example, illustrate well the repertoire of types found there and the fossilization of plan forms which seems to have occurred there after the 13th century (RCAMS 1975,25). It is instructive to note that certain small single cell chapels there, such as those on Cara and Sanda (RCAMS 1971,106-107,151-153, Nos.268,301) were still being built in the later medieval period.

It is difficult to sustain a chronological argument upon the basis of plan form alone. This problem is examined in some detail in Chapter 5 where Harold Leask's ideas of 3:2 and 2:1 building ratios are considered with reference to the corpus of Manx and Northern Isles ecclesiastical sites.

(iv) Archaeological Dating

Very few ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Isles have been excavated (Appendix 2b) and even fewer have been published in any detailed form. Nevertheless, a number of stratigraphical observations regarding the relative dating of features on certain sites may be made. The following summary excludes examples of simple superimposition of ecclesiastical sites over Iron Age and prehistoric structures. That material is examined in a different context in Chapter 7. Information derived from the analysis of standing buildings, regarding alterations to and constructions over earlier churches, is included. Further stratigraphical remarks, derived from this study's survey, are made in connexion with certain sites within the gazetteer (Volume 2).

Orkney

(a) St. Peter's chapel, Brough of Birsay

Excavations in the 1930's uncovered the remains of an earlier wall beneath the S wall of the present chapel. These earlier foundations were traced over a distance of approximately 7.60 m (Radford 1962a,168) and were shown to be more accurately aligned EW than the later, overlying, wall (RCAMS 1946,ii,fig.52). A number of graves were found to be aligned on the earlier wall. These are said to have been stratigraphically divorced from a series of graves which were aligned with the present building. As a consequence of Radford's dating of this building, the lower `level' of graves were assigned to a pre-Norse and Pictish horizon (Radford 1962a,168). The discovery of a Pictish symbol stone (RMS IB 243), which had apparently been set erect at the head of a triple grave, also lent some credence to the idea of a Pictish cemetery on the site. Mrs. Curle's (1982,91) recent account of the circumstances surrounding the finding of this stone, however, have discounted any funerary association and consequently must call into question the ethnic identity and date of the lower cemetery deposits.

It seems likely that the foundation beneath the S wall of the present chapel formed part of an earlier chapel. This has been suggested on the basis of the apparently associated cemetery deposits and on account of its spatial relationship to the later building. The earlier chapel has been assigned by Radford (1962a,167) to the Celtic period, although in his most recent assessment, he has allowed the possibility of its having been an earlier Norse church (1983,31). In Radford's view, this earlier

building would have to be dated to the period around the turn of the first Millenium. This is one consequence of Radford's dating of the standing structure to c.1050.

The present chapel, which has been variously attributed an 11th or 12th century date (see above pp.62-66), provides a terminus ante quem for the underlying structure. There is, however, insufficient evidence with which to ascribe the earlier chapel to either a pre-Norse or Norse horizon.

Subsequent alterations to the present chapel are believed to have included the insertion of a N entrance in the nave, the erection of altar bases in the NE and SE interior angles of the nave (Radford 1962a,179) and the insertion of a cross wall between the chancel and the E apse (RCAMS 1946,ii,3).

(b) St. Magnus' Church, Birsay

This is the traditional site of Christchurch, erected in c.1050 by Earl Thorfinn (see above p.58), although little is known for sure with regard to its form. The present building dates from 1664 but it was enlarged or restored in 1760 and again in 1867 (RCAMS 1946,ii,5). A late 18th century record, presumably referring to the work undertaken in 1760, however, refers to the demolition of an earlier church of cruciform plan (Marwick 1924b,51). The foundations of an E apse, belonging to this or another church, were recorded by Petrie beside the present structure (Anderson 1873,xcvi).

Excavations in 1982, in advance of drainage work around the church, clarified the phasing and form of the post-Reformation buildings on the site and revealed the existence of an earlier,

"probably 12th century church" (Barber 1982,17). Architectural detail was found to have survived in situ and other pieces from the masonry debris showed this earlier building to have been a church of some architectural sophistication. In the interim report (Barber 1983), this building has been reconstructed as a church of nave and chancel form. This had succeeded an earlier, probably 11th century, bicameral church. It would appear, however, that the earliest ecclesiastical building on the site, which was to form the chancel of the later churches, was a unicameral structure, possibly a small oratory. Radio-carbon dating of skeletal material associated with this early structure has returned a date of 830 ± 50 ad (GU 1631: J. Barber pers.comm; forthcoming).

(c) Saevar Howe, Birsay

Saevar Howe forms a prominent landmark on the Links at Birsay. It was partially excavated in the 1860's by Farrer (1862; 1868) who uncovered the remains of a building, over which a long cist cemetery had later been established. A small rivetted iron bell of Celtic type was discovered in a cist-like structure and as a consequence the site has frequently been considered as an Early Christian cemetery. Anderson (1881,172), for example, supposed the bell to have been buried in the face of a Viking raid.

Re-excavation of this site in the 1970's (Hedges 1983) and a re-examination of the artefact assemblage (Batey & Morris 1983), however, have thrown into question the identification of Saevar Howe as an Early Christian site.

John Hedges' excavation identified both Pictish and Viking phases of occupation on the site. The Viking structures, in particular, are fairly well dated and two C14 determinations (715 ± 78 AD; GU 1402: 760 ± 90 AD; GU 1400) together with a worn and reused coin of Burgred of Mercia, which was minted in 866 X 868, have been reasonably interpreted by the excavator to suggest that:

> "Taking all things into consideration, including the continuity of the building evidenced, it would not be unreasonable to say that the Phase II (Viking) occupation spanned the whole of the 9th century, possibly starting slightly earlier and finishing slightly later."
>
> J.W Hedges 1983,116

The long cist cemetery, which according to Farrer (1862) overlay these buildings, can thus be assigned to the 10th century at the very earliest.

There is now no doubt that the Saevar Howe long cist cemetery overlay a series of 9th century and earlier structures. The significance of the iron bell and its date, however, are less easily discerned since Farrer's (1862) account of its discovery does not explicitly associate it with the long cist cemetery. Hedges (1983,121), for example, has remarked that Farrer only discovered the bell after he had started excavating one or other of the structures which we now know to be of Pictish or Viking Age date. Clearly this problem cannot now be resolved. It is Hedges' (1983,121) opinion, however, that the bell is more likely to have been firmly stratified in Pictish, rather than Viking, occupation levels. Anderson's (1881,172) idea that the bell was buried in the face of a Viking raid may thus still be valid.

(d) Chapel: Brough of Deerness

Recent excavations at this site have succeeded in identifying two major phases of construction, in which an early timber structure, possibly with an exterior stone cladding, was later replaced by the surviving stone building (Morris forthcoming a). The timber building, with approximate interior dimensions of 5.75 x 3.10-4 m (Morris forthcoming a- Phase plan A1-2), underlay the later stone chapel and its longer axis was orientated approximately 3 degrees N of it. Meanwhile, a series of post-holes and slots, which defined an area 0.40 m EW and 0.75 m NS, were found against the centre of its E interior wall face. These features have been reasonably identified as a timber chapel with an associated composite timber altar (Morris forthcoming a). These features form part of Phase A in the Deerness sequence.

The timber structure was later replaced by the stone chapel. This rebuild (Phase C) did not, however, follow immediately upon the abandonment of the earlier structure, since the discovery of a number of features, including a gulley and spreads of burnt material, could be assigned, on stratigraphical grounds, to an intermediate phase of activity. This is Phase B.

The dating of these early phases (A,B & C) depends largely on two C14 determinations and a worn coin of Eadgar (959 - 975). The coin was found inside the chapel area, in the fill of the Phase B gulley. The cut of this gulley had intruded upon a post-hole of the primary timber building, whilst its fill was sealed by the earliest floor which can be associated with the stone chapel. The coin thus provides a terminus post quem for that

building's construction. Two C14 determinations were also obtained. One was obtained from a sample of mammal bone, found among the burnt spreads of Phase B (730 ± 90 ad: GU 1558). The other was taken from a sample of human bone (1030 ± 65 ad: GU 1574). This was obtained from one of the adult graves which can be associated with the Phase C stone chapel.

The coin evidence clearly provides a terminus post quem for the construction of the stone chapel on the Brough of Deerness. In the excavator's opinion that building is "most unlikely to have been built before the 11th century and could have been built later" (Morris forthcoming a). Meanwhile, the intermediate phase, Phase B, would seem, on the basis of the early C14 date and the coin evidence, to have been of some considerable duration. In an historical context, it has been suggested that activity in this phase may relate to the pagan interlude, between the time of the Norse settlement and their conversion. Finally, the timber phase chapel has been considered as a possible pre-Norse foundation (Morris forthcoming a).

The interpretation of Phases A and B at Deerness depends greatly on the single early C14 date. Without it, the excavator has readily admitted that it could be argued that:

> "the sites history could be wholly encompassed within the Norse period. With the radiocarbon date, it would seem likelier that the Timber Phase was pre-Norse. Given the evidence for an Intermediate Phase which includes the deposition of refuse such as mammal bone, amongst other material, the balance of probability would seem to be with a foundation in the pre-Norse period."
>
> C.D Morris forthcoming a

Interpretation of C14 dates is never easy. Nevertheless, Morris' frank analysis of this problem is reasonable and produces a coherent sequence for the development of the Deerness chapel site.

(e) Chapel: Newark, Deerness

This site has long been known locally and skeletons have frequently been exposed in the cliff face (RCAMS 1946,ii,248,No.654). A recent survey by Kenneth Steedman (1980,Site 49,pl.22) has shown that erosion is still active. The cemetery was investigated in the early 1970's and was found to be associated with a small chapel, both of which overlay a souterrain complex. Unfortunately, however, information regarding only the souterrains has been published. The chapel has been assigned to the 10th century on the evidence of coins which were discovered below its floor (Brothwell 1977,182).

(f) Sandside, Graemsay

In 1977 a long cist, containing a human skeleton, was discovered in the partially eroded shore-line at Sandside on Graemsay. The burial was void of grave-goods (Hedges 1978) and C14 dating of the bone returned a date of 1085 ± 55 ad (GU 1067: 1140 ± 75 AD: Renfrew & Buteux 1985,274). No other interments were noted in the small excavation which was undertaken (Hedges 1978) and the relationship of this burial to others or to any structure on the site is thus unknown. The site does not appear to have been remembered as a cemetery site.

(g) Tammaskirk, Rendall

Tammaskirk was partially excavated in 1931, disclosing the plan of a church of bi-cameral design. The relationship of the

nave to the chancel is uncertain, although some evidence was adduced to illustrate that the former predated the erection of the latter. It was noted that the masonry of the chancel was only poorly bonded with that of the nave, although the excavator felt assured that the chancel entrance was an original feature (Clouston 1932b,13). It was therefore suggested that either the chancel had been constructed very soon after the erection of the nave, or that the whole structure had been built at the same time, with tusking stones being left for the chancel walls whilst work progressed more rapidly on the nave (Clouston 1932b,13). The evidence, therefore, is inconclusive and as the RCAMS (1946,ii,73) have remarked, the relationship of nave and chancel cannot now be definitely decided either way.

(h) Chapel: Eynhallow

This site has not been excavated, although various analyses of the fabric of the present building have been offered (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,116-122: Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,36-43: RCAMS 1946,ii,230-234,No.613: Lamb 1973a,223-228). The RCAMS (1946,ii,231-232) identified a number of minor alterations and rebuildings which could be attributed to the 16th century domestic occupation of the site, but in essence regarded the church as of one build and datable to c.1200. Dryden (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,118) and Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,38-39), however, have identified the chancel arch as a later insertion. This has also been suggested by Lamb (1973a,226), who has noted that the N sector of the chancel arch sprang not from the wall abuttment but from what had evidently been intended as a

free-standing pier. The break between the `pier´ and the walling to the N is clearly visible. Much, however, necessarily depends upon ones interpretation of the fabric of the N wall of the nave as to which is the earlier of the two features.

The chancel arch is of pointed form and is Transitional in character and has been assigned to the 13th or 14th century (Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,40: MacGibbon & Ross 1896,121). This may provide a terminus ante quem for the dating of the nave. The relationship of the chancel arch to the chancel itself, whose walls are heavily cladded in 16th century work, however, is uncertain.

(i) St. Mary´s Church, Skaill, Rousay

This church, also unexcavated, has been attributed various dates. Dietrichson and Meyer (1906,29) believed it to be the work of the 12th century, comparing it with St. Magnus´ church on Egilsay. Dryden (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,108) considered it only as a pre-Reformation structure. The RCAMS (1946,ii,190,No.548), meanwhile, assigned a post-Reformation date to this structure. It has, however, only recently been realized that the walls of the building incorporate a number of architectural fragments of 13th and possibly also 16th century character (Lamb 1982,11: Lowe 1984,7-9). It has also been demonstrated that the present church overlies a building of similar dimensions (RCAMS 1946,ii,191), the full extent of which has recently been clarified (Lowe 1984,2-5).

The present church is not closely datable. Circumstantial evidence, however, might suggest that the building was constructed in the 16th or early 17th centuries. This may

provide a terminus ante quem for the dating of the underlying structure.

Shetland

(a) Chapel: St. Ninian's Isle, Dunrossness

This is the only ecclesiastical site to have been excavated in Shetland. It remains, however, essentially unpublished, although an attempt has been made by Thomas (1973a,11-13) to reconstruct the phasing of the site.

The apsidal chancel has been considered by Thomas (1973a,12) as a later addition to an originally single chambered structure, as represented by the present nave. This building overlay the walls of an earlier chapel (O'Dell 1960,figl: Small et al 1973,ii,fig.8). This earlier building has been associated with both the earliest Christian cemetery on the site and with the famous St. Ninian's Isle silver hoard (Thomas 1973a,12-13), which was possibly deposited in the period 775 X 825 (Wilson 1973,147-148). The building had been erected over an earlier short cist cemetery, where evidence of both crouched inhumation (Thomas 1973a,13) and cremation (Small 1973,7) burial rites has been recorded. The pre-Christian cemetery is believed to have overlain a domestic settlement of Iron Age date. Analysis of this site is returned to in a different context in Chapter 7.

Isle of Man

In contradistinction to the position in Orkney and Shetland, a great number of Manx ecclesiastical sites have been excavated (Appendix 2a) and over 40 of these were excavated under the

direction or supervision of Philip Kermode in the period 1908 - 1918. It is unfortunate, however, that relatively few stratigraphical observations, with regard to the relative dating of the keeills or the cemeteries, were made in these excavations. This information is reviewed below, together with other data derived from more recent excavations at Cronk yn Howe, Ronaldsway airport, Balladoole and Druidale. The current excavations at Peel Castle, which have disclosed an early cemetery, interpreted as monastic and of pre-Viking date (Freke 1984,16), are excluded from this review. Examples of superimposition over prehistoric structures are considered in a different context in Chapter 7.

(a) Keeill Woirrey, Kerroodhoo, Patrick

This site was excavated in 1909 by Lace (Kermode 1910,3-5). The excavation disclosed the form of the keeill and also uncovered the remains of 17 lintel graves, of which two underlay portions of the N and W walls. The relationship of these two graves to the others is not, however, known. Nonetheless, it is clear that the present building postdates at least part of its associated cemetery. There is, however, no evidence to suggest, contra Thomas, that:

> "the numerous early burials below the chapel avoid a central space in which there is room for a timber structure of the size of that found on Church Island."
>
> A.C. Thomas 1971a,71: (my emphasis)

This idea has recently been repeated by both Thomas (1986a,123) and Hamlin (1984,123), yet it is clear from the excavation report that the central area was not excavated. The excavator, for example, noted that "possibly the whole area of the keeill was so

occupied (with burials), the rest not being examined" (Kermode 1910,4: my emphasis).

(b) Sulbrick keeill, Santon

Excavations here also uncovered a number of lintel graves. Four of these, together with a simple dug grave, were found to underlie the walls of the present keeill (Kermode 1935,21-23).

(c) St. Patrick's Chapel, West Nappin, Jurby

The E gable of St. Patrick's chapel has been considered, on the basis of extant architectural detail, as work of the 14th or 15th century (Kermode 1911a,15). Excavation at the site demonstrated that several burials, some of which were covered with white pebbles, extended under the E gable wall and beneath part of the N wall at its E end (Kermode 1911a,17).

(d) North Keeill, Parish Churchyard, Maughold

An ambiguous account by Megaw (1950,172) refers to the discovery of lintel graves "underlying the level of the (keeill) walls." This might suggest that the keeill postdated part of an earlier cemetery. This relationship, however, was not noted by Kermode (1915a,21-24) in his account of the excavation.

(e) Ballameanagh keeill, Lezayre

Excavations at this site in c.1914 uncovered the remains of a lintel grave, aligned NE-SW. This was assumed to have underlain the N wall of the keeill, which had been removed some 30 years previously (Kermode 1915a,6). The earlier discovery of a "bone needle and some rings" is also mentioned by Kermode (1915a,7) and this, together with the fact of the grave's orientation, seems to have led Kermode to conclude that it had been "a heathen prehistoric grave" (1915a,7). This seems a tenuous argument and

although the evidence is not conclusive, it is at least possible that the Ballameanagh keeill was built over an earlier associated Christian cemetery.

(f) Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma, German

Kermode's excavations at this site did not conclusively establish the relationship of the present keeill to the cemetery. Three lintel graves, the most southerly of which was located hard against the S wall of the keeill, were discovered beneath its floor (Kermode 1910,8-12). These graves were not aligned with the present structure and may thus refer to an earlier keeill or cemetery. There is also some evidence, albeit that the report is ambiguous, to suggest that the most westerly grave was cut by one to the E: "another lintel grave, its side overlapping the E end of the first by 24 inches" (Kermode 1910,11: my emphasis).

(g) Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold

Kermode's (1915a,fig.44) plan of Keeill Vael shows two lintel graves, the more southerly of which is located hard against, and possibly underlying, the S wall of the keeill. This relationship was not noted by the excavator. Nonetheless, the plan evidence would seem to indicate the possibility that the keeill post-dates at least part of its associated cemetery.

(h) Upper Sulby keeill, Onchan

At this site, the remains of a líntel grave were discovered beneath the embankment which extended around the walls of the keeill (Kermode 1935,9,fig.1). If the keeill and embankment can be considered roughly contemporary, then the present keeill could presumably be assigned to a relatively late phase in the

development of the cemetery.

(i) Keeill Woirrey, Cornadale, Maughold

A similar discovery was also made by Kermode in his excavation of Keeill Woirrey, where a lintel grave was discovered outside the E wall of the keeill and apparently under the earth embankment. The grave was aligned with its longer axis set several degrees to the N of that of the keeill (Kermode 1915a,fig.43).

As at Upper Sulby, the relationship of these features might identify the keeill as a relatively late feature on the site. An alternative interpretation of this site, however, is postulated in Chapter 7. This alternative construct would require the grave to have been cut through the surrounding keeill embankment.

(j) Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory

Kermode's excavations at this site in 1918 have been reviewed by Bruce (1968,41-45). These excavations were primarily concerned with the clearance of the keeill itself. An unspecified number of lintel graves were also examined, as indeed were a number of prehistoric features. Sections too were cut through the circuit of the Iron Age enclosure within which the keeill is located.

The site was re-examined in 1944 - 1945 by Professor Bersu, whose excavations at the E fringe of the site uncovered a Viking boat burial (Bersu & Wilson 1966,1-44). The significance of this discovery for the purposes of this present summary lay in the fact that the boat burial had overlain and disturbed an extensive lintel grave cemetery. Furthermore, it was clear that the cemetery had been in use shortly prior to the erection of the

Viking monument over it, since a number of skeletons were found to have been disturbed whilst still in an articulated state (Bersu & Wilson 1966,12). The boat burial, on the basis of the artefacts found within it, has been considered to date to the period 850 X 900 (Bersu & Wilson 1966,87).

The relationship of the lintel grave cemetery to the present keeill, however, is unknown. It lies approximately 70 m to the W, and not over the boat burial, as has been recently stated by Radford (1983,23).

(k) Cronk yn Howe, Lezayre

This site was excavated in 1928 and, for its time, was well recorded. Two burials, `A´ and `C´ (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,274,294) were found to have underlain a later stone-built structure. Two timber-lined graves, `E´ and `G´, on the other hand, the latter of which partially overlay the former, were considered to post-date the construction of this building on account of their alignment with and proximity to it (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,284). A number of simple cross-incised stones, together with a rune-inscribed slab, were discovered both within and about the walls of this structure (Kermode 1929a,356-360). There were also indications that the W end of the N wall had been altered at some time (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,296).

The stone structure at Cronk yn Howe has been identified as a chapel and tentatively assigned to the 12th century on the basis of the rune-inscribed stone and the building´s elongated proportions (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,295-297). Page (1980,192), however, has questioned the identification of this structure as a

chapel and has suggested the possibility of it being a secular building. Page, for example, questioned whether "the foundations were identified as a chapel because a rune-stone (assumed to be a grave-stone) was found in them" (1980,192). These are important points, but the fact that a number of graves were apparently inserted with respect to that building would seem to negate Page's hypothesis.

Another interpretation of the site has been offered by Bersu. He suggested, on the basis of the many clench-nails that were found, that the chapel had been superimposed over a Viking boat burial (Megaw 1978,298). This suggestion has numerous implications for the many keeill sites which are found on what have been previously considered as Bronze Age burial mounds (Megaw 1978,298: see below Chapter 7). Bersu's idea is, of course, speculative. At the same time, however, this present study would be sceptical of this interpretation. It seems to be an unnecessarily elaborate view, given that several timber-lined graves or coffins are known from the site. The clench-nails could well have been derived from the disturbance of such features as these.

Interpretation of the Cronk yn Howe site is thus fraught with difficulties. It seems clear, however, that the excavated stone structure was an ecclesiastical building with associated burials and that it overlay an earlier and probably Christian cemetery.

(1) Ronaldsway II (Airport Site), Malew

This site was excavated in 1935 prior to the construction of the main runway at the Isle of Man airport. The site was poorly recorded, although the published plan (Neely 1940,pl.8) hints at

the magnitude and complexity of this site. The foundations of at least six circular and one rectangular structure were uncovered within the circuit of a stone-built enclosure, which was partially ditched externally. An extensive lintel grave cemetery and a large flagged area were also discovered, together with evidence of iron and bronze smelting (Bruce 1968,29). A supposedly subterranean structure, which lay outside the enclosure, was described as a sallyport (Neely 1940,76).

The listed finds included artefacts of native Iron Age and Viking type (Neely 1940,81-86: Skinner & Bruce-Mitford 1940). Little discussion of the site or its date, however, has been made. The cemetery has been tentatively associated with a battle which was fought nearby in 1275 (Neely 1940,72,80). A carved slab, 164(-), which was found forming one end of a `grave´ (see below pp.165-168), was thought to have originally been an 8th century altar stone (Neely 1940,72). The industrial residue, meanwhile, was said to have been "similar to that found at various places in Ireland during the past few years, and in this case could date from medieval times" (Neely 1940,80). No attempt was made, however, to provide a connected account of the site and its development.

Few stratigraphical observations are apparent in the published report (Neely 1940). The paved area in the centre of the site is said to have overlain some graves and underlain others (Neely 1940,73). It also overlay one of the circular structures. Another relationship is implied by the discovery of a simple cross-marked stone, 166(-), which was found in the matrix

of the surrounding enclosure wall (Neely 1940,76: Megaw 1939,163,pl.172). This stone, if not a later insertion, would date the enclosure to the Christian period, and if identified as a grave-marker, might imply that the erection of the enclosure post-dated the establishment of the cemetery. These points, however, are speculative and are only offered as possibilities. Finally, the noted absence of industrial residues in the grave fills (Neely 1940,80) might indicate that metalworking was a relatively late activity on the site.

(m) Keeill Vael, Druidale, Michael

This site was excavated in 1979 and 1980 in advance of the construction of the Sulby reservoir. The final report is in preparation (Morris forthcoming b). The basic development of the site, however, is clear (Morris 1981a; 1983a).

The keeill displayed two phases of construction. In the later phase much of the N and E walls of the earlier keeill were thickened. Five cross-incised stones, similar to those found at Cronk yn Howe, were discovered within the wall matrix of this later work. Another was found immmediately in front of the altar (Morris 1983a,fig.12). The stones, however, are not closely datable (Trench-Jellicoe 1983,128).

It was evident that the keeill had been established on an earlier site and had in part utilized the walls of an earlier structure in its original construction. This earlier pre-keeill structure had also evidently served as an enclosing wall to the N and E of the keeill (Morris 1983a,fig.14). Carbon-14 determinations on material derived from contexts which predate the pre-keeill structure will ultimately provide a

terminus post quem for that structure (Morris 1983a,121). The dating of the keeill, in either of its phases, remains, however, uncertain.

(v) Conclusion & Summary

This chapter has attempted to bring together all the available historical and archaeological evidence for the absolute or relative dating of chapel sites in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man. A brief review of Dietrichson and Meyer's criteria for distinguishing pre-Norse and Norse ecclesiastical sites has also been made. This area of study, which is concerned with the form and layout of ecclesiastical sites, is returned to in Chapter 5, where it is more convenient to examine the full corpus of Manx and Northern Isles chapel sites. Nonetheless, it should be clear that these sites are not on the whole closely datable.

The documentary evidence is clearly limited in what it may tell us about the dating of the chapels. It is true that a handful of sites have been dated very precisely indeed and that this has been done on the basis of the interpretation of events in Orkneyinga Saga. St. Peter's chapel on the Brough of Birsay and the churches at Orphir and on Egilsay, for example, have been dated to c.1050, 1118 X 1122, and 1135 X 1138 respectively (Radford 1962a,176: Dietrichson & Meyer 1906,21,28). It is important to realize, however, that each of these buildings is, in an Orcadian context, in some way exceptional. The apsidal termination at Birsay, the round tower at Egilsay and the circular nave at Orphir might all be considered in this context. The relevance of these sites for our understanding and dating of

the small district chapels might reasonably therefore be questioned. The chapels are examined in Chapter 5 and in Volume 2. For now it may be said that they are architecturally undistinguished and of a simple basic form. On the basis of these criteria alone, they stand apart from the high status and putatively earldom or bishopric churches which are mentioned in Orkneyinga Saga.

The archaeological evidence is more straight-forward. The evidence from Man, although of poor quality on the whole, nonetheless testifies to the fact that several of the extant keeills can be considered as relatively late structures. The dating of the sites, however, remains problematical. The archaeological evidence for the development of ecclesiastical sites in Orkney and Shetland has also been set out. The results of the modern excavation on the Brough of Deerness and the identification of a possibly pre-Norse timber chapel on the site are particularly encouraging. Unfortunately, however, in the face of such a small sample of excavated sites, it is impossible to assess how typical such a sequence may be for other ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Isles.

Excavation must ultimately be the way forward if the Manx and Northern Isles ecclesiastical sites are to be better dated and assigned to their rightful historical context. Until that happens, it seems we can only proceed largely by hypothesis as to which sites are Norse, which pre-Norse and which continued over the native-Norse interface. Such a hypothesis is presented in Chapter 6.

UNIV DUNELM

CHAPTER 5

SITE MORPHOLOGY: AN ANALYSIS OF CHAPEL FORM & SITE LAYOUT

Introduction

The problem of chronology has been considered in Chapter 4. This present chapter takes up some of the issues raised there and looks specifically at the corpus of Manx, Orcadian and Shetland chapel sites. The chapels are examined in terms of size and data concerning the form and positioning of doorways and windows are also provided. The evidence for flooring and roofing materials, as well as the evidence for internal fixtures and fittings is also summarized. Part One of this chapter also includes a detailed analysis of the different altar types which are known from these areas.

The second major part of this chapter contains a section on metrology and modular and proportional theories of design and construction. The chronological implications which are sometimes raised by such studies are also considered.

Chapel site enclosure forms are examined in Part Three. A provisional corpus of associated features such as `specially-marked graves´, graveyard shrines and leachta is also established for these areas for the first time and discussed.

Part 1: Manx, Orcadian & Shetland Chapels: An Analysis of their Structural and Formal Characteristics

(i) Manx Keeills

(a) Size, Form & Construction

Visible traces of keeills now remain at only some 35 sites (Cubbon 1982,266) although there are fairly complete records for

as many as 54 keeills in all (Note 1). The keeills may be described as small chapels, usually of a rectangular form, and they have been defined by Kinvig (1975,47), for example, as:

> "simple structures and usually quite small, the keeill at Ballachrink, Marown, being, for example, as small as 10 by 6 ft inside".

However, the Ballachrink keeill (MAROWN 10), which is one of the smallest keeills, is by no means typical. It has been considered worthwhile therefore to illustrate the total corpus of Manx keeills in order to emphasize the diversity of size, form and internal layout (figs.59-61). This is a necessary requirement if we are going to consider what is `typical´, `common´, `unusual´ or `rare´ about these sites. The schematic plans have been drawn to a uniform scale and they thus also serve as a direct formal comparison with the chapels of Orkney and Shetland (figs.63-68).

At a formal level, the keeills are almost all single-chambered rectangular structures, without an architecturally distinguished chancel. There are a few exceptions. Keeill Woirrey at Ballalough (Structure 15,fig.59), for example, has an apsidal E end. This same building would also seem to have been constructed with a structurally distinguished chancel area and a corner-buttressed W exterior wall face (Kermode 1926,468). The sites at Ballahimmin and Keeill Chiggyrt also have irregularly formed W fronts (Structures 14 & 35,figs.59,60). Meanwhile, Kermode´s (1915a,22,fig.32) excavation of the North Keeill in Maughold parish churchyard uncovered the vestiges of a porch-like structure, extending from, and of one build with, the W exterior wall face (Structure 32,fig.60). This same keeill also appears to have been buttressed at its SW exterior corner. This

wall too is said to have been tied in with the rest of the building (Kermode 1915a,22) and as such it may represent the vestigial remains of a chapel built in antis, that is where the side walls extend beyond the line of the gables (Leask 1955,55-56). Such a form is certainly rare in Man and has previously only been identified in St. Patrick's church on Peel Island (Radford 1965,47: Cubbon 1982,fig.16.7: Fig.62). However, the rectangular unicameral form is by far the most common type of ground plan found among the Manx keeills.

The keeills range in size from 3.05 x 1.85 m internally in the case of one of the keeills at Ballachrink (MAROWN 10) to as much as 8.55 x 5.85 m in the case of the early phase St. Patrick's church on Peel Island. The internal floor areas correspondingly range from just under 6 m2 to about 50 m2. The vast majority (72%) of keeills, however, have internal floor areas of 10 m2 - 25 m2 (fig.54).

There is a great deal of variation regarding the internal length of these structures although some 62% of the group have interior longitudinal dimensions of 4.50-6.50 m (fig.54). There is, however, markedly less variation in the internal widths of the keeills, with 76% of the group having dimensions of 2.50-4 m (fig.54).

Variation in wall widths is also quite pronounced. The walls may range in width from as little as 0.60 m to as much as 1.60 m but there appears to be little association between wall width and construction method (Table 2). Walls of lime or clay mortared construction, for example, were relatively slight, rarely

exceeding one metre in width. At the same time, however, it is clear that not all such narrow walls were necessarily thus constructed.

Four basic modes of wall construction may be discerned (Table 2). The keeill at Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7), for example, was constructed with walls which were stone-faced internally but formed externally of earth and/or turf (Kermode 1907,13). This type of wall construction would seem to have been comparatively rare.

Many keeills (Table 2) have walls formed of an internal and external stone facing, with the interstices packed with an earth and rubble fill. Others were shown by Kermode's excavations to have been constructed of laid stone throughout. These two methods of wall construction are common on Man and together account for 77% of the group for which data are available (Table 2).

A fourth method of wall construction is characterized by the use of a clay or lime mortar. There are six certain members of this group and a seventh, the keeill site at Ballanorris in Arbory, has been inferred by Bruce (1968,40: Table 2). Meanwhile, the walls of Keeill Vael at Balladoole, also in Arbory, are said to have been plastered internally and washed over with a red colouring (Bruce 1968,42).

(b) Entrances

The entrance is commonly located within the thickest wall of the keeill (Table 2). The location of the keeill entrance is known in 44 cases and it is most commonly situated in the W gable (Table 2: 35 examples-80%). There are seven examples of

S entrances and two examples of N entrances.

In some cases, it is possible that the location of the entrance could have been determined by local topographical conditions. At Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8), for example, there are reasons for supposing that the building is of two structural phases and this may have influenced the siting of the entrance at the SE angle of that structure (fig.4). Similarly, the N entrance into Keeill Vael at Druidale may have been largely determined by that building's insertion inside, and its partial utilization of, the walls of an earlier circular structure (Morris 1983a,fig.14). However, in the majority of cases it is impossible to discern any local topographical factor which would have necessarily determined the location of the keeill entrance. All we can therefore say is that on the basis of the surviving evidence the W gable seems to have been the preferred location for the keeill entrance.

The entrance was commonly formed of edge-set stones, overlain by semi-coursed stonework. This is well evidenced at Keeill Vael at Druidale (Morris 1983a,fig.11), although usually only the jambs now remain, as for example, at Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7: pl.5a) and Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8: pl.8a). However, in other examples, such as the keeills at Balladoole (Bruce 1968,fig.8) or Spooyt Vane (Kermode 1911a,fig.4), the entrance jambs were formed solely of semi-coursed stonework.

There is little evidence to indicate how these entrances were closed off. The entrance jambs are frequently splayed and it is commonly assumed that a wattle screen or a bundle of gorse would

have been used to block off the doorway (Oliver 1868,82). This remains a possibility and, indeed, such door coverings were certainly known in Ireland until comparatively recent times (Lucas 1956).

Evidence for permanent door fittings is rare, although at Lag ny Keeilley, Kermode (1909,20-21,fig.17) discovered a socket stone, apparently in situ, on the S side of the door and a large perforated stone found nearby was provisionally identified as the corresponding door lintel. Socket stones from Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8) and Ballachrink (MAROWN 9), from Knoc y Doonee in Andreas, the East Keeill at Maughold and from the Ballaglonney and Ballaqueeney keeill sites in Rushen have been identified as similar pivot stones for either door or window fittings (Kermode 1909,15-16; 1911a,24; 1915a,27: Bruce 1968,50,59,fig.12).

Evidence for checked or rebated entrances is also rare and it may be significant that two of the four possible examples were found at sites where the door jambs incorporated blocks of dressed sandstone in their construction. These are St. Patrick's chapel on Peel Island and the North Keeill at Maughold (Kermode 1910,22,fig.10; 1915a,21,fig.32). A third example of this feature was discovered at Keeill Chiggyrt in Maughold (Kermode 1915a,29, fig.40) and a fourth example is said to have been found at Knoc y Doonee in Andreas (Kermode 1911a,22-23,fig.21). This, however, is not convincingly demonstrated in Kermode's plan of the keeill.

(c) Windows

Window forms were single or double splayed and were usually located in the E wall and/or towards the E end of the S wall.

Keeill Woirrey at Kerroodhoo, meanwhile, is said to have had two lancet type windows in its E gable (Kermode 1909,4).

None of the recorded window forms is known to have been checked for a window frame and most are only known from their plan form. Those at Ballakilley, however, are said to have been flat-headed (Oliver 1868,88). Meanwhile, two window heads were discovered by Kermode (1909,24,fig.19 recte fig.20; 1911a,32, fig.29) during his excavations at Lag ny Keeilley and Ballavarkish. The window-head from the latter site was fairly complete and contained two round-headed lights, each approximately 180 x 90 mm externally. The lights feature two pairs of small holes on their inner chamfered faces and these may be interpreted as the fixing points for small glass roundels. No early medieval window glass or fragments of lead came, however, have been recorded in any of the Manx keeill excavations.

(d) Flooring

The floors of the keeills appear to have usually been paved. Often, however, as for example at Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma or at Knoc y Doonee (Kermode 1910,11; 1911a,25), the paving, if once present, has only survived around the entrance and the altar setting. Floors of trampled earth may also perhaps therefore be inferred. Some keeill floors, however, were certainly paved throughout and in a number of cases they seem to have been most carefully laid. The floor of the keeill at Balladoole was said to have been "carefully paved with small Poyllvaaish flags" (Bruce 1968,42). At the Eary Moar keeill the pavement stones "appeared to have their ends chipped to a round" (Kermode 1910,17), whilst

at Lag ny Keeilley, an early excavation by Dr. Simpson in 1849 described the floor there as having been paved with rounded quartz pebbles (Oswald 1860,77: cf.Kermode 1909,23). Probably the most remarkable floor, however, was discovered by Kermode (1909,10-11,fig.10) at Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6), where a central strip, 0.65 m wide and raised 0.10 m above the floor, formed a path between the keeill entrance and the altar setting.

Evidence for timber flooring is minimal and is not positively referred to in any of the Manx Archaeological Survey reports. The only possible allusion to such a feature is referred to in connexion with the excavation of Keeill Woirrey at Kerroodhoo where a number of substantial edge-set stones were found set against the S interior wall. Kermode (1910,4,fig.1) suggested:

> "Possibly these may have been to support the floor as they appear to serve no other purpose".

However, a paved floor is also mentioned in Kermode's discussion of that site.

(e) Roofing

It has sometimes been assumed by early writers (Oliver 1868,83) that the Manx keeills were roofed with slate. Archaeological evidence for this, however, is lacking and is confined to one or two instances where pierced roofing slabs were found in extremely dubious contexts, in the much altered chapel at West Nappin and in the North Keeill in Maughold churchyard (Kermode 1911a,16; 1915a,21). Indeed, a far more substantive case can be made for thatch roofs. By analogy with traditional roofing techniques, as seen today in the Open Air Museum at Cregneish, it might be suggested that the thatch would have lain

over a thin layer of top-turf, known locally as scraa or screg, the whole supported on a framework of couples and laths. Archaeological support for this contention may be reflected in the discovery of stone thatching pegs (Manx: bwhid suggane) from the keeills at Ballahimmin, Ballalough and Cronk yn Howe (Kermode 1910,16; 1926,471: Bruce & Cubbon 1930,287). A thatch roof might also be indicated by the discovery of a 50 mm thick deposit of interleaved layers of "bright red clay and wood ashes" (Kermode 1910,11), above the floor at Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma. It is conceivable that this might possibly have derived from the combustion of the roof materials.

Extant structural features might also indicate how certain keeills were roofed. It has been suggested, for example, that the surrounding walls at Keeill Woirrey in Glen Moar (pl.17a; fig.10) and at Keeill Vael in Druidale (Morris 1983a,fig.14) may have served as `cattle restraints´, as a means of deterring livestock from damaging the building´s roof matrix (A.M. Cubbon: Public Lecture, Peel 1982). This interpretation, again, would presuppose that the roofs were of thatch and/or turf.

(f) Altars

The altar is by far the most common and durable fitting found at keeill sites. Excavations in Man have revealed traces of 27 altars (Table 3) and several altar frontals and mensae or altar tops are also known. This material, together, almost certainly represents the largest corpus of altar fittings from any single region of the British Isles. This corpus has not previously been considered as a whole, although parts of it have been briefly

considered by Thomas (1971a,182) and Cubbon (1982,262-266).

Professor Thomas (1971a,176-178) has distinguished two basic types of altar forms which might be found on Early Christian sites in Britain and Ireland. One of these, the table or pedestal altar, is rare. An allusion to such a form is possibly contained in Cogitosus' Vita Brigidae (Kenney 1929,359-360) and such an altar is supposed to have been found in Thomas' (1967a,139) excavation of the timber phase chapel at Ardwall Isle. It must be said, however, that the criteria for distinguishing between a structural post-hole and one that was intended for an altar post are by no means clear.

Thomas' second basic type is what he has called the cavity altar and it is this form that we seem to be concerned with on Man. In an Insular context, the type-sites for such altar forms are the chapel at St. Ninian's Point on Bute (Aitken 1955,64-65, 73-74) and the stone chapel at Ardwall Isle (Thomas 1967a,137).

The altar at St. Ninian's Point appears to have been particularly well preserved. It measured 1.40 x 0.90 m and 0.70-0.90 m high (Aitken 1955,64,73) and contained two large, slate panels on its W face. Behind the frontal panel and approachable from a step on the S side of the altar, Aitken discovered a well-constructed void, 0.65 m deep, 0.25 m wide and possibly 0.45 m high. This feature has been identified as a relic cavity (Aitken 1955,64-65,73).

In spite of the numbers in which they are known, the Manx altars have been poorly preserved and frequently only the altar base, 0.10-0.25 m upstanding, has survived. A number of schematic plan forms, together with some selected elevations, are shown in

Fig.69. The form is usually rectangular although those at Spooyt Vane and Sulbrick (SANTON 8) were longer on the E than on the W. The Manx altars range greatly in size, from as little as 0.60 x 0.45 m to 1.60-2.30 x 1 m in the cases of those at Ballalough or Spooyt Vane respectively (Table 3). They are most commonly constructed with a length to breadth ratio of either 2:1 or 3:2 (Table 3), ratios which are frequently found in the buildings also (see below p.151; Table 9). However, as Thomas (1971a,182) has remarked, there appears to be little correspondence in general between the absolute length of the altar and the interior width of the keeill. Just under two-thirds of the group of Manx altars have lengths of between about two-fifths and a half the interior width of the keeill. The remaining group of altars are between roughly one quarter and one third the keeill's width. These data are expressed in percentage terms in Table 3.

Several of the Manx altars seem to have been slightly elevated above the level of the keeill floor. This feature is perhaps best demonstrated in the keeills at Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7) or Camlork (Kermode 1909,11-12; 1935,17,fig.20). Other altars were fronted on the W by a long narrow edge-set stone. This is seen, for example, at Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) and Sulbrick (SANTON 8) and elsewhere (fig.69). Such stones were referred to by Kermode (1909,10,21; 1935,22) as steps, although they might be identified alternatively as kneelers. Such an interpretation would certainly be consistent with the observed heights of the Knoc y Doonee and Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma altars

which were 0.60 m and at least 0.75 m high respectively (Kermode 1911a,25; 1910,10). The stones may also have had a functional role, as supports for a front altar panel. If so, such a feature could well indicate the form of the altar at those sites where the altar itself might have been largely destroyed.

Only two of the Manx altars have survived sufficiently intact to enable further discussion. The Knoc y Doonee altar, in fact, was almost complete and was formed of thin edge-set panels set around a rubble and sand core and apparently preceded on the W by an edge-set frontal support or kneeler (Kermode 1911a,25,fig.24). The mensa and the S side panel projected approximately 80 mm beyond the line of the rubble core and the presumably missing front panel would have been comparable in size to, for example, the Ballavarkish altar frontal (Table 4). The altar at Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma was of a similar construction, with the altar being defined by a series of thin vertically- or edge-set slabs (fig.69).

Other constructional forms are also evident. One of the most interesting is one which may be termed the corner-post or corner-pillar altar. Several examples of this type are known and would include the altar forms found at Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) and Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7), together with those from Ballalough, Cronk y Killey, Sulby and Glen Moar (fig.69; pl.17b). The corners, or sometimes only the forecorners, of this type of altar setting are defined by thin rounded stone pillars. The body of the altar seems to have been filled with drystone masonry. As a type, this form of altar is very similar to the one which was found in the stone chapel at Ardwall Isle, dated

by Thomas (1967a,175; 1971a,180) to the 8th century.

Solid drystone masonry altars form the third basic structural type found on Man. The altars at Balladoole or Ballakilmartin might be cited as examples (fig.69) although it must be allowed that such forms could be extremely denuded examples of what were originally altars of panel or corner-post type.

This study has sought to identify three basic types of altar on the basis of their constructional form. These may be classified as (A) corner-post, (B) panel and (C) drystone masonry altars. There can be little doubt that each of these altar types would have responded to certain aesthetic and constructional requirements or restraints. The local stone, for example, may have been particularly suited to masonry or panel building techniques. In this context, it is probably not without significance that the altar at the Ronaldsway I keeill site, which is located near the limestone area of Castletown, should have been built of roughly-squared limestone blocks (Bruce 1968,19). It is clear, after all, that the prime object on the part of the builders was to construct a roughly rectangular and raised area with a flat upper surface on which to celebrate the Eucharist and there is a limited number of ways in which that can be achieved. We should be wary therefore of imparting any chronological or cultural significance to a structure whose form and construction were largely functional. Nevertheless, there are one or two attributes of the Manx altar forms, as defined above, which deserve closer attention.

The corner-post altar, and perhaps the panel type too, could be considered as skeuomorphs of timber structures. This is particularly apposite in the case of the former type where the corner pillars and mensa could be seen as the equivalents, in stone, of a wooden table. The Knoc y Doonee panel altar could also reflect a carpentry tradition although the formal evidence is less unequivocal. The stone panels, for example, could imitate timber boards, the whole structure therefore reflecting a translation into stone of a wooden box-like structure. This, however, is less certain and the formal appearance of such altars could equally be due simply to the building potential offered by the local stone. The Manx panel altar can therefore only doubtfully be considered as a product of skeuomorphism. The corner-post altar, on the other hand, whose form is curious in terms of stone construction, almost certainly betokens a timber prototype.

The three types of altar which have been identified by this study are schematically illustrated in fig.70. The plan forms are well-attested. However, it should be realized that the reconstructed elevations have been made only on the basis of the plan form and we do not know, for example, whether the masonry of types A, Bii or C formerly contained a central panel or panels. Equally, we have as yet no evidence for a type which could have been produced through an amalgamation of the building techniques seen in altar types A and B. Such a composite form, type A/B (fig.70), could most conveniently be described as an altar of post-and-panel type. Such a form, if found, might well be considered a product of skeuomorphism.

It is clear that there is insufficient evidence on which to base any chronological scheme for the dating of the different altar forms herein identified and, in suggesting that certain forms presuppose an original timber prototype, this study is simply making a formal observation. No chronological significance should necessarily be attached to that observation. The different forms might well be contemporary and this study can see no logical reason for supposing any one type to be necessarily later or earlier than any other.

It has been suggested above (p.111) that the Manx altars are related to a type of relic altar known from Ardwall Isle and Bute. However, none of the Manx examples has for certain produced evidence of a relic cavity in its construction and such a comparison might therefore be considered somewhat vacuous. It could be argued that such relic cavities had been destroyed or overlooked during excavation. Charles Thomas (1971a,179), for example, has remarked that:

> "such cavities...are small...and are normally in the uppermost part of the altar, (and) can hardly be discussed in relation to a type of structure of which one expects, today, to find only the base."

However, this study's claim that the Manx altars may be seen as types of relic altars is not based entirely on negative evidence.

There is a feature of Manx altars which would appear to be unique in an Insular context. The best example of this feature, which has previously escaped comment, may be found at Keeill Vreeshy (MAROWN 4). Kermode's (1909,7-8,fig.7) excavation at this site uncovered a well-formed cavity within the wall-matrix,

immediately behind the altar. The cavity was 0.45 m deep, 0.40 m high and 0.30 m wide and as such is not dissimilar to the built cavity found in the altar of the chapel at St. Ninian's Point on Bute (p.111). The Keeill Vreeshy cavity was faced on the W by a thin edge-set stone. No finds, however, were recorded from this feature. A similar cavity has been reported from Keeill Woirrey in Glen Moar. This was formed of small flat stones and was located close to one of the altar pillar stones (Kermode 1909,19). The remaining pillar stone and the presumed S interior face of the wall cavity are shown in pl.17b and fig.10. Two other references to possible altar-sited wall cavities are discussed in the gazetteer in connexion with Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) and the keeill at Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7).

No small finds have been made for certain in connexion with this group of Manx altar-sited wall cavities, although it is possible that the example from Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) was associated with a deposit of quartz pebbles. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume, because of their location, an association with the altar itself and as such these wall cavities could be identified as relic cavities. Such relics may have been of the representative kind, such as strips of silk or cloth, or perhaps of the corporeal kind, possibly derived from the primary cemetery or brought from elsewhere in connexion with the original founding or dedication of the keeill. Either way, the Manx altar-sited wall cavity would seem to represent a complimentary form to the true relic altar. There is, however, one important difference between these types of relic altar. A key feature of the Ardwall Isle and Bute altars is that their relic cavities are presumed to

have been accessible from the outside. It is clear, however, that the Manx altar-sited wall cavities could not have been accessible. Nevertheless, this study would suggest that these different types of relic cavity are closely related and share a common origin in the Early Christian cult of relics.

(g) Altar Frontals

In addition to the corpus of fixed altars, excavations and stray finds have produced at least five cross-incised or decorated slabs which have been identified as altar frontals (Table 4). None, however, has been found in situ. The identification of these stones rests partly upon symbolic content, partly upon the stone's form and particularly its thickness. It might also be significant that on each of the five listed stones (Table 4) the central design is contained within an incised rectangular border. These stones have been most recently illustrated by Marshall Cubbon (1982,fig.16.3,pl.16.3).

The reconstructed dimensions of these stones are compatible with the observed dimensions of the altar settings (Table 3) and, importantly, these panels serve to provide some indication of the altars' height. The Ballavarkish, Ronaldsway II or Maughold panels would conveniently fill the W face of some of the smaller settings. In others, the frontals may have been incorporated into a drystone masonry base or have been flanked to either side by further, perhaps undecorated, panels as shown in Thomas' (1971a,186) reconstruction of the Phillack altar.

The Ballavarkish slab, 52(-), has been assigned, on art-historical and epigraphical evidence, to the second quarter of

the 8th century (Dr.R Trench-Jellicoe in litt 11.3.86). The Maughold and Ronaldsway panels have also been considered as examples of 8th century work (Trench-Jellicoe in litt 11.3.86). The Calf of Man crucifixion slab is generally regarded as an early 9th century piece (Kermode 1907,127: Megaw 1958: Trench-Jellicoe in litt 11.3.86), although Thomas (1971a,185) has suggested an early 8th century date. Meanwhile, the panel from Peel Island, 31(15), has been considered to date from the 10th or 11th century (Trench-Jellicoe 1985,ii,58-59). The pre-9th century slabs, if correctly identified as altar frontals, presumably indicate that there were keeills in the period prior to the conversion of the Norse settlers, as Megaw (1978,298) has pointed out.

(h) Altar Mensae

Five or six possible mensae, the upper flat surface of the altar, are known from Man (Table 5). These stones include both plain (unconsecrated) and cross-incised (consecrated) examples (Thomas 1967b,108-109; 1971a,182). The most positively identified of these stones was the one which was found in situ over the altar at Knoc y Doonee (Kermode 1911a,25,fig.24). The stone, measuring 0.85 x 0.45 x 0.07 m, was unmarked and, as Kermode pointed out, may have been used in conjunction with a small consecrated portable altar. A second stone which may be included in this group was found during ploughing on the Ballalough keeill site in 1924. The stone measures 0.75 x 60 m and features a deeply incised rectangular border on one face. It is assumed to have covered the four stone corner-posts of the altar which was subsequently discovered during excavation

(Kermode 1926) but the association can only be considered a possibility. Nevertheless, the stone and the altar setting are at least compatible in terms of size (Tables 3 & 5).

Only one stone in this group is marked with possible consecration crosses. This stone, 67(46), was apparently found in St. Patrick's church on Peel Island during the restorations of 1873 (Kermode 1907,119) or in the nearby St. Patrick's chapel (Kermode 1910,23). Kermode (1907,pl.XIV) believed that five small equal-armed crosses had been incised equidistantly upon the limbs of a cross carved in low relief. However, Trench-Jellicoe's (1985,ii,54-55) recent analysis has succeeded in identifying traces of as many as seven crosslets, three completely and four incompletely formed.

The stone was described by Kermode (1907,120) as an altar slab, although it is clear from the context of his discussion that he was inclined to the view that this was an example of a portable altar. However, in its present state, the stone measures approximately 0.50 x 0.50 x 0.05 m and a stone of such dimensions cannot easily be considered as portable. Charles Thomas (1971a,197), for example, has remarked that the average size of a portable altar would be of the order of 0.35 x 0.25 m, whilst others, such as St. Cuthbert's portable altar or the one found near Wick in Caithness, are both much smaller, measuring less than 0.15 x 0.15 m (Thomas 1971a,193-195). It is doubtful, therefore, if the Peel Island stone is a portable altar. Its identification as an altar <u>mensa</u> may also be questioned. Trench-Jellicoe (1985,ii,54-55), for example, has suggested that it is

impossible to suggest a function or date for this stone on a stylistic basis.

A fourth possible mensa was found during Kermode's (1935,22) excavation of the keeill at Sulbrick (SANTON 8). This stone, which is undecorated, was found lying in front of the altar. It measures approximately 1.30 x 0.75 m (Kermode 1935,fig.35) and this agrees well with the recorded dimensions of the altar itself (Table 3).

A fifth possible mensa has recently been found at Ballafurt (SANTON 3). The stone measures 0.75 x 0.40 m overall and contains a square recess, with sides up to 170 mm long and 15-20 mm deep, on one face. A groove on the underside, near the edge of the stone, may have held a supporting side slab (Dr.R Trench-Jellicoe in litt 15.5.86).

One final example, previously unrecorded, from Lag ny Keeilley, may also be tentatively included in this group of mensae. The stone, a rough slab of slate, measures approximately 0.85 x 0.35 x 0.10 m and displays, towards the centre of one face, a pecked out subrectangular or D-shaped hollow, approximately 200 x 100 x 30 mm deep (pl.20b). This hollow, like the example from Ballafurt, could conceivably represent a crude example of a recess for a consecrated super-altar. A medieval example of such a form has been illustrated by Thomas (1971a,198,pl.viii).

The Lag ny Keeilley stone is not among those which are known to have been found during Kermode's (1909,30) excavation. Its context therefore is unknown. Also it has to be remarked that, in its present state, this stone would not, by itself, have covered

the altar (Table 3). The identification of this stone as an altar mensa must therefore be open to question.

(i) Miscellaneous internal fixtures and fittings

There are few remaining features to be considered under this heading. Traces of wall-benches, for example, are unknown from any of the Manx keeill excavations. Examples of such are known only from the somewhat larger and later chapel on St. Michael's Isle, a structure which has been assigned on architectural grounds to the 12th or 13th centuries (Bruce 1968,23-24: Rigby 1915,420). Interestingly, this same site has also produced an unusual structure formed of two edge-set slabs, set at right-angles to one another and located against the NE interior angle of the chapel (Rigby 1915,fig.1: Bruce 1968,fig.7: Structure 48,fig.61). The structure encloses a square space, with sides approximately 0.75 m long. It has been identified as a sacristy (Bruce 1968,26,pl.VI,2).

One type of artefact, probably more than any other, is frequently associated with or found at keeill sites. These are often described as stoups or fonts, although it is clear that many of them may be identified as either parts of querns (see for example MAROWN 5 & 8) or as modern `bruising stones' (Bruce 1968,10,39,pl.xviii). A similar phenomenon has also been recognized in Cornwall (Thomas 1967b,113).

Some of these stone vessels may well have had an ecclesiastical association. This is even possible for the quernstones which may have been used to prepare the bread used in the celebration of the Eucharist. However, in the absence of any

known context, the identification of these stones as ecclesiastical objects remains difficult. All that can probably be said, therefore, is that whilst stone vessels might be confidently expected as part of the keeill furniture, none has been found in situ or in a satisfactory archaeological context.

Some of the stone vessels may be identified as water stoups (Bruce 1968,pl.XVII,3,4) although, again, none has been found in situ. The likely position for a water-stoup would have been in the vicinity of the keeill entrance. In this context, it is possible that the protruding stone brackets which were discovered by Kermode towards the W end of the S wall in the keeills at Lag ny Keeilley and Sulbrick (SANTON 8) may have supported such features (Kermode 1909,20,fig.17; 1935,21, fig.35).

(j) Summary & Context

It should be clear that the Manx keeills are similar in size to the small stone churches of South West Ireland (Cuppage et al 1986,257-346: Harbison 1982,618-624). There is, however, less variety in form. The majority of Manx keeills are of Harbison's (1982,618) Type 2, that is to say that they are simple rectangular structures with upright walls. A few may have been built in antis (Harbison Type 3). There are, however, no examples on Man of Harbison's Type 1 chapel, the corbelled rectangular structure such as Gallarus oratory or Harbison's Type 4 chapel, the church of nave and chancel type. The material evidence from Orkney and Shetland is considered next.

(ii) Orkney and Shetland Chapels

(a) Size, Form and Construction

Approximately 170 early chapel sites are known from Orkney. In Shetland 120 sites have been listed by Cant (1975,47-50). Both these totals, like that for the Isle of Man, should be regarded as only very rough estimates since the evidential bases on which the sites have been identified as chapel sites are extremely varied. The author is not familiar with every one of these sites. Nevertheless, there is good evidence, in the form of extant remains or earlier records, for the forms and dimensions for as many as 39 chapels in Orkney and these are illustrated in figs.63-66. The Unst chapels, together with a few others from Shetland, are illustrated in figs.67-68. It should, however, be realized that very few of the chapels of Orkney and Shetland have either been excavated (Appendix 2b) or are sufficiently upstanding to allow precise measurements to be made. At many sites the walls of the chapels remain as only slightly elevated turf-covered banks and thus internal dimensions and wall-widths can only be roughly gauged. All of these illustrations have been drawn to a uniform scale so as to allow comparison with the Manx material (figs.59-61).

Most of the Orkney and Shetland chapels are of one or other basic form. These may be defined as structures of unicameral and bicameral (nave and chancel) type. A third much smaller group of chapels have ground plans of multicameral or circular form.

The unicameral chapels in Orkney range in size from as little as 3.50 x 2.60 m internally in the case of Marykirk at Tuskerbister (Structure 14-fig.64) to perhaps as much as

11.30 x 4.70 m in the case of the chapel at the Head of Holland (Structure 13-fig.64). The Kirk of Etheriegeo in Birsay (Structure 3-fig.63) falls outside this range and apparently has internal dimensions of only about 2 x 2 m. Identification of this site, however, remains uncertain. The internal dimensions of Shetland single-cell chapels show a similar range in size, from 5.50 x 3.50 m to 12.70 x 4.50 m in the case of Halliara Kirk on Fetlar (Structure 3-fig.67) and St. Mary's chapel at Bothen (UNST 5: Structure 6-fig.67) respectively. The internal floor areas for the chapels of both areas correspondingly range from under 10 m2 to about 60 m2 (fig.55). A majority (58%), however, have internal floor areas of 15 m2-30 m2, as a group a little larger on average than the Manx keeills (fig.54). The internal floor area of the timber phase chapel on the Brough of Deerness (p.86), approximately 20 m2 in area, also falls within this range. A majority (65%) of the Orkney and Shetland chapels have internal widths, as in Man, of 2.50 - 4 m. About half the buildings are 5 - 7.50 m long internally (fig.55).

The bicameral chapels of Orkney and Shetland also range greatly in size. Many have internal dimensions of about 6-7 m x 3.50-4.50 m and 2-4 m x 2.50-3.50 m for the nave and chancel respectively (fig.56). A majority (64%) consequently have internal nave floor areas of 20 m2-35 m2 and at all but two sites, the chancel floor area is 5 m2-15 m2 in extent (fig.56).

There is comparatively little information from Orkney and Shetland regarding either differences in wall-width or wall-type. All of the non-unicameral structures, for example, have been

built with clay and/or lime mortared walls. Indeed this could be expected on constructional grounds alone, since the building of arches would necessitate the use of mortared stonework. The use of lime-mortar, given its association with what has been described as a Romanesque style of building (Radford 1962a,181), has consequently acquired a status as an indication of chronology. In the areas covered by this study, the use of lime-mortar is usually taken to signify a post-12th century date. Similar chronological conclusions regarding its use have been noted in the buildings of the Western Highlands and Islands (RCAMS 1971,145).

Lime-mortared walling is not confined to the non-unicameral structures and indeed almost all of the northern chapels, for which data are available, were so constructed. In fact, drystone construction is rarely found in the ecclesiastical buildings of these islands. The chapel on Auskerry was apparently of drystone construction, as would appear to have been the case also at St. Colm's chapel on the Holms of Ire (RCAMS 1946,ii,39,No.156). St. Mary's chapel at Framgord (UNST 20) would also seem to have been of drystone construction. Meanwhile, excavation of the chapel on the Brough of Deerness has suggested that the walls there were built with a clay core at the base and overlain with a fill of loose earth and rubble inside a dressed wall-face (Morris 1977b,3; forthcoming a). Earlier records, however, have also suggested that the Deerness chapel was pointed with lime-mortar (RCAMS 1946,ii,240-241). The single-cell chapels at Marwick (RCAMS 1946,ii,6-7,No.5), Halcro (OSCI ND48NE5) and St. Tredwell's chapel on Papa Westray

(WESTRAY 14), however, were all constructed with lime-mortared walls. At a purely constructional level, therefore, there is extremely little evidence to suggest that any of the extant structures are necessarily older than, perhaps, the 12th century. Drystone structures, meanwhile, in spite of their archaic appearance, can be dated with even less certainty.

(b) Entrances

There are only 13 single-cell chapels in Orkney and Shetland whose entrance location is known or suspected (Note 2). In five cases the entrance is located towards the W end of the S wall, in seven cases in the centre of the W wall, and in one possible case, at Halliara Kirk on Fetlar, it may be located towards the W end of the N wall.

In Man, the majority of the keeills were built with splayed and unrebated entrances. On the basis of the surviving evidence, however, it would seem that this feature is extremely rare in Orkney and Shetland. Splayed and unrebated entrances have only been noted in the chapels on the Brough of Deerness (Morris 1975,2) and at Framgord (UNST 20). St. Tredwell's chapel on Papa Westray (WESTRAY 14) and Marwick chapel in Birsay (RCAMS 1946,ii,6-7,No.5) were each built with parallel door jambs which were rebated towards their inner face, presumably for the insertion of a wooden door-frame. In the remaining nine cases there is little accurate information regarding the form, as opposed to the location, of the chapel entrance.

There are only eight nave and chancel chapels in Orkney and Shetland whose entrance location is known (Note 3). In five

cases, the entrance or the original entrance is located towards the W end of the S wall and in every case, with the exception of the Yell church, the entrance is formed of parallel and unrebated jambs.

Bicameral structures with W entrances, on the other hand, are even rarer. The doorway at St. Mary's chapel on Wyre (RCAMS 1946,ii,234-235,No.618) is built with parallel and unrebated jambs, whilst those in the chapels on St. Ninian's Isle chapel (O'Dell et al 1959) and at Lundawick (UNST 10) have been constructed with splayed and rebated jambs.

Data concerning entrance type and position are summarized in Table 6. Although there is little available data, there is, nevertheless, an interesting dichotomy between unicameral buildings on the one hand and bicameral structures on the other. The single-cell chapels seem to have been built with either splayed and unrebated or parallel and rebated jambs, whereas the doorways in the bicameral buildings seem to have had either splayed and rebated or parallel and unrebated jambs. There is also a tendency for W entrances, in both single and double-cell structures, to have been splayed. S entrances, on the other hand, seem to have been almost wholly built with parallel jambs. However, interpretation of this is difficult and these apparent dichotomies could well be fortuitous, given the paucity of data available.

(c) Windows

There is extremely little information from Orkney and Shetland regarding either window-form or position and most of what there is has been derived from the upstanding remains of

the bicameral chapels. For the single-cell structures, we have, unfortunately, exceedingly few facts to go on. There is a record of an E window, possibly containing tracery, at St. Tredwell's chapel (WESTRAY 14). There is also a tradition that St. Bride's chapel on Graemsay had narrow mullioned windows (OSCI HY20NW22). Meanwhile, the E window in the chapel on the Brough of Deerness is said to have been built with an internal splay but with parallel external sides for a glazed window frame (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,103). The remaining forms include examples of single- or double-splayed, round- or flat-headed windows. Examples of stepped and internally sloping sills have also been recorded (WESTRAY 5; UNST 10).

There are few diagnostic features which may be necessarily indicative of a specific chronological horizon, although the plain round-headed arch forms have been considered, on account of their association with bicameral buildings, as Romanesque-type work of the 12th century (Radford 1962a,181). The flat-headed window form, though of the simplest construction, may also be period-specific. The RCAMS (1971,22), for example, have suggested that such forms, as found in the ecclesiastical buildings of western Scotland, may be indicative of late medieval date. Certainly this type of window-form has been recognized as an insertion into the original fabric of the S wall of the nave at St. Magnus church on Egilsay (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,128,fig.102: RCAMS 1946,ii,228-229,No.611). The relative lateness of this form has also been graphically illustrated in the survey of St. Olaf's church at Lundawick (UNST 10) where the

original round-headed window in the S wall of the nave was later modified into a flat-headed form (fig.29). Flat-headed window forms may thus be indicative of late medieval date.

(d) Flooring & Roofing

There is little direct evidence as to how the chapels were either floored or roofed. Excavations at Tammaskirk in Rendall revealed a well-paved chancel but an apparently unpaved nave (Clouston 1932b,9-11). A similar distinction between nave and chancel was also noted by Radford (1959,12) during his excavation of the chapel on the Brough of Birsay. At the chapel on the Brough of Deerness, an earlier pebble floor was later superceded by paving, over which clay-mortar was later spread (Morris 1976,3; 1977b,1; forthcoming a).

Early writers, as in Man, have frequently assumed that the chapels were roofed with stone flags (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,115). There is, however, little archaeological evidence for this assertion, although a single stone-tile was found in a late context outside the chapel on the Brough of Deerness (RF.153; Phase D3-4; Morris forthcoming a). In many ways, however, this lack of evidence is not too surprising. Certainly, few sites have been excavated (Appendix 2b) and roofing slates are not likely to have been missed by stone robbers. Materials other than stone are, however, evidenced in the vernacular architecture of the Northern Isles. These could include thatch, turf, as well as flagstone, either singly or in combination (Fenton 1978,175-190). Certainly some of the parish churches are known to have been thatched. In 1678 the parish church of Rousay was described as "unthecked" (Craven 1893,76-77: Fenton 1978,189). In 1760, the

Birsay Kirk Session Minutes (=BKSM) reveal that the parish church was thatched with straw and simonds (ON. sima, straw rope: Fenton 1978,176), because "the slates are not as yet brought home" (BKSM,71: quoted in Barber 1983,2). The old parish church of Deerness is also reported to have had a thatched roof in c.1843 (Fenton 1978,182).

(e) Altars

Extremely few altars are known from Orkney and Shetland although, again, this is a factor concomitant upon the paucity of excavated chapel sites (Appendix 2b). Altars are known from only four sites in Orkney and two in Shetland (Table 7a). They are similar in size and proportion to those from Man (Table 3). There is, however, less variety of form, since all the known northern altars, with the exception of the timber altar at Deerness, are of the coursed masonry kind. The stone corner-post or panel altar does not appear to be represented. The Flotta altar frontal is discussed separately elsewhere (pp.132-133 below).

We have little idea as to the original height of the Orcadian and Shetland altars. The visible remains at St.Ninian's Isle and Brough of Birsay have been heavily restored (Radford 1959,12). The altar at St. John's church, Norwick (UNST 1), was built of "cut asbestos" (Low 1774(1978),154), presumably steatite, and is reported to have survived down to the late 18th century "as entire as when first built" (Low 1774(1978),163). Unfortunately, however, no further details were noted and no trace of it now survives. Only the altar bases survived at Orphir (Ritchie & Ritchie 1978,67) and Tammaskirk (Clouston 1932b,10-

11). Indeed, at only one site has the altar survived sufficiently well to an extent approaching what must have been close to its original height. The Brough of Deerness altar measured 1.10 x 0.80 m and was 1 m upstanding. It was of semi-coursed stone construction, subsequently mortared and later disturbed. This disturbance, unfortunately, removed all traces of any possible relic cavity (Morris 1976,3; 1977b,2; forthcoming a).

The Brough of Deerness chapel is also important in another respect. Excavations on the site disclosed a set of post- or stake-holes and slots against the centre of the E interior wall face in the timber phase chapel. These features defined an area 0.40 m EW and 0.75 m NS and have been reasonably interpreted as the remains of a timber altar (Morris 1977b,1; forthcoming a), possibly of the post-and-panel kind. This is the only archaeologically attested composite timber altar which is known from the British Isles.

(f) Altar Frontal

Only one possible altar frontal is known from the Northern Isles (Table 7c). This stone was found on the island of Flotta in Orkney sometime prior to the mid 19th century on the site of a ruin which was supposed to have been an ancient church (Allen 1903,23). An interesting record of the site is contained in a 16th century account which describes the demolition of an old house, possibly a church, and the removal of three crosses which formerly stood there:

> "Vetus Domus hic est diruta sola quam quidam ecclesiam, alii Presbiterium vocant, longitudine magna, ubi singulis annis comitia agebantur sacerdotum. Ternae trophae hic erectae sunt, quaae nos Crosses vocamus. Aversa sunt fabro murario."
>
> Mitchell & Clark 1908,311,321-322

The Flotta panel (RMS.IB 48) is a rectangular slab of grey sandstone and measures 1.65 x 0.80 x 0.10 m. A raised border extends along the top of the stone and three-quarters of the way down each of the shorter sides. The central design is a hollow armpit cross filled with interlace and is contained within a square panel (Allen 1903,fig.19: Thomas 1971a,fig.89: Ritchie 1985a,pl.9.7). The reverse side features two deeply cut vertical grooves. These extend from the base of the stone to within about 0.10 m of the top and are inset 0.07 m from the side edges (Thomas 1971a,187). The panel would thus have presumably formed part of a composite tongue-and-grooved structure.

The Flotta panel has been identified as an altar frontal (Thomas 1971a,186-187) and likened, in constructional terms, to the grooved stone shrine from Jedburgh (Radford 1955: Thomas 1971a,149: Cramp 1983).

(g) Altar mensa

No certain examples of altar mensae have been reported from either Orkney or Shetland. Only one possible stone, from the Brough of Deerness excavations, may be tentatively thus identified. This was found in front of and to one side of the stone altar. It was undecorated, badly decayed and also split. Its identification, however, is uncertain (Morris forthcoming a).

(h) Miscellaneous Internal Fixtures & Fittings

Few sites have produced evidence for internal fixtures and fittings. There are some examples of stone wall benches. In St. Peter's chapel on the Brough of Birsay, benches, 0.30 m wide and 0.30 m high, extended around the N, S and W walls of the nave and were subsequently added to the side walls of the chancel (RCAMS 1946,ii,3,fig.52). At St. Mary's chapel on Wyre, a previously unrecorded stone feature, set 0.40 m from the S wall of the nave and parallel to it, may also be reasonably identified as the remains of a stone bench (pl.46b). Excavations on the Brough of Deerness also uncovered the remains of a bench along the S wall of the chapel, together with possible traces of a second bench opposite. The S bench was clearly a later addition to the chapel. It was approximately 3 m long, 0.40 m wide and stood 0.35 m above the floor. It was formed of coursed stones and was delimited by upright slabs at its E end (Morris 1976,2-3; 1977b,1; forthcoming a). This survey has also located a similar feature, against the N wall of the nave in the chapel at Kirkaby (UNST 14).

Aumbries form another class of fixture but only a few of these have been found at sites in Orkney and Shetland. Examples are known from St. Peter's chapel on the Brough of Birsay and from St. Olaf's church on Yell. Both are located towards the E end of the N wall of the chancel and they have been interpreted as possible Easter Sepulchres (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,139,155). Another example has been recorded in a similar position in the chapel on the Brough of Deerness and has been similarly interpreted (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,104,fig.70). The examples

measure up to 1 m high, 0.80 m wide and 0.60 m deep. One further aumbry, which is situated by the doorway into the old Rousay parish church (Lowe 1984,5-6), has been interpreted as a recess for a holy water stoup (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,108).

A particularly interesting set of internal fixtures was discovered by Clouston in his excavation of the chancel at Tammaskirk (Clouston 1932b,10-11: Structure 31-fig.65; fig.73). Clouston's excavation uncovered one or possibly two stone seats against the W wall of the chancel, to the N and S of the chancel entrance. The S chancel seat, formed with a flagstone top and stone arm-rest, appears, furthermore, to have been connected, via a small square opening in the wall behind, with a seat which was built within the thickness of the E wall of the nave. This whole arrangement has been interpreted as a confessional (Clouston 1932b,11). Another feature also deserves some attention.

On the S side of the altar Clouston uncovered the remains of what he described as a small chamber, 1.20 m long and 0.70-0.85 m wide. The chamber had a paved floor and was apparently entered from the W by means of two steps. Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence as to how this chamber was formed. We do not know, for example, whether it was delimited by a wall or whether it was simply represented by the S and E walls of the chancel and the S side of the altar. There must, however, have been something which prompted Clouston's identification of this feature as a chamber. This problem, however, may be resolved.

Clouston´s (1932b) excavation account provides very little information with regard to the surviving elevations of these different chancel features. We only know the height and width of the four altar steps, the height of the altar relative to the top step and the level of the chamber´s paved floor relative to the top of the altar. This information would seem to indicate that the floor of the chamber may have been some 0.10 m below the level of the step to the W and although Clouston did not refer to this in his text, it may have been this feature which enabled him to differentiate between the paved floor of his chamber and the adjacent step.

No small finds were made in connexion with the excavation of this chamber. However, Clouston (1932b,11-12) interpreted it as a small sacristy or vestry which, he supposed, had been curtained off from the chancel. The chamber, he believed, would have held a chest containing a variety of church ornaments and vessels such as those which are specified in the 13th century Icelandic church inventories. These documents, preserved in copies dating from 1598 and 1601, hint at the kind of property and fittings that could be expected in a small Icelandic church of the Middle Ages. The property mentioned could include candlesticks, crucifixes, incense vessels, bells, psalters and lamps, as well as altar cloths, wall hangings, pictures and hand-basins and even a silver chalice and a shrine (Vigfusson & York Powell 1905,628-636).

Clouston´s identification of the Tammaskirk chamber as a sacristy is possible and, in any event, provides a welcome addition to our knowledge of church furniture. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that the chamber could also be interpreted as a

base for, perhaps, a shrine. A location on the S side of the altar has been proposed as a favoured position for such a structure (Thomas 1971a,145-146,157-159) and its stability would certainly have been aided by recessing its base below the surrounding floor level. This can only be a suggestion but the structure's elevated position and indeed the whole disposition of features in this chancel might suggest some quite developed form of ritual and such an interpretation may not be entirely misplaced.

(i) Summary & Context

The small single-cell chapels of Orkney and Shetland are similar in size to the Manx keeills. They differ, however, in building method and it should be clear that the use of drystone construction is rare in ecclesiastical buildings in Orkney and Shetland. There are no examples of corbelled chapels, nor any evidence for chapels built in antis. Only Harbison's (1982,618-619) chapel Types 2 and 4 are repesented in the surviving evidence.

Part 2: Metrology & Proportional Theory

(i) Introduction

Much has been written in recent years on the question of the identification of units of mensuration and their application to, and sometimes their chronological implications for, buildings of different periods (Fernie 1978: Grierson 1972: Huggins et al 1982: Rodwell 1986: Kjølbye-Biddle 1986). Indeed, the subject has long attracted the attention of writers and the development of the subject has been well summarized by Philip Grierson (1972) and Eric Fernie (1978, 383-388). Yet, as Grierson (1972,3) has pointed out:

> "the existing literature is extremely unsatisfactory, and...not all that has been written can be believed."

Similarly, much work regarding the origins and transmission of different foot measures has been rightly dismissed by Fernie (1978,387) as:

> "the very stuff of medieval romance, the metrological equivalent of the Chanson de Roland."

Grierson (1972,5), meanwhile, has called it:

> "mathematical romanticism and diffusionism run mad".

This section continues by examining different approaches to the subject of metrology. Firstly, Aage Roussell's use of different foot measures is examined.

(ii) Aage Roussell's Metrological Analysis of Orcadian Chapels

The early medieval chapels of Orkney have rarely attracted the attention of metrologists. One notable exception was the Danish archaeologist, Aage Roussell. Roussell (1944,132-135)

assembled an impressive set of metrological data for selected ecclesiastical buildings from Norway, Orkney, Faroe, Iceland and Greenland. He subsequently attempted to analyse these data in terms of both Roman and Greek foot measures, believing that the Greek foot represented an innovation of the late 13th or 14th century, replacing the earlier Roman measure (Roussell 1944,127,131). He argued, therefore, that buildings which were constructed on the basis of the Greek foot could be assigned to this later period. In theory, Roussell's approach to the study of church buildings could have been a powerful tool for settling the controversy which surrounds the dating of these northern chapels. The reality, however, is quite different.

The two measures used by Roussell (1944,127) were the Roman foot of 29.5 cm and the Greek foot of about 32.5 cm. This latter measure is also described by Roussell as the reduced-Greek or Carolingian-Greek foot. The Roman foot, as Fernie (1978,384) has commented, "has been unassailably established between 29.2 and 29.7 cm". This has been done on the basis of extant metal measures and representations on stone monuments. The Carolingian-Greek foot, on the other hand, is less securely established. Certainly, the measure is known from Carolingian lands at a much later date, in the form of the French pied de roi which was attested at 32.4 cm in 1742 (Fernie 1978,387). Eric Fernie's review of medieval foot measures has thus cast some doubt on the value, if not the existence, of the so-called Carolingian foot and he has concluded that "the length of the Carolingian foot has not been unequivocally established" (Fernie 1978,391; 385-388). Metrological problems thus underlie the very

basis of Roussell´s work.

Roussell´s (1944,134) Orkney chapel data is presented in Table 8. This data has been translated into the nearest whole number of Roman and Greek Feet and this, according to Roussell, is to be understood as the intended design size of the building. The difference between this and the observed (metric) dimensions is then given in centimetres. Thus, for example (Table 8), the exterior length of the chapel on the Brough of Deerness is within 6 cm of 25 Roman Feet or within 4 cm of 23 Greek Feet.

According to Roussell (1944,133-134), St. Tredwell´s chapel (WESTRAY 14), the Round Church at Orphir and the chapel on the Brough of Deerness were constructed on the basis of the Roman Foot. It is certainly true that St. Tredwell´s chapel does appear to respond better in terms of Roman than Greek units of mensuration. There is, however, little to choose between Roman and Greek units in the case of the Deerness chapel. Certainly, one of the Greek dimensions is up to 8 cm different from the observed dimension, yet the values for the exterior length and interior width respond better in terms of Greek than Roman Feet (Table 8). Finally, it seems absurd to claim that the interior radius of the Round Church at Orphir was constructed on the basis of 10 Roman Feet, to within 4 cm, when that figure can be given as 9 Greek Feet to within 1 cm.

Roussell (1944,130,134) proposed that St. Mary´s chapel on Wyre and Linton chapel on Shapinsay were constructed on the basis of the Greek Foot and could therefore be considered to date to the late medieval period. The information in Table 8, however,

clearly shows that there is little to choose, in the case of the Wyre chapel, between Greek or Roman Foot measures. The Shapinsay chapel, meanwhile, clearly responds better in terms of Roman Feet. At this point, however, Roussell (1944,134) cleverly reduced his reduced-Greek or Carolingian-Greek Foot to 32.2 cm or 32 cm and consequently `demonstrated´ that the Wyre and Shapinsay chapels really had been constructed according to Greek measures ! As Eric Fernie (1978,385) has said, in a different but similar context, "confusion is completely confounded."

The great difficulty with Roussell´s metrological analysis is that we have to face the problem that any length can be expressed in whole numbers of a smaller unit to within a small percentage of doubt. This is euphemistically described by metrologists as builders´ error. In Roussell´s case it is clear that any attempt to define a building in terms of Roman or Greek Feet is going to fail because the units are so similar. Furthermore, we must, as a necessary corollary, also abandon any hope of extracting any chronological information from these data. The interpretative element of Roussell´s work, regarding chronology, cannot succeed since a demonstrative base for establisning that interpretation is nowhere firmly evidenced. Roussell´s thesis thus fails at the primary level of demonstration.

(iii) Harold Leask: 3:2, 2:1 and other proportional theories

Proportional theory can be considered as a separate entity within the field of metrology, as a kind of half-way house between the arithmetical approach of Roussell and the geometrical approach favoured by Dryden and Fernie (p.149). It is concerned

less with determining units of mensuration than with demonstrating the relative relationship of one structural dimension with another. Proportional theories are also considered here on account of the chronological implications which have been claimed by some writers. The name most associated with this aspect of proportional theory is that of the Irish architect, Harold Leask.

Leask's work on the early Irish church can be said to have popularized the concept of the 3:2 building ratio of interior length to breadth as an indicator of early date (Leask 1955,31, 49,60). This proposition contained within it the implication that buildings of elongated or increased proportions, such as the 2:1 ratio, could be assigned to a later chronological horizon (Leask 1955,60). Certainly these views have found their way into the general archaeological literature as if they were established facts. Lloyd Laing (1975,384-385), for example, has stated:

> "By the Romanesque period the classical ratio of 2:1 was increasingly favoured and the nearer the internal proportions are to the classic 3:2, the earlier the chapel is likely to be."

However, the evidential bases of this argument are far from proven.

There can be little doubt that the 3:2 building ratio was popular in early Irish ecclesiastical architecture. This is well evidenced in the monuments discussed by Leask (1955). The ratio is also referred to in a medieval document, describing the system of payments which were made to the artificers of timber (dairthech, duirtheach) and stone churches (doimliacc, daimhliag):

"If it be a duirtheach of fifteen feet or less than that, that is fifteen feet in its length, and ten feet in its breadth, a heifer for every foot of it in breadth, or for every foot and a half in length: this (is) when the roof is of rushes: but if the roof be of shingles, it is a cow for every foot of it in breadth, or for every foot and a half in length. If it be more than fifteen feet, a heifer for (every) two-thirds of a foot of it in breadth, or for (every) foot in length: this (is) when the roof is of rushes: if the roof be of shingles, a cow for (every) two-thirds of a foot of it in breadth, or for (every) foot in length....The daimhliaq: if its covering be of shingles, it is of equal price with the duirtheach which is proportioned to it".

MS Trinity College Dublin H.3.17: Petrie 1845,362

The 3:2 proportion is not only referred to in terms of the building's dimensions (15' x 10') but it is also described twice as ratios of one to one-and-a-half, and two-thirds-to-one. This document survives in a late 15th or 16th century copy (date suggested by R.Thirneysen Studies in Early Irish Law 1936: see Radford 1977,1), although it evidently referred to an earlier period, probably prior to the 12th century (Radford 1977,1: Leask 1955,6). The term dairthech, for example, is referenced down to the mid 11th century in the Annals of Ulster (MacDonald 1981, 306) and Leask (1955,6) has claimed, without reference, that the latest annalistic record of the term occurs in the 12th century. An 11th - 13th century date has also been suggested by Harbison (1982,625) on the basis of the language employed in the document. The MS.TCD H.3.17, then, is presumably good evidence for the popularity of the 3:2 building ratio sometime prior to the 12th century. It does not, however, imply that the 3:2 proportion was necessarily an early feature in Irish

ecclesiastical architecture.

The greatest difficulty faced by Leask was undoubtedly the problem of dating and he was ready to acknowledge that the dates assigned to the small plain churches contained in his review were "necessarily approximations and matters of opinion" (Leask 1955,2). Frequently, structures are simply described as early or late and, although these terms are nowhere specifically defined, it is clear that the term `early´ was intended to signify a date towards the 8th or 9th centuries, whilst the term `late´ could be understood as denoting perhaps the period 10th-12th centuries (Leask 1955,21,28). However, Leask´s dates were frequently made on the basis of a building´s proportionate size. For example, St. Macdara´s chapel in Galway is described as early "because it is a single-chamber edifice and is of the very short plan-proportion of 1.4:1 (recte 1.33:1)" (Leask 1955,31).

This naturally begs the question as to whether or not we can make an equation between proportion and date. It is clear, for example, that proportions of 3:2 or thereabouts are evident in a number of small chapels which can be readily assigned to the 12th century on account of extant architectural detail in the form of mouldings and other decorative devices. St. Flannan´s oratory at Killaloe, Cormac´s chapel at Cashel and the original church at Kilmalkedar, for example, each have proportions of around 3:2 (Leask 1955,36,115-116,121,126). The whole problem of proportional theory is really quite intractable and it is one which comes down, in the final analysis, to whether or not we can accept, as Leask (1955,60) did, that "structures which look most

archaic are generally of the shortest proportion." There is no evidence known to this writer which might enable acceptance of such a conclusion and the equation between archaic appearance and early date must remain as a supposition which still awaits proof.

Ann Hamlin (1984,121) has recently suggested that Leask's work, from the point of view of dating Irish churches, is not a reliable guide. Peter Harbison's (1970; 1982,623-624) review of Gallarus oratory, for example, has questioned the very early dating schemes suggested for that structure by Leask and others. Gallarus oratory has frequently been considered as a structure of mid 8th century date (Leask 1955,21) and has been assigned a central role in the supposed progression from the beehive hut to the fully developed church with upright walls (Leask 1955,27). This evolutionary approach has been called into question by Harbison who has, furthermore, gone on to demonstrate that "most of the older arguments in favour of an early date for Gallarus are at worst wrong, and at best unproven" (1970,48). Harbison's suggestion that Gallarus could in theory be as late as the 12th century carries with it the implication that questions regarding structural form and plan-proportion are not easily resoluble into chronological terms.

The question of proportional principles in early Irish church architecture has also been taken up by P.L McSweeney (see Bibliography). McSweeney's primary aim was less concerned with the dating of ecclesiastical buildings than with trying to demonstrate the basic principles which lay behind their design and construction. McSweeney's work is of some interest insofar

as it places Leask´s 3:2 building ratio into something of a broader context. Nevertheless, in his discussion of the rationale which lay behind the use of 3:2 and other building ratios, McSweeney could be said to verge on the brink of what Grierson (1972,5) has called "mathematical romanticism."

McSweeney´s primary concern was with the group of proportions known as the consonantal or perfect ratios, that is the ratios of 1:1, 2:1, 3:2 and 4:3. Buildings with these four perfect ratios were taken to represent an aesthetic model (McSweeney I,25). Support for the symbolic importance of this group of ratios could be founded on Biblical authority and elements of what is called Pythagoreo-Platonic number mysticism.

The great problem with McSweeney´s work is whether it can really be believed. The idea that proportional principals were used as a means of establishing a symbolic harmony with concomitant religious or mystical connotations is one which, as Fernie (1978,86) has pointed out, can lead "into a quagmire...because any cap can be made to fit any head." It thus remains for McSweeney´s data to be examined.

St. Declan´s oratory at Ardmore in Co. Waterford and the W oratory at Inisfallen in Co. Kerry were proposed by McSweeney (II & III) as examples of buildings which had been constructed on the basis of the four perfect ratios. In both cases the ratios of 4:3, 3:2, 2:1 and 1:1 were extracted from the proportions of exterior length to breadth, interior length to breadth, exterior length to interior breadth and exterior breadth to interior length respectively.

Gallarus oratory was another site at which McSweeney (IV) tried to demonstrate the presence of the four consonantal ratios. The 3:2 proportion at Gallarus is reflected in the relationship of interior length to breadth. However, the 4:3 proportion is only found in the relationship of the interior length to the exterior breadth, including the plinth. The proportions of 1:1 and 2:1, meanwhile, are only discovered with some difficulty as a result of quite complex geometry (McSweeney IV,figs.7-9). Thus Gallarus oratory can only be made to respond in terms of 4:3, 3:2, 2:1 and 1:1 as a result of a quite complex manipulation of dimensional data. Furthermore, it is significant that the recently discovered E plinth at Gallarus (Harbison 1970,58) would not only invalidate McSweeney´s proportional analysis, but it would also do it in such a way that the building stills fails to respond in terms of perfect ratios.

The notion that the consonantal ratios were employed by church builders in order, as McSweeney believed, "to give an intellectual meaning to (their) work", appears on the surface as an attractive proposition. However, only two examples are offered by McSweeney and a cursory examination of Leask´s (1955) work would add only one further structure (Temple Benen: Leask 1955,49) to that list. The number of sites which contain all four perfect ratios thus appears to be small. Yet McSweeney also argued that structures containing only one or two of the consonantal ratios could also be understood as aesthetic models, since the missing ratios, he believed, would have been evident in the building´s elevation. This is negative evidence at its worst and it greatly diminishes the case that a set of proportional

principles was actually employed and adhered to.

The problem with proportional or modular theories is similar to that of metrological studies in general, namely the problem of deciding what to measure and what allowance to make for builders' error or the subsequent settlement of the structure. It is also worth noting that the chances of discerning the four perfect ratios will necessarily increase the more complex the structure's form becomes, since more dimensional data will be available for analysis. In this context it is probably not without significance that the external N and S plinths at Gallarus oratory are sometimes included and other times excluded from McSweeney's analysis of the exterior proportions of that structure (McSweeney IV,figs.7-9).

We may, therefore, be examining not so much the builder's desire to bring "intellectual meaning" or "mathematical order" to his work (McSweeney I,24-25), but rather the efforts of a contemporary scholar to manipulate the dimensional data into a preconceived model of aesthetic perfection. The fact that an apparently significant set of proportions may be discovered in a building's plan-form or postulated in its missing superstructure, does not, in the absence of contemporary documentary evidence, prove that such proportions were an intentional part of the original design. Even less can the case be made that such proportions necessarily reflected a desire for symbolic harmony or mathematical order. This, in effect, is the intellectual quagmire referred to by Fernie (1978,86).

(iv) Geometric Proportions: Root 2 and Vesica Piscis

This section on metrology concludes with a review of geometric proportions, that is to say proportions which operated on the basis of shapes rather than on any simple ratio of numbers. Two well-known geometric proportions, both of which were recognized by Dryden in his survey of Orcadian and Shetland chapels (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,101-162), are Root 2 and Vesica Piscis.

The Root 2 proportion is founded upon the square and is defined as the relationship of the side of the square to its internal diagonal (Fernie 1976,fig.1). This relationship can always be given as the proportion 1:Root 2 or 1:1.414.

The proportion of Vesica Piscis is based on the equilateral triangle and is defined as the relationship of the base to two times its perpendicular height. This relationship can always be given as the length-breadth proportion of 1:0.57.

These proportions were noted by Dryden in several of the Orcadian and Shetland chapels. For example, certain parts of the chapels on the Brough of Deerness, on Wyre, on Eynhallow, and at Kirkaby (UNST 14) and at St. Olaf's church on Yell are each said to have been constructed according to the principle of the Root 2 proportion (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,104,116,122,147,156). However, the proportions at Wyre and Eynhallow, 1.36:1 and 1.44:1 respectively, could equally represent approximations to modular proportions of 4:3 or 3:2.

The interior proportions of the naves of the chapels on Eynhallow and Brough of Birsay and at Linton on Shapinsay, meanwhile, respond well in terms of the Vesica Piscis proportion

(MacGibbon & Ross 1896,122,124,140). However, in the case of the Linton chapel, the Vesica Piscis proportion is only evident in the relationship of the nave´s exterior length to interior breadth.

A geometrical analysis falls foul of criticisms similar to those already noted in connexion with the methodology employed by both Roussell and McSweeney. The difficulty of establishing which structural dimensions may be considered as significant remains as a very real problem. It is equally difficult to decide on what constitutes an allowable margin of error. For example, the external dimensions of the nave at St. Mary´s chapel on Wyre (25´7" x 18´10" (7.80 x 5.70 m): MacGibbon & Ross 1896,116) have been analysed on the basis of the Root 2 proportion. However, if the Root 2 proportion had been strictly adhered to, an exterior width of 5.70 m would have produced an exterior length of 8.05 m (5.70 x Root 2). If the proportion represented an approximation to the modular proportion of 4:3, the exterior length would have been just under 7.60 m (5.70 x 4/3). In either case there is a difference of about 0.20 m between the observed and the predicted dimensions. It is thus extremely difficult to decide which of these, if either, were to have been intended in the building of this structure. It should be clear, therefore, that geometric proportions, like metrological theories in general, suffer greatly from the possibility that we can in no way be absolutely certain that the dimensional data that we extract from a building was necessarily present in the first place. We may, in effect, therefore be illustrating not so much the genius and intellect of

past builders, but rather demonstrating our own ability to discover dimensional patterns which may have no existence independent of our own analyses.

(v) A Metrological Survey of Ecclesiastical Structures in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man

In view of the opinions offered above, it may well seem inappropriate to embark upon a metrological survey of the early chapels of Man and the Northern Isles. The subject would be vast and the amount of dimensional data generated would be large. A full survey of the relationships of interior and exterior dimensions, or dimensions measured to the wall mid-point or a mensural analysis of dimensions in terms of Greek, Roman or other feet, is not therefore, offered. Instead, this study would prefer to present a selected sample of data for review.

It should be clear from this study's criticism of Roussell's work (pp.140-141) that it is extremely difficult to differentiate between the use of different foot measures and thus this avenue of approach is pursued no further. Some attention will instead be addressed to the question of modular and geometrical proportions.

Data regarding the structural proportions of the Manx keeills and the unicameral chapels of Orkney and Shetland are presented in Tables 9 and 10. It is apparent that many different ratios can be discerned among these buildings. Many of the ratios are awkward or irregular. There is, for example, no evidence to suggest that any of the Manx keeills were constructed according to the proportions of 4:3, 3:2, 2:1 and 1:1 and only the keeills at Lag ny Keeilley and Knoc y Doonee come close to McSweeney's

model.

The data from the Northern Isles (Table 10) is only slightly more encouraging. McSweeney's four consonantal ratios do appear to be evident at St. Colm's chapel on the Holms of Ire and in the chapel on Auskerry. Meanwhile, the chapels at Hillside, Halcro and St. Tredwell's chapel (WESTRAY 14) each approximate to the ideal 4:3, 3:2, 2:1 and 1:1 model (Table 10). However, this seems an insubstantial base upon which to found a theory in favour of proportional principles in early ecclesiastical architecture.

There would also seem to be little evidence to support the use of geometric proportions. On Man, for example, it would appear that only two chapels could have been constructed on the Vesica Piscis proportion. The interior dimensions of Keeill Pherick at Ballafreer (MAROWN 5) and Keeill Unjin in Malew are both within 0.10 m of the Vesica Piscis proportion. Similarly, the interior dimensions of only two keeills, Keeill Woirrey in Maughold and Killabragga in Lezayre, respond in terms of the Root 2 proportion, to within the same margin of error.

A cursory examination of the Orcadian and Shetland material, meanwhile, can add hardly any further examples of Root 2 or Vesica Piscis to those already listed by Dryden. The interior dimensions of the chapel at Marwick (5.20 x 3.70 m), for example, could have been formed on the principle of the Root 2 proportion (5.20 / 3.70 = 1.405) but few other structures would appear to have been thus proportioned.

(vi) Conclusion & Summary

The material evidence from Man and the Northern Isles may suggest that the early church builders were not necessarily applying any rigid set of architectural principles to their work. The buildings, for example, may have been simply laid out by eye or by experience. The structures may, essentially, therefore, have been unplanned. This in itself would be an important conclusion. However, this argument would have to come to terms ultimately with a fundamental problem. If, as has been suggested (p.150), we can never be certain that the proportions that we extract from a building were necessarily intended in the first place, then neither can we demonstrate the opposite. In other words, it is also impossible to demonstrate that a building was simply just laid out by eye or by experience, without the aid of any guiding set of architectural principles. The usefulness of metrological theory for resolving archaeological problems, with regard at least to the ecclesiastical buildings of Man and the Northern Isles, could be considered minimal.

This may be an excessively negative conclusion. After all, we may well suppose that the early church builders in Man and the Northern Isles knew what a church should look like and what proportions it should have. The problem, however, is that we have no means at our disposal for discovering this and any attempts we might make to this end are bound to be theoretically flawed.

Part 3: Ecclesiastical Enclosures & Associated Funerary Structures

(i) Introduction

There is a growing body of opinion among archaeologists that the form of an ecclesiastical enclosure may be indicative of a site's antiquity. A recent survey of Early Christian sites in Cumbria, for example, has suggested that:

> "rectilinear churchyards were uncommon and unpopular, at least in highland parts of Britain, until the Conquest, but that they came into a greater vogue with the Middle Ages."
>
> D. O'Sullivan 1980,242

Similarly, in areas of intensive Norse settlement, the rectilinear enclosure has been seen as a typically Norse type of cemetery form (Radford 1962a,172,180). Such views are based partly on the demonstrable association of medieval churches with rectilinear graveyards and partly on those few examples where a rectilinear enclosure has replaced an earlier one of curvilinear form. This is supposed to have been demonstrated in Radford's excavations on the Brough of Birsay (Cruden 1965,23-24,fig.1) and a similar association of curvilinear and rectilinear enclosures has been noted at the chapel site on Cava (Lamb 1973a,243). Meanwhile, Nørlund and Stenberger's (1934,34-35,fig.12) excavations at Brattahlid in Greenland also produced evidence for the replacement of a curvilinear by a rectilinear enclosure form.

There has been a tendency, therefore, to view the curvilinear enclosure as a relatively early phenomenon. Certainly, there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that Early Christian cemeteries, if they were enclosed at all, were bounded by an enclosure of curvilinear form (Thomas 1971a,50-90: Swann 1983).

Recent excavations at Reask in County Kerry have demonstrated well the early (5th-7th century) and perhaps primary nature of the oval enclosure wall at that site (Fanning 1981a,98-100,157-158). However, although rectilinear enclosures are known to predominate from the medieval period onwards and curvilinear forms are evidenced from the Early Christian period, we are, as Deirdre O´Sullivan (1980,242) has pointed out, hardly entitled to claim that all curvilinear enclosures are necessarily indicative of early sites. Richard Morris (1983,58), for example, has recently remarked that there are a number of circular churchyards in Wales which are known to have been newly created in the 12th century. Meanwhile, Mary Harman (1977,255) has noted that the oval enclosure at Christchurch on Hirta was constructed as recently as the first half of the 19th century.

This study can see no reason why the first Christian Norse converts in Man and the Northern Isles should not have followed native practice and have established their cemeteries and chapels within a curvilinear enclosed site. This naturally begs the question as to whether the converted Norse established sites de novo or resorted to earlier foundations, but to view the rectilinear enclosure form as something that was "the Norse type of cemetery" (Radford 1962a,180) severely prejudges the issue. The present section continues with a review of the different enclosure types found in Orkney, Shetland and Man.

(ii) Ecclesiastical Enclosure Forms: Isle of Man

Detailed information regarding the size and form of the enclosure is available for 36 of the Manx keeill sites (Table 11). The vast majority of these, with 27 examples, are of a curvilinear form (Table 11a,). A handful of rectilinear enclosed sites are also known (Table 11c). There is also a small group of sites (Table 11b) whose enclosure form cannot easily be classified as either wholly curvilinear or wholly rectilinear. The enclosure at Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8; fig.4), for example, seems to contain rectilinear characteristics in its S and E sections and yet curvilinear features on the N and W. No reason for this apparent anomaly was noted by this survey. A similar enclosure form is also evident at Keeill Woirrey in Maughold (fig.6), where curvilinear features are evident in the W half of the site whilst rectilinear characteristics predominate in the E sector. Terms such as sub-rectangular or ovoid could be applied, with equal justification, to either of these enclosure forms. These same terms could also apply to the enclosure form at the Raby keeill site in Patrick, which has been described as "rectilinear...with rounded corners" (OSCI SC28SW15).

This question of definition, of actually examining the terms we use for distinguishing shape and form, is considered to be important. It is important, not only because of the cultural or chronological implications which are sometimes given, but because the issue of enclosure form cannot be looked at in isolation from topographical factors. Thomas Fanning (1981a,155), for example, has noted a frequent correspondence between enclosure form and local topography during his fieldwork in South West Ireland.

Similarly, topographical factors may well have determined the disposition of the enclosure at Keeill Woirrey in Maughold. The site (fig.6) is bounded on the E by a streambed, on the S by an area of boggy ground and on the N and W by a natural line of drainage from the hillside above. Further possible examples of the interrelationship between topography and enclosure form are also evident. In Orkney and Shetland, for example, there are a number of cases where chapels were established on earlier domestic settlement sites. This subject is considered in more detail in Chapter 7. Nevertheless, it is reasonably clear at several of these sites, such as, for example, at Marykirk in Harray or St. Mary's church at Culbinsbrough, that the ecclesiastical enclosure may have reused, or its course have been determined by, earlier structural remains.

The physical size of the Manx keeill enclosures has not previously been examined in a quantitative way and thus their largely diminutive size has perhaps not been generally recognized. Twenty-six of the 36 sites listed in Table 11, for example, have enclosures which range in size from only 0.02-0.08 ha. As a comparison it may be noted that a recent survey of Cumbrian sites has observed a size range of 0.10-0.70 ha, with the majority of sites there falling within the range 0.15-0.35 ha (O'Sullivan 1980,247-248). The enclosures at Church Island or Reask, approximately 0.14 ha in extent (O'Kelly 1973,76,pl.XVII: Fanning 1981a,155), appear to be of a similar order of size. Meanwhile, it has recently been noted that the enclosures at the majority of ecclesiastical sites in the Dingle Peninsula range

between 30 m and 70 m in maximum dimension, thus enclosing areas of perhaps 0.07-0.38 ha in extent (Cuppage et al 1986,257). Furthermore, Swann (1983,274) has noted that Irish ecclesiastical curvilinear enclosures, in general, are, on average, of the order of 90-120 m in diameter. The area thus enclosed would range from approximately 0.63 ha to 1.13 ha. Swann (1983,274) has gone on to note that a small number of sites are 25 m - 50 m in diameter (0.04 ha - 0.19 ha), whilst "sites smaller than 25 m (0.04 ha) are virtually non-existant."

The vast majority of the Manx keeill enclosures are, therefore, extremely small and, in part, this may reflect the size, if not the nature, of the population who were served by these cemeteries. Unfortunately, as O´Sullivan (1980,249) has pointed out, it is really impossible to assess that relationship in any quantitative way since we have no means of knowing how long the sites were used. Also, we are hardly in a position to assume that all of the area enclosed would have necessarily been given over for burial. Nevertheless, it may be worthwhile to give some idea of the potential numbers of burials which might possibly be expected. For example, a 0.05 ha enclosure containing a keeill with external dimensions of, perhaps, 8 x 5 m, and assuming a similar density of burial as demonstrated at Glentraugh (Garrad 1978,fig.16.1) or Balladoole (Bersu & Wilson 1966,fig.5), could contain up to 200 interments at any `individual level of burial´. Or, to take an actual example, tne rectangular burial enclosure at Keeill Vael, Balladoole (Bruce 1968,fig.8) could contain around 60 interments. These figures do not take account of the superimposition of graves; nor is it

likely that a cemetery would have developed in such a neatly tiered way as has been assumed for the purposes of this demonstration. Nevertheless, these figures may perhaps indicate that the keeill enclosures, although small, could have provided nonetheless for quite a substantial population.

The majority of curvilinear enclosed sites on Man range in size from 0.02 ha to 0.08 ha. The few intermediate curvo-rectilinear enclosures (Table 11b) also fall within this range. There are few truly rectilinear enclosed sites on Man (Table 11c). The sizes of two of these, Balnahow (SANTON 4) and Balladoole, fall within this same size range. Two others, the enclosures at St. Mary's chapel, Ballure (Kermode 1915a,20) and the chapel on St. Michael's Isle, are slightly above average size (Table 11c), whilst those at St. Trinian's chapel(MAROWN 2) and the recently rediscovered site of Keeill Coonlagh (Higham & Jones 1984,13) appear excessively large. With the exception of these latter two sites, all the Manx keeill enclosures, regardless of form, thus fall within the range 0.02-0.21 ha. There would thus appear to be little, if any, correspondence between enclosure size and enclosure form.

(iii) Ecclesiastical Enclosure Forms: Orkney & Shetland

It is noticeable too, in Orkney and Shetland, that there is little correspondence between the size and form of the chapel enclosure. A selected list of sites is presented in Table 12. Curvilinear enclosed sites are rare in Orkney and Shetland although there are perhaps more examples than has been generally recognized. Further examples are considered in Chapter 7.

Data regarding a group of curvilinear enclosed sites, including both certain and possible examples, are listed in Table 12a. Curvilinear enclosed sites may be seen to range in size from 0.03 ha to 0.12 ha. A similar size range (0.02-0.12 ha) may also be seen to apply to the more common rectilinear enclosed sites (Table 12b). The Northern Isles chapel enclosures are thus of a similar order of magnitude to the Manx keeill enclosures.

(iv) Associated Funerary Structures

The curvilinear enclosure form has attracted the attention of fieldworkers in their search for what may be early ecclesiastical sites. It has, however, already been suggested that curvilinear enclosure forms, by themselves, need not necessarily be invested with such chronological significance and some examples of the interrelationship between enclosure form and local topographical factors are examined in Chapter 7. Nevertheless, the association of curvilinear enclosed sites with, what Thomas (1971a,58) has called, `specially-marked graves', and other features related to the early cult of relics such as slab and corner-post shrines and possibly leachta also, may be chronologically significant. The developed cemeteries model and its applicability to the sites and monuments of the Northern Isles and Isle of Man is considered in Chapter 7. Here, however, the material evidence, for what are now largely intramural graveyard features, is reviewed.

(a) Specially-marked graves

In Thomas'(1971a,58-64) class of specially-marked graves, the graves were structurally distinguished above ground and contained within a curvilinear or rectilinear low wall or ditch. They are

also noted to have been frequently situated at a focal position within the cemetery and they are said to have occurred at the rate of rarely more than one per cemetery. Examples of such grave forms have been noted from the pre-Roman and Roman Iron Age (Thomas 1971a,59-61) and thus they have been seen as early features when they appear in what may be Early Christian cemeteries (Thomas 1971a,67). Indeed, part of this sequence may apply to the recently excavated Saxon cemetery at Lechlade in Gloucestershire, where a rich female burial, containing a silver cross and located within a small circular ring-ditch, has been proposed as a first generation Christian convert following the mission to the West Saxons in 635 (Miles 1986). This grave, together with others which could be assigned to the 7th century on the basis of the types of dress fastenings and brooch forms, was orientated EW, unlike the earlier inhumations which were aligned NS. The idea of the curvilinear enclosed grave as an Early Christian type of the late 7th or 8th centuries has also been suggested as a result of Hogarth's (1973) analysis of the Saxon cemetery at St. Peter's, Broadstairs in Kent. There is thus some evidence from recent excavations to suggest that the appearance of curvilinear grave surrounds at final phase cemeteries may represent either the reutilization of an earlier grave form in a Christian context or the introduction of a specifically Early Christian type of grave.

Manx examples of specially-marked graves have not previously been considered in this context. Only one example of the type discussed above is known to the author. This is now considered, together with the evidence from two other sites. However, no

examples of this type are known from either Orkney or Shetland.

Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory

Excavations at Balladoole uncovered the remains of a Viking boat-burial, a keeill and part of an extensive lintel grave cemetery and have thrown light on an earlier domestic settlement (Bersu & Wilson 1966,1-44: Bersu & Bruce 1972: Bruce 1968,41-45). The cemetery, although its extent is unknown, would appear to have been quite large since Kermode's 1918 excavation (Bruce 1968,43) discovered lintel graves at many places throughout the Iron Age enclosure, including some in and against the enclosure ramparts. However, the discovery of a single specially distinguished grave has previously gone largely unnoted. This lintel grave was located to the E of the keeill and near the centre of the Iron Age circuit (Bersu & Wilson 1966,fig.2) and was situated within a raised circular enclosure. Excavation of the lintel grave showed it to contain "a few round bones and many white pebbles" (Bruce 1968,43). The grave enclosure, however, appears not to have been excavated. This feature is now visible as a turf-covered circular depression, 0.40 m deep and with an internal diameter of approximately 6.50 m. Slight traces of a bank remain at the edges of the hollow.

Skyhill, Lezayre

A second possible example of a specially-marked grave may have been found at the Skyhill keeill site in Lezayre. This has been previously considered by the author in a criticism of Sheila Cregeen's (1951,64-65) analysis of that site (Lowe 1981,12-13).

Kermode's excavation at Skyhill uncovered the remains of a small keeill and a series of pathways (Kermode 1915a,3-5,fig.1: MM.MS.K.XV,49). The paths were roughly paved and in places delimited by a series of upright stones. One led from the S side of the burial ground to the keeill; a second, longer, path extended from the N side of the cemetery to the N wall of the keeill, whilst a third path led diagonally from the E perimeter and intersected with the longer path near the centre of the burial ground. At this point, Kermode's excavation uncovered the remains of "a stone-lined grave of very archaic appearance" (Kermode 1915a,4,fig.1). The cist, covered by two cap-stones but unlined on its base, measured 1.20 x 0.60 x 0.50 m deep and was orientated EW. Nothing was found inside this feature.

The site is now turf-covered (pl.12b & fig.9). The keeill is represented by a slight rectangular hollow and a break of slope towards its SW corner indicates the site of the entrance. The pathways on the N side of the keeill, and presumably the line of Kermode's trench, are clearly evident and are indicated by areas of paving with upright stones at the sides. The paths, however, are not as regular as Kermode's (1915a,fig.1) plan would suggest. The central grave, however, is clearly visible. There is no certain trace of the path on the S side of the keeill, although its location may be indicated by a break of slope which curves away to the SE. There are slight traces of a low bank in the SW quadrant of the site, whilst two irregularly-shaped hollows to the N might be due to unreported excavation or quarrying activity.

The interrelationship of the different features at Skyhill is unknown. We do not, for example, know for certain how the longer NS pathway relates to either the keeill or the central grave. However, the fact that Kermode´s (1915a,fig.1) site-plan shows the line of the paths to continue within the central cist might suggest that the pathways postdate the insertion of that feature. It could be argued, furthermore, that the short section of pathway outside the keeill entrance may represent a continuation of the longer NS path, whose apparent termination at the N wall of the keeill would otherwise be curious.

Kermode´s (1915a,fig.1) site-plan may thus conceal by implication up to four major episodes in the development of this site. The earliest identifiable feature would almost certainly be the burial ground itself, since the pathways would appear to have been cut through a fairly substantial cemetery deposit. The burial ground is raised quite considerably and it would seem more likely that the paths were cut into it, rather than for the cemetery itself to have been raised up in respect of the pathways. The central grave, meanwhile, could predate, postdate or be contemporary with the primary burial ground. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that the feature was marked above ground. It might conceivably, therefore, be roughly contemporary with the NS and EW pathways since their intersection at or over this feature would scarcely seem to have been accidental. Finally, the keeill, which possibly overlies the course of the extended NS pathway, would represent the latest identifiable feature at this site. The proposed sequence can be summarized thus: (1) burial ground, (2) central grave, (3)

extended NS and EW pathways, and (4) the keeill.

This sequence could be accommodated within an Early Christian context. The central cist could have held the disarticulated remains of an early saint. The intersecting pathways might be associated with a pilgrimage ritual at the site. A similar phenomenon has also been postulated in connexion with Grave No.1 at the Cannington cemetery in Somerset (Rahtz 1968,194: Thomas 1971a,63). The establishment of a keeill might then represent the full development of this site. However, the site could be interpreted in quite a different manner.

There is, for example, nothing necessarily Christian about either the central grave or the intersecting pathways. Either, or both, features, together with the mound itself on which the keeill has been erected, could quite conceivably be accommodated within a pre-Christian context. The Skyhill cist, for example, is comparable in terms of size and form to those discovered in a pre-Iron Age context at Balladoole (Bersu & Bruce 1972,647-649, figs.10 & 11)

The Skyhill site illustrates well the problems involved in interpreting a site whose basic record is incomplete. The fact that we can interpret these remains in an Early Christian context should not, however, lead us to assume that we are necessarily correct.

Ronaldsway II (Airport site), Malew

This site was excavated in the 1930's although no definitive account of those excavations has yet been produced. The primary accounts which are of relevance in this present context are

those of Neely (1940) and Cubbon (1935b). These two accounts, taken together, describe quite vividly the apparently special treatment which was given to two quite remarkable grave structures at this site.

The two structures were located close to the centre of, and at the most elevated point within, the site enclosure (Neely 1940,pl.VIII: Cubbon 1935b,156). Both structures were orientated EW and were formed of massive slabs of slate and limestone, supported externally by stone buttresses (Neely 1940,pl.IX,1). The W face of the N grave contained the so-called Ronaldsway altar-slab, 164(-).

The structures measured approximately 1.90 x 0.65 x 0.60 m and were full of white quartz pebbles (Cubbon 1935b,156). Removal of this deposit subsequently revealed a lower chamber, covered by a single slab of limestone, in which was discovered an extended male inhumation burial.

The significance of these two structures does not appear to have been widely appreciated. Bruce (1968,29-30), for example, simply refers to the structures as "heavily constructed lintel graves". This study, however, would argue that the term `lintel grave´ is hardly appropriate for these structures.

It has not been generally recognized that these two structures were intended as free-standing monuments. Neely (1940,72), for example, states that they were built on a former ground surface, although admittedly the phrase could be ambiguous since the chronological viewpoint of what was intended by the adjective `former´ is not made explicit. Cubbon (1935b,156), meanwhile, has added that:

> "white stones filled the graves to overflowing, continuing in all directions for several yards and forming a layer of white stones quite 8 inches (0.20 m) thick."

This pebble spread could represent post-depositional disturbance of the grave interior by ploughing. On the other hand, it is possible that the pebbles may have formed a contemporary surface around and over the graves. This factor, too, might indicate that the graves were free-standing monuments.

There is, however, one further piece of evidence which clearly indicates that these structures were above-ground and free-standing monuments. This is the external buttressing, referred to and illustrated by Neely (1940,72,pl.IX,1). A subterranean location for these structures would obviate the need for external buttresses since the structure would have been fully stable within the confines of a normal grave-cut. The fact, however, that it was deemed necessary to support the upper chambers of these structures surely implies that these were intended as free-standing and visible monuments. The ground surface identified by Neely would thus be contemporary with the construction of these monuments. A reconstructed isometric drawing of the two monuments, together with the possible surrounding quartz pebble feature, is presented in fig.72.

The two Ronaldsway double-chambered structures have been classified by this study as specially-marked graves. This is reflected in their complexity of construction, their free-standing nature, their elevated location on the site and also in their possible association with an extensive external deposit of quartz pebbles (Appendix 6). These factors differentiate them

from the many ordinary lintel graves which were discovered at this site (Neely 1940).

This re-analysis would also question the identification of the Ronaldsway altar-slab, 164(-). This stone, given its association with what was clearly some kind of special monument, could well have been found <u>in situ</u>. Or at least this study would suggest that there are no compelling reasons for necessarily accepting the identification of that stone as an altar frontal. The simple truth of the matter is that we are hardly in a position to be able to differentiate between cross-inscribed slabs which formed parts of altars and others which could have been accommodated into some kind of shrine structure like the Ronaldsway example. In other words, our previously automatic identification of 164(-) as an altar frontal from an earlier lost or undiscovered keeill has severely prejudiced the issue and has tended to limit, rather than widen, our understanding of Early Christian ecclesiastical structures.

(b) <u>Slab Shrines</u>

The term slab shrine has been applied by Thomas (1971a,141, fig.68) to a small group of monuments which are known almost exclusively from Ireland. These structures comprise a rectangular cavity, 1.05-1.20 m long, dug into the ground and roofed over with slabs (Thomas 1971a,fig.63). The complete monuments, as Thomas (1971a,141) has remarked:

> "resemble little ridge-tents in stone, with the two long-side slabs forming a sharp ridge, and with two triangular-shaped end-pieces as gables."

In some examples, such as those from Kilpeacan, Killoluaig and Killabuonia (Henry 1957,82,98,101,figs.11,17,18, pl.xxxix,a,b), the side or end-stones of the monument are pierced so as to provide access to the disarticulated corporeal remains inside. These structures, viewed by Thomas as insular versions of the Mediterranean cellae memoriae, have in Ireland been considered to date from the 7th century (Thomas 1971a,144). Recent excavations at Reask, in which an abraded sherd of Bii ware was discovered in the upper fill of a slab shrine might support such a proposition (Fanning 1981a,84-86,fig.7,pl.III,b: Thomas 1976).

Excavations in the Isle of Man, Orkney and Shetland have not produced a single certain example of a slab shrine. This is hardly surprising, with regard to the Northern Isles, given the paucity of excavated ecclesiastical sites in those areas and the present known slab-shrine distribution in the Irish Sea area (Thomas 1971a,fig.68). Their absence on Man, however, given the apparent discovery of such a feature at Ardwall Isle (Thomas 1967a,141,165-169,fig.27,pl.XXII), may suggest that such features still await recognition. This study therefore continues with a review of some features which could conceivably be attributed to structures of this type. The material discussed almost wholly relates to a collection of pierced stones which, like those from Killabuonia and elsewhere, could have allowed of access to the shrine interior. The author, however, readily admits that this material is most unsatisfactory for this kind of discussion and all interpretations are necessarily provisional.

Colli Ness chapel site, Sanday, Orkney

Dr. Lamb (1980a,26) has drawn attention to a 19th century account (NSA,xv,1842,142) which describes the discovery of rows of orientated flagstone-lined graves and a cross slab which, he supposes, may have formed part of a slab shrine. This identification, however, seems tenuous.

Keeill Killane, Lonan, Isle of Man

An interesting account of the discovery of what was called a `shrine stone´ was given by the Rev. Canon Quine at a meeting in Ramsey in December 1906 (Proc.IOMNHAS,I,1906-1915,50). The stone is said to have been discovered near Keeill Killane, a site which appears to have been greatly damaged when the electric tram-line was cut through in the latter half of the 19th century (Kermode 1915a,40).

The stone, of unknown size, was perforated by an apparently elliptical hole 0.60 m long and 0.05-0.40 m wide. An aperture of such size, however, can hardly be considered to have formed part of a slab shrine and Quine´s identification of this stone as part of a receptacle within an altar may be more apposite. Alternatively, the slab may have functioned as a window opening, although an ecclesiastical provenance is, of course, by no means certain. The present whereabouts of this stone is not known.

Ballachrink I (MAROWN 9), Marown, Isle of Man

Kermode´s excavation at this site uncovered a large slate slab, 1.20 x 0.90 m which was pierced in the centre by a small hole, 0.10 m in diameter. The stone was located towards the E edge of Kermode´s excavation area and was found to overlie an unlined recess which contained "a fine soil with ashes and

apparent traces of burial" (Kermode 1909,16,fig.16). This feature was considered to have formed part of an altar setting (Kermode 1909,16).

The pierced stone and recess feature could be identified as a form of monument related to the Irish slab shrine. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, the feature could be accommodated within a prehistoric context, as a short cist cremation burial. The evidence for this is considered in the gazetteer (Volume 2: MAROWN 9).

Ballaqueeney, Rushen, Isle of Man

A similar feature has also been reported from the Ballaqueeney keeill site in Rushen. Excavations by railway workers in 1871 X 1874 uncovered a number of pierced flat-lying slabs which, when lifted, were found to overlie an accumulation of ashes (Bruce 1968,56).

Interpretation of this, like the previous entry, is difficult and much must necessarily depend on what was intended by the term `ashes´. If this term is taken to imply the presence of cremated human bone, then we might speculate that the later accessible Christian slab shrine could have developed within a purely insular context. However, further work would be required before this aspect of continuity could be seriously entertained.

Greeba Mill, German, Isle of Man

One final pierced stone to be considered in this section was discovered at the Greeba Mill keeill site "on top of, but not as part of, one of the lintel graves" (Kermode 1910,22). The stone, 170(-), is roughly cruciform in outline and is pierced in

the centre by a star-shaped hole just over 0.10 m wide (Cubbon 1966b,26-27,pl.8). The stone measures 0.50 x 0.30 x 0.05 m and may have formed one end of a slab-shrine type structure. This has also been suggested by Trench-Jellicoe (1985,ii,64). Kermode (1910,22), meanwhile, believed the stone was a window light.

(c) Corner-post Shrines

The British corpus of corner-post shrines has been fully considered by Charles Thomas (1971a,149-163; 1973a; 1983) in his discussion and analysis of shrine fragments from Papil and St. Ninian's Isle in Shetland. Altogether, Thomas has identified two corner-post shrines from St. Ninian's Isle and possibly as many as four from Papil on West Burra. Examples of both single and double shrines have been represented.

The distribution of this type of monument is almost exclusively North British (Thomas 1971a,150,fig.68) and it has been suggested that the monument represents an 8th century introduction from Northumbria via Pictland (Thomas 1971a,154-156; 1973a,27-28). No examples are known from either Orkney or the Isle of Man.

(d) Leachta

The final type of ecclesiastical monument to be considered is the leacht (Old Irish lecht, Latin lectus), meaning bed or grave (Thomas 1971a,144). The Manx word is leabba and this is found, for example, in the Abbeyland boundary tracts: "per locum qui dicitur Leabba Aukonaway" (Broderick 1979,f.54.r: Bruce & Cubbon 1930,308: Kneen 1979,533-534: p.219 below).

The leacht has been described as a type of open-air altar:

> "a rectangular block of masonry or dry stone, often surmounted by one or more cross-marked slabs"
>
> A.C. Thomas 1971a,144

Several Irish examples are known and Thomas (1971a,169-175) has postulated a connexion between these monuments and the altar graves of early Mediterranean Christianity. The great problem, however, as Thomas acknowledged, is that none has yet been excavated, or perhaps knowingly excavated, given that the special graves at Ronaldsway (pp.165-168 above) might conceivably be more properly considered as forms of leachta. However, these aside, only two such possible monuments are known from the area covered by this present study.

St. Patrick's Chair, Marown, Isle of Man

One of the best known leachta outside of Ireland is probably the monument in Marown which is known as St. Patrick's Chair. This structure (pl.2b) is located in the middle of a cultivated field known as the Margher-y-Chiarn, `The Field of The Lord' (Kermode 1907,102).

The monument is of drystone and earth construction and is orientated NE-SW. It measures 2.15 x 1.20 x 0.45 m high and is surmounted by two cross-incised slabs, 6(5) and 7(6) (Kermode 1907,fig.46,pl.VI: Thomas 1971a,fig.84). These were temporarily removed in 1894 but no indication of a burial was discerned (Kermode 1907,103). The cross forms have been dated on stylistic grounds to the 7th or 8th century (Trench-Jellicoe 1985,ii,143-144).

Interpretation of this site is difficult, given its apparently isolated location. The Irish examples listed by Thomas (1971a,168-175), for instance, seem to have been exclusively associated with identifiable ecclesiastical establishments. Kermode (1907,102-103) suggested that St. Patrick's Chair may have been an early moot-hill or pagan burial place. This remains a possibility but only excavation is likely to improve our understanding of these monuments.

Brough of Birsay, Orkney

Only one possible leacht is known from the Northern Isles. This was discovered on the S side of the chapel during excavations on the Brough of Birsay in the 1950's. It has been described as a rectangular structure with rounded angles, marked by a long stone kerb on its N side but much reduced in its other sectors. It was apparently raised 0.30 m above a contemporary ground surface (Radford 1959,14-15; 1962a,168-169: Cruden 1965,24-25).

The 1950's Brough of Birsay excavations are as yet still unpublished and the available accounts of this feature are brief. In essence, the accounts describe only a stone kerb, 2.40 m to 3 m in length (Radford 1959,14; 1962a,168: Cruden 1965,24) and discussion of this feature is thus difficult. Charles Thomas (1971a,173), for example, appears to have been less than convinced by this feature. A recent survey by Anna Ritchie (1985a,193), meanwhile, has suggested that the feature might be more properly considered as a kerbed cairn like those identified elsewhere by Patrick Ashmore (1980) as a specifically Pictish type of grave setting. In any event, until the final report is

available, identification of this feature as a leacht must be considered somewhat doubtful.

(v) Summary & Conclusion

Part 3 of this chapter has set out the Manx and Northern Isles evidence for curvilinear enclosure forms and associated funerary structures. These features represent an integral part of Charles Thomas' developed cemeteries model. The material which has been assembled here is not vast but then again much of it has not been brought together in this way, or been considered in this context.

It will be clear that the developed cemetery features discussed above are better represented in the Manx evidence than in that from Orkney and Shetland. This may be because fewer sites have been excavated there (Appendix 2b) or it may be due to the possibility that the development of Northern Isles sites may have been different. Other aspects of the development of ecclesiastical sites are considered in Chapter 7. The next chapter, however, considers the relationship of the Manx and Northern Isles chapels to the land divisions of those islands.

Notes: Chapter 5

Note 1:

The 54 keeills for which fairly complete records exist are illustrated in figs.59-62 and listed in the accompanying index.

Note 2:

The location of the entrance can be traced in as many as 13 of the Orkney and Shetland single-cell chapels. These are illustrated in figs.63-68 and some of them are listed in Table 6 which sets out the evidence for different types of entrance form. The 13 sites are as follows: Marwick chapel, Birsay: Auskerry, Stronsay: Head of Holland chapel, Kirkwall: Brough of Deerness chapel: Rood chapel at Mucklehouse in South Ronaldsay: St. Tredwell's chapel on Papa Westray: Brims chapel on Walls: Chapel Knowe at Lunna in Nesting: Halliara Kirk and Kirkhouse on Fetlar: the chapels at Bothen and Framgord on Unst: and Crosskirk at Eshaness in Northmavine.

Note 3:

The location of the entrance can be traced in as many as eight of the nave and chancel chapels of the Northern Isles. These are illustrated in figs.63-68 and most are listed in Table 6. The eight sites are as follows: Linton chapel on Shapinsay: St. Mary's chapel on Wyre: Peterkirk in Evie: Tammaskirk in Rendall: Crosskirk on Westray: St. Olaf's church at Lundawick on Unst: St. Olaf's church on Yell and the chapel on St. Ninian's Isle.

CHAPTER 6

CHAPELS & LAND DIVISIONS: AN ANALYSIS OF LOCATION

Introduction

The early chapels of Orkney, Shetland and Man have been associated with areas of land division known respectively as urislands, scattalds and treens. Much of this work was done in the first half of this century and is associated with the names of Professor C.J.S Marstrander (1937), J. Storer Clouston (1918a) and Hugh Marwick (1952a,191-251).

The basis of that research is contained in much earlier traditional accounts. In the Isle of Man, for example, the earliest reference to keeill and treen is contained in the 16th century Traditionary Ballad (p.25). In Orkney, the relationship between chapels and urislands was first reported by the Rev. George Low, the minister for Birsay and Harray:

> "Remains of popish chapels are many because every eyrsland of 18 pennyland had one for matins and vespers, but now all are in ruins."
>
> OSA 1799(1978),13

A similar phenomenon can also be traced in St. Andrew's parish (Clouston 1918a,223) and in the parish of Orphir:

> "Romish chapels are to be met with in every district of this parish."
>
> OSA 1799(1978),177

This is also found in Shetland. Low, during his tour of 1774, for example, was informed:

> "There have been in the days of Popery no less than 22 chapels, the island (Unst) being divided into 22 parts, called Scathills."
>
> Low 1774(1978),162

In this present chapter the Manx evidence is reviewed in detail and some assessment is made of Marstrander's (1937) approach to the problem. In this new analysis reference is made to the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2) and the discussion is then extended so as to enable a comparative analysis of the keeill sites and land divisions of the island as a whole. The results of this research are then summarized and a new dynamic model for examining chapels and land divisions in the Isle of Man is offered. This model is then tested against the evidence from Orkney and Shetland.

(i) Land Divisions in the Isle of Man, Orkney and Shetland

(a) Isle of Man: Quarterland and Treen

The basic unit of landholding in the Isle of Man throughout the later medieval period and down to the last century was the quarterland (quartrona terre).

In the Rentals (Talbot 1924), it was usual for several quarterlands to be grouped together to form treens. Some treens, for example Renncullyn in Maughold or Ardrenk in Ballaugh, only comprised one quarterland or less. Others, such as Gordon in Patrick or Gresby in Braddan, comprised six quarterlands. Meanwhile, the treen of Arnicarnigan & Foxdale in Patrick was formed of as many as seven or eight quarterlands. However, as the name suggests and as Davies (1956,105) has shown, most treens comprised four quarterlands. In terms of size, the treens could be as small as 48 acres or as large as 970 acres. Most, however, as Davies (1956,105) has noted, are 200-500 acres in extent. The average size of the quarterland has been calculated at approximately 90 acres (Davies 1956,109).

The treens, in turn, were grouped together to form parishes. Five treens go together to make up Jurby parish. The parish of Andreas, on the other hand, comprised as many as 16 treens. Nine or ten treens per parish seems to be the norm but this matter is complicated by the fact that the treen divisions have not been preserved in those areas where the medieval Church had extensive land holdings. These different types of holdings were known as Abbeyland, Stafflands, Barony Estates, and Particles.

The parishes, in their turn, were grouped into six Sheadings, of two or three parishes each. The Sheadings of Glenfaba, Michael and Ayre, which lay to the NW of the major SW-NE water-shed, formed Northside. The Sheadings of Rushen, Middle and Garff formed Southside (Kinvig 1975,9-13: Davies 1956,100-102). The pre-1796 disposition of parishes and sheadings is illustrated in figs.40-45. The territorial structure of the island, as Davies (1956,102) has remarked, rests ultimately on the quarterland. This hierarchy has recently been illustrated by Fletcher & Reilly (forthcoming,fig.1).

The early rentals (Talbot 1924) are organized on a parochial basis. The accounts list the name of the treen, the names of the tenants, the size of their holdings in quarterlands or fractions thereof, and the amount of rent that was due. The quarterland and treen rent varies greatly from one holding to another. In the parish of Marown (Table 13), for example, excluding the single quarterland treen of Garth, the lowest and highest treen rents were £1 3s 10d and £2 17s 2d in the case of Cardall and Sanbrick respectively. The average rent per quarterland in each of these

two treens was 7s 11d and 10s 5d respectively. In the treen of Trollaby the average rent per quarterland was as much as 13s 2d.

Data for the number of quarterlands per treen and the rents demanded in the parish of Santon are presented in Table 14. Here the lowest and highest rents per treen were £1 8s 6d and £4 3s 7d, for Sanbrick and Arrogan respectively. The average rent per quarterland was 8s 2d and £1 0s 11d respectively.

The average treen rent also varies from parish to parish. These data are presented in Table 15. The extremes are represented by the parishes of Marown and Malew where the average rent per treen was £2 2s 3d and £4 17s 5d respectively. It is thus not really accurate to say, as Marstrander (1937,301,412) did, that the average rent amounted to 17s 10d per quarterland and £3 11s 4d per treen. Sveaas Andersen (1983,155), meanwhile, has assessed the average treen rental as £2 17s 8d and has used this as one criterion for identifying centres of early Norse settlement. Neither study, however, takes into account the fact that there are considerable variations in rent and average rent totals across the island.

Sanbrick, for example, is the largest treen in Marown, yet its rental value of £2 17s 2d would suggest, according to Sveaas Andersen´s calculations, that the holding was of below average size for the island as a whole. At the other end of the scale, Aust treen in Lezayre was assessed at £3 17s 0d. This is well above Sveaas Andersen´s figure for the average treen rent but it is low for the parish as a whole where the average rent amounted to £4 9s 0d (Table 15).

It is likely that variations in quarterland and treen rent may be due to the size of the holding and the quality of the land and these factors may have chronological implications. This present study, for example, would consider that Sanbrick treen was developed at a relatively early date because it forms the largest holding in Marown. Aust treen, on the other hand, could be considered a relatively late holding within the context of the development of the treens in Lezayre parish. Admittedly, it is difficult to account for these considerable variations from parish to parish. Nonetheless, it is suggested that these differences in rent total can be better understood at the parish level. This is the approach used by this present study in its comparative analysis of different types of treen formation (Section ii: pp.203-218).

Other elements of the Manx land system remain to be introduced. Dr. Elwyn Davies (1956,103-106,fig.3) pointed out many years ago the general correspondence between the 600´ (183 m) contour and the upper limit of the quarterland holdings:

> "it separates the lands with more, and less, arable in a system of mixed farming, and the pastures which are good enough to fatten and `finish´ cattle from those which are better suited to raising store cattle"
>
> E. Davies 1956,105

Above the quarterlands on the slopes and sometimes below them too in the valley bottoms lie the intacks. These were rented enclosures from the common land or waste. The mapping of these divisions of the landscape, the treens, quarterlands, intacks and waste, remains to be defined.

The boundaries of the treens, quarterlands and intacks are marked by streams, hedges and stone walls, some of which follow the course of paths and tracks which have become lanes or roads. The physical enclosure of the Manx landscape has been considered largely a product of the post-Medieval period. In 1577, for example, statutes were enacted confirming that:

> "all Manner of Tenants, as well my Lord's as Others, shall make a sufficient Ditch to defend his Goodes from his Neighboures, that is to know such a Ditch as shall defend Horse or Cow and to be made from the Annunciation of our Blessed Lady till Michaelmas"
>
> Quoted in Kneen 1923: Killip 1978,402

and Killip (1983,81), for example, has argued that in most cases the quarterland holdings lay open until the 17th or 18th centuries. The boundaries were, however, known locally but left undefined. The enclosure of the quarterlands was based on oral evidence, witnessed by the people of the locality and settled by a four-man jury known as the `setting quest' (Killip 1978,403-404; 1983,81).

It is clear, however, that certain boundaries were physically established much earlier than the 17th century. The Fell Dyke or mountain hedge which divided the quarterlands from the waste is referred to in statutes dating from 1422 (Killip 1978,401). Also it has not previously been noted that the late 13th century boundary tracts, the Limites seu divisiones terrarum monachorum de Russyn, are also important in this context. These tracts are appended to the Cronica regum mannie et insularum (Broderick 1979,f.53r-f.54v) and have been dated, on paleographic and historical grounds, to c.1280 (Megaw 1976,6-7,37-38; 1978,271:

Broderick 1979,v).

The Limites describe the holdings of Rushen abbey in the parishes of Malew, Lezayre and at Skinscoe in Lonan-Maughold (Gelling 1978,262-264: Andersen 1983,150). The importance of these tracts with regard to the medieval Manx landscape has not previously been fully considered. The vocabulary which is employed in these texts for the definition of boundaries, for example, is particularly interesting. Four main categories or naming conventions may be identified. These are used either singly or in combination and the frequency of their occurrence in the different boundary tracts is illustrated in Table 16. This evidence is now considered. All references to the Limites, where unaccounted, are to Broderick's (1979) edition.

The first type of boundary description (Category 1: Table 16) refers to those natural features of the landscape which have a specific geographical extent and whose line can be readily determined. Thus this category is limited to references to streams and rivers, features which clearly have a special relevance as boundary indicators. The boundaries, for example, are said to have ascended or descended along the course of streams or rivers (per rivulum, per amnem, per ripam amnis).

In Category 2 (Table 16) the boundary description refers to man-made features in the landscape which are similarly 'contained' and boundary-specific. These are references to walls and ditches. There are 12 references to walls and/or ditches in the abbeyland bounds.

The most common construction, used on four occasions (five examples), is "by the wall and ditch" (per murum et foveam). On two occasions (four examples) the boundary is described as having followed an "old wall" (per veterem murum); on another occasion (two examples) simply "wall" (per murum) is used. In another case, the boundary is said to have descended per veterem siccam. Kneen (1979,546) translated this as "by the old dry-land", a rather meaningless phase but nonetheless one that is a good translation of the Classical Latin word siccus (Lewis & Short 1879,1693: Glare 1982,1755). However, in medieval usage, siccus meant stream or ditch (Latham 1965,438) and thus Broderick's (1979,f.54r) translation, "by the old ditch", is the more correct.

In the third type of boundary description (Category 3: Table 16), the boundary is defined with reference to the names of adjacent settlements or farm holdings. This is frequently used in conjunction with one or other of the categories already described above and the phrase is usually introduced by the expression qui est inter or some variant thereof. For example, in the Malew abbeylands the boundary followed the wall between Cornama and Totmanby: "descendit per eundem murum inter Cornama et totmanby" (Broderick 1979,f.53v).

There are 13 examples of this formula. On nine occasions it is clear that treen boundaries are involved in this construction. These are villa castelli (Scarlett; Kneen 1979,101), Arveuzryn (Arernan; Kneen 1979,89), Totmanby (Tosaby; Kneen 1979,122) and Villa Thorkel or Kyrke Mychel (Kirk Michael; Kneen 1979,112) which occur twice, Conisakir (Comissary / Conessary; Kneen 1979,

103), Gretastaz (Gretch; Kneen 1979,261) and finally Rynkurlyn (Rencullen; Kneen 1979,308).

The accompanying place-names in these formulas may almost certainly be identified as adjacent quarterland farms. These are Villa MacAkoen (Ballakaigan; Megaw 1978,307), Bylozen (Billown; Kneen 1979,98), Cornama (Cordeman; Kneen 1979,103), Herynstaze (Orrisdale; Kneen 1979,116), Balesalazc (Ballasalla; Kneen 1979,94) and Balygil (Ballagilley; Kneen 1979,92).

The place-name material is classified according to type in Table 17. Twenty-seven or more of the 47 names listed there are the names of treens or quarterlands. But of particular interest are those instances where the treens and quarterlands are said to have been physically contained or delimited by walls, ditches or streams.

There are seven examples of this phenomenon in the Malew bounds. The boundaries between Arernan and Staynarhea, and Ballagilley and Conessary were marked by streams. Walls marked the boundary line between Cordeman and Tosaby, Oxrayser and Tosaby, and Kirk Michael and Ballasalla. The wall and ditch between villa castelli (Scarlett) and the Monk's land is referred to twice.

In the shorter Skinscoe bounds there are two further examples of the same combined formula. The boundary between Tofthar Asmund and Rencullen was marked by a stream whilst the river and valley at Laxey signified the boundary between St. Nicholas' chapel, which is located on a detached part of Colby treen, and the treen of Gretch. There are no examples of this formula in the

Lezayre bounds since the adjacent estates formula (Category 3) was not used in that document (Table 16).

The fourth type of naming convention (Category 4: Table 16) which may be distinguished in the boundary documents refers to geographically inexact or indeterminate features or areas of the landscape. This category includes a variety of both natural and man-made features. The boundary, for example, may be said to go from the lake, along the valley, up to the thicket, by the rock and along under the mill. Doubtless the boundaries so described were well known to the local populace. They are, however, spatially less specific, unlike walls, ditches or streams.

This type of description, like Category 3, is also found in association with one or other of the main types described above (Categories 1 & 2). However, in the Lezayre tracts the Category 4 type of boundary description frequently stands alone. The preponderance of minor topographical detail in the Lezayre abbeyland description has also been noted by Megaw (1978,272-273), albeit in a different context. This is seen in different ways in Tables 16 and 17.

It is clear that these boundaries were locally known and recognized. This is made explicit in the Skinscoe bounds where the phrase sicut notum est provincialibus ("as is known to the locals") occurs twice. A third example of this construction is also contained in the Malew section: per murum et foveam in amnem de Russyn sicut notum est provincialibus (Broderick 1979,f.53v). It is unclear, however, if the phrase refers to the name of the river or the boundary.

The evidence of the abbeyland boundary tracts and in particular its references to physically contained estates may be suggestive of early enclosure. It could, however, be argued that the abbeyland estates, being ecclesiastical holdings, were somehow exceptional. The formation and establishment of ecclesiastical estates and baronies in the Isle of Man lies outside the scope of this study. Nevertheless, some assessment of this must be made in view of this study's interpretation of the boundary tracts and its suggestion concerning the early enclosure of land.

There is much to commend the view that the abbeyland and barony holdings represent aggregations of early treen estates (Megaw 1949,174). The quarterland extent of these holdings has been listed by Marstrander (1937,406) and these can be expressed in terms of a notional treen equivalent (Note 1). The former treen names of some of these estates are also known or suspected. The Rushen abbey holdings in Lonan, for example, have been identified with the former treen of Skinscoe (Kermode 1915a,37). Meanwhile, the 13th century grant to the Priory of Whitnorn refers to "the church of St. Ninian of Ballacgniba" and Megaw (1949,176,180) has suggested that Ballacgniba was the ancient treen name for what was to become the barony of St. Trinians. A third possible example is mentioned in a 16th century account of the holdings of Bangor abbey at the time of the Dissolution:

> "The abbot also enjoyed a town-land in the Isle of Man, called Clenanoy"
>
> Monasticon Hibernicum M. Archdall 1786,109

Clenanoy (Glenmaye) has thus been proposed as the former treen name for the Barony of Bangor and Sabal estate in the parish of Patrick (Megaw 1949,174). In a fourth possible example the lost place-name Orumsouz has been equated with the later estate of Cristen's barony in Maughold (Kneen 1979,304).

This study would suggest that the references in the abbeyland bounds to enclosure by wall, ditch or stream are not exclusive to these estates simply because they were ecclesiastical holdings. The fact that the boundaries are said to have followed old walls and ditches which were known and recognized by the local people, for example, could imply that the church authorities were acknowledging an ancient division of the landscape. The purpose of these boundary documents must also be briefly examined.

It is clear that these boundary clauses served to establish the claims or rights of Rushen abbey to the ownership of these various estates. Megaw (1949,174) has suggested that the purpose of the ecclesiastical barony estates was for the establishment of a cell, monastery or hospital from among the monks of the mother house. This is possible but, in the vast majority of cases, this study would suggest that the various types of ecclesiastical estate were essentially economic concerns and that for the Manx farmer of the time, it would have been merely a question as to where he paid his rent.

The medieval Manx ecclesiastical holdings are unlikely, on the whole, to have been newly created estates, reclaimed from the waste. On the contrary, it is likely that they comprised fully productive farms, once organized into treens, whose land had probably been cultivated and exploited for centuries. The Rushen

abbey holdings in Lezayre, the land of the monks of Myroscough (terram monachorum de Myrosco: Broderick 1979,f.54r), however, may have been an exception. This area may have only begun to have been exploited as a result of the ecclesiastical settlement there of monks from Rievaulx abbey in the late 12th century (Cronica s.a 1176: Broderick 1979,f.40r).

This might be significant for it might well explain the peculiarities noted above with regard to the naming conventions and place-name types (Tables 16 & 17) which are found in the Lezayre abbeyland bounds. The relative paucity of treen and farm names, the absence of the qui est inter formula (Category 3), the almost total lack of references to walls and ditcnes and the consequent preponderance of minor topographical detail could be explained if the estate they referred to had only recently been created from the waste. By drawing on a wider frame of reference, by looking at the textual formulas and conventions (Table 16) and by examining the place-names simply in terms of whether they refer to farms, streams or other topographical landmarks (Table 17), it is possible to place the Limites document into what this study would argue is its true context. This does not necessarily detract from what either Megaw (1978,272-273) or Gelling (1978,259) has said about this document. It does, however, emphasize the point that the boundary tracts have more to offer us than just a list of Gaelic and Norse place-names.

The significance of the Limites document lies in the fact that the boundaries were actually committed to writing and thus defined. It is suggested, therefore, that the medieval Manx landscape was relatively more enclosed than Killip (1978; 1983) suggested. These estates, which may almost certainly be identified as treens, were already physically delimited and even then (c.1280) these boundaries could be described as `old´. This need not, in itself, necessarily take us back more than one or two generations (perhaps c.1200), much less to the period of the Norse settlement of Man or the Early Christian period. The possible development of the Manx land system is considered in Section iv. First, however, it is necessary to define the methodology employed in the mapping of the treen and quarterland divisions of the island.

The primary documents which enable the mapping of the Manx land system are the early 16th century rentals (Talbot 1924) and James Woods´ A New Atlas and Gazetteer of the Isle of Man of 1867. These sources provided the basis for Davies´ (1956) study and his maps of the treens and quarterlands and William Cubbon´s hand-drawn and coloured maps of 1930, now in the Manx Museum (also published in black-and-white in Kneen 1979). These primary and secondary sources have formed the bases for the maps in this present study (figs.40-45: Note 2).

In the manorial rolls of 1511-1515 (Talbot 1924) the quarterland holdings, although grouped together into treens, are nevertheless unnamed. The only information provided concerns the tenant´s name, the size of his holding and the amount of rent payable. However, by and large, the rents laid on these

properties remained unchanged, apart from doubling in 1703, down until their abolition in 1916. Thus the individual holdings, although not named until the 17th or early 18th centuries, can usually be identified by their rental value (E. Megaw 1978,331). The intacks, meanwhile, although perhaps belonging to one quarterland or another, were nevertheless distinguished and treated separately in the rental documents.

Woods' (1867) Atlas shows the boundaries of the quarterlands and intacks and records in a tabular form the names of the treens and quarterlands and the acreages of the holdings. Woods' Atlas was based on the Tithe maps of c.1840 and others which he himself had been commissioned to prepare for the Asylum Board in 1860 (Davies 1956,103). Woods' maps do not show field boundaries or minor topography. Nevertheless they are accurate enough, if combined with local observation, to enable the recognition of the quarterland boundaries on the modern OS 1:10560 maps. The treen boundaries can then be represented as an aggregation of the appropriate quarterlands, as known from the early rentals (Talbot 1924). This method of transposition and aggregation formed the basis of Davies' (1956) study of the Manx land system.

(b) Orkney: Tunship and Urisland

The basic unit of landholding in Man has been identified as the quarterland. In Orkney the comparable unit, with its mixture of arable and meadow land and with rights to hill and shore, was the tunship (Clouston 1920: Marwick 1952a,216-223). It also represents the basic unit of assessment in the earliest surviving rentals of 1492 and c.1500 (Peterkin 1820).

The rentals are organized on a parochial basis and list the skats (taxes) and the landmails (rents) which were due from the various tunships or farms, the extent of which was expressed in terms of pennylands. It is clear that the size or productive capacity of the tunships, as indicated by the pennyland extent, could vary considerably. Some comprised 18 pennylands or more; others amounted to just one or two pennylands or even fractions of a pennyland. The physical acreages of these holdings could also vary from pennyland to pennyland (Thomson 1981,20-21).

Some of the small tunships may be similar to the single quarterland treens in Man, such as Garth in Marown (Table 13). Others perhaps could be relatively recently created holdings like the Manx intacks. Alternatively, they could be considered as detached parts of larger tunships (Marwick 1952a,217). This could be implied by the fact that certainly some of these small holdings were liable for skat. Others, however, technically quoyland (Marwick 1952a,193,228), whilst liable for rent, were not however skatted and this would support the identification of these holdings as medieval and later creations.

The complexities of the Orcadian land system, the intricate nature of the related fiscal system and the methodology of skat assessments lie outside the proper scope of this study. These subjects have been fully examined by Johnston (1933) and more particularly by Marwick (1929,157-158; 1935; 1952a,191-223) and reference to those works will be made where necessary. The purpose of this present study is concerned solely with the identification of the various districts and the problems of

defining them in a cartographical way.

The physical enclosure of the Orcadian landscape has been considered largely the product of the 19th century `improvements´ (Fenton 1978,89-100). On Shapinsay, for example, the entire landscape was remodelled and the land set out into a grid of ten-acre squares (Thomson 1981,37; 1985). However, much of the pre-Enclosure Orcadian landscape has been preserved in an estate map of c.1770 (OCL.E29) and this, together with the documentary evidence discussed below, forms an important source for the reconstruction of the tunship and urisland boundaries.

It is clear from the charter evidence of the 16th and 17th centuries that some tunships were physically divided from one another and from the commons by turf and perhaps by turf-and-stone dykes (Clouston 1920,16). The boundaries of the tunships were known locally, although some, it seems, were only physically marked out as a result of litigation. In a decision of 1583-84, regarding the boundaries of Sabay, Toab and Tankerness (REO,lxxii), the court found "the old marches to be just and true" and directed the sheriff "with certain of the honest men" to erect march stones at the debated points along the boundary.

In Man, it has been assumed that the knowledge of local boundaries was known and transmitted through the family and/or the community until the boundaries were physically established by the statements of various witnesses. In an early 16th century document from Orkney we see for the first time the kind of processes that are likely to have been involved in the transmission of this local knowledge. The document dates from 1519 and agains concerns the boundaries and privileges of Sabay

with regard to Toab and Tankerness. In this dispute John Irving of Sabay was able to produce "sax famous and wordie discreit men off great age" who were able to testify:

> "on thair saull and conscience that thay knew perfytlie the mairchis betuixt Sabay and Thoep and Tankarnes, for quhen thay war xxj yeir auld thay rad behind thair fatheris bak on a horse quhen thay red all the mairchis of the parochin".
>
> REO,xli

This custom was also to be found in Shetland (pp.200-201). The bounds of Sabay were marked by dykes, march-stones and streams and by reference to minor topographical features, both natural and man-made (REO,xxxvii; xli; lxxii). Similar boundaries are described in REO (xxxviiA; l; lxxxiv).

Various names exist for the different types of dykes or boundaries found in Orkney. The hill dyke, for example, separated the tunship from the commons and would have been breached or rebuilt according to the seasons of the agricultural year. Another type of boundary referred to in the documents is the `auld bow´ or `bow dyke´ (REO,clxxxviii) wnicn Clouston (1920,25-26) has suggested was the boundary of the old arable lands of the tunship, lying within the hill dyke. In two of the Sabay charters (REO,xli; lxxii) references are made the `scat dyke´, a term which seems to refer to that part of the hill dyke which lay between adjacent tunships. It is also a clear reference to the fiscal system with which the tunships came to be associated. The reconstruction of the tunship and urisland boundaries remains to be considered.

It should be stated at the outset that the mapping of the Orcadian urislands is not a particularly easy task. Dr. Hugh Marwick, for example, did not consider it possible to produce an urisland map of Orkney which would compare with a map of the Manx treens (Megaw 1978,297). Thomson's (1981,19) map of the notional districts of Rousay, formed of half, one and one-and-a-half urislands, illustrates well the cartographical problems involved. This present study, however, attempts to bring together such "scattered evidence" (Megaw 1978,297) as does exist.

The true urisland constituted 18 pennylands. The term uris terre and the equation is encountered throughout the early rentals. Tuquoy and Air, on Westray, for example constituted "ane uris terre...thair is xiij d terre...and of the uther v d terre.." (Peterkin 1820,1503 Rental,79-80). The term and the equation were still known as late as the late 18th century (OSA 1799(1978),13: see above p.177).

Other post-medieval and modern references to the urisland are also known. Clouston (1918a,94), for example, has recorded that the old burial districts of certain Orkney mainland parishes were still known as `erselands' or `urslands' down to the present century. In the parish of Orphir it seems likely that the 18th century Church Elders' districts, called `quarters', were identical to the earlier urislands (Clouston 1918a,94: Johnston 1940,100-130: see below pp.240-241). In the parish of Holm the equation between the urislands and the Elders' districts, called `urslands' or `uslands' in the Kirk Session Records for 1701 and 1763 (Johnston 1940,64,81), is actually stated. The same is true in Westray where, in 1678, the "Elders were ordained that each

should bring the Inhabitants of his Urisland with him" (Craven 1893,74).

The earliest documentary reference to Orcadian urislands is contained in Hákonar Saga Hákonarsonar (Vigfusson 1887a: Dasent 1894: p.202 below) in an account which describes King Hakon´s overwintering in Orkney after the battle of Largs in 1263:

> "Hákon konungr lét þá skrá lendum mönnum ok sveitar-höfðingjum eyris-lönd til vista-töku, at halda þaer sveitir sem við þeim vóru, ok svá af hverjum eyris-löndum".
>
> Hákonar Saga Hákonarsonar, cap.328: Vigfusson 1887a,353

This account concerns the provisions which were made for the quartering of Hakon´s army and as Marwick (1929,202) rightly concluded it is clear that the urislands were already by then in existence. Dasent (1894,365) translated eyris-lönd as `geldable land´ or `crown estate´ and Marwick (1929,202) suggested that Hakon used the urislands "as a basis of valuation in the quartering of his men" (my emphasis). Clouston (1918a,231), on the other hand, suggested that the account referred to the actual billeting of the army on physically defined estates and this seems the more likely interpretation.

The Orkney tunship, like the Manx quarterland, provides the key for the mapping of the larger, urisland districts along the lines of Davies´ (1956,103) method of the `transposition and aggregation´ of the smaller units to form the whole. The problems involved are, admittedly, somewhat different and this is due largely to the different ways in which the early rentals of Man and Orkney were arranged. In Man there is documentary evidence which permits the identification of the constituent quarterlands

of each treen. In Orkney, however, we are forced to consider the pennyland extent of the tunships and ultimately, where possible, to group adjacent tunships into districts of 18 pennylands or thereabouts. A few examples from the rentals, noted by Clouston (1918a,95-104), illustrate this method.

In the parish of Harray four districts have been identified. These are identical to the 17th and 18th century lawrikmen districts (Clouston 1916,52-54). The Lawrikmen were district officials who represented local landholders. The first district comprised the adjacent tunships of Knarston (4½d.land), Mirbister (3d.land), Garth (4½d.land), Corston (4d.land) and Corrigall (2d.land) making 18d.land in all. The second district comprised Noltclet (4½d.land), How and Ramsgarth (4½d.land), Hunscarth (3d.land) and Binbister (6d.land) which together with Overbrough (9d.land) formed 27d.land or 1½ urislands. The third district comprised Netherbrough (12d.land) and Rusland (6d.land), whilst the fourth was identical to the single tunship of Grimeston (18d.land). Elsewhere, however, the districts cannot be resolved into 18d.land units. In the parish of Firth, for example, the four urislands seem to have been represented by 15d.land, 11d.land, 16½d.land and 13½d.land districts (Clouston 1918a,101). In the parish of Orphir the districts comprised 12d.land, 14d.land or 15d.land (Marwick 1952a,103-108: cf.Clouston 1918a,101). The cartographical representations of these districts are now considered.

A number of early maps have been utilized in this study as a basis for reconstructing the old land divisions. The old hill

dykes, for example, are depicted in Murdoch MacKenzie's Orcades Sea Atlas of c.1750, a work that was commissioned by the Earl of Morton (Robinson 1981,24). William Aberdeen's map (OCL.E29) of c.1770, made for Morton's successor, Sir Laurence Dundas, who became the owner of the Orkney earldom estate in 1766 (Fenton 1978,67), is also important. It shows the divisions inside the hill-dyke in far more detail and it is likely that most of these smaller divisions represent the tunships of the early rentals. MacKenzie's and Aberdeen's maps of the Westray land divisions are illustrated in figs.48 & 49.

A third map which has been used in this study is an early 19th century map of the parish of Orphir, showing the hill dykes and the boundaries of the individual tunships (fig.51). This was made in 1813 and published by A.W Johnston (1904). Clouston (1918a,101) has suggested that the urisland districts were formed by the tunships of Clestrain & Petertown, Houton & Midland, Orphir, Swanbister & Smoogro, Tuskerbister & Kirbister and Groundwater & Hobbister. Examination of the Kirk Session Records for November 18th 1764 (Johnston 1940,120), on the other hand, would suggest that Petertown formed part of Houton & Midland and that Clestrain was a single tunship district.

These three maps, together with the rental evidence, form the basis for the cartographical representation of the Orkney urisland districts.

(c) Shetland: Tunship and Scattald

In medieval Shetland, as in Orkney, the tunship represented the basic unit of landholding (Fenton 1978,40-48). In the

earliest surviving rental documents of c.1500 (SRO.GD.1/366/1) and 1628 (SRO.E.41/7), skats were sometimes levied, as is usually the case in Orkney, on a single tunship or group of tunships (Smith 1984,101). This, however, was not the case in Unst.

The sections dealing with the northern isles of Shetland, including Unst, have not survived in the c.1500 skat-book. In that of 1628, however, the various skats, assessed in wodmell, butter and oil, were levied on those larger districts which can later be identified as the scattalds. The skat-book of 1716 (SRO.RH.9/15/176), compiled by Thomas Gifford of Busta, is far more detailed than either of the earlier documents. Gifford's skat-book lists the constituent tunships of each scattald and it thus becomes possible for the first time to see the wide variations in size between the different districts. The scattald of Underhoull, for example, was assessed as 100 merk lands and comprised the tunships of Underhoull (51 merks), Vinstrick (16), Baila (9), Crosbuster (18) and Osmansgarth (6). The large scattald of Baliasta, assessed as 336½ merks, comprised 20 tunships, including the isle of Balta, whilst Kews (Quoyhouse), at 12 merks, constituted a single tunship scattald.

Pennylands and urislands are not known in Shetland, although the term `eyrisland' is met with as a fiscal unit in the c.1500 rental (pers.comm B.Smith). The etymology of the word `scattald' is unclear (Smith 1984,99). Nevertheless, the connexion with ON. skattr and the association of these units with chapels provide a link with the Orcadian urisland. The two units, however, are not quite the same. It is clear from the rental evidence that scattald originally referred to the arable and

pasture lands of the tunship within the hill dyke as well as the grazing areas outside (Smith 1984,100-101: Fenton 1978,35-36). The entire Shetland landscape, with but few exceptions (Bruce 1933,147), was thus divided up into scattalds. This represents the most fundamental difference between the Shetland scattalds and the Orcadian urislands.

The scattald boundaries are described in several documents. Most of these are contained in the records of the Court of Session and date from the last century when the scattalds were divided (Knox 1985,185-195). Others are contained in early accounts which describe the perambulation of the scattald marches. This custom was known as `riding the hagri´. The earliest reference to this custom is contained in a document of 1431 (SA.SA.2/188), preserved in a copy of c.1550, which refers to the tunships of Caldback, Garth and Crooksetter. This area appears as Garth scattald in the 1716 skat-book (Smith 1984,103). Another document of 1681 (SA.SA.2/178), concerning the "haggrie of Eshaness", has also been referred to by Smith (1984,103). Further accounts of the scattald marches of Yell, Fetlar (SA.CH.2/151/14) and Unst, dating from 1667, 1710 and 1771 respectively, have also been preserved. The Yell and Unst march descriptions have also been published (Bruce 1933: Johnston 1910-1912).

Riding the hagri was once an annual event. Hibbert (1822,458) has recorded that:

> "the baliff of each parish, with twelve honest men, should annually ride the marches of the parish betwixt the first of October and the last day of April, or at any other time wnen

> required by the scattlers, the penalty of non-performance being Forty pounds Scots."

Gilbert Neven, the bailie of Yell, was accompanied by as many as 31 portioners and "many other Witnesses" when he set out to survey the scattald marches of Yell in 1667 (Bruce 1933). It is clear that the scattald perambulation was very much a community affair which was used as a means of examining and reaffirming the boundaries, the knowledge of which would be passed down to the younger members of the community. This could be done in a number of ways. A document of 1843, for example, tells us:

> "at a perambulation of the scattald marches of Unst in the year 1818 or 1819...Mr. Mowat to make it to be the better remembered that Tonga was the march, gave Fredman Stickle, one of the parties present....a crack over the back with his horse-whip".
>
> SA.D.16/389/25/1: B. Smith 1984,104

A similar tradition has also been reported by Mrs. Saxby (1932,109-111).

The scattald boundaries were recognized by a variety of both natural and man-made features. The march between the scattalds of Skaw and Norwick in Unst, for example, was marked by march stones, building ruins and prominent mounds or hillocks (Johnston 1911,192-193). The courses of streams or old dykes are also referred to in these descriptions (Johnston 1910-1912). In some cases the scattalds are reported to have been entirely delimited by trenches and dykes. Examples of this have been reported from the Sandsting area of West Shetland Mainland (Knox 1985,190). In other cases, the grazing habits of animals were examined as a means of defining the scattald boundaries (Knox 1985,190).

The scattald marches of Unst were first illustrated by O´Dell (1939,264). More recently, the scattalds and their 19th century division have formed the subject of a new study by Susan Knox who has produced a series of maps of the pre-division Shetland landscape (1985,184-234). The scattald map of Unst offered by this present study (fig.52) has been largely based on the march description of 1771 (Johnston 1910-1912). The method employed, like that followed by Knox (1985,188-195), has been to identify where possible the locations specified in the 1771 perambulation on the OS 1:10560 or 1:10000 maps of 1878, 1902 and 1973.

(d) Summary

Section 1 of this chapter has formed an introduction to the different elements which go together to make up the land divisions of Orkney, Shetland and Man. The documentary evidence for urislands, scattalds and treens has been introduced. The cartographical evidence and the methodology for reconstructing the districts have also been presented. The following sections draw upon the material which has been introduced here.

Translation: see page 196 above

> "King Hakon had therefore a register made for his lendirmen and chieftains of the `urislands´ on which they might quarter their men- and that of every `urisland´ ".
>
> H. Marwick 1929,202

(ii) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man: A review and critique of the work of C.J.S Marstrander

The study of the Manx keeills is almost synonymous with the work of the Manx antiquarian and scholar, Philip Kermode, whose efforts between 1908 and 1918 formed the basis of the first five reports of the Manx Archaeological Survey (Kermode 1909;1910; 1911a;1915a;1935). Kermode did not live to see the completion of his work but it is clear from his personal correspondence of 1917 that he was aware of what was still required:

> "maps of each sheading marking all the keeills, holy wells, crosses...and the boundaries of our Treens which date back at all events to our later keeills."
>
> J.R. Bruce 1968,1

William Cubbon's (1930: Kneen 1979) treen maps were, in part, an answer to this but it was the Norwegian scholar, Professor Carl Marstrander (1937) who examined the subject of keeill and treen in detail.

Marstrander's (1937) data-base for sites and monuments information was founded on the five survey reports (Kermode 1909;1910;1911a;1915a;1935) which were available at that time. For information regarding the keeills in Rushen Sheading, Marstrander would have been reliant on Kermode's (1930) List of Manx Antiquities. These, together with some correspondence with Cubbon and Kneen (eg.MM.MS.1132A) are likely to have formed Marstrander's primary set of data for the keeills. The rental evidence was taken from Talbot (1924), whilst information regarding the treens would have been supplied by Cubbon (1930). The treen maps were used by Marstrander (1937,371 fn4,373,fn10) although unfortunately they were not incorporated

into the monograph. This data-base comprised 174 keeill sites, including the parish churches, and from the Manorial Rolls (Talbot 1924), Marstrander (1937,370-380) listed 175 treens.

It was clear that the 174 keeill sites were not evenly distributed among the 175 treens. Many keeills, including those which were to become the parish churches, were located on ecclesiastical estates where treen organization had not survived. These sites were consequently disregarded in Marstrander's (1937,417) analysis, thus leaving 124 sites altogether for further consideration. These were distributed among 96 treens (including intacks: see below pp.216-217) and the hypothesis of the association of treen and keeill essentially depends upon the ratio of 96 treens and 124 keeills.

Marstrander (1937,347) then considered the negative evidence. 83 treens were known to be without keeills but many of this group, he proposed, could have been formed later than the `Age of the Keeills'. Place-name and rental evidence formed the criteria for distinguishing these late treen formations (Marstrander 1937,347-351,417-419). This group included the `alia', `beg-moar' and the `renn' type treens. There are 17 examples of these types of treen formation and they are discussed in detail below (pp.208-212). The exclusion of this group from the analysis effectively reduced the number of `empty' treens to 66 (ie.83 minus 17).

Other reductions could also be made. In some cases, the parish churches could be re-associated, with some confidence, to their former treen divisions. For example, Michael parish church

would naturally fall within the bounds of Balleira (fig.42). Meanwhile, it is likely that Onchan parish church would have been associated with Howstrake (fig.44). Marstrander (1937,349) believed that this could be demonstrated in 13 cases, the exceptions being the parish churches of Malew, Braddan, Maughold and Lezayre. Marstrander (1937,419) consequently reduced the category of `empty´ treens by a further 13, leaving a total of 53 treens where no keeills had been reported (Note 3).

In the case of the 53 `empty´ treens, Marstrander (1937,419-420) necessarily concluded that either the sites had been lost or that the treens were of a relatively late formation and postdated the construction and use of the keeills. In respect of the 124 keeill sites and their distribution among 96 treens, Marstrander (1937,352,419) demonstrated that 71-74% had one keeill, 21-22% had two keeills, whilst 2-3% had three keeills. Marstrander (1937,362,420-421) therefore concluded:

> "Det kan efter dette ingen tvil vaere om at treenen helt fra den kristne kirkes første tid på Man hadde iallefall én keeill på sin grunn".

In an early study of the Manx keeills (Lowe 1981) the present writer was over critical of Marstrander´s work. This study accepts the basic relationship between keeill and treen but suggests that the processes involved were far more complex and more dynamic than Marstrander allowed. This present study´s criticism is thus limited to a review of Marstrander´s use of his sources.

Marstrander´s work was founded on the earlier efforts of Kermode. It is easy to be critical of Kermode´s corpus of keeill sites. This, however, would be irresponsible. It must be

allowed that Kermode, as a Manxman and antiquarian and as one who knew the local traditions at first- or second-hand, was as objective a reporter as could have been expected at the beginning of this century. Certainly some sites were either overlooked or unknown to Kermode. Keeill Vael in Michael, for example, although reported in Kermode's (1930,22) List, was omitted from the Manx Archaeological Survey Third Report (Kermode 1911a,3-13). Perhaps as a consequence of this, the site was also absent in Marstrander's (1937,324-325) list of Manx keeills, although curiously it is referred to elsewhere in the monograph (Marstrander 1937,335). Other sites, such as Cronk yn Howe (Bruce & Cubbon 1930), were discovered after the publication of the survey reports. Others, on the other hand, have since been excluded from Kermode's data-base. The site at Cronk ny Merriu (Kermode 1935,24-25: SANTON 9), which has been shown by excavation to have been a domestic structure of the Norse or medieval period (Gelling 1952), is one example. Others have been listed by Bruce (1968,31-32,69-70).

Excavation remains as probably the only sure way of establishing the general validity of the sites reported by Kermode. Survey can identify new features or reinterpret known ones but it can add little in those many cases where physical remains are no longer extant. For these reasons, therefore, it will be apparent that such differences as exist between the Kermode-Marstrander data-base and the one utilized here (Appendix 1) are due largely to the benefit of hindsight. These are very minor differences and consequently they do not radically

alter the general proposition that keeill and treen were somehow related. It is, however, with regard to the processes involved in that relationship, that this present study most differs from Marstrander's work on the subject.

Marstrander's model for the association of keeill and treen is cast within an undynamic, almost static framework. The received impression is that an equilibrium between keeill and treen was very rapidly achieved and that little else occurred at these sites until some of them were raised to the status of parish churches in, perhaps, the 12th century (see below p.233). Throughout his analysis, Marstrander seems to have considered the problem almost totally from the viewpoint of the keeills as adjuncts to the treens. He never seems to have considered the alternative idea that the keeills, or some at least, could have been taken onto the treens through an expansion of the original holding.

This subject is now examined in detail with reference to those treens which Marstrander believed had emerged in the post-keeill period. These are the alia, the beg-moar, the renn and the lesser treens. These are considered in conjunction with the intack keeills and those which are located on treens containing the eary place-name element.

Marstrander (1932,310-316,349-350; 1937,347-349,417-418) considered that the alia and beg-moar type treens originated from the division of older, larger treens. This opinion was also shared by Kneen (1979,343,501).

Data concerning the alia treens are presented in Table 18 and the treen rent totals are expressed as a proportion of the

Average Treen Rent for the Parish (ATRP: Column C, Table 18). This study's preference for using ATRP figures has been explained above (pp.180-181).

The alia treens are illustrated in fig.46a. In three cases, keeills are associated with the head treen (Begoade, Gresby & Sulby). In two instances, the keeill is located on the alia treen (Raby & Gnebe) and in one example (Colby) keeills were associated with both parts of the holding. Keeills have not been reported from Dalby or Leodest.

Marstrander (1937,417-418) believed the distribution was slightly different, with five examples of keeills on the head treen and two examples of alia treen associated keeills. These differences are due largely to the fact that Marstrander included the intacks together with their respective treens. Thus, for example, Lag ny Keeilley, which lies far out on the intack to the S of Alia Dalby (fig.41), was assigned to Dalby treen which lies 2 km away to the N. This study, however, would consider it prudent to exclude the intack keeills at this point for the simple reason that their inclusion does not allow the comparison of like with like. Marstrander, for example, cannot conclude that the keeills were associated with the cultivable land which was formed into treens if his analysis, at the same time, includes sites which were not located on treen land. Nevertheless, Marstrander's (1937,418) proposition that the keeills were assigned to either the head or the alia treen, but not both, remains largely valid. Marstrander (1937,348,418) thus suggested:

> "the keeill of the original, larger treen, being older than the division, consequently served also for the alia treen."

At the same time, however, Marstrander (1937,348,418) also suggested, somewhat differently, that the keeills had outlived their purpose at the time this division occurred:

> "på det tidspunkt da den gamle treenen blev delt, hadde keeillen altså utspilt sin rolle".

The beg-moar (Manx: small,large;lesser,greater) type treens were also identified by Marstrander (1937,349,418) as products of treen division. The same may also have applied to the three Baldalls in Braddan and the three Cranstalls in Bride which were distinguished by descriptive suffixes and ordinal prefixes respectively. Each of these naming conventions is also encountered in the nomenclature of the quarterlands.

Table 19 illustrates the quarterland extent, the rental value and the presence or otherwise of a keeill on these treens. The treen rent totals are again compared against the figure for the ATRP (Column C; Table 19). The beg-moar type treens are illustrated in fig.46b.

A similar distribution of keeill sites is noticeable among this group of treens. The Cornaas and the Cranstalls have two or more sites each, whilst in two cases the keeills are located once on the head treen (Smeall) and once on the so-called derivative treen (Crosby Beg). Only one keeill site is known from the three Baldalls.

Marstrander (1937,349,418) assigned this process of treen division to the Norse period, citing as evidence the fact that most, if not all, of the alia and beg-moar type treens have Norse

place-names. It is questionable, however, whether this is really relevant to the question of keeill and treen. This problem can be illustrated by reference to the rental evidence. Table 20 compares the total rent for these so-called original treens with the figures for the ATRP.

The productive capacity of the reconstructed `original´ treens, as indicated by their rent assessment, is between roughly 1.5 and 3.5 (`Gresby´ 1.42: `Baldall´ 3.42) times the ATRP (Column C; Table 20). The mean average is 2.16 or in other words the reconstructed `original´ treens were, in rental terms, roughly twice the size of their neighbours.

These data can also be considered in a different way so as to take into account the number of component treens which formed the `original´. The component treens (Column E; Table 20), on average, are roughly 0.75 to 1.25 times the size, in rental terms, of their immediate neighbours. The mean average is 1.002 (Column E; Table 20).

This can also be seen if we return to consider the alia and beg-moar type treens separately (Tables 18 & 19). The rent totals for these treens are comparable to the ATRP figure, whose standard would be expressed as 1.00. The alia treens are slightly below average at 0.94, whilst the head treens, the beg and the moar treens average 1.03, 1.11 and 1.04 respectively (Column C; Tables 18 & 19). On the whole, therefore, the alia and beg-moar type treens could be considered as independent holdings in their own right, being comparable in terms of physical size and worth to the other treens in their parishes.

The concept of treen division is by no means the only interpretation that can be proposed for these groups of treens. It is possible, for example, that the alia and beg-moar place-name elements have superceded an earlier toponomy. In this context, an example from the Limites document (Broderick 1979,f.53v), regarding "villa Thorkel que alio nomine vocatur Kyrkemychel", may be cited. Alternatively, this group of `derivative´ treens may have simply been named with reference to the head treens, without neccessarily having been divided from them. In the case of the three Baldalls it seems that three personal names have simply been attached to the general area name. Thus Baldall Reynylt may have signified `Crennell´s farm in Baldwin´ (Kneen 1979,176,177,181 sub Baldwin, Ballachristry, Ballavriew & Balnacregnilt). It is suggested, therefore, that this is really a problem of nomenclature and possibly of no significance for the development of the estates themselves. The physical creation of this group of treens is now considered.

The relatively high rent totals for the alia and beg-moar type treens (Tables 18 & 19) and, in many cases, the presence of keeill sites within their bounds are not the kind of intrinsic features which would be expected of relatively late treen formations. This study would suggest, on the contrary, that the alia and beg-moar type treens could be considered to have developed from early intacks, as `infilling´ between older established estates. This alternative view allows a relative sequence in the formation of different treen types to be postulated.

A third group of treens which Marstrander (1937,350-351, 418-419) believed had originated from the division of older, larger treens were the renn treens (Manx: rheynn, division, part). There are four examples and information regarding their quarterland extent and rent totals is presented in Table 21. The renn treens are small and of low value. Furthermore, no keeills are known to have been located within their bounds. On the basis of this evidence, Marstrander (1937,351,419) suggested that they had been segregated from older, larger treens. This is a reasonable view although, again, it is possible to consider them as enclosed intacks which became treens. In either case, they would appear to have been relatively late formations.

A comparison (Tables 18,19 & 21) of the average proportional rent totals for the alia (0.94), beg (1.11) and renn treens (0.18) clearly emphasizes the differences between these three groups. These differences may be due to chronological considerations (see below pp.215-216) and consequently the renn treens could be considered as much later formations than the alia and the beg treens. The absolute dating of these processes is difficult to determine. Nevertheless, the reference to Rynkurlyn (Rencullen) in the Skinscoe section of the late 13th century Limites document (Broderick 1979,f.54v) may provide a useful terminus ante quem for the formation of these treens as a group.

Similar considerations may also apply to another group of small treens which can be distinguished by a deficit of quarterlands. Following Marstrander (1937,351), this group comprises treens with less than two quarterlands. Rental data

for this group are presented in Table 22. The `eary´ treens are considered separately elsewhere (pp.214-215 & Table 23).

There can be little doubt that the small treens, as a whole, are probably relatively late formations. This can be suggested on the basis of several criteria. The average proportional treen rent total of 0.27 (Table 22), for example, is comparable to the figure of 0.18 for the renn treens (Table 21). Also, like the renn treens, the toponymic evidence is of a kind associated with types of secondary settlement. The place-names Le Garre and Gertnegelghy, for example, contain ON. garðr, meaning enclosure or small farm (Kneen 1979,45,165). Testrawe and Testro, meanwhile, may derive from a Scandinavian word teigströd, meaning paddock or a close for grazing cattle (Kneen 1979,196).

Topographical evidence would also suggest that the small treens are of a relatively late date. Several of this group are located on the slopes, above the prime agricultural land and this is reflected, for example, in the place-names Scard and Ardrenk (Kneen 1979,53,453). Others are located on the valley sides, adjacent to the lowland intacks and waste. The treen of Logh, for example, as its name suggests, occupies a stretch of boggy ground, once a lake, between the treens of Kirk Michael and Conessary in Malew (fig.40). In this context, it may be significant that whilst Kirk Michael and Conessary are mentioned in the Limites document (Broderick 1979,f.53v), Logh, however, is not and the treen might, therefore, be associated with a later medieval settlement.

One final group of treens may be considered. These are the eary treens of which there are six examples (Table 23). This group was not specifically investigated by Marstrander (1937,359).

The Manx earys (Scots Gaelic: airigh, dairy, summer pasture, shieling) have formed the subject of a detailed examination by Eleanor Megaw (1978) and toponymic aspects have been discussed by Gillian Fellows-Jensen (1980). About 40 treen, quarterland and farm names in eary have been listed by Megaw (1978,343-344) who has noted a general correspondence between these farms and the 600′ (183 m) contour. This represents, in general the upper limit of cultivable land in the later medieval period (Megaw 1978,328-329: Davies 1956,115). The eary farms are located, like the majority of the renn and small treens, above the areas of prime agricultural land.

The eary farms were associated with the practice of transhumance, the seasonal movement of cattle to the hill pastures. In time some of the eary farms and certainly those which are listed as treens in the Manorial Rolls became permanent farm settlements.

Two eary place-names, Aryeuzryn and Hath Arygegormane are recorded in the late 13th century Limites document (Broderick 1979,f.53v;f.54r). Aryeuzryn (Arernan) is a treen name and although the evidence is not conclusive, it may, nevertheless, suggest that certain eary treens were already in existence by c.1280. This may provide a terminus ante quem for the formation of these treens as a group.

It is also notable that all but one of the eary treens were associated with keeills and Megaw (1978,333) has suggested that this is an indication that the holdings had become permanent farm settlements by at least the 12th century. However, it is also possible that the earys could have developed as early intacks and that the keeills on those sites are earlier than the estate formation. The evidence is inconclusive but nevertheless the possibility still remains.

The average rent totals for the eary treens relative to the ATRP remains to be considered (Column C; Table 23). As in the case of the renn and small treens (Tables 21 & 22), the proportional rent totals vary for any individual holding, from 0.11 in the case of Aryhorkell to 0.89 for Aresteyn. As a group the figure of 0.48 (Table 23) falls conveniently between the alia/beg group on the one hand and the renn/small treen group on the other. This information is summarized in Table 24.

It is suggested that these data (Table 24) reflect a basic chronological development in treen formation. It must be stressed, however, that this is intended only as an explanation for these treen types as a group. It could be argued that, on the whole, the alia and beg treens are older than the eary treens. These in turn could be considered to predate the formation of the renn and small treens.

This idea is based on the assumption that wealth, in a pre-industrial society, is primarily reflected in land. It also makes the assumption that there is a close relationship between landed wealth and the amount that the land could produce in terms of rent or taxation. It finally assumes that, on the whole, the

more heavily taxed areas will have been in cultivation or will have had a greater productive capacity for a longer period of time than those areas which were less heavily assessed for taxation. The topographical evidence for the siting of the eary, renn and small treens would also bear out some of these basic assumptions.

This analysis has tried to determine a very basic relative chronology for different types of treen formation which Marstrander (1937,348,428) believed postdated the `Age of the Keeills´. The renn and small treens appear to be late, post-keeill formations. The alia and beg treens, on the other hand, do not and in addition to the criticisms cited above (pp.210-211), the apparent association of keeills with the presumably later eary treens may be significant.

Throughout this analysis, these different treen types have been viewed as early intacks which subsequently became treens. This has been found useful because it allows us to view the problem of keeill and treen from a different perspective, from the viewpoint of an expanding land system taking in sites which originally may have had no association at all with settled or cultivated areas. The true intacks thus remain to be considered.

Most intacks are located above the quarterlands and Davies (1956,111) has shown that they usually extend up to an elevation of 750´-1000´ (228-305 m), varying with slope and aspect. Others are located in the glen bottoms and particularly in the marshy expanse known as the Curragh in the parishes of Ballaugh and Lezayre. It is significant that the upland intacks are situated

in more elevated locations than treen land and as Davies (1956,111) has pointed out, this would suggest that the intacks are younger than the land which is formed into treens. The intacks, in other words, represent the latest phase in the development of the Manx land system.

The process of creating intacks was well established by the beginning of the 16th century, as is evidenced in the Manorial Rolls of 1511-1515 (Talbot 1924). It is clear that the intacks were associated with certain quarterlands (Sherwood 1899,119). Nevertheless, their separate identity was maintained in the early rentals and Davies (1956,115) has suggested quite plausibly that the individual recording of intacks may have been a consequence of feudal tenure:

> "The distribution of treens and quarterlands may probably be regarded as showing the extent of the land cultivated of old...It may be that it represents the stage at which a family or `tribal´ system gave way to a scheme of feudal tenure which recorded additions as intacks"
>
> E. Davies 1956,115

The intacks, then, are almost certainly late and may, as a group, be assigned with some confidence to the late medieval and early modern period.

The presence of keeills on the intacks deserves some attention. In his discussion of keeill and treen, Marstrander (1937,347,417) did not distinguish between treen and intack and this has been criticised above (p.208). The intack keeill sites appear, on account of their very location, to be a class apart from those which are located on the treens proper. Ten sites are known altogether. These are Keeill Woirrey, Keeill Cronk y Noe

and the site at Ardcoillen in Maughold, Rullick y Doonee in Malew and Keeill Vian in Lonan, and the sites at Killabragga in Lezayre, Kirkill in Rushen, Speke in Braddan, Kerrowgaroo in German and Lag ny Keeilley in Patrick. This group may also include Cabbal Niglus which is located on a detached portion of Colby, on a small `island´ of treen land surrounded by intack (fig.44).

Data regarding these sites are limited. However, with regard purely to their location on marginal, lately enclosed land, the possibility is entertained that these sites may be considered as potentially early foundations, possibly hermitage sites of the Early Christian period. The keeills which are associated with the alia, beg and eary treens, estates which are considered by this study as possible early intacks, may also represent early foundations. These claims are now considered in conjunction with a detailed analysis of the Manx keeill sites and aspects of boundary location.

(iii) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man: An Analysis of Boundary Association

The association of the Manx keeills with the treen boundaries was first noted by the present writer in an earlier study of the keeill sites in the parish of Kirk Michael (Lowe 1981,29-34,51). A similar phenomenon is also apparent in Marown and Santon. These data are contained in the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2). Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8), for example, is located within 35 m of the boundary between the treens of Cardall and Sanbrick (fig.45). At Keeill Pherick (MAROWN 5), part of the enclosure actually forms a section of the boundary between the treens of Glenlogh and Trollaby (fig.45). The sites at Ballavale (SANTON 6), Ballavartin (SANTON 7) and Sulbrick (SANTON 8) are also located close to treen boundaries. It is also interesting to reflect that Leabba Aukonaway, possibly the site of Cronk yn Howe in Lezayre (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,308: Kneen 1979,533-534), is referred to as a boundary mark in the late 13th century Limites document (Broderick 1979,f.54.r). The concept of boundary association is now considered within the context of the island as a whole.

There are as many as 177 keeill sites in the Isle of Man and these are listed in Appendix 1. In 22 instances (Category E: Note 4) there is either a lack of information regarding the boundaries or the sites are unlocated. Information is thus available for 155 of the Manx keeill sites and this is presented in detail in Note 4.

At least 73 sites (Categories A & B: Note 4) are located within 50 m of a treen boundary and this represents 47% of the sites for which data are available. Another 25 sites (16%) are

located 50-100 m from a treen boundary (Category C: Note 4). Finally, 57 sites (37%) are located more than 100 m from a treen boundary (Category D: Note 4).

The area occupied by a 50 m wide boundary zone varies from one treen to another (Note 5). In the case of those treens which are known to have been associated with keeills (Appendix 1), a 50 m wide boundary zone could occupy as little as 10% or as much as 28% of the treen area in the cases respectively of Scarlett in Malew and Aryhorkell in Michael. In 83% of the cases a 50 m wide boundary zone occupies 10-18% of the available treen area and a figure of 15% could be taken as a rough average. It can therefore be suggested that 73 keeill sites, 47% of the sites for which data are available, are located on 15% of the land. The remaining 82 keeill sites (Categories C & D: Note 4), 53% of the sites for which data are available, are located on 85% of the land.

On the basis of a 50 m wide boundary zone occupying on average 15% of the treen, by random distribution we could expect 23 sites to be thus located (15% x 155). On the 28% basis, as in the worst case of Aryhorkell treen, we could expect 43 sites to be located within a 50 m wide boundary zone (28% x 155). The fact that at least 73 keeill sites are located in a boundary zone would thus seem to be significant and to be possibly due to deliberate siting.

Deliberate siting, however, is difficult to prove. It is possible that an outside factor may have independently determined the siting of boundaries and keeills. Both features, for example, may have been located on marginal land, independently,

in different periods of history simply because the ground was of little agricultural value. The association, therefore, may be with marginal land, not the boundary, but it would be extremely difficult to distinguish this. Similarly, boundaries and keeills may have been located, independently, with reference to the same topographical features of the landscape, such as watersheds, rivers or streams. These matters, however, are not easily demonstrable, although this study would suggest that it is more likely that the association was with the boundary, perhaps as a marginal area, rather than with marginal land itself.

One final aspect of the association of keeills and treen boundaries remains to be considered. It is possible that this association has been produced by factors which have had an influence on the survival of archaeological evidence. The most obvious factor is land use since it is possible to consider the boundary-sited keeills as survivors of a once more extensive distribution.

It is known that many sites have been removed by the exigencies of agriculture, both through ploughing and by the extension of farm buildings. The sites at Ballachrink (MAROWN 10), Balnahow (SANTON 4), Ballakilley in Malew (Bruce 1968,7-10) and many others have been removed without trace. The important point, however, and one which somewhat weakens the site-survival hypothesis, is that the sites have been remembered locally, especially in the field-nomenclature. Survivals of this kind have also been noted at the many now featureless chapel sites in Orkney and Shetland.

In part, the remembrance of these sites is likely to have been due to the reverence or awe in which they were held by the local populace. Kermode, for example, was refused permission to excavate some sites, such as Ballafreer (MAROWN 5), Ballachrink (MAROWN 10) and Cabbal ny Cooilley in Bride and his rather clandestine operations at Ballacregga (SANTON 5) are noted in the discussion of that site in Volume 2. Meanwhile, Bruce (1968,6) has reported the reluctance of a farm-hand who was instructed to plough up the then seemingly intact keeill site at Kerrowkeil in Malew. The superstitious regard for the so-called `Witchstone', possibly the cross-incised slab 148(-), has also been recorded (Oswald 1860,200-201: Kermode 1929,354-355). Superstition or reverence for these sites have thus been factors in their oral preservation.

These different factors, together with the fact that keeills in non-boundary locations are also known (Category D: Note 4), severely negate the hypothesis that site-survival has influenced the association of keeill sites and treen boundaries. It is suggested, therefore, that boundary association has not been the product of differential site survival processes. The origins and significance of this association are now considered.

(iv) Keeill and Treen in the Isle of Man:

The Origins and Significance of Boundary Association

(a) Introduction

A large number of the Manx keeill sites are associated with boundary zones. This relationship does not appear to be due to random distribution or chance survival in the archaeological

record. Comparative historical and archaeological evidence is now considered. This section will then present the hypothesis that boundary association may be indicative of chronological importance and a model for the development of the Manx land system and the keeills, over time, is then presented.

(b) A Review of Comparative Material

Past studies of the keeills have been limited in their outlook and have sought only to equate them with the small chapels of Orkney and Shetland (Marstrander 1937,398,427: Marwick 1935,28). The Western Isles' chapel sites (RCAMS 1928;1971;1975; 1980;1982: Nieke 1983,311,318-319) represent another potential source of material for comparison (Marwick 1949,11: Megaw 1978,298) and the political connexions between these three areas in the 11th and 12th centuries could be significant. Recent syntheses (Cubbon 1982,266; 1983,22) have thus tended towards the conclusion that the association of keeill and treen was predominantly a feature of 10th-12th century Norse Christianity. However, small district chapels are by no means a feature which is exclusive to areas of Norse settlement. These are also found in Ireland and, perhaps significantly, this is also an area where ecclesiastical sites are found on boundaries.

Recent work in Ireland has concentrated on detailed surveys of relatively small and geographically confined areas, such as northern County Clare (Mytum 1982), Counties Cork and Kerry (Hurley 1982) and the Dingle Peninsula (Cuppage 1986). Mytum's work on chapel distributions, like Hurley's, illustrates well certain parallels with the Northern Isles' and Manx evidence.

Mytum (1982,351), for example, has suggested that the ecclesiastical sites in northern County Clare were deliberately located in the border zones of the territory of the Corcu Mruad. Political and socio-religious reasons have been proposed for this distribution

> "which had the added benefit of increasing status for the patrons, providing a buffer on the edge of the territory, absorbing surplus population and strengthening tribal solidarity"
>
> H. Mytum 1982,360

Hurley's (1982) work, meanwhile, has done much to dispel the once widespread notion that Irish ecclesiastical sites were necessarily located in isolated or remote areas. Well over one hundred early ecclesiastical sites and possibly twice that figure have been claimed for Cork and Kerry (Hurley 1982,304). Some of these may be hermitage sites but the vast majority appear to have been associated with

> "areas where settlement was quite heavy and where large numbers of ring-forts and stone forts are found"
>
> V. Hurley 1982,310

The similarities with the situation in Man and the Northern Isles should be clear and it is possible that the similar distribution patterns or associations with domestic settlement sites or boundaries may have been dictated, in part at least, by the very nature of rural settlement in these different areas. The association of Manx and Northern Isles' chapel sites with domestic settlement sites is considered in Chapter 7.

Examples of boundary association are also known from south-west Ireland and Hurley (1982,311) has referred to a number of

documentary references to this effect. Meanwhile, the enclosures at Fanlobbus, Kilmacoo and Bawnatemple in Cork are shown to have been co-terminous with the townland boundaries (Hurley 1982,314-319). The Early Christian site at Reask is also located close to a townland boundary (Fanning 1981a,72,fig.1). This association between Irish ecclesiastical sites and the townland boundaries has also been commented upon by Dr. Leo Swann (1983; pers.comm RESCUE Conference, Peel, June 1986: see also McErlean 1983). The major work on boundary association, however, has been that of Professor O´Riain (1972).

O´Riain (1972) has stressed the importance of the boundary zone as a place for, among other things, the location of markets, fairs and ecclesiastical settlements. This has also been stressed quite recently by Hodges (1982,50-53). The association of ecclesiastical sites and fairs is well documented on Man (Kneen 1926), whilst the association of `holy wells´ with boundary zones has also been emphasized by O´Riain (1972,14) and commented upon in a Manx context by Davies (1956,102-103).

O´Riain (1972,17) has drawn attention to the apparent concern of early Irish clerics for determining boundary lines. Saints Ciaran and Brennain, for example, are said to have settled their boundary dispute by having recourse to the grazing habits of a cow:

> "as far as she goes grazing today, let the place in which she stops be the boundary between us"
>
> C. Plummer 1922,i,114

Interestingly, an animal´s grazing habit was also considered an acceptable method for the establishment or recognition of

boundaries in 19th century Shetland, for determining the scattald marches (Knox 1985,190-192).

The association of ecclesiastical sites with boundary zones appears to have been an extensive phenomenon in Ireland and O´Riain (1972,18), for example, has noted, in all, over four hundred examples of this association. Other examples have also been recognized in the distribution of the parish churches of Wales and Cornwall and in the Lan place-names of Brittany (O´Riain 1972,18-19).

O´Riain´s (1972) paper does not deal in any great detail with actual ecclesiastical sites or their specific proximity to boundaries. Hurley´s (1982,311) comment that "we have only the most general idea of the location of most tribal boundaries" consequently deserves some attention. O´Riain´s territorial units or tribal areas are, in his words, "generalized coreferential units" whose boundaries lie

> "immediately proximate to.....natural features, the crest, slope, or foot of a mountain or hill, the bank of a stream, the edge of a lake or an island within it, the area immediately surrounding a natural well or source"
>
> P. O´Riain 1972,17

The Irish material, at present, thus lacks the kind of detail which has been brought together in this study regarding the association of the Manx keeills with the treen boundaries. Nevertheless, it is suggested that the Irish evidence may be directly relevant to the Manx material and some assessment of the origins of boundary association is now made.

O´Riain (1972,26) has suggested that the purpose of boundary association was "essentially a mediatory one". This may be

reflected in the religious significance of ecclesiastical sites in the boundary zone. The transitional nature of the boundary can be illustrated at both a physical level, in the sense of the division of land, and at a socio-religious level regarding the mediatory position of the Church between the living and the dead.

Assemblies with which ecclesiastical sites are known to have been associated, such as markets and fairs, can also be expressed as mediatory activities. The gathering of goods within the sanctuary of a church at a time of tribute transaction (Walsh 1920,58) may also illustrate the mediatory position of the church within society. The boundary location of ecclesiastical sites, given their attendant `store-house´ or `clearing-house´ functions, may equally be of relevance to the issue of the despoilation of churches in Ireland in the early medieval period (Lucas 1967: Smyth 1979,126-154: Mytum 1982,355). All of these factors, as outlined by O´Riain and summarized above, seem relevant to the question of the origins and significance of the boundary location of ecclesiastical sites.

It is possible that ecclesiastical sites were established at boundary zones because such a location fulfilled the requirements of the society of which the Church was part. These needs can be interpreted in political, economic or socio-religious terms. It is possible, however, that this association may have been founded on an earlier, pre-Christian, model.

The idea that boundary burial might reflect an earlier pagan practice might be represented in the earliest Norwegian laws which seem to have considered this a suitable burial site for

suicides, thieves and other non-desirables:

> "evildoers, traitors, murderers, truce breakers, thieves, and men who take their own lives....shall be buried on the shore <u>where the tide meets the green sod</u>."
>
> <u>Gulathinglaw</u>: Larson 1935,51 (my emphasis)

Meanwhile, there are clear references in the early Irish laws to the association of boundaries with burial mounds or <u>fertae</u> and these have recently been collated by Charles-Edwards (1976). A late 6th or early 7th century law tract, <u>Din Techtugad</u> (O'Donovan & O'Curry 1875,2-32: Binchy 1978,iv,1139-1234), describes the necessary procedure for establishing hereditary right to land. In this the claimant, with a team of yoked horses and in front of witnesses, was required to enter the estate over the burial mound of his ancestors. The full procedures have been described by Charles-Edwards (1976,83-84). The rationale behind these actions seems to have lain, as Charles-Edwards (1976,85) has pointed out, "in the belief that the dead...may take an active part in the affairs of the living". Literary echoes of this belief can also be found in Nennius' <u>Historia Brittonum</u> (cap.44; J.Morris 1980,32,72).

It is thus perhaps within the context of boundary association that the real significance lies of what has been perceived as the continuity of sacred sites over the pre-Christian and Early Christian periods (Thomas 1971a,53-58). The idea that boundary location may have played a fundamental role in this process is considered in Chapter 7.

This section has sought to place the Manx material into a different context from that proposed by Marstrander (1937) and

Marwick (1935) and the Irish evidence, as summarized above, may represent a suitable alternative. The dating of the association of the district chapels with the boundaries, however, is still a problem. The fact that there may have been both a pre-Christian and a Christian interest in boundary zones, as expressed in terms of the location of `holy wells´ and burial mounds, and ecclesiastical sites, markets and fairs respectively, does not in itself allow us to conclude that a close temporal relationship necessarily existed between them. It is conceivable, for example, that churches were not built at boundary locations until as late as the 10th or 11th centuries. On the whole, however, it seems unlikely that such a late chronological scheme could be maintained. Purely as a working hypothesis, therefore, it is suggested that the Manx boundary keeills, as a group and as sites, may be Early Christian foundations of perhaps the 7th or 8th centuries. The writer is aware of the lack of substantive evidence for this claim. The idea of locating keeills in boundary areas does, however, seem more applicable to an earlier rather than a later period.

(c) Theoretical Model

A purely theoretical model for the development of the Manx land system and its association with the keeills is now proposed. It is based on the assumption of an expanding land system and it is presented in a diagramatic form in fig.74. This model brings together the evidence of boundary association and reintroduces the non-treen sited keeills and the putative early types of treen formation discussed above (pp.207-218). This model is now explained.

This model would discern five major phases in the development of the keeills and their relationship to the land divisions of the Isle of Man in the period 5th-12th centuries. A sixth phase can be ascribed to the later medieval period. In this model (fig.74) the land divisions, normally treens, are represented by large circles and land divisions new to each phase are shown in dotted outline. The keeill sites are indicated by small dots and keeill sites new to each phase are shown partially shaded.

Phase I

This represents the pre-Christian situation. Kindred groups occupy the treens which are fully exploited for their meadow, pasture and arable land resources. The treens are surrounded by broad expanses of unused or underexploited waste.

Phase II

Phase II represents the situation in the early centuries following the introduction of Christianity. Some keeills are located at the boundaries of the treens, whilst others, the non-treenland type, are situated on what was then the waste.

Phase III

Phase III represents the expansion of the original treen holding. This is suggested as the place for the emergence of the alia and beg type treens (pp.207-211). This process of expansion may envelop earlier keeills of the non-treenland type and such sites may find themselves either centrally or peripherally located within the new treen landscape. Not all sites, however, are brought within the confines of the treens.

Phase IVa

In this phase, possibly contemporary with IVb, there is further expansion of the landholdings. This is assumed to represent the stage at which the eary type treens became permanently settled and cultivated. This expansion, as in Phase III, may take in sites which were previously located on the waste. Other sites, however, still remain in waste locations.

Phase IVb

In this phase, some new keeill sites are established in more centrally located positions, often in close proximity to the quarterland farms. This may happen on all types of treen formation, including the recently established or contemporary eary treens. Other sites may have been refurbished or rebuilt on their original sites; others may have have fallen into desuetude. It should be noted that some treens now have two keeill sites within their bounds. Others, however, still lie outside the treens.

Phase V

Phase V represents another period of expansion in the land system. These new formations, however, are not provided with keeills, nor, on the whole, do they take within their bounds the sites of earlier foundations. These may be the renn and the small treens (pp.212-213 above).

The major feature of this phase is the emergence of a more or less centrally placed parish church, built on the site of an earlier keeill. The parish boundary has also been ascribed to this phase but this is for graphical purposes only. It is intended to depict the idea that during this phase the keeills

were gradually being abandoned and replaced by the parish church.

Phase VI

This phase is not strictly relevant to the question of keeill and treen. It is intended to depict the further expansion of land holdings during the later medieval period. The new units here are the intacks which, it has been suggested (pp.216-218), like the alia, beg, eary, renn and small treens before, are indicative of in-filling between established estates. It should be noted that one further keeill site, by now doubtless a grass-covered ruin of the countryside, has been brought onto non-waste land. One other site, however, is still located on the waste. It is suggested that Phase VI essentially represents the present-day distribution pattern.

It has been suggested that this is a dynamic model which represents the development and association of treen and keeill over time. Such development, however, cannot be illustrated graphically. Instead the model (fig.74) merely provides us with six or seven arrested pictures of this process. It is not suggested, for example, that a keeill site, once established, was necessarily maintained through to a later phase. Doubtless, some sites were long-lived but others may have been abandoned, for a variety of reasons, within a very short period of time. Others, on the other hand, may have been restored at a much later date. This model seeks to provide no more than a possible explanation for the perceived distribution of sites.

The fact that the model attempts to represent a dynamic process in terms of a series of arrested views can, to some

extent, be overcome by using a number of overlapping chronological schemes for each individual phase. The justification for the dating of these phases is now attempted.

Phase I is intended to represent the situation immediately prior to the introduction of Christianity to the island and a date in or around the 5th century could be inferred from the traditional and later historical accounts (pp.20-26). Phase V, on the other hand, towards the other end of this sequence, a phase which witnesses the establishment of the parish church and the introduction of a parochial form of organization, may be broadly assigned to the period late 10th-12th century. The later date is the one preferred in general histories of the island (Kinvig 1975,77) and can be supported in the historical documentation (p.33). We should not be misled, however, into interpreting an historical notice as a terminus post quem statement. Archaeological evidence, for example, could be employed to support the earlier, late 10th century, date. There is, for example, a remarkable association between the majority of the corpus of rune inscribed crosses and the sites which were or were to become the parish churches. These have been recently listed, and their recorded history traced, by Page (1980,189-193). On the basis of the art-styles, the majority of these stones have been assigned by Sir David Wilson to the second half of the 10th century or a little later (Wilson & Klindt-Jensen 1966(1980),118: Wilson 1971,18; 1983,185). It is possible, therefore, that the period, late 10th-12th century, witnessed the gradual abandonment of the keeill sites in favour of a `head' or parish church. The rationale behind the provisional dating of

Phases II-IV is now accommodated within the constraints presented by the dating of Phases I and V.

Two types of evidence are utilized for the dating of these intermediate phases. These, however, are essentially based on hypothetical relative chronologies. On the one hand there is the proposed relative sequence for the development of the different types of treen formation discussed above (pp.215-216). On the other hand, there are the keeills whose location at peripheral or central points, it has been suggested, is indicative of chronological significance. On these bases, Phases II, III and IV could be roughly assigned to the periods 5th-8th, 7th-10th and 9th-11th centuries respectively. These, of course, can only be rough guesses. Phase VI, on the other hand, can be assigned with some confidence to the later medieval period, 12th-15th centuries. This model is now placed within a possible historical context.

The boundary location of keeills has been proposed as an early phenomenon (pp.223-229). The central location of sites, on the other hand, could be assigned to a relatively late scheme. It is convenient to label these responses as `native' and `Norse' respectively, but these ethnic `tags' disregard the fact that the emergence of a mixed polity can be recognized on various evidential bases. For example, in the art styles and runic inscriptions of the Manx crosses (Wilson 1971,17: Cubbon 1982, 271-275: Margeson 1983,104) and in the literary and patronymic evidence (Megaw 1978,276-279,288-292).

Boundary association could be considered as an attractive proposition for a society which was concerned with the early organization and apportionment of land. On the other hand, it might appear unattractive and perhaps essentially meaningless for any later arrivals, such as the Norse, to have located their chapels and burial grounds in such positions. They may, of course, have refurbished earlier sites but that is not the issue at hand. It is suggested, in line with Glanville Jones' (1965; 1979) ideas of multiple estates and the nature of the Viking settlement in northern England, that the Norse settlement of Man did not, on the whole, involve the immediate creation of new farms or estates. Rather, it is more likely that it may have involved the taking-over of pre-existing farms and treens, in a way similar to that which has been suggested for the creation of the later ecclesiastical baronies (pp.187-189). After their conversion to Christianity, certainly from the second quarter of the 10th century, the Norse may have established their own small keeills and burial grounds and their native neighbours may have done likewise, or both may have resorted to earlier, perhaps abandoned, sites. In short, therefore, it is suggested that there exist two basic keeill site distributions. One is relatively early and is linked up with the idea of boundary association. This is placed within a native context. The other, later, distribution incorporates parts of the earlier one but, in addition, contains a number of newly established sites, located in proximity to the farms. This distribution is placed within a Norse context, although it is possible, given the evidence for the emergence of a mixed polity, that this later distribution

could be considered as much a `native´ response as the putatively earlier distribution based upon boundary association. For this reason the chronological terms `early´ and `late´, rather than the ethnic labels `native´ and `Norse´, are preferred. The applicability or relevance of this Manx model is now tested against the data from Orkney and Shetland.

(v) Boundary Association: The Evidence from Orkney

(a) Introduction

Three major problems arise when we come to consider the question of boundary association in Orkney. The first is concerned with the problem of the reconstruction of the urisland districts and their cartographical representation (pp.191-198). The second problem is concerned with the predominantly coastal distribution of the Orcadian chapel sites. This naturally places a large number of chapels in boundary locations. However, in order that the Orcadian and Manx evidence can be examined in a comparable way, this study is inclined to accept examples of boundary association only in those cases where the chapels are located at territorial landed boundaries. Finally, there is the question of sample size. For the Isle of Man, this study has looked at the keeill sites and land divisions of the whole island. This, however, has not been done in any detailed way in the case of Orkney. Instead, only the sites on Westray and Papay, together with those in Orphir and on South Ronaldsay have been examined.

It should be clear, therefore, that such examples of boundary association as may exist, may be statistically insignificant and be due rather to factors of random distribution. This problem naturally arises because of the very nature of what is being attempted. The model, it should be remembered, is essentially a Manx model whose relevance for our understanding of Orcadian and Shetland sites is considered in a concluding section (pp.246-247).

(b) Westray & Papay

The island of Papay was skatted as approximately four urislands and divided into two roughly equal areas, known as `yards´, by a prehistoric treb dyke (Marwick 1925,33,43: Lamb 1983b,176,182; 1983c,17,No.25). The rental evidence for Westray, assessed as 13 or 14 urislands (Clouston 1927a,333: Peterkin 1820,1503 Rental,79-87; 1595 Rental,71-76), however, is more difficult to interpret. In part, this is due to the many different types of estate, whether odal, earldom or bishopric, which existed on the island. In part, it is also due to the substantial size of several of the districts, as expressed in pennylands. Rackwick, Wa (=Pierowall) and Noltland Bewest, for example, were each assessed as 36 pennylands (2 urislands). These problems, however, are not central to what follows since the traditional districts are known and their size, in pennylands, can be reconstructed from the various rental documents (Peterkin 1820: Marwick 1952a,31-47). Equally, and this has not been previously attempted, their boundaries may be reconstructed from the 18th century pre-enclosure maps of MacKenzie (c.1750) and Aberdeen (c.1770). These maps are

reproduced as figs. 48 & 49.

The later Aberdeen map clearly shows more detail with regard to the divisions within the hill dyke. MacKenzie (fig.48) shows only those divisions between Rackwick and Aikerness, and Cleat and Skelwick. Aberdeen´s map (fig.49), on the other hand, throws considerably more light on the disposition of the northern and south-western tunships, centred on Pierowall and Tuquoy respectively and the chapel sites have thus been transferred onto this more detailed map.

It should be clear (fig.49) that few of the Westray and Papay chapel sites are located in close proximity to these boundaries. The gazetteer sites, WESTRAY 2,5,7,9,11,12 and 13, would not appear to have been established in boundary locations. The Holm of Aikerness (WESTRAY 15), an island site, can also be excluded. The chapel site at or near to the Mound of Skelwick (WESTRAY 8) can also probably be dismissed in this context, although it should be noted that the alternative location, in the region of Langskaill (Volume 2), would place it in the vicinity of the hill dyke. Nevertheless, this is too insubstantial an argument. Similarly, the Kirbist site (WESTRAY 6), although conceivably at a boundary location, must nevertheless be discounted since the extant physical remains do not enable the identification of this site in ecclesiastical terms (Volume 2). The Peterkirk site (WESTRAY 10), although situated in a relatively peripheral location with regard to the Bu site (WESTRAY 9) and the district of Rapness as a whole, must also be discounted from this analysis. The boundary indicated to the south of Peterkirk lies

some 700 m distant.

A handful of sites, however, do seem to have been located close to these district boundaries. One such example is that of the putative chapel site (WESTRAY 3) at Noltland castle which would lie either at or certainly within 100 m of the boundary between Noltland/Dykeside and Wa. The evidence for this site, however, is inconclusive (Volume 2). A boundary location is also possible for the Curquoy/Kirkhouse/Saintear site (WESTRAY 4) but, again, there is little substantive evidence for this site and its precise location is unknown. Nevertheless, the Curquoy grid-reference would place the site near to the hill dyke. An alternative location, suggested elsewhere (Volume 2), would place the site close to the boundary between Wa and Brough.

A few sites seem to have been established in boundary locations. For example, according to Aberdeen's map (fig.49), the parish church of Ladykirk in Pierowall (WESTRAY 1) would appear to have been sited at the boundary between the districts of Wa and Rackwick. One further possible example may be St. Tredwell's chapel (WESTRAY 14) on Papay which is located quite close to the boundary between the north and south yards of that island.

The extant physical remains at many of the Westray and Papay chapel sites are poorly preserved and often an ecclesiastical identification is difficult to substantiate (Volume 2). Nevertheless, even if we accept such sites as Noup (WESTRAY 2), Noltland castle (WESTRAY 3), Curquoy (WESTRAY 4), Cleat (WESTRAY 7), Skelwick (WESTRAY 8) and the Bu of Rapness (WESTRAY 9) as <u>bona fide</u> chapel sites, it is clear that, at most,

only some three or four of the group (WESTRAY 1,3,4 & 14) may have been located near the district boundaries. On the basis of the theoretical model which has been proposed as a result of this study's examination of the Manx evidence, this distribution would tend to identify this small group of boundary sited chapels as relatively early, pre-Norse, foundations. The majority of the Westray and Papay sites, however, could be interpreted as later, Norse, foundations.

(c) Orphir Parish

A distribution map of the chapel sites and land divisions of the parish of Orphir is presented in fig.51. The evidential basis of this map has been discussed above (p.198). Again, however, there is little in the way of archaeological verification for the majority of the Orphir chapel sites. The Round Church at Orphir (RCAMS 1946,ii,174,No.483: pp.66-69) is well known. Meanwhile, uncontrolled and unreported excavations at the Houton site succeeded in emptying out the interior of a small structure, aligned EW and measuring approximately 4 m x 3 m internally. The walls of this structure are founded on a basal course of large edge-set slabs, a feature which the OS (OSCI HY30SW7) have argued is not suggestive of an ecclesiastical building. The grounds for this view, however, have not been set out. Even so, it would seem rash to dismiss this structure on the grounds of the building method employed in its construction since so few ecclesiastical sites have been excavated in Orkney. Four small `medieval' bronze bells have been associated with this site although their find-spot was some considerable distance

away, in a nearby field to the north-west (pers.comm: proprietor of Houth, June 1983). Other Orphir sites have been briefly discussed by Clouston (1918a,101). The OS record, meanwhile, is largely devoid of any further information.

Very few of the Orphir chapel sites can be said to have been situated in boundary locations (fig.51) and only those at Kirbister, Tuskerbister and Groundwater could conceivably be so considered. One interesting point of this distribution, however, is the apparent association of the chapel sites with the individual tunships and not with the larger territorial districts as reconstructed . This,in itself, might suggest, on the basis of the theoretical Manx model, a relatively late date for the majority of the Orphir chapel sites.

(d) South Ronaldsay

The island of South Ronaldsay was skatted as approximately eight urislands (Peterkin 1820, 1503 Rental,19-25: Marwick 1952a,169) and comprised two parishes, centred on St. Peter's church in Paplay and St. Mary's church in Burwick. The original urisland districts are difficult to distinguish (Marwick 1952a,169), although Clouston (1916,58), using the evidence of the 17th century lawrikmen districts, has identified four in the north parish. These were Herston & Widewall, Hoxa & Ronaldsvoe, Cara & Grimness and East Side. This present study, however, would seek to identify ten districts in all, five in each parish. The method, used elsewhere by Clouston (1918a: see above p.197), has been to group together adjacent tunships into units which approximate to the standard 18 pennyland urisland.

The putative South Ronaldsay urisland districts are listed below, together with an indication of their size as expressed in pennylands (Peterkin 1820, 1503 Rental,19-25: Marwick 1952a,169-177).

North parish:	I	Ronaldsvoe, Blanster & Hoxa	20d.land
	II	Cara, Grimness & Grutha	10d.land
	III	Widewall & Herston	c14d.land
	IV	Paplay & Cletts	9d.land
	V	Aikers,Lythes & Stews	18d.land
South parish:	VI	Sandwick	9d.land
	VII	Windwick,Massetter & Linklater	15d.land
	VIII	Holland,Cleat & Isbister	15d.land
	IX	Brough,Liddle & Thurrigar	c.20d.land
	X	Barswick, Burwick & Gossiger	18d.land

These districts are shown in fig.50. This map has been taken directly from that of Aberdeen (c.1770) and information regarding the chapel sites has been transposed onto it. This has been done by reference to the internal scale of Aberdeen´s map (calculated as approximately 1:66000) and by reference to the coastline.

It is clear that several of the South Ronaldsay sites (fig.50) may be considered to lie at boundary locations. The sites at Ronaldsvoe (St. Margaret´s chapel), Grimness (St. Colm), Halcro (St. Mary) and probably also the two Burwick sites (St. Mary´s and St. Colm´s) are located, respectively, at the boundaries of districts I, II, VIII and X. The sites at Widewall (St. Ola), Paplay (St. Peter) and Windwick (St. Andrew) are located at boundaries within, respectively, districts III, IV and VII. Meanwhile, the chapel site of St. Ninian´s in Stews is located in a peripheral location with regard to the rest of district V. St. Colm´s chapel in Hoxa and the Rood chapel at Mucklehoose in Sandwick do not, however, appear to follow this pattern. Nevertheless, this seems to be a significant

distribution and one which most closely resembles that seen in the Isle of Man. A provisional assessment of this material, on the basis of the theoretical Manx model, might, therefore, suggest that a large number of the South Ronaldsay sites may be early foundations and that several were resorted to and reutilized in the later, Norse, period.

(vi) Boundary Association: The Evidence from Shetland

(a) Introduction

Only two of the three major problems, as outlined above (p.236) in connexion with the Orcadian sites, arise when we come to consider the question of boundary association in Shetland. The cartographical and documentary evidence for the scattald boundaries have been clarified above (pp.198-202). Nevertheless, the problems of the coastal distribution of the chapel sites and the question of sample size remain.

(b) Unst

The tradition has been recorded by Archibald via Low (1774(1978),162) that:

> "There have been in the days of Popery no less than 22 chapels, the island being divided into 22 parts, called Scathills".

Twenty-four scattalds are listed in the 1771 perambulation (Johnston 1910-1912), although it is conceivable that some of the smaller ones, such as Cliff and Quoyhouse, may have been originally joined (Knox 1985,226). The opposite, however, would seem to have been the case for Framgord and Sandwick which were certainly treated as separate scattalds in the rentals of 1628

(SRO.E.41/7) and 1716 (SRO.RH.9/15/176).

Eighteen chapel sites were listed by Saxby (1932). Twenty-one possible sites have been identified by this present survey (Volume 2). The physical evidence at three of these sites, however, does not enable their identification as ecclesiastical monuments. These are Burrafirth (UNST 4), Gletna Kirk (UNST 11) and Millyskara (UNST 18). A further six sites remain as doubtful possibilities. These are the Kirk place-name group comprising Kirkamool in Cliff (UNST 7), Kirkhoull at Baltasound in Baliasta (UNST 8), Kirkamires and Kirk in Underhoull (UNST 15 & 16), and Kirk and Kirkhoull at Gunnister in Wick scattald (UNST 12 & 13). At three further sites there are insufficient physical remains extant although the sites may be considered as ecclesiastical monuments on the basis of earlier records and dedication evidence. These are the sites of Bartleskirk (UNST 2), St. Sunniva's chapel on Balta (UNST 9) and Kirk Knowe (UNST 17). Only nine of the twenty-one sites, however, can be positively identified as chapel sites (UNST 1,3,5,6,10,14,19,20 & 21).

The distribution of the Unst chapel sites and the scattald divisions are shown in fig.52. Chapel sites have not been recorded from eleven of the Unst scattalds. Nevertheless, even with regard to the distribution of 21 possible sites among 13 scattalds, there is not one certain example of boundary association. This observation is not entirely inimical to the proposed model. The answer, for example, may lie in the possibility that all of the Unst chapel sites may be relatively late, Norse, foundations. The absence of boundary-sited chapels is, however, curious in view of the situation which can be

discerned on the neighbouring island of Fetlar, to the south.

(c) Fetlar

The island of Fetlar is divided in two by a prehistoric treb dyke known as the Funzie Girt dyke (RCAMS 1946,iii,60-61,No.1227). The areas either side of this boundary are known as Est Isle and Wast Isle and comprise five scattalds each. Maps of the scattald divisions of Fetlar have been previously published by Stewart (1968,177), Knox (1985,3) and FitzGibbon (1985,19). The scattald map offered by this present study is based on the summons in the Court of Session case of Nicolson versus Dundas (SA.D.16/388/131) of 1849, in which the boundaries are described. As in the case of the scattald map of Unst, the boundary marks have been identified, where possible, on the OS 1:10560 maps of 1878 and 1902 and then plotted, together with the chapel site distribution, onto the OS 1:25000 map (fig.53).

It seems likely that two or three of the Fetlar chapel sites are situated in boundary locations. The sites at Northdale (Dale scattald) and Russetter (Russetter scattald) would be located within 50 m or so of the scattald divisions. Meanwhile, the enclosure at Halliara kirk actually abutts the scattald boundary to the east, between the scattalds of Hubie and Aith, and is mentioned as a boundary mark in the Court of Session paper. This site is located on top of a massive rock outcrop, high above the farm of Feal which lies down-slope to the west. The remaining six sites, however, do not appear to have any obvious relationship to the scattald boundaries. Chapel sites have not been reported from two of the Fetlar scattalds (Aith and Gruting).

(vii) **Preliminary Assessment: Orkney and Shetland**

It would be premature to suggest that the few examples of boundary association so far discerned among the chapel sites of Orkney and Shetland need necessarily be invested with the chronological significance which has been proposed for the boundary keeills in the Isle of Man. The proposed model (fig.74) is intended to provoke discussion as much as to answer questions or to provide a hypothetical framework for analysis. Far more work on all the Northern Isles' chapel sites would be required before any firm conclusions might be offered. Nevertheless, there are one or two points which may perhaps be considered.

The boundary association of ecclesiastical sites is a fairly common feature on Man and indeed it has been the recognition of this which lies at the very heart of this study. This association, it has been suggested, may reflect an essentially Early Christian form of organization. If this association is as early as this study believes, then the possibility arises that areas which are lacking this feature could have been ecclesiastically settled and the native population converted at a date relatively later than these events occurred in Man. The fact that examples of boundary association are relatively rare in those areas examined in Orkney, and even rarer in Unst and Fetlar, represents the kind of situation which might be expected on simple geographical and historical grounds. It might be inferred therefore that the relative absence of boundary association in Orkney and Shetland may be due to chronological reasons.

The relative absence of boundary-sited chapels in the Northern Isles could also be related to a second factor. On Man, it has been emphasized throughout this study that it is the boundary sites, and not necessarily the structures now extant on those sites, which may be early. This thus presupposes that the Manx boundary-sited keeills were resorted to over a relatively long period of time, in both the pre-Norse and Norse periods. The boundary association of ecclesiastical sites could thus be considered as a measure of the relative success which the Church enjoyed in establishing itself in the first place in these different island areas. The extent to which boundary association can be recognized may also reflect the ability of pre-Norse society in Man and the Northern Isles to withstand the disruption which, to a greater or lesser extent, presumably followed upon the Norse settlement of the islands. The preliminary results of this study's analysis of boundary location and ecclesiastical sites in Orkney and Shetland would therefore suggest that Christianity was relatively late in arriving in these islands and boundary sites, if initially established, were not, in the main, resorted to at a later period.

The relative absence of boundary sited chapels in the Northern Isles could thus be due to an element of discontinuity. On the other hand, if we disregard the Manx model, it may have been the case that the early Northern Isles' sites were not located in these boundary zones in the first place. Alternative views of the possible development of ecclesiastical sites in the Northern Isles and Isle of Man and aspects of continuity are considered in the next chapter.

Notes: Chapter 6

Note 1:

In Patrick parish the Barony of Bangor and Sabal amounted to 6 quarterlands (1½ treens). In German, the abbeyland, particles and bishop's barony estates represented 18 quarterlands (4½ treens). In Michael and Ballaugh the adjacent bishop's barony land comprised 8 quarterlands (2 treens), the parish boundary dividing the estate equally. In Jurby the ecclesiastical estates amounted to 7¾ quarterlands (2 treens). The abbeyland and particle estates in Lezayre amounted to 14 quarterlands (3½ treens). The extensive holdings in Malew represented 52 quarterlands (13 treens). In Marown the bishop's barony and the Barony of St. Trinian's amounted to 8 quarterlands (2 treens). In Braddan 6 quarterlands (1½ treens) represented the bishop's barony whilst the Priory of Douglas, containing approximately 11 quarterlands, may have represented 3 former treens. In Onchan 8 quarterlands (2 treens) formed the abbeyland estates there, whilst in Lonan the Skinscoe estate seems to have comprised 4 or 5 quarterlands (1 treen). Finally in Maughold, Cristen's barony encompassed one former treen whilst the Barony of St. Bees, the particles and the staffland estates in the north of the parish around the parish church amounted to two former treens.

Note 2:

The treen and quarterland maps for the parishes of Michael, Marown and Santon were checked against Woods (1867), Davies (1956) and Cubbon (1930) and initially drawn up on the relevant OS 1:10560 maps. The treen and quarterland maps of the remaining

parishes were drawn up directly onto the OS 1:25000 map of 1982. This is a photographically reduced copy of the 1:10560 maps. In this present study the maps of the treens and quarterlands (figs.40-45) have been photographically reduced to a common scale of 1:100000.

Note 3:

It should, however, be noted that the treen of Edremony, within whose bounds stood Rushen parish church, was already known to be associated with other keeill sites and thus, strictly speaking, the treen should not have been removed and then readmitted into Marstrander´s equation. This, however, is but a minor criticim of Marstrander´s analysis.

Note 4: Boundary Classification of Manx Keeills

In the following Table the Manx keeill sites are referred to by their catalogue number as listed in Appendix 1. These data are organized into the following categories:

Category A: The sites in this group are associated with treen land and are located within 50 m of a treen boundary.

Category B: The sites in this category are also located within 50 m of a treen boundary. These, however, are located on ecclesiastical estates or intack.

Keeill Coonlagh (JURBY 4), for example, lies at the boundary between the Particle estate and Andreas parish. Keeill Moirrey (GERMAN 2) is located at the boundary between the Particle and Abbeyland estate in German and these are likely to represent the old treen estates (pp.187,248). The parish churches are also included in this category since there are reasons to suppose that

these sites have been detached from the treens. Onchan parish church (ONCHAN 1), for example, would seem to have formed part of Howstrake treen, Bride parish church (BRIDE 1) part of Kirk Bride treen (figs.43,44).

Some intack sites are also included in this category. Keeill Woirrey (MAUGHOLD 18), for example, lies at the boundary between a detached part of Cornaa Moar and the intack (fig.44).

Category C: The sites in this group are located on treen land, ecclesiastical estates or intack and are located between 50 m and 100 m of a treen boundary.

Category D: This group comprises sites which are located more than 100 m from a treen boundary. These do not appear to have had any association with the treen boundaries.

Category E: There is little boundary information for the sites in this group. Some, such as Ballakilley (MALEW 14) or Lhergy (MALEW 17) are located on the Abbeyland estates where evidence for internal divisions has not been preserved. Others, such as the chapels on St. Michael's Isle (MALEW 8) and the Calf of Man (RUSHEN 14), are located on small islands where boundary location becomes irrelevant.

In other cases, such as Cabbal ny Guilcagh (ANDREAS 6) or Ballamenagh (PATRICK 11), the sites are unlocated. Others are medieval sites, such as Rushen Abbey (MALEW 2) or St. Mary's chapel at Castletown (MALEW 6), and lack evidence of early foundation. The multiple keeill sites at Maughold (MAUGHOLD 2-5) and on St. Patrick's Isle at Peel (PATRICK 2) are also included in this category.

Parish	A	B	C	D	E
ANDREAS	3,5	1	2	4	6
ARBORY	3,4,9	1	5,7,8	2,6,10	-
BALLAUGH	2,3,4	1	-	5	-
BRADDAN	2,9	1	-	3,4,5,6 7,8	10
BRIDE	6	1	-	2,3,4,5	-
GERMAN	4,5,9,12	1,2	3,6,10,11	7,8,13,14	-
JURBY	3	1,4	-	2	-
LEZAYRE	8	1,9	2,4,6	3,5,10	7
LONAN	4,8	1,7,11	9	2,3,5,6 10,12	-
MALEW	9,10,13	1,15,16 18,19	3,4,5,11	12	2,6,7,8 14,17
MAROWN	5,8	1	-	2,3,4,6 7,9,10	-
MAUGHOLD	7,11	1,10,13 18,19	-	6,8,12 15	2,3,4,5 9,14,16 17,20
MICHAEL	3,4,5,7,8	1	9	2,6	-
ONCHAN	6	1	4	2,3,5	7
PATRICK	3,4,5,13	1	8,10	6,7,9,12	2,11
RUSHEN	3,11,13	1,7	2,4,5,10	6,8,9,12	14
SANTON	6,7,8	1	4	2,3,5	-
Totals:	42	31	25	57	22

Percentage Summary: Data Size = 155 (Categories A - D)

Categories A/B: 0- 50 m boundary-sited keeills: 47%
Category C : 50-100 m boundary-sited keeills: 16%
Category D : Non-boundary-sited keeills: 37%

Note 5: A Note on the Calculation of Boundary Zone Areas

The area occupied by a 50 m wide boundary zone has been based on calculations extracted from information on the OS 1:10000 and 1:25000 maps and Woods' (1867) Atlas. These calculations can only be considered a rough guide, although any errors are unlikely to substantially affect this study's analysis of boundary association. It is understood that Paul Reilly's work in a related field, using digitized cartographical information, bears out the basic observations of this present study (pers.comm).

CHAPTER 7

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ECCLESIASTICAL SITES IN THE NORTHERN ISLES AND ISLE OF MAN: ASPECTS OF CONTINUITY

(i) General Introduction

It has been suggested above (Chapter 6) that the association of territorial boundaries and ecclesiastical sites may be connected with the question of chronology and that sites so located may perhaps be considered as foundations of the Early Christian period. On Man, the existence of two basic keeill-site distributions (fig.47) has been postulated on this basis. One, distinguished by the peripheral siting of keeills, has been identified as an essentially native and pre-Norse phenomenon. The other, marked out by the central location of keeills in proximity to centres of settlement, has been proposed as a later and Norse distribution. This hypothetical Manx model has then been applied to Orkney and Shetland, where the peripheral siting of ecclesiastical sites, although evidenced in places, nevertheless appears to have been less pronounced. It has been suggested that relative differences in the frequency with which this phenomenon can be shown to occur in these different island areas may be due to chronological reasons connected with the establishment of Christianity. However, throughout this assessment, it should be realized that any chronological ascriptions have referred to the site and not necessarily to the structures which may now be in evidence.

In the absence of excavation we can have little idea of the extent to which these sites were continuously in use. Survey alone, for example, can hardly be expected to distinguish between

a keeill site and burial ground which was long-lived and which underwent several phases of development, and another which may have been abandoned soon after its foundation but which was later refurbished, restored and reutilized. The physical remains at both sites might well be very much the same. It is thus extremely difficult to speak convincingly of continuity in any necessarily meaningful sense. Indeed the term `continuity' itself can be interpreted in several different ways as has been demonstrated by Janssen (1976) in his discussion of Merovingian Gaul. In the Northern Isles and Man, however, there are two particular aspects of continuity which deserve some attention and these are now considered. Professor Thomas' (1971a,53-58) ideas regarding the continuity of religious sites over the pre-Christian and Christian periods is examined first. This is followed by a review of Dr. Lamb's (1976,151;1979,2;1985,41) alternative thesis which has suggested that the chapel sites of Orkney and Shetland emerged from the domestic settlements of the pre-Norse Iron Age. The evidence from Man and the Northern Isles is examined in terms of both models. Any correlation between ecclesiastical and pre-Christian burial grounds, and the ideas of boundary association, previously outlined (Chapter 6), is also noted.

(ii) Ecclesiastical Sites and their Spatial Association with pre-Christian Burial Grounds

The idea that Early Christian cemeteries were established at pre-Christian burial grounds is one which has a respectable pedigree. Bede's record of the letter from Pope Gregory to Abbot Mellitus (H.E I,xxx: Colgrave & Mynors 1969,106) regarding the

ulilization of fana idolorum would form an obvious starting point. In the more recent past, the discovery of cremated remains at several ecclesiastical sites on Unst (Volume 2: UNST 1,2,11 & 18) led Jessie Saxby (1905,137) to suggest that:

> "the astute Catholic Fathers....built their Christian kirks amid the ruins of heathen temples.....and they buried the baptized dead beside the cremated ashes of their ancestors."

In the Isle of Man, Swynnerton, in a newspaper article of 1910 (MM.MS.5215C), similarly suggested that the discovery of cremation burials at keeill sites need not necessarily be assigned "to a far more remote period than did the original keeills." Most recently, this theme has been taken up and emphasized by Professor Charles Thomas (1971a) who has suggested that the correlation between pre-Christian and Christian burial grounds may be a significant factor in the primary development of Early Christian cemeteries. Thomas (1971a,58) has argued that such correspondances cannot be due simply to coincidence since:

> "the areas devoted to burial occupy a tiny fraction....of the tracts of land settled by those communities which they serve"

This is an interesting remark and one which deserves some attention. Nevertheless, it is an observation which has greatly ignored the extent to which such pre-Christian burial sites could have remained as visible monuments in the early medieval landscape. A cairn-field or barrow-group, for example, could have presented itself as a possible site for the location of a Christian cemetery at any time after its establishment. It would be unwise, therefore, to assume that any close temporal

relationship necessarily existed between the different phases of funerary activity on the site. Equally, we have no means of knowing whether or not the significance , as recognized by modern scholars, was actually comprehended by the early keeill builders in their choice of site. Nevertheless, the material evidence from the Northern Isles and Man is now examined.

(iii) Associated Christian and pre-Christian Burial Grounds on Man

(a) Introduction

Two Manx examples of this correlation between pre-Christian and Christian burial grounds are referred to by Thomas (1971a,56). One of these, the site of Keeill Lingan (MAROWN 8), is considered in the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2).

At Keeill Lingan, Kermode (1909,14-15) discovered, beneath the walls, a number of short cists containing charcoal and ashes, together with fragments of what he believed were cinerary urns. It is not known if these early graves were originally marked above ground in any way. Nevertheless, the location of this site close to the Cardall-Sanbrick treen boundary would incline this writer to the view that the association of a pre-Christian and Christian burial ground at this site was probably deliberate. A close temporal relationship between the two cemeteries may also have existed. This is unlikely to have been the case, however, in the second example which has been quoted by Thomas (1971a,56).

At Keeill Vael on Chapel Hill at Balladoole in Arbory, Kermode's excavation inside the keeill uncovered fragments of possible cinerary urns (Bruce 1968,42). Bersu's later excavations at this site, in 1944-45, meanwhile, identified

several phases of occupation (Bersu & Bruce 1972). However, the cremation and contracted inhumation burials, referred to by Thomas, would appear to have pre-dated an extensive Iron Age occupation of the site (Bersu & Bruce 1972,646-649). The Iron Age levels, however, were disturbed when the site was given over as a Christian cemetery. The natural implication of this would, therefore, seem to be that, in this case at least, the correspondance between a pre-Christian and a Christian burial ground was largely fortuitous. In many ways, therefore, the Balladoole site might be more properly considered in the context of Dr. Lamb´s ideas regarding the development of ecclesiastical sites from the domestic settlements of the pre-Norse Iron Age (see below pp.328-329). Some further Manx examples, however, are first considered.

(b) Mounded Keeill Sites

There are 29 keeill sites in Man which might conceivably be said to have some degree of association with pre-Christian burial grounds. These are listed in Table 25. The identification of these sites, however, is difficult and the material for discussion is, in many cases, less than wholly satisfactory.

Fifteen of the 29 keeill sites are sited over or in close proximity to large earthen and stony mounds. Several of these, such as the sites at Kerrowkeil in Malew or Ballaglonney and Ballagawne in Arbory (Bruce 1968,6-7,35-37), are now ploughed out but when seen by Savage (MM.MS.78A) in c.1880 were thought to have been sited over large prehistoric burial mounds. The sites at Cronkbane in German, Keeill Maloney in Maughold, Ballaoates in Braddan (Kermode 1910,12;1915a,28;1935,15-16: OSCI SC37NE2) and

the unexcavated site of Cabbal ny Cooilly in Bride might also be similarly considered. A possible pre-Christian religious horizon at Ballaqueeney, in Rushen, and at Skyhill, in Lezayre, has already been commented upon above (pp.162-165,171), whilst the reported discovery of "fragments of pottery and calcined bones" near Keeill Moirrey in German (Kermode 1910,19) might also suggest some degree of association between a pre-Christian and a Christian burial ground.

It should be clear that much of this evidence is circumstantial and our record of sites, now destroyed, is poor. Certainly we should be mindful of Basil Megaw's (1978,298) identification of some of Kermode's `cinerary urn' fragments as burnt clay or daub. Equally we should also be wary of necessarily identifying all artificial mounds in a prehistoric funerary context. Bruce and Cubbon's thorough excavation of the Cronk yn Howe keeill site, for example, failed to identify any burial deposit which could not be accommodated within a purely Christian context (1930,288). The mound was considered, rather tentatively, to have been erected de novo sometime in the late 7th century (Bruce & Cubbon 1930,292-293). Professor Bersu's excavation of the Viking period burial mounds at Ballateare and Cronk Moar (Bersu & Wilson 1966) and Megaw's (1978,282-283) comments on those in Jurby parish as a whole, including the one in the parish churchyard, should also be borne in mind. It should be clear, therefore, that a prehistoric and funerary context for the mounded keeill sites is by no means proven. Indeed, such is the state of the evidence that only 3 of the 15

mounded keeill sites, listed in Table 25, are considered by this survey as acceptable examples of ecclesiastical sites with a clear pre-Christian funerary horizon. These, together with 2 other possible candidates, are now considered.

Ballahimmin, German (pl.12a: fig.71)

The keeill and tumulus at Ballahimmin were excavated by Kermode in 1909. The site lies in a field to the NW of Ballahimmin, and a field boundary, which adjoins the site, runs down to the W to an escarpment above the Rhenass river (pl.12a). The fields to the N and S of this boundary are known as "the big" and "the little chapel field" respectively (Kermode 1910,12). Graves, of unspecified type, are reported to have been found during ploughing both to the N and S of the keeill (Kermode 1910,16).

The turf-covered remains of the keeill, measuring 4.50 m along its longer axis and 2.70 m transversely within walls 1-1.50 m thick, are located over an artificial mound. This mound is of sub-oval form, 10-12 m in diameter, and stands up to approximately 1.80 m above the level of the surrounding fields.

Kermode's excavation of the keeill interior uncovered the remains of a partially paved floor and, in the SE corner of the keeill, a large edge-set stone, 1.35 m long, 0.10-0.20 m thick and, as excavation later showed, 1.15 m wide or deep (Kermode 1910,13-15,fig.5). This stone was aligned NS and extended from the centre of the keeill to the S wall. The excavator then proceeded to deeply trench the S half of the keeill interior. This was done in two stages, the area to the W of the large edge-set stone being excavated first. A schematic composite

longitudinal section across the keeill and mound, based on Kermode´s (1910,12-16; MM.MSS.K.IX;XV) excavation account, is offered in fig.71.

The stratigraphical record, as revealed in this section, is complicated and is difficult to explain. In particular, it would seem to contradict Kermode´s (1910,16) statement that the layers, which underlay the keeill, were undisturbed. Perhaps the key feature in this section is the large edge-set stone, 1.15 m deep, 0.55 m of which was set below the keeill floor. To the W of this stone and some 0.15-0.20 m below the keeill floor, Kermode exposed "a layer of hard `black rock´...heavily charged with iron" (1910,15). This overlay a 0.25 m thick layer of densely packed quartz boulders, among which was found a small quantity of charcoal and a number of thin pottery sherds. These latter have been verified by Basil Megaw (1978,298). Beneath this was a thick layer of "red sandy soil with many quartz boulders and traces of wood ashes" (Kermode 1910,15). This layer is calculated to have been about 0.40 m thick since an horizon, interpreted as "the undisturbed soil of the original surface" and described as "a loamy marl of an ochreous yellow", was discovered about 0.90 m below the keeill floor. Within the `red sandy soil´, Kermode discovered an undisturbed deposit of calcined bone. This was located at a depth of 0.60 m below the keeill floor, just below the interface of the densely packed quartz boulders with the underlying `red sandy soil´. The obvious interpretation of this arrangement is that the cremation deposit was cut into the latter context and then sealed with a cairn-like

material.

A different stratigraphical sequence was revealed in Kermode´s excavation to the E of the large edge-set stone, between it and the S and E walls of the keeill. At the level of the keeill floor, Kermode discovered a second edge-set stone, aligned roughly NW-SE and measuring 0.60 x 0.60 x 0.05 m (1910,15,fig.5). The upper edge of this stone was roughly at a level with that of the larger stone and appears to have contained on its N side a fill of earth and small quartz stones. This feature was thought by Kermode (1910,16) to have been the base of an altar, the smaller edge-set stone having formed the S side of the same. Kermode´s `altar base´ overlay a 0.90 m thick deposit of white quartz stones, a few centimetres below which was found a second, evidently undisturbed, pile of calcined bone. This deposit was found in the red sandy soil layer and, again, had evidently been cut into it. Kermode´s `loamy ochreous yellow marl´ appears not to have been located in this second sondage.

Kermode (1910,16) concluded that a keeill had been inserted over and into a Bronze Age tumulus which contained cremation burials. The large edge-set stone, which Kermode believed to have been a feature of this earlier period, was left, he suggested, and later reutilized as the frontal piece of the keeill altar. This suggestion was based on the fact of the stone´s great depth and on what Kermode (1910,16) remarked was the lack of any "trace of disturbance of the soil and stones below". Kermode also believed that, had the stone been set in position during the construction of the keeill, it would have been positioned opposite the middle of the keeill´s E wall.

The reconstructed composite section across the keeill and mound, together with this survey's re-appraisal of the site, can neither confirm nor deny, absolutely, the conclusions offered by Kermode. However, the one thing that is very clear from this section is that certainly one or other of the contexts beneath the keeill floor has been disturbed by the insertion of the large edge-set stone. Either the 0.90 m thick deposit of quartz stones has been cut by the insertion of the edge-set stone and the layers to the W have built up against it, or, more likely, these latter have been cut, with the deep deposit of quartz stones subsequently forming against the E face of the large edge-set stone. The solution to this dilemma now underlies the walls of the keeill but in either case it would seem that the large edge-set stone can have had little association with the cremation deposits. A Christian period horizon for this large stone is not ruled out by the evidence of the section. Certainly, its position is unusual but perhaps a cut or slot for a second stone, perhaps now robbed, remains to be discovered in the unexcavated N half of the keeill. Such an arrangement may have served as a base for an elevated altar with lateral relic cavities or shrines ? Alternatively, perhaps the stone is the frontal of an altar, positioned for some reason, now unknown, in the SE corner of the keeill. On the other hand, the stone could represent the fugitive remains of a short cist structure which was inserted into the mound and then subsequently destroyed when the keeill was superimposed onto it. These are only vague possibilities but they should be considered should the site ever become available

for future excavation.

The basic sequence which has been proposed at Ballahimmin, that a keeill was superimposed upon a tumlus which had received astructural cremation deposits, is not affected by any of the foregoing remarks. The recognition of a possible intermediate phase, marked by cisted inhumation or cremation burials, may however be significant.

Corrody, Lezayre (pl.13a: fig.8)

Kermode´s excavations at this site uncovered the remains of a keeill which had been inserted over and into an artificially raised mound. The edges of this mound were marked by a series of large upright stones. Meanwhile, beneath the floor of the keeill, Kermode discovered an inverted and almost complete cinerary urn containing cremated human bone (1911a,37;1915a,7-9, figs.4-6).

The site (fig.8) owes much of its present appearance to Kermode´s excavation. In particular, the excavation appears to have followed the exterior wall lines of the keeill and at one point, to the S of the keeill, part of the underlying mound seems to have been partially excavated. In its present state, therefore, the mound now appears as a sub-circular bank around the keeill. The mound stands up to 0.50 m above the level of the surrounding field and measures approximately 13.50 m in diameter over a continuous turf-covered stony bank, 1.30-2.80 m in width. The mound is delimited externally in its N and E sectors by a series of massive vertically-set stones, the largest of which has sides of 0.60 m and 0.40 m and stands 0.80 m above ground level. Two other upright stones, one outside the S wall of the keeill,

the other close by the missing NE corner of the keeill, may define an interior line to this same feature.

This stone feature may be identified as the retaining kerb of a round barrow or cairn. It is not, however, the only archaeological feature at this site which may predate the keeill, since there are, to the N, the turf-covered remains of a long, low amorphous shaped mound. This feature, known as the Crónk y Keeillee is briefly referred to by Kermode (1915a,8) as "a piece of rough ground". It is aligned approximately NS and measures 18 m along its longer axis, 14 m transversely at centre and tapers to 5.50 m in width at its N end. This mound, which is quite stony underfoot, is raised 0.20-0.40 m above the level of the surrounding field.

The relationship of this feature to the postulated barrow and keeill is uncertain and cannot be assessed by survey alone. It could be associated with either monument, in the latter case perhaps as a cemetery area for the keeill. In any event, at a purely formal level there is a certain similarity with the oval and mounded keeill site at Skyhill in Lezayre (see above pp.162-165 and fig.9).

The structural remains at Corrody and the sequence implied may also help in interpreting the material remains at two other Manx keeill sites. These are now briefly considered as possible examples of the association of Christian and pre-Christian burial sites.

Keeill Woirrey, Cornaa, Maughold (pls.13b, 14 & 15: fig.6)

Keeill Woirrey is located at approximately 250 m above OD on the steep S slope of North Barrule and towards the head of Cornadale. The keeill is located within the N sector of an enclosure of ovoid or sub-rectangular form and is surrounded on all but the S side by a number of vertically-set stones, presumably grave-markers (pls.13b,15b; fig.6). The ground below the keeill, to the S, slopes steeply down and thus the keeill and the visible remains of the cemetery are situated on an upper, less steeply sloping, plateau.

The keeill walls are contained within a sub-circular earth embankment, open to the W opposite the entrance to the keeill. This feature is raised 0.15-0.35 m above the surrounding ground level and measures 11.30 m EW and 10.20 m NS over a turf-covered stony bank 1.80 m in width. The inner face of this bank lies 0.35-1.55 m distant from the exterior wall-face of the keeill and is partially defined by a number of thin vertically-set slabs. Part of the NE exterior sector is similarly defined.

This feature was interpreted by Kermode (1915a,33) as the remains of a dumped earth and stone embankment which had been thrown up against the walls of the keeill. Such embankments are certainly well referenced (see for example MAROWN 4) and indeed they could be considered as parallels to the Irish annulae, such as were found at Church Island and Reask (O'Kelly 1958,70,fig.3: Fanning 1981a,90, figs.8,10). The embankment at Cornaa, however, may not fit into this class. The exterior stone kerb, which was not noted by Kermode, is unusual and may, together with the possible interior stone edge, be reminiscent, albeit on a smaller

scale, of the arrangement seen above (pp.263-264) at Corrody. Furthermore, Kermode´s (1915a,33) discovery of a possible cremation burial below the keeill floor might be relevant to this study´s identification of the Cornaa keeill embankment as a kerbed round barrow or cairn into which was subsequently inserted the keeill building.

Keeill Vreeshy, Marown (MAROWN 4) (pl.2a: fig.2a)

The site of Keeill Vreeshy can only tentatively be included among the list of mounded keeill sites with possible pre-Christian associations. Kermode´s (1909,5-9) excavations, for example, failed to identify any feature which could not be accommodated within a Christian period context. Nevertheless, the site, and particularly its small stone-faced enclosure (pl.2a: fig.2a), is unusual, both in terms of its size and form. Certainly there would have been little space available for burial within this enclosure and it is thus perhaps relevant to note that traces of a lintel grave cemetery have been encountered during ploughing to the NE of the site (Kermode 1909,8). It is possible therefore that the apparent enclosure at this site represents, like at Corrody and possibly as at Corna as well, the remains of a kerbed barrow or cairn into which the keeill has been inserted. In any event, this feature, which measures 12-15 m overall, is of a similar size, form and appearance to those at Corrody and Cornaa which were 13.50 m and 10.20-11.30 m in diameter respectively.

Keeill Vael, Barony, Maughold (pl.16: fig.7)

Keeill Vael is situated in an extensive cairn field on the summit of Barony hill, an area now used as rough pasture. It is located close to the boundary between Cristen's Barony, formerly the treen of Ormeshau (Kneen 1979,282,304), and the intack which lies to the W.

The site was first surveyed by the Ordnance Survey in 1869 (OS VIII,11,(2347):see also Cubbon 1982, fig.16.5b). A small rectangular structure, presumably the keeill, is shown to be aligned NE-SW and to be located within the NW sector of a pentagonal shaped enclosure. A single tumulus is located a few metres N of the keeill, within the enclosure, and another 14 have been plotted outside the enclosure, to the NE and S.

Keeill Vael was partially excavated in 1914 by Philip Kermode (1915a, 34-36). The excavation was primarily concerned with defining the size and form of the keeill and, to that end, the keeill was shown to be a unicameral structure measuring approximately 6.10 x 3.35 m within walls up to 1.20 m thick. The walls were faced both internally and externally, the interstices being packed with earth and small stones, and stood up to six courses (0.60 m) high. The W half of the structure was found to be largely destroyed although disturbed wall-core material and a fragmentary stone floor served to define the interior limits of the building. A W entrance to the structure was also postulated on the basis of a 0.60 m wide continuation of the paving as it extended across the site of the missing W gable.

The discovery near the N wall of a small grave containing a few quartz pebbles has been recorded by Kermode (1915a,35). Two

lintel graves were also discovered, 0.30 m below the paved floor and close to the S interior wall-face (Kermode 1915a, fig.44). Although not remarked by the excavator, it is possible that the more southerly of the two graves may, from its position, partially underlie the keeill wall and thus predate the erection of that building. No artefacts were found with the graves, only "a little black unctuous soil and a very little wood charcoal" (Kermode 1915a,34).

Kermode's work at Keeill Vael was also directed towards the excavation of the cairn which is located immediately N of the keeill. This cairn, measuring approximately 9.15 m in diameter, was shown to contain near its centre a stone-lined cist. This was packed around with small surface stones and was contained within a ring of larger stones, the whole structure subsequently being capped with more large slabs and rubble.

Keeill Vael was visited by this survey in 1981 and a second visit, combined with an aerial reconnaissance of the site, was undertaken in 1983. The keeill, though in part covered with a mass of field clearance stones and other rubble, clearly lies more accurately EW (N 88 E Magnetic in 1981) and is situated more centrally within the pentagonal enclosure than either Kermode (1915a) or the Ordnance Survey officers of 1869 believed. The fact that the keeill has been incorrectly plotted was first noted by Edwards in 1955 (OSCI SC48NE4). The keeill is visible in the aerial photograph (pl.16: fig.7) in the area which is largely devoid of stone and is represented by a rectangular area, approximately 7.50 x 4 m within banks up to 1.80 m wide. These

dimensions may refer to Kermode´s trench edges and spoil heaps.

The field-clearance stones form a roughly rectangular area, now partially turf-covered at the edges, outside of which lies, some 1.50-3 m distant, the line of the pentagonal enclosure. This feature is now almost ploughed out and is represented by a low turf-covered bank, spread some 2-3 m in width. A break in the N circuit of this enclosure may mark the location of an entrance. A short turf-covered bank and field boundary, both previously unnoted, are also evident to the S of the keeill enclosure. This bank, which is barely raised above the level of the surrounding field, is up to 4 m in width. It extends S for approximately 10 m where it joins a sinuous field boundary which, on the E, runs in a SE direction, between cairns 11 and 12, before turning abruptedly E and apparently terminating at the NS aligned field wall. It is conceivable, however, that the sinuous field wall immediately adjacent on the E may preserve the course of this feature. To the W of the junction, that is to the SW of the keeill site, the field boundary runs downslope between cairns 7 and 8, possibly intruding upon the latter (fig.7), and apparently terminates at the Barony - intack boundary.

The keeill and its associated burial ground are presumably among the latest features on the site and can be assigned to an early medieval or medieval horizon. The cairn field, meanwhile, could be broadly assigned to a Bronze Age horizon. These features can be loosely considered as `late´ and `early´ respectively. The problem, however, concerns the relative chronological position of the sinuous EW boundary within the overall sequence which goes to make up the present day and

visible palimpsest.

Three very basic alternatives are immediately available for consideration. On the one hand, the boundary line could be seen as the earliest feature on the site. This zone may then have been utilized in the pre-Christian period as a burial area. Interestingly, the disposition of cairns to both N and S of the boundary might be seen to suggest that more than one social grouping was burying its dead in this zone. A third phase might then have witnessed the establishment of the Christian cemetery and keeill.

A second model, on the other hand, could propose the primacy of the cairn field as a single homogenous unit which was later divided by the EW boundary line. The third phase would be as above.

A third alternative is also possible. This again begins with the cairn field as the primary monument on which an enclosed cemetery and keeill were established in phase two. The boundary could then be relegated to a relatively late, third, phase.

The EW boundary line can thus be viewed as a primary, intermediate or late feature vis-a-vis the cairn field and keeill site. The possibility that the boundary may truncate one of the cairns would naturally exclude the first of the three basic alternatives offered above, but there would seem to be little hard evidence available to choose between either of the remaining models.

The development of the site on Barony hill is doubtless more complex than any of the above demonstration models will allow.

In particular, the fact that the keeill enclosure is seemingly joined to the EW boundary is an unusual feature and it is difficult to explain this in terms of either agricultural practice or territorial management. The function of this short length of bank, whose relative position in the above models cannot easily be inferred, is therefore unknown. Nevertheless, the site's location close to the old treen boundary and its association with a pre-Christian burial ground would seem to be significant.

(c) Non-mounded Keeill Sites

There are 14 examples of non-mounded keeill sites which, through virtue of the discovery of cinerary urns, cremated human remains or short cist burials on site or in the vicinity, may have had some degree of association with pre-Christian burial grounds. Since a pre-Christian funerary horizon at such sites may have been less obviously visible, this group of keeill sites would be of some importance for Thomas' ideas regarding the continuity of religious sites over the pre-Christian and Christian periods. Unfortunately, however, the material evidence for a pre-Christian funerary horizon and, in one or two cases, for the keeill site itself, is far from satisfactory.

The sites at Ballingan and Ballachrink (MAROWN 8 & 9) have already been considered in this context. Other examples are also known. At Ballakilmartin, for example, fragments of charcoal and decomposed pottery, interpreted as the remains of a cinerary urn, were discovered in the region of the keeill's W wall (Kermode 1935,10). A similar feature seems to have been found close by the NW wall of the keeill at Scarlett burial ground (Reilly

forthcoming a). Meanwhile, in his excavation at Camlork in Braddan, Kermode (1935,16) interpreted a smear of bright red clay as "doubtless....a Bronze Age burial".

There are 19th century reports of discoveries of cinerary urns at Keeill Pharlane in Michael, at St. Patrick´s or St. Cecilia´s chapel in Jurby, at Maughold parish church and at Kilkillane in Lonan (Kermode 1911a,3,15-21;1915a,28,40, figs.7,36). At Sulbrick (SANTON 8), we have only Kermode´s (1935,21-22) report of finding `ashes´ of an unspecified nature beneath the keeill floor. At Glencrutchery in Onchan, meanwhile, traces of cremation have been reported (Kermode 1935,10), whereas the keeill site, though evidently once well-known in the district, has been nowhere defined. There is similarly no trace now remaining of the Gramma keeill in Rushen. The record of this site depends essentially on Savage´s report (MM.MS.78A), written in c.1880 and describing the discovery, in c.1850, of "stone graves and urns". Savage, however, was unable to trace any tradition of a keeill at this site and Bruce (1968,51) has regarded it as one of the least authenticated keeill sites in the parish of Rushen. The keeill and cemetery sites at Balladoole in Arbory and at Ronaldsway II in Malew, however, are well-evidenced, as indeed are a number of prehistoric burials at both sites (Bruce 1968,42: Bersu & Bruce 1972,646-649: Cubbon 1935b,158: Neely 1940,85: Stenning 1935,146). However, since the funerary horizon at both sites seems to have been interrupted by a phase of domestic occupation, consideration of these sites is left to a subsequent section (see below pp.328-330).

It should be clear that there are extremely few examples where some kind of a funerary association between pre-Christian and Christian phases on a site may be clearly demonstrated.

(iv) Boundary association and its possible relevance to potential multiperiod funerary sites on Man

The documentary evidence from Ireland regarding the association of boundaries and burial mounds or fertae, as collated by Charles-Edwards (1976), has been summarized above (p.228) in connexion with this study's analysis of the boundary association of ecclesiastical sites on Man. The question was posed (p.228 above) whether or not this association had any connexion with the utilization of pre-Christian burial grounds as the sites for Christian cemeteries and keeills. This is an extremely difficult question to answer.

Fifteen of the 29 keeill sites listed in Table 25 are located at boundary locations. Six of the mounded keeill sites lie within 50 m of a treen boundary, another 3 within 100 m. For the non-mounded keeill sites, 4 are within 50 m, and another 2 are within 100 m, of a treen boundary. It is difficult, however, to judge the significance, if any, of these data.

Just under two-thirds of the mounded keeill sites are situated at boundary locations. The best Manx examples of this are at Keeill Vael and possibly also at Keeill Woirrey at Cornaa, both in the parish of Maughold. This phenomenon, however, is open to various interpretations since the association of cairn, keeill and boundary could have occurred in a number of different ways and for a number of different reasons. For example, the question of boundary location might by itself have been the

single most important determining factor for the positioning of these sites. Certainly we could point to the fact that there are a further 83 keeill sites in boundary locations (p.219) where there is apparently no evidence for a pre-Christian funerary horizon. These 9 examples (Table 25a) could therefore be due simply to coincidence and be related to the question of the visibility of those monuments in the early medieval landscape. Alternatively, we could suggest, with Thomas (1971a,53-58), that the pre-Christian funerary site was the important factor which determined the siting of the earliest keeills. The 15 examples (Tables 25a & 25b) where this association occurred in a boundary setting might therefore be due to chance. Alternatively, these two ideas or themes, regarding boundary location and the spatial proximity of a pre-Christian and a Christian religious site, could be brought together and a case for the early definition of territorial boundaries, marked out by burial mounds, could be proposed. The later siting of Christian cemeteries in similar or the same locations could thus be viewed as a development, following on from traditional custom or beliefs in, perhaps, the sacred or special nature of the boundary zone. Such a view would also answer many of the problems regarding the antiquity of the Manx land system. This, however, would be a simplistic solution to what is clearly an extremely complex problem.

The association of keeill sites and boundary locations, as outlined in this study, is based largely on the frequency with which that relationship can be shown to occur. The fact, however, that some 15 boundary sited keeills may have a pre-Christian funerary association cannot, by itself, imply a

necessarily great antiquity for the Manx land system. Before this could be done, and perhaps not even then, the whole corpus of pre-Christian burial sites would need to be examined and it should be emphasized that only those correspondances with keeill sites have been touched upon by this study. It is difficult, therefore, for this analysis to proceed any further.

A realistic assessment must, in many ways, reiterate some of the points already made above. We must agree, with Thomas (1971a,58), that the correspondance between a pre-Christian and Christian burial site cannot always be just coincidence. At the same time, however, we must make some allowance for the fact that the visibility of some monuments might negate any arguments which proposed that a close temporal relationship in the funerary use of such sites existed. On Man we can point to 29 sites which have a possible pre-Christian funerary horizon. Yet in all but a handful of cases, the evidence for such an ascription is extremely inadequate. Thus in spite of the intrinsic merit and attraction of Thomas' ideas regarding the continuity of pre-Christian and Christian religious sites, and in spite also of the idea that such a relationship could be linked to the question of the boundary association of early ecclesiastical sites, unfortunately this study can find no hard, convincing evidence to maintain either or both hypotheses. This assessment may appear excessively negative. If it has, it is because the material evidence to substantiate either or both interpretations is lacking. Future excavation should address itself to these problems and only then may we consider more properly the question of multi-period funerary sites in boundary locations.

(v) The Northern Isles: Introduction

There would seem to be extremely few chapel sites in the Northern Isles which have any possible pre-Christian funerary associations. In part this may be due to the paucity of excavated chapel sites in Orkney and Shetland (Appendix 2b). In part it may be due to an apparently greater association with Iron Age domestic settlements (pp.298-327). In fact only one site from this area can be considered as a good example for the association of a pre-Christian and Christian burial ground. This is the site on St. Ninian's Isle in Shetland, recently discussed by Small (1973,5-7) and Thomas (1973a,11-13,fig.8), and reviewed below (pp.280-283).

In this study's discussion of possible multi-phase funerary sites on Man, it was considered useful to discuss them under the headings of mounded and non-mounded sites. This was done in order that some assessment might be made with regard to the visibility or otherwise of such monuments in the landscape and their importance, if any, for influencing the distribution of keeill sites at treen boundaries. This distinction between mounded and non-mounded sites, however, is not pursued any further in the following review of Orcadian and Shetland chapel sites. This is because there are too few sites for consideration and also because the material evidence is not suitable for making such distinctions.

(vi) Associated Christian and pre-Christian Burial Grounds in Orkney

In Orkney only 5 examples of a possible association between a pre-Christian funerary site and a chapel are known to this

writer. The ascription is, in almost every case, either poorly founded or speculative. At Sandwick parish church, for example, there is a report of the discovery of a crouched adult female inhumation burial, made during road-widening operations to the S of the churchyard (RCAMS 1946,ii,270,No.733). Another account (Spence 1920) has identified a now turf-covered mound, 75 m SW of the Kirk of Kirkgoe (RCAMS 1946,ii,6,No.4), as a pre-Christian burial mound. Spence (1920,89) postulated that a close temporal relationship existed between the two sites, implying that the chapel was established immediately upon the abandonment of the earlier burial ground. This identification and interpretation, however, are both entirely speculative.

A third possible example is the site of St. Mary's chapel at Isbister in the parish of Rendall. This has been identified with a flat-topped stony mound, now partially turf-covered (pl.49a). It measures approximately 8 m in diameter and stands 1 m above the level of the surrounding field. The chapel is supposed to have been erected over this mound and the remains of a slight rectangular hollow on its summit may be indicative of such a structure. The underlying mound, meanwhile, has been described by both Clouston (1918a,98) and Fraser (1928,71) as a broch. This, however, is unlikely, not only in view of the mound's slight size (see for example Hedges 1987,iii,fig.3.2: Fojut 1981b,table 1a), but also in view of the fact that none of the exposed stonework appears to form any coherent structure or to be of a massive proportion. A number of burnt stones were noticed at the time of this survey's visit to the site (March 1982),

though hardly in sufficient quantity to merit the identification of this site as a burnt mound. The setting would also be quite inadequate for such a monument as there is no nearby water source. Equally, it would seem far too substantial to have been formed simply by field clearance, although doubtless such activity may have contributed to the mound's present form. A funerary interpretation is therefore conceivable, although hardly proven.

The site at Isbister is one of only two possible examples in Orkney of the phenomenon, quite frequently found on Man, of the superimposition of a chapel over a burial mound. The other site which might be considered in this context is that of St. Peter's chapel on the island of Muckle Skerry. This site has recently been surveyed by Hunter and Dockrill (1982a,521-523,fig.2: Hunter 1982) who, following Lamb's (1973a,171) tentative interpretation of this site as that of a conjoined oratory and living cell, have gone on to postulate that these structures were inserted over or into an earlier possible burial mound. The site appears as an open mound, 25 x 13 m, containing two drystone chambers. These are apparently divided by a NW-SE lying cross-wall (Hunter & Dockrill 1982a,fig2: Hunter 1982,pl.1). The site of St. Peter's chapel, however, had previously been identified with a large oriented rectangular structure on Broti Ber, a narrow headland to the NW of the mound site (RCAMS 1946,ii,296,No.869: Lamb 1973a,171: Hunter & Dockrill 1982a,521-522,fig.2). The identification, therefore, of the the mound site as that of a chapel with a pre-Christian funerary horizon, and thus its inclusion in this provisional list of Orcadian multi-phase

cemetery sites, can only be properly determined by excavation.

The final site to be considered in this context, and perhaps the best example, given the state of the evidence so far, comes from Rousay where recent excavations have been conducted at Church Knowe, near Hullion (Marwick 1984a). There is some evidence to suggest that the chapel at this site was either robbed or ploughed out in the first half of the 19th century. Certainly, it was remembered by some inhabitants at the time of the OS visit in 1880 (ONB 16,1880,193). No structural remains of a chapel or an enclosure, however, were traced during excavation, in spite of extensive trial-trenching. Indeed such was the state of on-site preservation, that only those features which had been cut into the boulder clay survived. Such features included 5 putatively Christian extended inhumations in dug graves, 4 of which were oriented EW, the other being aligned NS. Three cremation burials were also discovered and tentatively associated with a narrow curving slot which predated at least two of the inhumation burials. Two of the cremation burials were contained within coarse pottery vessels, set in small pits. The third was contained within a fire-reddened natural hollow. No grave-goods were associated with any of the funerary deposits.

The evidence from Church Knowe is not unambiguous and the extended inhumation burials, as the excavator rightly remarked, can only be considered as putatively Christian (Marwick 1984a). Nevertheless, the association of such features at a site for which there is good traditional and toponymic evidence would suggest that a more positive identification might be possible.

In any event, the combined evidence at Church Knowe would merit the site's inclusion in the list of Orcadian ecclesiastical sites with pre-Christian funerary associations.

(vii) Associated Christian and pre-Christian Burial Grounds in Shetland

In Shetland only 6 possible examples of this association are known to this writer. Only one of these, and the one for which the evidence is least incontrovertible, has previously been considered in this context (Thomas 1973a). This is the site on St. Ninian's Isle which was excavated in the 1950's by Andrew O'Dell (O'Dell et al 1959). These excavations have recently been reviewed by both Alan Small (1973) and Charles Thomas (1973a) but these authors supply slightly differing interpretations, with Small's being the more conservative.

O'Dell's excavations clearly demonstrated the presence of a multi-phased Iron Age complex with both domestic and funerary remains over which was later established a Christian cemetery and related ecclesiastical structures. This, in essence, is Small's (1973,7) summary. Structural remains associated with Broch or Wheelhouse period pottery were discovered in the SW corner of the excavation area, to the S of the church (Small 1973,6,fig.5). Meanwhile, beneath the nave, a cisted cremation burial, containing the rim fragments of a Broch period pot, was found among a confused mass of domestic remains, possibly of Iron Age date (Small 1973,5-6). Further short cists containing human bone and one containing a crouched adult inhumation burial were found in the area to the S of the church (Small 1973,6-7,fig.5). This

latter had been inserted over a NS aligned wall of unknown date and function and other short cists had been built up against it.

Little of the site's stratigraphy was preserved as far as the excavation record. Small's account makes clear the fact that whilst stratigraphical observations were noted in certain small areas, no proven connexion, however, could be made between them. Only a barren sand horizon, into which the long cist cemetery was cut, acts as a stratigraphical ceiling to the domestic and funerary features so far discussed.

These problems were somewhat minimized by Thomas in his interpretation of the site's development. Thomas (1973a,11-13,fig.8), for example, has placed the short cist cemetery in an intermediate position between the domestic Iron Age structures and the Christian long cist cemetery. His evidence for this depends on the fact that a number of short cist burials postdated the substantial drystone wall which extended NS across the site. However, the age of this wall and its relationship to other features on the site is unknown. Small (1973,6), for example, has remarked that there is no stratigraphical link between it and those features to the W which had produced Broch or Wheelhouse period pottery. Only the cisted cremation burial beneath the church might support Thomas' identification of the short cist cemetery as Iron Age but even this must depend upon whether or not we can accept that the pottery sherds found with it were necessarily <u>in situ</u>. However, even if we accept this association for a moment, it has no direct bearing upon the relationship of that cremation burial to the domestic structures in the SW sector of the excavation area which produced later Iron Age wares. In

other words, the short cist burials could still be of Iron Age date but could as well predate as postdate the domestic Iron Age structures on the site.

The upshot of this is that there is no firm stratigraphical evidence for the dating of the short cist cemetery at St. Ninian's Isle. Thomas' ascription of this cemetery to the period 5th-6th or 7th century (1973a,13) depends solely upon the assumption that all the domestic features, the floors, walls and pavements, were broadly contemporary and roughly assignable to the period "commencing in the first few centuries B.C and lasting until the 3rd or 4th centuries A.D" (Thomas 1973a,13).

Indeed, an alternative construct could suggest that an Iron Age domestic complex succeeded an earlier Iron Age cemetery which had, in turn, been established on an earlier settlement focus of unknown type and form, as represented by the NS aligned wall and the `confused remains' beneath the church. This may appear, and probably is, an over-elaborate reconstruction. Nevertheless, it is in accord with the published data. One outcome of this alternative interpretation would therefore be to see the domestic Iron Age settlement, and not the pre-Christian cemetery, as the possible focus for the later development of the ecclesiastical site on St. Ninian's Isle.

The present writer would neither support nor refute such an alternative interpretation of this site. Such a scheme would be liable to the same criticisms as have been employed against Thomas' original model. Indeed, this study is inclined to agree with Thomas' interpretation and, given the state of the

excavation record (Small 1973), would consider that many of Thomas' assumptions are reasonable in the circumstances. The alternative construct, however, will have served its point if it has shown Thomas' interpretation to be less definitive than might otherwise have first appeared.

The material evidence at St. Ninian's Isle regarding the use, and perhaps successive use, of a pre-Christian burial ground as a Christian cemetery can be considered problematical. Even more so then is the case with regard to the remaining Shetland sites under consideration in this context where the evidence is even less satisfactory.

"Two earthen urns", for example, are reported to have been found in c.1921 near the putative chapel site at Cutts on Trondra (RCAMS 1946,iii,125-126,No.1534). The discovery nearby of a short cist, containing a crouched inhumation burial, is also still remembered locally (pers.comm propriator of Cutts: July 1986). Meanwhile, the discovery of "several broken urns" in the cemetery on Fair Isle has been recorded by the RCAMS (1946,iii,48, No.1203). Interestingly, a recent survey of the site by Hunter (1984a,5,25,figs.23 & 24) has succeeded in identifying a curvilinear bank, containing a number of possible cell-like features, outside the W wall of the present graveyard.

At Sandwick on Unst, the site of the Kirk of Millyskara (UNST 18) is traditionally associated with an area in which a number of cist burials, of unknown type, are reported to have been exposed and removed by marine erosion. It is possible, however, that these cists may be contemporary with the kerbed cairn which was excavated by Bigelow and McGovern and which

returned a C14 determination of 415 ± 75 AD (GU 1291: Bigelow 1984b; 1985,100-103,pl.20). As such, these cists could represent the remains of a Late Iron Age cemetery. There is, however, little evidence for any ecclesiastical structures at this site (Volume 2: UNST 18) and thus any discussion of the continuity of a religious site over the pre-Christian and Christian periods is difficult. Nevertheless, it is clear that the traditional folklore of the area certainly makes some kind of an association between the Sandwick site and that of St. Mary's chapel at Framgord (UNST 20) which lies nearby on the N side of the bay. The interpretation of that account has been considered elsewhere (Volume 2).

Identifiable ecclesiastical features are also noticeably absent at the two putative chapel sites which remain to be considered in the context of the association of pre-Christian and Christian burial sites. Both, again, are on Unst and have been fully considered elsewhere (Volume 2). These are the sites of Bartles Kirk (UNST 2) and Gletna Kirk (UNST 11).

Casual excavations at or near Bartles Kirk in the latter half of the last century uncovered a number of urns, including some of steatite "containing what was believed to be human ashes" (Edmonston 1872,285). A number of short cists containing cremated remains are also known from the site (Irvine 1885,386-387). Meanwhile, construction work on the new road by Gletna Kirk exposed a number of urns containing "ashes and charred bones etc." (Saxby 1905,136). No identifiable ecclesiastical structures, however, are evident at either of these sites. The

suggestion, therefore, that these sites were later adopted as Christian cemeteries can only be tentatively proposed.

(viii) The Boundary Association of Christian and pre-Christian Burial Sites in Orkney & Shetland

Three of the six Shetland sites considered above are on Unst and the poor correspondance between the ecclesiastical sites and territorial boundaries of that island has already been considered (p.244). The remaining three Shetland sites, those on St. Ninian's Isle, Trondra and Fair Isle, are each on small islands where the processes of division by scattald would have been unnecessary.

The Orcadian material hardly fares any better. The site on Muckle Skerry, for example, can be excluded for much the same reasons as the small island sites of Shetland. Meanwhile examination of Aberdeen's map of c.1770 (OCL.E29) would suggest that neither Sandwick parish church, nor the Isbister site in Rendall was situated in a boundary location. This same source, however, would suggest that the Kirk of Kirkgoe was situated in the vicinity of the old boundary between the, now conjoined, parishes of Birsay and Harray. Aberdeen's map shows this parish boundary as having extended NE from the Dounby area, possibly along the line of the present B9057 and perhaps even along the course of the Burn of Lushan itself, on whose bank the chapel stands. There are, however, two problems with this. Firstly, such a boundary line would place the Kirk of Kirkgoe within the parish of Harray, not Birsay, since the site is located on the S side of the burn. Secondly, and more importantly, modern maps

(for example: Fraser 1925,21: Marwick 1970,xii: Firth et al 1975,72), based on the 1903 OS 1:10560 map, place the Birsay - Harray boundary much further S, on a line between Dounby, the Kame of Corrigall and Mid Tooin. The best that might be inferred, therefore, is that the Kirk of Kirkgoe, which is located far out on the moorland, is sited in a peripheral location in the general area of the marching of the parishes of Birsay and Harray with Evie and Rendall to the E.

The final site to be considered within the context of the boundary association of ecclesiastical sites with possible pre-Christian funerary remains is the site of Church Knowe on Rousay. Fortunately the land divisions of this island are less debatable. These have already been illustrated in a notional manner by Thomson (1981,fig.3).

Church Knowe is situated on the half urisland tunship of Frotoft, a district which is bounded to the NW by that of Inner Westness and Corse. The division between these two areas is shown by Thomson to have lain roughly between the Point of Corse and Peerie Water. However, examination of Aberdeen's map (OCL.E29) would suggest that this division is rather the intra-district boundary between Corse and Inner Westness, not Frotoft. Rather the boundary between Corse and Frotoft would seem to lie somewhat to the SE, possibly along the line of the burn which meets the sea at the old Hullion pier (Note 1). This burn also defines the W edge of the field in which Church Knowe is located. Aberdeen's map would therefore suggest that Church Knowe, a site which excavation has shown to have a possible ecclesiastical and pre-Christian funerary association, is located close to the

boundary between the districts of Frotoft and Inner Westness & Corse.

There is insufficient data from Orkney and Shetland which would allow any further analysis to be made of the association of pre-Christian and Christian funerary sites and their siting in boundary locations. All that can be hoped for at present, in the Northern Isles as well as Man, is that such examples be noted. However, next an alternative model, which seeks to find the origins of ecclesiastical sites in Orkney and Shetland in the domestic settlements of the Late Iron Age, is examined. The Manx evidence is also briefly examined from this point of view.

(ix) The Association of Ecclesiastical and Iron Age Settlements

(a) Introduction

It has long been recognized that a large proportion of the chapel sites of Orkney have been established at or near the sites of brochs or other Iron Age settlement sites. This was first noted by the compiler for the NSA (1842) for Sanday and was reiterated by Dr. Marwick in his examination of the monuments of that island (1923a,27). This phenomenon was also noted by Clouston (1918a,105) who, like Marwick, similarly concluded that:

> "this was simply for the utilitarian purpose of securing a handy quarry (of building stone)".

Certainly, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that brochs and other structures were quarried for their stone by later builders. This has been noted in Volume 2 in connexion with the sites at Skelwick, Peterkirk and St. Tredwell's (WESTRAY 8,10 &14) and it is frequently referred to in the RCAMS inventory for Orkney (see

for example RCAMS 1946,ii,91-92,No.321). More recently, however, Dr. Lamb, in a series of articles, has suggested that the frequent association of the urisland chapels with Late Iron Age domestic settlements may represent an important element of continuity (1973a,196-197; 1976,151; 1979,2; 1983b,178; 1985,41). Lamb´s model of the development of ecclesiastical sites from the domestic settlements of the Late Iron Age thus represents an alternative to Thomas´ `developed cemeteries´ model. The development of ecclesiastical sites, in other words, may have lain not in the association with the old burial grounds but rather with the domestic settlements themselves. This model does not entirely negate the ideas of either Clouston (1918a,105) or Marwick (1923a,27) with regard to the idea of the brochs as readily available sources of building stone. It does, however, lend an academic and possibly also a chronological significance to what has formerly been viewed as a purely utilitarian association.

Survey alone cannot resolve these different views. Certainly, the processes behind the association of ecclesiastical and Iron Age settlements may have been manifold and a number of interpretations are conceivable. It is possible, for example, that the chapels were constructed to serve an existing Christian community. Some such process was suggested many years ago by Scott (1926,48) in his discussion of the ecclesiastical artefacts which were found at the Broch of Burrian on North Ronaldsay (pp.292-294). Alternatively, it is possible that broch sites were gifted to early ecclesiastics by secular patrons in much the same way as either Fursa was granted urbs Cnobheri (HE iii,19:

Colgrave & Mynors 1969,270) or Bassa received the Roman shore fort at Reculver (ASC sa.669: Whitelock 1955,154). The reuse and reoccupation of Roman sites, particularly forts, in Anglo-Saxon England is a well-evidenced phenomenon and has been examined in several recent studies (Cramp 1976,212-215: Rigold 1977: R.Morris 1983,40-45). The importance of secular patronage is also reflected in Bede's account of Colman's foundation of an ecclesiastical settlement at Mayo (HE iv,4: Colgrave & Mynors 1969,346-349). Hughes and Hamlin (1977,20), meanwhile, in reflecting upon the inordinate size of the enclosure at Inishmurray, have suggested that the monastery there may have been established within an earlier secular ring-fort. There is thus plenty of historical evidence to support the notion that former places of secular importance could have been considered suitable for the establishment of ecclesiastical sites. In the Northern Isles and Man, however, we are hampered by a lack of early historical documentation (Chapter 2). The proposition, therefore, that brochs and other Iron Age settlement sites could have been gifted in this way, and reused and reoccupied, rests only upon our knowledge of the state of affairs known from elsewhere in Britain and Ireland. Nonetheless, it is a reasonable suggestion.

Secular patronage might be invoked as a likely mechanism which would produce a relatively high frequency of associated ecclesiastical and Iron Age settlements. In any event, the reuse and reoccupation of former settlement sites is fairly easily demonstrable, even if that association were only for a purely

utilitarian purpose. It is, however, far more difficult to demonstrate that the sites were continuously occupied and that the chapels "originated as Christian nuclei among the Pictish population" (Lamb 1976,151). This proposition can only be tested through excavation. However, that it can be postulated at all is due, in no small part, to the very great advances that have been made in Late Iron Age and Viking studies in recent years. Individual chapel sites with possible Iron Age associations are examined in detail below (pp.298-327). First, however, some mention must be made of the present state of Pictish - Viking settlement studies since an appreciation of these is a necessary prerequisite for even considering whether or not the chapels could have had such early origins.

(b) The Identification of Late Iron Age Settlements in Orkney and Shetland: a Brief Review

This sub-section is not intended as a definitive account on Late Iron Age settlement in the Northern Isles. That subject stands outside the main area of this study and instead reference should be made to the most recent surveys by John Hedges (1985; 1987), Anna Ritchie (1985a) and Christopher Morris (1985) whose works supplement and update the earlier reviews of Hamilton (1962) and Wainwright (1962a; 1962b).

One of the most significant advances in Scottish archaeology in the last 10-15 years must undoubtedly concern the increased visibility of the Picts in the archaeological record. This movement, anticipated by Wainwright in the 1950's, became a growth area in the 1970's (Wainwright 1955a: Ritchie & Ritchie 1981,159). Late Iron Age structures and artefact assemblages

which, at least on chronological grounds can be assigned to the Pictish period, are now known from an increasing number of sites in Orkney and Shetland. The excavations at Saevar Howe (Hedges 1983) and Buckquoy (Ritchie 1977) in Birsay and at Pool (Hunter 1984b;1985;1986b) on Sanday have all produced clearly identifiable phases of both Late Iron Age and Viking occupation. These ascriptions have been based on stratigraphical and typological considerations and/or C14 determinations. Meanwhile, Noel Fojut's (1980) survey of Iron Age sites in Shetland has discovered several examples where rectilinear structures, possibly Viking, have been established on or at broch sites. Such examples might include the brochs at Eastshore and Dalsetter in Dunrossness, Snaburgh on Unst and Gossaburgh on Yell. However, these sites, with the exception of Saevar Howe (pp.84-85) do not have any direct ecclesiastical association. Nevertheless, they are important for identifying Late Iron Age structure and artefact types and this has led to a reanalysis of earlier excavations and the `rediscovery', for example, of Late Iron Age structures in the extra-mural settlements at Gurness and Borwick (Ritchie 1974,fig.1;1977,182;1985a,194-196: Alcock 1980, fig.4.2: Hedges 1983,117). Meanwhile, Hedges' excavations at Howe broch, near Stromness, have suggested that occupation on the site continued up to the 8th century and beyond. Furthermore, the excavator has suggested that this may have been the general case with broch sites, rather than the exception (Hedges 1985,171; Hedges 1987,iii,41-49: Hedges & Bell 1980a; 1980b).

The effect of this recent work has been two-fold. On the one hand, it has broadened the range of sites which might be considered as Late Iron Age. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, it has suggested that a number of broch sites could have been occupied sufficiently long enough for their inhabitants to have become converted. In other words, it is not entirely inconceivable that these excavations have rediscovered the settlements of Christianized Picts. From this it follows on that it may not be entirely fanciful to suggest, therefore, that ecclesiastical sites could have been established nearby to serve these communities. Proof of this, of course, is lacking, but nevertheless, the possibility should be considered. In this context, four excavated sites with Late Iron Age and ecclesiastical associations deserve a brief mention. Unfortunately, the evidence from these sites is, for a variety of reasons, not wholly available in a published format.

The Brough of Birsay is one site which could be considered in this context, although here there is the problem of distinguishing between ecclesiastical and secular Pictish occupation (Lamb 1974). A second site is the Broch of Burrian on North Ronaldsay, excavated by Traill in 1870 and 1871.

Broch of Burrian, North Ronaldsay, Orkney

The site is well known for having produced a cross-incised slab on which was inscribed a bind-ogam inscription and possibly also a symbol of a fish (Traill 1890,pl.xlvi: Allen 1903,24). These excavations also produced a second ecclesiastical artefact in the form of a small iron bell (RMS.GB306), of the type usually associated with the early Irish church and dated in Scotland from

the 8th century (Bourke 1983). The cross form and ogam inscription are likewise thought to be assignable to the same period (Jackson 1955,139: Thomas 1971a,187).

Traill´s excavation of the broch interior uncovered two major phases of occupation, the latter being represented by a paved surface which partially sealed earlier floor and occupation levels. The Broch of Burrian has subsequently been heralded as a `stratified´ site and it is unfortunate that the most recent review by Hedges (1985,154) should have perpetuated the belief that "the finds were rigidly separated". That this was not necessarily the case had been demonstrated several years earlier by MacGregor (1974,69-70) in his reappraisal of the excavation and artefact assemblage. Indeed, before this, Stevenson (1955b,283) had warned that Traill´s (1890,364) list of artefacts from primary and secondary levels was "too clear cut not to have been partly subjective". MacGregor´s review of the artefacts has suggested, on both typological and comparative grounds, that the later occupation at Burrian could be assigned very roughly to the period "two or three centuries before the arrival of the Vikings" (1974,84).

The find spot of the iron bell is not mentioned in Traill´s report and indeed it is absent from his small finds list. The cross-incised slab, on the other hand,

> "was found towards the south side of the broch, where the wall was so low that, though the slab lay not much above the floor of the tower, it was also not far from the surface"
>
> W. Traill 1890,346

Marwick (1923b,54) and Radford (1962a,170) interpreted the presence of Christian artefacts at Burrian as evidence that a chapel, hermitage or monastery had been established in the vicinity of the broch. Scott (1926,48), meanwhile, went so far as to say that an ecclesiastical site had been "laid out under the protection of the chief who occupied the broch at that time". The excavator's own view, however, seems to have been that the cross, at least, was inserted over the broch at a later time when "the ruins....could have assumed the appearance of a grassy mound adapted to purposes of sepulture" (Traill 1890,346). Traill's account, however, is not a little ambivalent.

Skaill, Deerness, Orkney

A cross-marked stone was also discovered in Peter Gelling's excavations of a Late Iron Age and Viking site at Skaill in Deerness. The stone (Gelling 1984,fig.3) was found on Site 2 where it had been placed face-downwards in a path which led up to the entrance to the primary structure, House 1. It is unfortunate, however, that the only published C-14 determinations (Gelling 1985: Renfrew & Buteux 1985,273) relate to the Early Iron Age site, Site 5, and the apparently long-lived Iron Age site, Site 6 ("1st century BC-7th century AD and probably later": Gelling 1984,12). The dating of Gelling's House 1 depends wholly on the relative dating of the later, overlying Viking structures (Houses 2-4) and for a terminus post quem, on the cross-marked stone itself. A date of around the middle years of the 8th century has been suggested for the stone's incorporation into the pathway, albeit that this has been done on historical grounds alone (Gelling 1984,15).

Gelling's House 1 is described as Pictish (1984,12,36). The evidence, however, is far from conclusive. Excavation produced no diagnostic artefacts and, in structural terms, the excavator readily admitted that although "it does not look Norse....equally it is not entirely like the Pictish buildings on Site 6" (Gelling 1984,36). Nevertheless, the discovery of fragments of human skull, built into the walls of House 3, a building provisionally assigned to the period 850-1000, suggested to Gelling (1984,19-20) that a disturbed cemetery of the Pictish period may have lain closeby.

In view of the chronological arguments for the dating of the various buildings on Site 2 (Gelling 1984,36-39), it is questionable whether the evidence can really be taken this far. Nevertheless, one might feel oneself to be on slightly firmer ground than is the case with either the largely unpublished material from the Brough of Birsay or the bare account of the Burrian excavations. In any event, the idea that an Early Christian site may have been established to serve a nearby Pictish settlement, represented by Gelling's Site 6 and possibly Site 2 as well, remains an intriguing possibility. The site of the nearby parish church of St. Mary's may thus have a greater antiquity than is generally appreciated.

Jarlshof, Dunrossness, Shetland

One final excavated site with Late Iron Age and ecclesiastical associations remains to be considered. This is the multi-period settlement site at Jarlshof, whose small ecclesiastical assemblage has, perhaps not surprisingly, frequently been overlooked. It was mentioned in passing by

Wainwright (1962a,114) and more recently has been obliquely referred to by Lamb (1985,42), who has commented that "the lack of a chapel at Jarlshof is one of the most puzzling features of that site".

The ecclesiastical assemblage at Jarlshof is small and consists only of two or three pieces of worked stone. The first of these is a rectangular piece of slate, with sides approximately 70 mm long, on which has been incised a cross with expanded terminals and small S-scrolls on the arms (Hamilton 1956,pl.17a). Two other fragments (Hamilton 1956,pl.37) describe a representation of a coiled beast. These latter pieces bear no obvious Christian symbolism but nevertheless have been described as parts of "an ornate grave slab...of 10th or 11th century date" (Hamilton 1956,189).

The incised slate fragment was found on the threshold of the latest entrance in Field Hut 2. This entrance was subsequently blocked when a Viking period building, Structure 1D (Hamilton 1956,111,fig.53), was established over it. On stratigraphical grounds, there is thought to have been no great lapse of time between these two events since an occupation layer, producing Viking artefacts, was established immediately over the latest hearth in Field Hut 2 (Hamilton 1956,129). No trace of wind-blown sand, nor a dispersed hearth deposit was discovered, such as might have been expected had the building been left abandoned for some time.

The coiled beast fragments were discovered on the beach, below an eroded cliff section. Their actual find-spot, however,

is uncertain. In one section of the Jarlshof report it is implied that they were found to the W of the site complex; in the next paragraph, however, it is implied that they had originally been inserted into the mound over the broch settlement (Hamilton 1956,189) and thus they would have been located on the eroded S beach and not that to the W. In this context it may be noted that Hamilton (1956,189) actually refers to the discovery of a burial beneath the W gable wall of "medieval Jarlshof", presumably to be identified with the late 16th and early 17th century buildings on the site (see for example Hamilton 1956, 194-197). Furthermore, as Hamilton (1956,189,196) pointed out, the memory or tradition of a possible cemetery (?pre-Reformation) on the broch mound may have facilitated the acceptance of the mound as a convenient burial place in the 18th century when the abandoned courtyard was so used.

There can be no doubt that these are all disparate pieces of information which, on their own, would probably not amount to very much. Taken together, however, they may be significant and may suggest that the postulated chapel and cemetery lay or lies, not outside the excavation areas but rather within them, possibly beneath the post-medieval range. Presumably, however, such ecclesiastical remains as may have survived will have been greatly disturbed by the erection of those later buildings. Admittedly, this is all entirely speculative but the idea of a chapel, in an elevated location and in an association with a Late Iron Age settlement, is at least visually attractive, if not actually archaeologically demonstrable at the present time.

Comment

It will be apparent from the above review that the evidence, from excavation, for the postulated development of ecclesiastical sites from Late Iron Age domestic settlements is at best unproven and at worst entirely speculative or even unfounded. This, however, is the nature of the evidence and only future excavation will be able to satisfactorily refute or confirm this model. In the following three sections (Sections x-xii) the material from Orkney, Shetland and Man is examined within this context. In each case the association of ecclesiastical and Iron Age sites is one of proximity and nothing more. It is worth bearing in mind that the Iron Age sites may have been gifted by means of secular patronage or the chapels may have been established to serve a nearby community on the site. Survey, however, cannot be expected to differentiate between either model.

(x) The Association of Ecclesiastical and possible Late Iron Age sites in Orkney

A provisional list, for Orkney, of ecclesiastical sites which have been established at or near Iron Age settlement sites is presented in Table 26. Forty-four sites have been listed and this represents approximately 25% of all the known or suspected Orcadian chapel sites.

An attempt has been made to distinguish between `certain', `probable' and `possible' examples of this phenomenon. Other reviewers might consider this writer's distinction between `probable' and `possible' as too subjective. It must, however, simply be a matter of opinion. Thus, for example, the Brough of Deerness is included in Table 26 as a possible example of this

association simply on account of Low's (1774(1978),56) and Lamb's (1973a,204,245; 1980b,68,79) identification of the breastwork (Morris 1977a,fig.9) as possibly having originally formed part of an Iron Age promontory fort. The Knowe of Haewin, otherwise known as Howan broch (RCAMS 1946,ii,17,No.20), is also considered as a possible broch site with ecclesiastical associations on account of the traditional and place-name evidence (Clouston 1918a,95: Fraser 1923,32: Firth et al 1975,78-79). This survey, however, was unable to discern any physical evidence for a chapel at this site, unless a grass-covered rectangular hollow on the E side of the summit of the mound can be so identified. Nevertheless, the association remains a possibility.

Meanwhile, at other sites, not visited by this survey, the author has simply had to rely on earlier accounts. Some of these are agonizingly brief and enigmatic. For example, indeterminate structures, traditionally identified as chapels, have been reported at Sandsend on Shapinsay and at Cleat on Stronsay (RCAMS 1946,ii,279,No.796; 331,No.964: Lamb 1984,28,No.145). Meanwhile, a donation account by David Balfour (PSAS 4,1862,490) refers to the ruins of an unlocated chapel on Shapinsay, known as St. Salvador's chapel:

> "The site was an ancient burial ground, and immediately beside it was a congeries of underground chambers called `Picts Houses'".

This description, of course, could refer to almost any structure of any period or type.

The list of sites presented in Table 26 is not therefore a definitive list but rather a provisional one which future work will doubtless amend. It should be clear, nonetheless, that this writer´s use of the word `possible´ in this context covers a very broad category of sites. Some are almost certainly attributable to the Iron Age, but can only possibly be considered as ecclesiastical sites (for example the site on the Loch of Wasdale in Firth). Others are clearly ecclesiastical but then only possibly Iron Age (for example, the Brough of Deerness or Cross parish church on Sanday), whilst still others are only possibly ecclesiastical and possibly Iron Age (for example Karny Kirk or Lambaness on Sanday). These difficulties are caused by the varied nature of the evidence available upon which judgements have had to be made. Bibliographic details are appended to Table 26 and further reference should be made to these. Some individual sites are now briefly reviewed in some detail. For convenience, these spatially associated Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites, and these include certain as well as probable and possible examples, are examined with reference to their topographical setting and, where possible, a site from the Westray and Papay inventory (Volume 2) is put forward as a type or model.

(a) Lochside Promontory Sites:"St. Tredwell´s type" (WESTRAY 14)

A number of spatially coincident ecclesiastical and Iron Age sites are located on narrow peninsulas on the sides of lochs. The type-site for this arrangement is St. Tredwell´s chapel on Papa Westray (fig.17). A similar site is that of Marykirk (fig.18), at Grimeston in Harray, described by the RCAMS

(1946,ii,18,No.24;37,No.134) as a probable broch site with an overlying chapel. This site has not previously been surveyed. This site, like St. Tredwell's, also appears to have been a pilgrimage centre in the 16th century. It is described by `Jo.Ben' as:

> "magna Ecclesia dedicata Sanctae Mariae...de qua homines multa fabulantur. Hic multi confluunt ex diversis insulis"
>
> Mitchell & Clark 1908,309,320

The Marykirk chapel is represented by a large turf-covered rectangular structure measuring approximately 8 x 4 m within walls 1.40-1.60 m wide. There is now no trace of the chancel or apse reported by Fraser (1923,32), although there is a curious dog-legged line of masonry, now turf-covered, at the NE exterior angle of the chapel. Circumstantial evidence might suggest that the masonry was mortared since three lumps of a shelly lime mortar were recovered from a rabbit burrow on the S side of the chapel during a subsequent visit to the site in 1984. The building has been erected over an artificial mound, 32-40 m in diameter, and the promontory on which these sites stand, is delimited on the landward side by a single rampart, apparently of dumped earth construction.

The artificial mound has been interpreted as the site of a broch (Clouston 1918a,95: Fraser 1923,32: RCAMS 1946,ii,18,No.24) although the actual evidence for this attribution has not previously been set out. A plan reconstruction of this site is possible. There is a distinct gulley-like feature around and outside the W gable of the chapel. It is formed by an inner and

an outer bank (fig.18), the former of which is visible just outside the SW and NW exterior angles of the chapel. The outer bank is well represented to the W and NW of the chapel, and its inner face, as well as the outer face of the inner bank, may be represented in the hollow feature to the N of the chapel. These features display a regularity of form and would not seem to have been simply due to random quarrying activity. These features appear to have a curvilinear disposition and they might tentatively be identified as the inner and outer walls of a ground-galleried broch. A plan reconstruction of such a structure, done as an overlay on the physical remains shown in fig.18, is presented in fig.19. Each wall thickness, thus reconstructed, is approximately 2.50 m and the broch interior, thus defined, is approximately 9.50 m in diameter. As a parallel, the average wall thickness at Midhowe broch on Rousay is about 2.20 m and the interior diameter 9.75 m (RCAMS 1946,ii,193-200,No.553,fig.273). The proposed dimensions for the Marykirk broch are also compatible, given the method of reconstruction, with Fojut's (1981b,fig.1) summary and analysis of Shetland broch dimensions.

The identification of these features does not, however, necessarily aid their interpretation. One possibility, however, is that the outer broch wall may have served or been reutilized as an ecclesiastical enclosure. The area enclosed by the bank to the W of the chapel and its possible continuation in the area of the settlement mound to the E would be of the order of 0.07 ha.

The St. Tredwell's or Marykirk type of site has also been noted in four or five other cases; at Kirk of Cletton in Harray,

at Wasdale in Firth, possibly the site known as Ness or Voy in Sandwick and the Brettaness and Burrian sites at the Loch of Wasbister on Rousay.

The indeterminate remains at Kirk of Cletton, a promontory on the E side of Loch Harray, have been identified as a possible broch (RCAMS 1946,ii,18,No.23), whilst on the landward side of the mound a roughly rectangular area, 11 m EW and 5.50 m NS, marked by protruding stones, may indicate the site of the chapel. The site at the Loch of Wasdale (pl.48a), on the other hand, though clearly of artificial construction and recent modification, is a far more enigmatic site. There is no trace of a chapel at this site, although presumably if once present it will have been robbed to build the wall pens now evident on the S flank of the mound. A broch or related structure is only indicated by the sheer magnitude of the extant remains which now lie under the turf. Meanwhile, at The Ness, on the N shore of Loch Stenness, there is good traditional evidence for the chapel and its associated burial ground is reported to have been contained within a circular enclosure (ONB 17,1880,193). An Iron Age component to the site, however, is more debatable but may be represented by the artificial mound still evident at the site and by analogy to the St. Tredwell's or Marykirk model.

The two remaining St. Tredwell's type sites are both located on the Loch of Wasbister on Rousay. Hugh Marwick (1924a,19) first drew attention to these sites, together with that of a third, the site of Cross Kirk, now marked by a modern graveyard which lies on the W shore of the same loch. The Burrian site,

first recorded by Low (1778(1915),5) in the 18th century, has been classified, on the basis of the toponymic and topographic evidence as a possible broch or ring-fort (RCAMS 1946,ii,227,No.599: Lamb 1982,22,No.69). The site is located on a substantially artificial islet within the loch and is approached from the NW by a now submerged, dog-legged causeway. The site has been used as a garden plot in recent times and is now heavily overgrown. No trace, however, remains of any structure which could be identified as a chapel. Interestingly, however, Marwick (1924a,19) has recorded a possible dedication to St. Peter for the Burrian chapel and there is a 19th century reference to the discovery of coins on the site (ONB 16,1880,42). This discovery could be accommodated within a context of the post-medieval veneration of early ecclesiastical sites. The site on Burrian might therefore be considered as an Iron Age site with a later ecclesiastical association.

The Brettaness peninsula is located on the E shore of Wasbister Loch and, like Burrian, would seem to have been largely of artificial construction. The place-name has been interpreted by Marwick (1924a,19) as a possible dedication to St. Brittiva, Bridget or Bride. Meanwhile, recent excavations on the site (Marwick 1984b) have identified structures and artefacts of Late Iron Age type. A single wall-footing, aligned EW and located on the landward side of the settlement mound, was found in association with a lime mortared spread and has been provisionally identified as an ecclesiastical structure, perhaps of 12th century or later date (pers.comm R.G.Lamb). A 19th century reference, meanwhile, appears to record the chapel's

destruction and the subsequent dispersal of its stone around the margins of the peninsula (ONB 16,1880,40).

(b) Coastal Promontory Sites: "Peterkirk type" (WESTRAY 10)

A few spatially coincidental Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites are also located on coastal promontories. This type of setting has been extensively explored by Lamb (1973a; 1973b) in his analyses of putative pre-Norse and Norse monastic sites. Indeed, the chapel site on the Brough of Deerness could be interpreted in such a context (Lamb 1973b,93-94: cf. Morris 1977a,70). Other than the Deerness site, only three of the Orcadian sites with possible Iron Age horizons can be considered in this context. One is the Broch of Burrian on North Ronaldsay (pp.292-294). Another is the Peterkirk site on Westray (Volume 2) and the other is on the Colliness peninsula on Sanday. A 19th century account of this site describes the discovery of a chapel (NSA 1842,xv,140-142). It measured 3.65 x 2.45 m (presumably internal dimensions) and nearby was discovered a number of cist graves, in which were found a gold ring and a cross-marked stone (p.169). The chapel is reported to have been established over the site of a broch (RCAMS 1946,ii,170,No.458, 172,No.473), although modern alterations have made certain identification difficult (Lamb 1980a,26,No.173).

(c) Coastal Sites,Non-Promontory:"St. Boniface type" (WESTRAY 11)

A large number (Table 26) of spatially coincidental Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites are located along the coastal margins, although this is hardly surprising, given the frequency with which such a setting could be adopted, independently, by the

builders of both brochs and chapels (Morris 1985,fig.10.6: RCAMS 1946,i,figs.11 & 12: Hedges 1987,iii,fig.3.1). Of the sites discussed in the gazetteer, the St. Boniface church and Munkerhoose complex, on Papa Westray, are perhaps the best example of this phenomenon.

The site of St. Peter's church, the old parish church of Stromness, abandoned in the late 17th or early 18th century (OSA 1799 (1978),255), is very similar in setting and scale to the St. Boniface example. The name `Munkerhoose' has also traditionally been applied to this site (OSA 1799 (1978),262). This name originally referred to the area immediately adjacent to the cemetery on the W, an area which now lies within the graveyard extension.

The Stromness cemetery stands above an eroded shoreline, in the face of which are visible the extensive remains of a broch and its associated outbuildings. These were first identified by Laing (1868,60-61) and have recently formed the subject of a survey by Bell and Carter (1980). In the cemetery there are the remains of two drystone walls, possibly the gable walls of two chapels of uncertain date (RCAMS 1946,ii,321,No.916). Both have been incorporated into funerary monuments of the 18th and 19th centuries. Few finds are known from the site. It should be noted, however, that a gilded bronze mount and the terminal portion of a penannular brooch of St. Ninian's Isle type (Wilson 1973,89) were discovered at St. Peter's in c.1889 and 1868 X 1887 respectively (PSAS 26,1892,86: Cursiter 1887,346,fig.6).

Two types of grave structure have been reported from this site. One type, reported to Laing (1868,61) by the then

gravedigger, can be identified as a long cist or lintel grave, the structure being formed by a series of edge-set stones and covered over by one or more flagstones. It can be inferred from Laing's description that graves of this type were known from the area to the W of the 19th century graveyard, on the site of Munkerhoose, also known as The Monker Green. The same account seems also to imply that these graves were cut into midden material. A second type of grave structure was found overlying the remains of a circular wall which was exposed in the cliff section. It was distinguished by being formed "not of flags set on edge, but...of rudely squared stones" (Laing 1868,61). It was described as "apparently medieval". The lintel graves, on the other hand, were judged to be contemporary with an occupation of the broch, although that conclusion was based only on Laing's observation of the relative levels involved. The relationship of these different grave types, however, is essentially unknown, given that the land surface falls away to the W in the area formerly known as The Monker Green, where the lintel graves appear to have been discovered. The available evidence is thus tantalizingly brief. Certainly the lintel graves, the gilded metalwork and the traditional place-name evidence are all suggestive of an early ecclesiastical site. However, the issue as to whether or not Iron Age occupation at this site could have continued sufficiently long enough to enter a Christian context must remain an open question.

The physical remains at Peterkirk (fig.21), in the Costa district of Evie, are less impressive than those at either

St. Boniface or St. Peter's, Stromness. Nevertheless, the fact that this chapel was not raised to parochial status has, perhaps, had the effect of retaining more of the site's original appearance.

The chapel is of nave and chancel type and is situated on the highest point of an artificial mound. The mound is up to 75 m in diameter, including a centrally elevated portion which is some 30 m across. Drystone structures are partially visible in the exposed, but largely grass-covered, cliff section which lies immediately N of the chapel. This survey's discovery of fragments of coarse Iron Age type pottery on the beach below may support Clouston's (1918a,103) identification of this underlying structure as a broch. The setting and scale of the site are certainly suggestive of such an interpretation.

The nave of the chapel is largely masked by later rebuilding. It measures approximately 6.50 m along its longer axis and 5.10 m transversely within walls up to 1 wide. There are traces of an entrance towards the W end of the S wall, whilst the chancel entrance, 1.50 m wide but now blocked (pl.45b), is situated in the centre of the E wall. The chancel is now marked by two lines of turf-covered walling which enclose an area with sides roughly 4.70 m long overall.

On the E fringe of the settlement mound there are half a dozen or so single or multiple stone settings (fig.21; pl.45a). These may be tentatively identified as grave-markers, although none is inscribed. In any event, there are records of the exposure of skeletons in the adjacent cliff section (Fraser 1929,43). To the E of the stone settings and visible in the

exposed cliff section, there are the remains of a drystone wall. Identification of this feature is difficult, given that its relationship to the structural features in the cliff section to the W, is not easily demonstrable. Nevertheless, it would appear to be stratigraphically high and Dr. Lamb's (OR 650) provisional identification of this wall as part of an ecclesiastical enclosure seems feasible.

On the W fringe of the settlement mound there is a turf-covered mound, 0.60 m high and oval-shaped on plan with axes 6.50 m and 9 m long. This feature has been described as a cairn (OSCI HY32NW16) and may be identical with a mound described by Fraser (1929,45) as "the priest's house". Excavations on the summit of the mound have revealed the line of a concave interior wall-face which may represent the remains of a domestic structure. Further discussion of its date or function is not possible. Meanwhile, to the S of the chapel and adjacent to the drystone wall which surrounds the site, there are the remains of a modern agricultural building (sheep shelter ?). Immediately NW of this building, there are the turf-covered remains of an angular structure of indeterminate age and function.

Other non-promontory located coastal sites are listed in Table 26.

(d) Inland and Lochside Sites (Non-promontory)

Few chapel sites are located in a truly inland setting (Morris 1985,fig.10.6). The same is also true of the brochs (RCAMS 1946,i,fig.11: Hedges 1987,iii,fig.3.1) and thus it should not be surprising that there are few examples of spatially

coincident Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites in such locations. Indeed, where this does occur, it is as likely as not to be close to the side of a loch. Two examples, the sites at Lyking in Sandwick and Houseby in Birsay, are now considered. Others are listed in Table 26. None of the Westray or Papa Westray gazetteer sites with possible Iron Age associations falls within this category.

The chapel site at Lyking has not previously been surveyed and previous accounts of it have been brief. The site was first recorded by the officers of the Ordnance Survey as "the supposed site of an ancient chapel and burying place" (ONB 17,1880,177). A few years later Clouston described the chapel as a rectilinear structure "about 20 feet by 10 or 12" (1918a,100: 6.10 x 3.05-3.65 m). The site was included by Fraser in his list of the antiquities of Sandwick parish but was not visited, owing to the presence of a bull in the field: "discretion postponed the visit to another time" (1924,27). The RCAMS (1946,ii,271,No.738) entry is similarly blank. In 1966 Lyking was visited by the OS investigator, whose report defined the line of the chapel enclosure, within which was traced a building. The building was described as of sub-oval form and is said to have measured 10 m EW and 5 m NS (OSCI HY21NE10).

The Lyking chapel site is located about 100 m from the N shore of the Loch of Stenness. The line of the chapel enclosure (fig.20; pl.47a) is marked by a low turf-covered bank for much of its course. The W sector is just traceable in an area of rough ground left by the plough in an adjacent field, whilst the E sector appears to be physically undistinguished and marked only

by the line of a slight scarp down to the Burn of Lyking below. The enclosure thus defined is of a subrectangular form and measures approximately 35 m EW and 15-18 m NS. Near the centre of the enclosure are the turf-covered remains of a small, almost square-shaped, structure. It is aligned EW and measures roughly 6 x 5 m overall and is well defined internally, particularly in its W sector where stonework can be traced under the turf. The orientation of this structure and the general disposition of features at this site, together with the traditional evidence for a chapel at the site, would enable the identification of these remains in ecclesiastical terms.

The Broch of Lyking, also known as Stackrue broch (RCAMS 1946,ii,251-252,No.677), is located closeby, some 75 m N of the chapel site. It has been much destroyed by the line of the modern road, although sufficient survives to identify the broch itself and the remains of an enclosure rampart to the S and E. Part of the rampart, in the adjacent ploughed field to the W of the fence-line (fig.20), is now reduced to a low rise. Sherds of Iron Age type pottery and fragments of burnt and unburnt animal bone were recovered from the ploughsoil, within the line of the rampart to the N. In the uncultivated pasture field to the E, and also within the line of the rampart, there are a series of amorphous turf-covered features and protrusive stones (not surveyed). These might reasonably be related to structures of an extra-mural broch settlement. A pronounced break in the line of the SE sector of the rampart could represent an entrance into the settlement.

At Lyking, the ecclesiastical and Iron Age components of the site are situated next to oneanother. At Houseby, however, it seems likely that an ecclesiastical site has been superimposed over earlier features.

The Houseby chapel site is located to the S of the deserted farmstead and close to the E, not W (RCAMS 1946,ii,37,No.131), shore of the Loch of Sabiston and near to the mouth of the Burn of Beaquoy. The name Kirkgreen has been recorded for this site (Marwick 1970,93) and the artificial mound, to which this name refers, has been described as "prehistoric....perhaps the site of an ancient broch" (Marwick 1931,25).

The Kirkgreen mound is of suboval form with a circumference of approximately 100 m and a diameter of roughly 30 m. It stands up to 1 m above the level of the surrounding field and occupies an area, identified by Fraser (1925,25) as a burial ground, of about 0.07 ha. The mound (fig.22) is bisected by a modern tractor track and would seem to have been quarried in the past for its stone if several turf-covered pits in the NW and SE sectors of the mound can be so interpreted. In the NE sector of the mound there are the turf-covered remains of a subrectangular structure, aligned EW. A wall-face is visible at the E end of the S wall and around the SE exterior angle. Elsewhere the wall-lines are well distinguished, both internally and externally. This structure has not previously been noted. Its orientation and size, together with the place-name and traditional evidence would suggest that this is the Houseby chapel (pl.49b). There are indefinite traces of a second possible building or buildings to the SW of the chapel, although the extant remains form no

coherent plan. Marwick's identification of the site as a possible broch, meanwhile, may be indicated by the size and substantial nature of the mound. Confirmation, however, cannot be made without excavation.

(xi) Associated Ecclesiastical and possible Late Iron Age sites in Shetland

A provisional list, for Shetland, of ecclesiastical sites which have been established at or near Iron Age settlement sites is presented in Table 27. Only nine sites which might be so considered have been traced by this fieldwork or documentary research and of these only three can be considered as certain examples. As the Shetland corpus is so small, it is proposed to discuss these three sites first and then introduce the remaining six.

(a) Association Certain

Housabister, Nesting & Burravoe, Yell

St. Olaf's church, the parish church of Nesting, stands just N of the broch at Housabister and is reported to have been built entirely from the stones of that structure (RCAMS 1946,iii,78,No.1282). The chapel at Burravoe on Yell, meanwhile, is reliably reported to have been built on the site of the broch which stood on the N side of the voe and close to the shore (RCAMS 1946,iii,166,No.1737). Neither site, however, is personally known to this writer. Ecclesiastical and Iron Age remains, however, are well preserved at the church at Cullingsburgh, also known as Culbinsbrough or Culbinsgarth, on the island of Bressay.

St. Mary's church, Culbinsbrough, Bressay (HU 5210 4230)

This church was first surveyed by Dryden in 1855 (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,157-159) and described as cruciform. No trace of the S transept now survives, although a break in the foundations of the S wall at a point 1.65 m from the E end may mark the site of a return. The drystone walling to the W of this break has been crudely rebuilt and incorporates within its matrix part of a modern (19th century ?) tombstone bearing an inscription ***SUNT in Roman capitals. In its present form therefore the church consists of a nave, chancel and N transept (fig.39; pl.63a) and is essentially the same as when Muir (1885,134) visited the site in the latter half of the 19th century.

The main body of the building measures 12.35 x 4.90 m over walls 0.70-0.90 m thick. The N transept, in its present form, measures 2.80-3.60 m NS and 3.80 m EW over walls 0.60 m thick. Much of this building has been substantially rebuilt in drystone, although there are traces of an earlier foundation beneath most of the walls. In the chancel walls, at least, there is some evidence that these have been pointed with a shell mortar.

There is little that can be said definitively with regard to the structural development of this building and previous surveys by Dryden (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,157-159) and the RCAMS (1946,iii,1,No.1083) have remarked only upon the drystone rebuild of an originally cruciform church. This present survey, however, was able to note some indications of a butt joint between the foundation of the nave wall and that of the N transept at its

exterior SW corner. This might suggest that the earlier church was a small oblong to which the transepts and chancel were subsequently added, or that the building was originally a long oblong into which N and S transepts were inserted. In either event, the cruciform plan would appear to be a relatively late feature. Indeed, Dr. Cant (1975,45) has suggested that much of the structure may be work of the 17th century, following Sibbald's (1711,60) remark that it was "inlarged (sic) by the late minister", whom Cant identifies with William Umphray (1639-1668). However, one possible problem with this extremely late chronology concerns the two early 17th century tombstones, dating to 1628 and 1635 (RCAMS 1946,iii,1-2), which are located at the W end of the nave and which appear to be <u>in situ</u>. If this is so, then these two graves, one of which belongs to Claes Jansen Brugh, a captain in the Dutch East India Company, may serve as a <u>terminus ante quem</u> for the building of the cruciform church, since it is barely conceivable that such a building would have been erected after it had been used as a burial place. If this argument can be maintained, then the cruciform church must presumably be pushed back to the 16th century at the latest and its proposed predecessor, therefore, could be loosely considered as medieval. This suggestion, however, transforms Sibbald's statement regarding the enlargement of "St. Maries" into something of an enigma. It can only be suggested, therefore, that perhaps the term "St. Maries" was used in the extended sense of referring to the graveyard, not the church building.

St. Mary's church is located below the SE margins of a substantial turf-covered stony mound. The mound is 17-20 m in

diameter and stands 3.50-4 m high. The present graveyard wall rides up over this feature (pl.62b). The mound has been described as a probable broch (RCAMS 1946,iii,4,No.1086). Meanwhile, the most recent survey by Fojut (1980; 1985,81) has succeeded in identifying a set of ramparts and subsidiary buildings around the mound and has proposed its positive identification as a broch.

The present graveyard at Culbinsbrough is a large walled rectangular enclosure, with sides approximately 35 m long. However, examination of the 1878 OS 1:10560 map (Sheet LIII) shows the E sector of the graveyard to have formerly been of a curvilinear form. Indeed, traces of this earlier enclosure line are still evident on the ground. It is set 2-4 m from the E wall of the church and can be traced over a distance of approximately 25 m (fig.39; pl.63b). It is shown to particularly good effect from the air (Fojut 1986,pl.8). The date of this feature is unknown. Nevertheless, it is interesting to reflect upon the frequency with which curvilinear enclosure forms in the Northern Isles are found in association with spatially coincident ecclesiastical and Iron Age sites. Professor Thomas' (1971a: see above pp.54,154-155) ideas regarding the antiquity of curvilinear enclosure forms might lead one to propose St. Mary's as an early and possibly pre-Norse site. Alternatively, of course, the curvilinear bank could be interpreted as part of the original Iron Age outworks which was subsequently reused as an ecclesiastical feature. Certainly one or other of these possible interpretations would seem to have been accepted by Fojut

(1986,pl.8 text).

The idea that the association of these features (broch, chapel and curvilinear enclosure) may be significant and perhaps indicative of an early date must necessarily remain speculative. There is, however, one further piece of evidence which may support this view. This is the so-called Bressay stone (RMS.IB109), which is said to have been found near St. Mary's church sometime before 1852 (Allen 1903,6) and which has been considered, on stylistic grounds, to be a copy of the Papil stone (RMS.IB46: Stevenson 1981). The stone displays a number of sculptured motifs, including two hooded ecclesiastical figures with croziers and book satchels. It has been described by many authorities (Allen 1903,5-10: RCAMS 1946,iii,2-3,No.1084: Stevenson 1981: Close-Brooks & Stevenson 1982) and repetition is therefore unnecessary. The stone also contains an inscription, in ogam, along its sides. This has been most recently transliterated in Close-Brooks & Stevenson (1982,35), after Allen (1903,8) as:

CRROSCC : NAHHTVVDDADDS : DATTRR : ANN
BENNISES : MEQQDDRROANN

Many authorities have commented upon the mixed linguistic nature of this inscription, containing as it does both Gaelic (mac) and Scandinavian (dattaer) words, as well as a punctuation system more commonly found in Norse runic inscriptions (Jackson 1955,140: Gordon 1978,338: Allen 1903,9). The stone is thought by Stevenson (1981,284), therefore, to have been "erected by a Christian Pict, or half Pict, in Norse times".

The combined evidence of the physical remains at the site and the Bressay stone itself cannot irrefutably prove that the ecclesiastical site developed out of a Late Iron Age domestic settlement. The evidence provides too insubstantial a base for such an argument but nevertheless these factors may suggest that such a process may have been possible. There are, of course, many variables to be considered. The broch itself is undated and we can only postulate, with Hedges (1985,171), that broch occupation continuing up to the 8th century and beyond may have been the norm. The Bressay stone, meanwhile, is presumably good evidence, if Stevenson's dating is correct, for a 10th century ecclesiastical site at Culbinsbrough and one might be tempted to bridge the gap between these notional dates and argue in favour of a continuity of settlement. Such temptations, however, should be avoided and it can but be suggested that the possibility of such a sequence be tested should the site ever become available for excavation.

(b) Association Possible

The remaining six Shetland sites (Table 27) can only be considered as possible examples of ecclesiastical sites with Iron Age associations.

Chapel Knowe, Lunna, Nesting (HU 4853 6914)

The site of Chapel Knowe is located on a natural prominence, immediately NW of St. Margaret's church at the isthmus between East and West Lunna voes. The earliest reference to the site is contained in Edmonston's (1809,124) account of the discovery there of "ornamental sculpture". Hibbert (1822,294) also refers to this or another discovery and describes the pieces as

"architectural carvings executed in a soft magnesian stone of steatitic kind, named Kleber". Their whereabouts, however, is not now known. In addition to these pieces, T.S Muir has also described the discovery at different times of a crucible, a quern and a quantity of animal faunal remains (1885,173). More recently, the RCAMS (1946,iii,78,No.1280) account mentions the finding of several sherds of Early Iron Age pottery and a steatite whorl. Further sherds of a coarse hand-made pottery of Iron Age type were also discovered by the present survey in 1985.

The site on Chapel Knowe is generally supposed to have been the site of a monastery. This tradition was recorded in both 1878 by the officers of the Ordnance Survey (ONB 3,1878,143) and in 1885 by Muir (1885,173). This identification, however, is difficult, given the extant remains (see below), and indeed has been considered doubtful by MacDonald and Laing (1968,128).

The earliest description of Chapel Knowe is contained in Muir´s accounts of 1863 and 1885. The chapel is described as a small unicameral building

> "some twenty-eight feet (8.50 m) in length... ...[and]..erected on ground more anciently occupied, as there are the remains of a burgh quite close to its south side"
>
> T.S. Muir 1885,173

The discovery nearby of `rectangular cells´ is also reported in the same source (Muir 1885,173).

The most comprehensive account of the site is contained in the RCAMS (1946,iii,77-78,No.1280) inventory. There is a particularly interesting account of the site enclosure. It is described as of curvilinear form, measuring approximately 21 m NS

and 18.30 m EW within a substantial earth and stone rampart, partially reduced but still standing up to 0.90 m high and 1.80 m broad. The area enclosed is approximately 0.03 ha. The enclosure is said, furthermore, to have been divided into two almost equal parts by a wall which extended along the line of an outcrop of rock NS across the site. The chapel is reported to have been located on the W side of this wall where the ground surface was elevated above that to the E. The E half of the enclosure was believed to have been deliberately lowered. A second, long, rectangular structure (12.20 x 3.05 m) was also reported outside the enclosure.

The most recent published account of the site, together with the only published plan of Chapel Knowe, is that of MacDonald and Laing (1968,127-128). Their account is basically the same as that of the RCAMS although, aside from some notable differences with regard to the dimensions of certain features, they were unable to positively identify either the NS dividing wall or that the E half of the enclosure had been deliberately lowered. Both these features were considered to be probably natural (MacDonald & Laing 1968,128). The long rectangular structure which lay outside the S sector of the enclosure was also noted by MacDonald and Laing, as well as "possibly other structures within and on the perimeter of the enclosure" (1968,127). These latter, however, were considered to be probably natural features.

Chapel Knowe was visited briefly on two occasions by the present survey in 1982 and 1985. It is, as MacDonald and Laing rightly remarked "a very difficult site to assess" (1968,127).

The enclosure and chapel (pl.64), however, are clearly defined and the turf-covered remains of the latter are evident within the NW sector of the site enclosure. A series of protruding stones serve to define a building 8.50-8.60 x 3.90 m over walls 0.70 m thick. These have been faced internally and externally, with the interstices packed with small stones and earth. An entrance, 0.80 m wide, is located S of centre in the W wall. The long rectangular building is also clearly evident on the ground. On the whole, therefore, this writer would concur with MacDonald and Laing´s basic description of the site and would agree with their reluctance to follow fully the earlier RCAMS account. Nevertheless, it is clear that several features have either been overlooked or previously been considered as natural phenomena. Many of the numerous mounds on the site, for example, although possibly founded on natural outcrops, are clearly not of a totally natural formation. Extensive rabbit disturbance in these mounds has thrown out sherds of coarse pottery and fragments of burnt stone and other material. The turf-covered footings of a further structure, with sides approximately 3 m long, are also clearly evident at the site and could perhaps be identified as one of Muir´s "rectangular cells". There is, however, as MacDonald and Laing (1968,128) remarked, no trace of Muir´s `burgh´, the feature located S of the chapel being almost certainly a mound of natural formation. Nevertheless, Iron Age activity on the site would seem to be indicated by the small pottery assemblage.

A re-survey of Chapel Knowe is planned by this writer for 1988. In the meantime, however, it should be clear that the site

is more complex than has been previously allowed. As at Culbinsbrough, it is possible that an ecclesiastical site has been established at an earlier domestic settlement. Whether the two were ever actually contemporary, with the chapel serving a recently converted secular population, cannot of course yet be determined. We can, however, point to their apparent spatial coincidence and raise that possibility.

Hillswick, Northmavine (HU 2811 7700)

A second possible site with an Iron Age and ecclesiastical association can be found at Hillswick, on the site of the present-day cemetery. The cemetery is contained within a stone wall and is curvilinear on plan. It measures approximately 47 m along its longer, EW, axis and 36 m transversely and thus encloses an area of approximately 0.12 ha. The site is surrounded by marshy ground on all sides but is entered from the E along a made up embankment. The ground within the enclosure is elevated approximately 1 m above this marshy ground.

A traditional account has recorded that the Hillswick cemetery was established on the site of a broch, the stones of which are said to have been found from time to time during gravedigging (ONB 17,1878,182). Interestingly, the same source describes the marshy ground around the site as a small loch and goes on to define it in more detail as a `moat' to the broch. The specific location of this site thus strongly recalls the island dun type of site (see for example St. Tredwell's chapel on Papa Westray) and the crannog (Morrison 1985,ch.2).

The most recent surveys of the site have discounted its identification as the site of a broch (RCAMS 1946,iii,99,No.1388: OSCI HU27NE13). Nor is it included in Fojut's (1985,81-82) list of Shetland broch sites. Nevertheless, the discovery in the last quarter of the 19th century of a nearby midden, producing Iron Age pottery and other material (Coughtry 1872: Fojut 1985,75,83), may be significant.

The association of an Iron Age and ecclesiastical site at Hillswick may be tenuous. Nevertheless, the finds and this survey's re-appraisal of the site's location could reopen the question of there being an Iron Age domestic settlement of some kind beneath or in the vicinity of the Hillswick cemetery.

Orbister, Northmavine

The possible chapel site at Orbister is not listed in either the RCAMS (1946,iii) inventory or in Dr. Cant's (1975) list of Shetland chapel sites. The site, however, is referred to in passing by Calder (1963,80) in his discussion of Shetland burnt mounds and a local report, recorded in 1969, has also been noted by the Ordnance Survey (OSCI HU37NW6). Unfortunately, the present writer has no first-hand knowledge of the site.

The NGR corresponds with a small curvilinear enclosure, approximately 25 m in diameter (0.05 ha), which is located at the S end of a field known as Benigarth (ON.boen-gardr: `prayer-enclosure'). The site is described only as "disturbed stony ground" (OSCI HU37NW6). Meanwhile, an entry in PSAS (93,1960,253) recounts the donation of sherds of Iron Age pottery from both the churchyard (sic) and Benigarth.

A broch site has also been recorded at Orbister (RCAMS 1946,iii,98,No.1385). It is believed to have stood below Benigarth and to have been destroyed by coastal erosion. However, this site has been discounted by Fojut in his list of Shetland brochs and is said to show "no convincing remains of any period other than modern" (1985,84).

The evidence for either an ecclesiastical or an Iron Age site at Orbister is thus extremely tenuous and rests only on a place-name, an enclosure form of unknown age and a handful of pottery sherds. However, this evidence seems worthy of mention and thus has been included here as a possible example of the association of Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites.

St. Ninian's chapel, Papil, Yell (HP 5426 0407)

The ecclesiastical site and midden, exposed above the beach at Papil, are both briefly mentioned in the RCAMS inventory (1946,iii,166,Nos.1732 & 1734). The only published plan of the site, together with a detailed description, is to be found in MacDonald and Laing's survey of early ecclesiastical sites in Scotland (1968,127). The site therein illustrated is a curious one and depicts a triangular enclosure with sides 5.80 m, 10.65 m and 18.30 m long, with a small NS aligned building set in its NW corner. The dimensions of the building are given as 8.55 x 5.20 m. The published account of the site (MacDonald & Laing 1968,127) would appear to identify these remains as ecclesiastical. However, in an unpublished account, MacDonald (OSCI HP50SW4) admits that the remains "could be anything".

The site was visited by this present survey in 1982. The triangular enclosure and building are as described above. However, the most notable feature on the site, when viewed from the beach, is the eroded cliff section. This is exposed over a distance of about 30 m. At the SW end, near to MacDonald and Laing´s triangular enclosure, there is a well defined exposure 5.30 m long (pl.65a). The base of the section is composed of midden material, rich in Iron Age type pottery sherds, fish, bird and mammal bone, and shells, predominantly limpets but including also some winkles and mussels. This midden layer is at least 0.80 m thick and is overlain by 1.20 m of clean sand which in turn lies below the modern turf-line, 0.15 m thick. A similar sequence can be observed at the NE end of the exposed section. The base is again composed of a similar midden material. This is overlain by a 0.45 m thick deposit of clean sand, which in turn is covered by a 0.10 m thick layer of dark sand. Above this lay a structure of some kind, the wall or walls of which, 0.55 m high, are clearly visible in section (pl.65b). Perhaps significantly, the walls are mortared with a shelly lime mortar mix. This stonework can be traced over a distance of 3.60 m and is covered by a 0.30 m thick layer of turf and topsoil.

Marine erosion at Papil has been severe. The writer was informed that 3-4 m have disappeared since 1958 (pers.comm D.Nesbit). The same informant had also, from time to time, seen human skeletons in the cliff section and on the beach below in the area towards the NE end of the exposure. None was seen by the writer, nor could any indications of grave-cuts be traced in the section. Such a search was made particularly difficult,

however, as grasses have re-established themselves over much of the central section of the 30 m exposure. A 19th century reference to the discovery of great quantities of human remains at the site (ONB 19,1878,51), however, would suggest that the site has been eroding for at least the last 100 years and much of the cemetery may have already gone.

The place- and dedication-names, together with the skeletal remains, are presumably good evidence that an ecclesiastical site existed somewhere near the present day shoreline. The writer, however, is reluctant to accept the site posited by MacDonald and Laing. That building's orientation and its enclosure form seem too anomalous. Similarly, the size of the building does not really square with a 19th century account which records that "traditionally a chapel of considerable dimensions stood here" (ONB 19,1878,51). It might be inferred that a building, which was noted for its size, would have been mortared and for these various reasons, therefore, this survey is inclined to postulate that St. Ninian's chapel may possibly be identified with the mortared remains which are visible at the NE end of the exposed cliff section.

In view of what has been said about the use of mortared masonry in the islands (p.126), the postulated chapel at Papil would therefore be assigned to a period not earlier than the 12th century. It may not, of course, have been the first chapel on the site and in this context perhaps MacDonald and Laing's site might be reconsidered. It is difficult, however, to associate either site with the underlying, possibly Iron Age,

midden since both are stratigraphically divorced by a substantial deposit of wind- or sea-borne sand. In this case, therefore, the spatial correlation of Iron Age and ecclesiastical sites might be considered entirely fortuitous. Nevertheless, this entry is retained for future consideration.

Kirkaby, Unst (HP 5664 0640)

The chapel at Kirkaby and its curvilinear enclosure have been fully considered in the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2: UNST 14). The reason for its inclusion in this section lies with Dryden's reference to the "ruins of a brough or other ancient building" (MacGibbon & Ross 1896,147) on the site. The dilemma posed by Dryden has been set out elsewhere (Volume 2) and a solution offered. The structure(s) which underlies the chapel at Kirkaby is essentially indeterminate and undated and thus this site can only be considered as a possible example of an associated Iron Age and ecclesiastical site.

St. John's church, Norwick, Unst (HP 6516 1411)

Like Kirkaby, this site has also been fully considered in the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2: UNST 1). The church is believed to have been built on the site of a broch (RCAMS 1946,iii,126,No.1536) and a circular wall at the site, possibly the line of an earlier enclosure, has also been recorded (Saxby 1905,135). The same source also notes the discovery of occupation debris in the graveyard. The inclusion of St. John's in this present section, however, rests only on those earlier records. The association of an Iron Age and an ecclesiastical site here is problematical.

(xii) Associated Ecclesiastical and possible Late Iron Age sites on the Isle of Man

Few of the Manx keeill sites appear to have been located at former domestic settlements. Instead, as has been shown above (pp.219-222,249-251), some preference for a peripheral siting in the boundary zone would appear to have been exercised. Such locations have also sometimes been spatially associated with possible pre-Christian burial grounds. There are thus few sites to be considered under the present heading.

Keeill Vael, Balladoole, Arbory (SC 2463 6816)

The prime Manx example of a spatially associated Iron Age and ecclesiastical site is probably to be found at Balladoole in Arbory. It has already been considered above (pp.256-257) in connexion with the discovery of prehistoric cist burials on the site. These, however, were sealed by an occupation layer which the excavator assigned to an Iron Age horizon (Bersu & Bruce 1972,647). The hill-top enclosure, three hearths and several dozen post-holes were also assigned, on stratigraphical grounds, to the same chronological horizon. Unfortunately, no coherent ground-plan could be recognized for any of the settlement's buildings. Nonetheless, the excavator was of the opinion that:

> "the entire area...within the ramparts was fairly heavily populated for a long time; no break of stratification or succession of `floors' was noted, so that the occupation must have been practically continuous"
>
> Bersu & Bruce 1972,655

At some time in the Early Christian, pre-Norse, period, at least part of the enclosure was utilized as a lintel grave cemetery. This cemetery was still in use around the period 850 X 900

(Bersu & Wilson 1966,87) when a Viking boat burial was inserted over the lintel graves. This was indicated by the fact that certain of the skeletal remains, although disturbed, had nonetheless been moved whilst still in an articulated condition. As Bersu and Wilson (1966,12) have rightly commented, "clearly...little time can have elapsed between these interments and the erection of the Viking mound". However, the age of the cemetery remains uncertain. This study's provisional identification of a specially-marked grave on the site (p.162) might, on Thomas' model, suggest an early date for the cemetery's inception. Whether or not secular occupation on the site continued down to the Christian period, however, will only be discovered through future excavation.

Ronaldsway II (Airport site), Malew (SC 290 686)

Ronaldsway II, like Balladoole, is a multi-period settlement site with Iron Age and early medieval occupation. The excavations of the 1930's have been summarized above (pp.97-99) and this study's re-examination of the published material has proposed the identification of two anomalous structures on the site as possible leachta (pp.165-168). Further work by LLoyd Laing, meanwhile, has argued that his Phase II round-houses, together with part of the rectangular structure in the NW sector of the site, extend chronologically into but not beyond the 6th century (RESCUE conference, Peel: June 1986). This judgement has been based on a re-analysis of the artefact assemblage. Two composite bone combs (Neely 1940,82,pl.XIII,1), in particular, are said to be of Early Christian type (Laing: RESCUE Conference, Peel 1986).

It is clear, however, that the finds from Ronaldsway II (Neely 1940,81-86) have been poorly recorded and in essence should be considered largely unstratified. It would thus be dangerous to associate particular artefacts with particular structures on the site or phases of its development. Nonetheless, the possibility that secular activity may have continued on the site down to the 6th century would presumably suggest that the site was abandoned and then reused as a cemetery in the Early Christian period. There is little datable artefactual evidence at Ronaldsway to suggest that secular and ecclesiastical settlement went hand in hand, with the latter developing from and serving the former. The site may, therefore, fall within Thomas' developed cemeteries model, in the context of which its location at the boundary between the treens of Conessary and Logh (p.229; fig.40) may be significant.

Miscellaneous Sites

Three parish churches, at Braddan, Maughold and possibly also Andreas, are also located in proximity to putative Iron Age enclosures or forts. Insufficient research has been undertaken in connexion with these sites, which are, in any case, undated and indeterminate. An interesting account of the Braddan site is contained in Oswald (1860,190-193,pl.9) and the hill-fort to the E of Maughold parish church is mentioned by Cubbon (1973,26-27). At Andreas, a large earthwork, described as `ancient', is shown at SC 4130 9915, some 200 m SW of the church.

(xiii) Observations and Conclusions

In this chapter the ecclesiastical sites of Orkney, Shetland and Man have been examined in terms of their spatial association with both pre-Christian funerary sites and putative Late Iron Age settlements. The evidence, in many cases, has been shown to be most unsatisfactory for such an analysis and this study has had to constantly consider the association of these various phenomena as only possibilities. Nonetheless, this simple analysis would seem to point out certain trends and emphasize certain differences between the ecclesiastical sites of the different island groups under consideration. This information is set out in Table 28.

Few ecclesiastical sites in either Orkney or Shetland would appear to be related to pre-Christian funerary sites. When these are expressed as percentages of their respective totals, the figures obtained are extremely low with only 3% and 5% respectively of all the chapel sites of Orkney and Shetland being thus located (Table 28). A similarly low figure is also seen with regard to the number of Manx sites which are situated on former domestic settlements (Table 28).

When the data from the Northern Isles and Isle of Man are considered together, it is clear that a relatively high number of Manx keeills would seem to have been established at former burial grounds. Yet it will be apparent that the 29 sites which are listed in Table 25 represent only 16% of the total Manx corpus. Other examples may, of course, be discovered in the future but nonetheless it should be clear that the evidence for a pre-Christian funerary horizon at most of the sites already claimed

as such is uncertain (pp.258,271-272). Interpretation of this phenomena is necessarily difficult and it would be unwise to state categorically that the continuity or re-utilization of pagan burial sites was a necessarily influential factor in governing the siting of the keeills. The boundary model, proposed above (pp.219-236), for example, would seem to have been far more influential in this context.

In Orkney we have seen that a relatively high number of chapel sites were established in proximity to putative Iron Age settlements. The figure is quite high, with over a quarter of all sites being thus located (Table 28). Interpretation of this is, again, difficult. It is particularly interesting, however, in view of the fact that the comparable figures for Shetland are so low, where just over 7% of all ecclesiastical sites are located at putative Iron Age domestic settlements (Table 28). This appears to represent a very great difference between the Orcadian and Shetland chapels. After all, even if the association were only for the utilitarian purpose of obtaining stone, the archaeological landscape of Shetland is, like Orkney, rich in Iron Age remains. It is difficult to explain this apparent dichotomy between the ecclesiastical sites of Orkney on the one hand and those of Shetland on the other. However, if the association of ecclesiastical sites with Iron Age remains really does have the chronological significance that has been claimed, then an obvious conclusion might be that the Shetland chapels, on the whole and as a group, are much later in date than their southern counterparts. This would be an important conclusion

and it is one which has been suggested elsewhere (pp.246-247) on the basis of differences in the relative frequency with which the boundary association of ecclesiastical sites can be discerned in Man, Orkney and Shetland. Both points, however, would have to be tested by excavation.

The significance, if any, of these findings is difficult to evaluate. The association of ecclesiastical sites with earlier burial grounds or domestic settlements or territorial boundaries (Chapter 6) have been considered in this study as possible means for identifying the ecclesiastical sites of the Early Christian period but clearly the case is by no means proven. Each of these factors may be significant but each may be more relevant to one area than another, and perhaps more applicable to certain areas at different times. The chapels and land divisions of Orkney, Shetland and Man appear to present to us a similar picture. The important point, however, is that a monocausal explanation for the development of ecclesiastical sites in these areas, whether based on the developed cemeteries model, Lamb's model of association with Late Iron Age sites or this study's model of boundary association, is likely to prove unsatisfactory since all three factors may have contributed. Future progress, however, will only be made when these models are tested by excavation.

Notes: Chapter 7

Note 1

Observations with regard to the location of the boundary between the districts of Frotoft and Inner Westness & Corse have been made on the basis of a visual inspection of three maps.

Those of Thomson (1981,fig.3) and Aberdeen (OCL.E29) have been compared with reference to the modern (1976) OS 1:50000 map. Particular attention has been given to the indentation of the coastline between Moa Ness and the Taing of Tratland. These points are well defined on all three maps. Aberdeen's boundary between Frotoft and Corse is shown to lie just under half way between the small bay, just E of Corse, and the Taing of Tratland. The burn, already referred to above (p.286), would form the natural boundary mark in this area.

There is the problem, however, that the farms of Banks and Newhouse, which lie on the W side of the burn, are considered part of the Frotoft district (see for example Marwick 1947,47,81). However, it would seem that little weight should be attached to this since Corse is also similarly regarded (Marwick 1947,15), in spite of the fact that the early 16th century rentals are quite clear on the association of Corse with Inner Westness (Peterkin 1820,1503 Rental,75-76: Marwick 1947,14-15). The solution to this dilemma would therefore seem to lie in the fact, as Marwick (1947,25) was the first to notice, that the old Frotoft half-urisland was much smaller than todays district of the same name. This study's analysis of the Aberdeen map would tend to confirm that observation.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSIONS & PROSPECT

It should be realized that this study represents a preliminary, and not a definitive, account of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels. Such an account would be impossible, given the present state of the archaeological evidence. Nonetheless, it is hoped that this work has put any future study of the Manx and Northern Isles' chapels onto a firmer footing. For example, much of the basic data which would be necessary for any future work has been brought together here for the first time and has been summarized and discussed in Chapters 2-5. Meanwhile, a detailed survey of ecclesiastical sites in parts of Orkney, Shetland and Man has been presented in Volume 2. These sections of this work have provided the necessary background and data for the analysis and ideas contained in Chapters 6 & 7.

In an early part of this study (p.56), it was suggested that the lack of evidence for the dating of the Manx and Northern Isles' monuments is a handicap which greatly impairs our understanding of the sites and their development. This question of chronology was and still is a very real problem and it is one whose solution should be given a high priority if the relationship of the chapels to the land divisions is to be better understood.

It should be apparent that this problem of dating is one which is encountered again and again in this study. It is, for example, inherent in the three development models which are explored in Chapters 6 & 7. Thomas' developed cemeteries model, like Lamb's `developed settlements' model, and like the one based

on boundary association, which is proposed here, each make a series of chronological assumptions. At present, it seems there is little way of knowing which is the more valid model since this is only likely to be demonstrated as a result of future excavation. These models are not mutually exclusive but nonetheless, in the meantime, it would appear (Chapter 7) that Thomas´ ideas, like the boundary association model, are more applicable to Man, whilst Lamb´s are more relevant to Orkney, and perhaps Shetland. However, this study has suggested that the association of ecclesiastical sites with boundaries may be regarded as a `chronological tool´ for distinguishing between early and late sites. This idea is based on this study´s analysis of the Manx material. The writer remembers well his own scepticism when he first encountered Bonney´s (1966; 1979) work on early boundaries and estates in southern England. Yet the association, in Man, of a large number of the keeills with the treen boundaries seems clear enough, as a result of both this, and Reilly´s (pers.comm.: forthcoming b) work.

This present study has suggested that the peripheral siting of ecclesiastical sites is more likely to have happened earlier, rather than later, in the conversion process. The possibility, for example, that boundary association may lie at the root of what Thomas has perceived as the continuity of sacred sites over the pre-Christian and Christian periods could represent one way in which the relative `earliness´ of the boundary model might have operated. There is, however, at present insufficent evidence to substantiate this idea (pp.273-275). Alternatively,

peripheral siting could be considered as a natural response by the first Christian converts, as a means of literally distancing themselves from their unenlightened neigbours. There is perhaps a reflection of this in the Eirik´s Saga account of Thjodhild who "had a church built not too close to the farmstead" (Magnusson & Pálsson 1976,86-87).

The idea that the association of ecclesiastical sites and boundaries may be assigned to an early phase in the conversion process has several implications. On the one hand, as outlined above (pp.236-247), in areas such as Man and the Northern Isles, where it is reasonable to suppose, on historical (Chapter 2) and art-historical (Small, Thomas & Wilson 1973) grounds, that there was a Christian population in the pre-Norse period, it is possible that boundary sites may represent the sites of Early Christian foundations. On the other hand and following on from this, the extent to which the evidence still survives for recognizing boundary sited chapels could represent an index against which the thorny subject of the relationship of native to Norse (Ritchie 1973; 1974: Crawford 1981) could be gauged. In other words, areas with large numbers of boundary sited chapels might be identified as places where estates or districts remained relatively intact and where the integration of the indigenous population with the Norse settlers was achieved relatively quickly. This is not to say that the Norse settlement was either a particularly bloody or a relatively bloodless episode in the islands´ history, only that there was sufficient `tolerance´ around to allow the chapels to be used and in many cases later refurbished with the structures now extant at the boundary sites.

The evidence for the location of chapels might therefore be considered, in some degree, as a reflection upon, or as a measure of, the disruption which, to a greater or lesser extent, presumably followed in the wake of the Norse settlement of the islands.

The idea that boundary sited chapels may represent the sites of Early Christian foundations obviously rests on a theoretical basis which stems from this study's work on sites in the Isle of Man. However, the validity or otherwise of this model could be tested through excavation. For example, there are several instances on Man where there are two or more keeills per treen (Appendix 1). According to this study's interpretation of the significance of boundary association, the sites at, for example, Spooyt Vane (MICHAEL 5), Ballafreer (MAROWN 5) or Greeba Mill (GERMAN 9) should be older than those at Cronk y Killey (MICHAEL 6), Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6) or Cronkbreck (GERMAN 8) respectively. In Shetland, Halliara kirk might stand in a similar relationship to the chapel site at Houbie, in Hubie scattald on Fetlar (p.245; fig.53).

Future excavation of sites such as these ought to be able, provided suitable dating material was obtained, to confirm or refute the model which has been presented in this study. Excavation should also be employed to test Thomas' and Lamb's ideas regarding the origins and development of ecclesiastical sites. Kirkaby (UNST 14: Volume 2) would present itself as a likely candidate for a research excavation, given its curvilinear enclosure form, the place-name (Appendix 5) and its possible, but

by no means certain, association with adjacent `cells´. Meanwhile, St. Tredwell´s chapel (WESTRAY 14) might conceivably be considered as a possibility for a `rescue´ excavation, given its generally overgrown and dilapidated state. A good case for the site, although not the present structure, as an early foundation could be entertained on various evidential bases. The site, for example, could be interpreted as a potentially curvilinear enclosed site with associated cells, or as an associated Late Iron Age and ecclesiastical site or as a peripherally-sited chapel. St. Mary´s church at Culbinsburgh on Bressay (pp.314-318) would be another good site at which Lamb´s ideas might be tested through excavation.

Future work ought also to consider the question of the superimposition of ecclesiastical sites on pre-Christian burial grounds and whether this phenomenon is of any chronological significance. This study has already suggested (p.255) that the `visibility´ of the earlier monuments in the early medieval landscape is an important factor in this context and one which might minimize the significance which some writers, such as Thomas (1971a,58), have accorded this phenomenon. Even so, future work in this area would still be required before we could pronounce decidedly, one way or the other, on the possible significance of this association. Modern excavation of the keeills at Ballahimmin (GERMAN 14), Cornadale (MAUGHOLD 18) or Barony (MAUGHOLD 19) might go some way towards answering some of these problems. Excavation of the latter two sites might also throw some light on the antiquity of the Manx land system, since both are located at treen boundaries (Table 25a). However, as

noted above (pp.274-275), this would require a re-examination of the whole corpus of pre-Christian Manx burial sites and this obviously lies outside the scope of this present work. Nonetheless, the relationship of earlier burial mounds to the land divisions would form an obvious subject for future study.

Future work can thus progress along several different lines of enquiry. The various models which have been examined in Chapters 6 & 7 might be tested by excavation and provide a basis for an initial research design. Meanwhile, future survey work at ecclesiastical sites in North and West Britain, including Ireland, ought, perhaps, to take into account the boundary model which has been proposed here and the claims that have been made for it. Real progress, however, will only be forthcoming when a good sample of sites, such as those listed above, have been excavated.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1:

CORPUS OF MANX KEEILL SITES

This appendix sets out the corpus of chapel sites in the Isle of Man and assigns them a catalogue number in order to facilitate the presentation of the data in Chapter 6 Note 4 and Appendix 2.

The Orkney chapels have been listed by Clouston (1918a,233-240) and the RCAMS (1946,ii). Further information has been forthcoming as a result of the local surveys by Fraser (1923-1929) and Lamb (1980a; 1982; 1983c; 1984). The Shetland chapel sites have been listed by the RCAMS (1946,iii) and most recently by Dr. Cant (1975,47-51).

Cat. Name	Site	Treen Name
ANDREAS 1	Parish Church	? Ballasteen
ANDREAS 2	Knoc y Doonee	Kirk Asston
ANDREAS 3	Keeill Tushtag	Smeall
ANDREAS 4	Ballagonnell/Keeill Columb	Ballamegagh
ANDREAS 5	Cronk Keeill Traie, Ardonan	Regaby
ANDREAS 6	Cabbal ny Guilcagh	Guilcagh
ARBORY 1	Parish Church	? Ballafaden
ARBORY 2	Cabbal Dreem Ruy	Aryssynok
ARBORY 3	Keeill Moirrey	Aresteyn
ARBORY 4	Ballaglonney	Testrawe
ARBORY 5	Ballagawne	Ballacarmyk
ARBORY 6	Keeill Catreeney	Colby
ARBORY 7	The Friary	Bymacan
ARBORY 8	Ballanorris	Bymacan
ARBORY 9	The Crofts	Balladoole
ARBORY 10	Keeill Vael	Balladoole
BALLAUGH 1	Parish Church	? Ballamona
BALLAUGH 2	Brooghjiarg Moar	Brooghjiarg
BALLAUGH 3	Cronk Skeylt, Ballacurnkiel	Ballacurn
BALLAUGH 4	Faaie ny cabbal, Ballamoar	Carmodil
BALLAUGH 5	Keeill Moirrey, Carmodil Beg	Carmodil

Cat. Name		Site	Treen Name
BRADDAN	1	Parish Church	-
BRADDAN	2	Keeill Abban, Algare	Baldall Cryste
BRADDAN	3	Ballaoates	Camlork
BRADDAN	4	Knoc Rule	Camlork
BRADDAN	5	Camlork	Camlork
BRADDAN	6	Castleward	Castleward
BRADDAN	7	Ballaquirk, Farm Hill	(Bishops Barony)
BRADDAN	8	Speke	(Intack)
BRADDAN	9	Bealevear	Gresby
BRADDAN	10	St. Bridget's Nunnery	(Abbeylands)
BRIDE	1	Parish Church	? Kirk Bride
BRIDE	2	Faie Cabb'lagh	1st Cranstal
BRIDE	3	Port Cranstal	3rd Cranstal
BRIDE	4	Ballavarkish	Ballawarranaugh
BRIDE	5	Ballawannell	Glendowne
BRIDE	6	Cabbal ny Cooiley	Crosby Beg
GERMAN	1	Parish Church	-
GERMAN	2	Keeill Moirrey, Ballalough	(Particles)
GERMAN	3	Tynwald Hill	Balladoyne
GERMAN	4	St. John's, Tynwald	Balladoyne
GERMAN	5	Ballahowin	Balladoyne
GERMAN	6	Beary	Balladorgan
GERMAN	7	Kerrowgaroo	(Intack)
GERMAN	8	Cronk Breck	Alia Gnebe
GERMAN	9	Greeba Mill	Alia Gnebe
GERMAN	10	Eary Moar	Earyrody
GERMAN	11	Knocksharry	(Abbeylands)
GERMAN	12	Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma	Sandall
GERMAN	13	Cronkbane	Lambfell
GERMAN	14	Ballahimmin	Lambfell
JURBY	1	Parish Church	? Sartfell
JURBY	2	St. Patrick's chapel	Knock Shavell
JURBY	3	Ballacurry	Sulby
JURBY	4	Keeill Coonlagh	(Particles)
LEZAYRE	1	Parish Church	-
LEZAYRE	2	Cronk yn Howe	Alkest
LEZAYRE	3	Ballakillingen	(Particles)
LEZAYRE	4	Skyhill	(Particles)
LEZAYRE	5	Keeill Phoogan, Ballagarrow	Aldyn
LEZAYRE	6	Ballameanagh	Brerick
LEZAYRE	7	Bellevue	(Abbeylands)
LEZAYRE	8	Ballacuberagh	Sulby
LEZAYRE	9	Killabragga	(Intack)
LEZAYRE	10	Corrody	Corrack

Cat. Name	Site	Treen Name
LONAN 1	Parish Church	Alia Raby
LONAN 2	Kilkillane	Rhaa
LONAN 3	Ballacoar	Swarthow
LONAN 4	Ballaleany	Brundal
LONAN 5	Ballaquine	Amogarry
LONAN 6	Keeill Vian, Ballamilgen	Alia Colby
LONAN 7	Keeill Vian, Grawe	(Intack)
LONAN 8	Cabbal Niglus	Colby
LONAN 9	Ballayolgane	Agneash
LONAN 10	Keeill Woirrey	Gretch
LONAN 11	Skinscoe	(Abbeylands)
LONAN 12	Keeill Vael, Ballamoar	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 1	Parish Church	-
MALEW 2	Rushen Abbey	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 3	Keeill Oran	Scarlett
MALEW 4	Keeill Pharlane	Scarlett
MALEW 5	Scarlett	Scarlett
MALEW 6	St. Mary's Chapel, Castletown	-
MALEW 7	Lorn House	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 8	St. Michael's chapel	Conessary
MALEW 9	Ronaldsway(II)	Conessary
MALEW 10	Ronaldsway(I)	Kirk Michael
MALEW 11	Keeill Unjin	Grenby
MALEW 12	Kerrowkeil	Warfell
MALEW 13	Moaney Moar	Arernan
MALEW 14	Ballakilley	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 15	Ballaglonney	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 16	Cronk Rhennie	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 17	Lhergy	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 18	Renshent	(Abbeylands)
MALEW 19	Rullick y Doonee	(Abbeylands)
		(Intack)
MAROWN 1	Parish Church	-
MAROWN 2	St. Trinian's chapel	(Barony St.Trinian's)
MAROWN 3	Rhynne	Ballaterson
MAROWN 4	Keeill Vreeshy	Ballayeman
MAROWN 5	Keeill Pherick	Glenlough
MAROWN 6	Cabbal Druiaght	Glenlough
MAROWN 7	Ballaquinney Moar	Sanbrick
MAROWN 8	Keeill Lingan	Cardall
MAROWN 9	Ballachrink(I)	Ballanicholas
MAROWN 10	Ballachrink(II)	Ballanicholas

Cat. Name		Site	Treen Name
MAUGHOLD	1	Parish Church	-
MAUGHOLD	2	North Keeill :parish church	-
MAUGHOLD	3	Middle Keeill:parish church	-
MAUGHOLD	4	West Keeill :parish church	-
MAUGHOLD	5	East Keeill :parish church	-
MAUGHOLD	6	Ballaterson	Ballaterson
MAUGHOLD	7	Port y Vullin	Lewaigue
MAUGHOLD	8	St. Mary´s chapel	Ballure
MAUGHOLD	9	Ballagilley	Ballagilley
MAUGHOLD	10	Keeill Maloney	(Particles)
MAUGHOLD	11	Ballaglass	Cardle
MAUGHOLD	12	Cardle Veg	Cardle
MAUGHOLD	13	Keeill Cronk y Noe	(Intack)
MAUGHOLD	14	Keeill Croit ny Howe	(Barony St.Bees)
MAUGHOLD	15	Keeill Chiggyrt	Ballafayle
MAUGHOLD	16	Ballachrink	Corna Moar
MAUGHOLD	17	Ballacorteen	Corna Beg
MAUGHOLD	18	Keeill Woirrey, Cornaa	(Intack)
MAUGHOLD	19	Keeill Vael, Barony	(Cristen´s Barony)
MAUGHOLD	20	Ard Cooillen	(Intack)
MICHAEL	1	Parish Church	? Balleira
MICHAEL	2	Keeill Pharlane	Orristal
MICHAEL	3	Cooildarragh	Ballanimade
MICHAEL	4	Glen Moar	Ballanimade
MICHAEL	5	Cabbal Pherick, Spooyt Vane	Ballacarnane
MICHAEL	6	Cronk y Killey	Ballacarnane
MICHAEL	7	Cronk ny Fedjag	Shughlaig
MICHAEL	8	Ballakilleyclieau	Cammall
MICHAEL	9	Keeill Vael, Druidale	Aryhorkell
ONCHAN	1	Parish Church	? Howstrake
ONCHAN	2	Sulby	(Abbeylands)
ONCHAN	3	Keeill Vartin, Ballakilmartin	Begoade
ONCHAN	4	Ballachurry Park	Tremsare
ONCHAN	5	Glencrutchery	Tromode
ONCHAN	6	Ballaquayle	Douglas
ONCHAN	7	St. Martin´s chapel	Douglas
PATRICK	1	Parish Church, Peel Is.	-
PATRICK	2	St. Patrick´s chapel,Peel Is.	-
PATRICK	3	Ballaquayle	Ballamoar
PATRICK	4	Keeill Crore	Gordon
PATRICK	5	Gordon	Gordon
PATRICK	6	Raby	Raby
PATRICK	7	Crosh Pharlane	(Barony Bangor)
PATRICK	8	Keeill Woirrey, Glen Moar	(Barony Bangor)
PATRICK	9	Keeill yn Chiarn	(Barony Bangor)
PATRICK	10	Lag ny Keeilley	(Intack)
PATRICK	11	Ballamenagh	Arnicarnigan
PATRICK	12	Keeill Woirrey, Kerroodhoo	Arnicarnigan
PATRICK	13	Keeill Vout	Ballahig

Cat.	Name	Site	Treen Name
RUSHEN	1	Parish Church	? Edremony
RUSHEN	2	Ballaqueeney	Edremony
RUSHEN	3	Keeill Catreeney	Edremony
RUSHEN	4	Gramma	Edremony
RUSHEN	5	Ballaglonney	Bradda
RUSHEN	6	Surby	Saureby
RUSHEN	7	Kirkill	(Intack)
RUSHEN	8	Keeill Pharick	Kirk Patrick
RUSHEN	9	Ballagawne	Kirk Sansan
RUSHEN	10	The Smelt	Kirk Sansan
RUSHEN	11	Keeill Moirrey	(Abbeylands)
RUSHEN	12	Glenchass	Fishgarth
RUSHEN	13	Rullic y Lagg Shliggah	Shenvalley
RUSHEN	14	Calf of Man	-
SANTON	1	Parish Church	? Knock Slemyn
SANTON	2	Glentraugh	Arrogan
SANTON	3	Ballafurt	Arrogan
SANTON	4	Balnahow	How
SANTON	5	Ballacregga	How
SANTON	6	Ballavale	Grenwick
SANTON	7	Ballavartin	Knock y Loughan
SANTON	8	Sulbrick	Sanbrick

References:

Bruce 1968: Bruce & Cubbon 1930: Curphy 1982: Garrad 1978: Higham & Jones 1982;1984: Kermode 1909;1910;1911a;1915a;1915c; 1926;1935: Kneen 1924;1979: Megaw 1938;1949: Morris 1983a: Neely 1940: OSCI: Rigby 1915

APPENDIX 2:

A LIST OF EXCAVATED CHAPEL SITES & CEMETERIES IN THE ISLE OF MAN AND THE NORTHERN ISLES

(a) Isle of Man

Cat. Name	Site	Date	Reference
ANDREAS 2	Knoc y Doonee	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,23-28
ARBORY 10	Balladoole	1918;1945	Bruce 1968,41-45
BRADDAN 3	Ballaoates	1914/18	Kermode 15-16
BRADDAN 4	Knoc Rule	1914/18	Kermode 1935,15
BRADDAN 5	Camlork	1914/18	Kermode 1935,16-18
BRADDAN 8	Speke	1967	Med.Arch 12,1968,163
BRIDE 4	Ballavarkish	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,32-35
GERMAN 1	Parish Church	1982-	Freke 1984
GERMAN 2	Keeill Moirrey	1925	Kermode 1926
GERMAN 5	Ballahowin	1937	Megaw 1938
GERMAN 8	Cronk Breck	1909/10	Kermode 1910,19-21
GERMAN 10	Eary Moar	1909/10	Kermode 1910,16-17
GERMAN 12	Keeill Pherick	1909/10	Kermode 1910,8-12
GERMAN 14	Ballahimmin	1909/10	Kermode 1910,12-16
JURBY 2	St. Patrick's ch	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,15-22
JURBY 3	Ballacurry	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,15
LEZAYRE 2	Cronk yn Howe	1928	Bruce & Cubbon 1930
LEZAYRE 4	Skyhill	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,3-5
LEZAYRE 6	Ballameanagh	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,6-7
LEZAYRE 10	Corrody	1910	Kermode 1915a,7-9
MALEW 2	Rushen Abbey	1913/14	Bruce 1968,13-17
		1926/28	Med.Arch 23,1979,254
		1978/79	Med.Arch 24,1980,242
MALEW 5	Scarlett	1917	Reilly forthcoming a
MALEW 6	St. Mary's Ch	1960/61	Cubbon 1971
MALEW 9	Ronaldsway (II)	1935	Neely 1940
MALEW 10	Ronaldsway (I)	1917	Bruce 1968,17-19
MALEW 18	Renshent	1917	Bruce 1968,4-5
MAROWN 2	St. Trinian's ch	1908	Kermode 1909,4
MAROWN 4	Keeill Vreeshy	1908	Kermode 1909,5-8
MAROWN 6	Cabbal Druiaght	1908	Kermode 1909,9-11
MAROWN 7	Ballaquinney	1908	Kermode 1909,11-14
MAROWN 8	Keeill Lingan	1908	Kermode 1909,14-15
MAROWN 9	Ballachrink (I)	1908	Kermode 1909,15-16

MAUGHOLD	2	North Keeill	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,21-24
MAUGHOLD	3	Middle Keeill	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,24-25
MAUGHOLD	4	West Keeill	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,25
MAUGHOLD	5	East Keeill	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,25-28
MAUGHOLD	12	Cardle Veg	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,28
MAUGHOLD	15	Keeill Chiggyrt	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,29-31
MAUGHOLD	18	Keeill Woirrey	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,31-33
MAUGHOLD	19	Keeill Vael	1911/14	Kermode 1915a,34-36
MICHAEL	5	Cabbal Pherick	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,4-8
MICHAEL	6	Cronk y Killey	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,8-11
MICHAEL	7	Cronk ny Fedjag	1910/11	Kermode 1911a,12
MICHAEL	9	Keeill Vael	1979/80	Morris 1981a;1983a
ONCHAN	2	Sulby	1914/18	Kermode 1935,7-9
ONCHAN	3	Keeill Vartin	1914/18	Kermode 1935,9-10
ONCHAN	4	Ballachurry Park	1971	Med.Arch 16,1972,168
ONCHAN	6	Ballaquayle	1915	Kermode 1935,10
PATRICK	1	Parish Church	1962	Cubbon 1982,280
PATRICK	3	Ballaquayle	1974/77	Med.Arch 21,1977,216
PATRICK	8	Glen Moar	1908	Kermode 1909,19
PATRICK	10	Lag ny Keeilley	1908	Kermode 1909,19-26
PATRICK	12	Kerroodhoo	1909	Kermode 1910,3-5
PATRICK	13	Keeill Vout	1909/10	Kermode 1910,3
SANTON	2	Glentraugh	1976	Garrad 1978
SANTON	5	Ballacregga	1914/18	Kermode 1935,23-24
SANTON	6	Ballavale	1914/18	Kermode 1935,23
SANTON	8	Sulbrick	1914/18	Kermode 1935,21-23

(b) Orkney & Shetland

Site	Date	Principal References (excluding RCAMS 1946)
St. Peter's chapel, Brough of Birsay	1866/67 1934/39 1956/61	MacGibbon & Ross 1896,135-141 (unpublished) (unpublished)
Saevar Howe, Birsay	1862 1977	Farrer 1862; 1868 Hedges 1983
St. Magnus ch. Birsay	1982	Barber 1983; forthcoming
Marwick chapel, Birsay	c.1930	(unpublished)
Chapel, Brough of Deerness	1975/77	Morris 1976; 1977a; 1977b; forthcoming a
Newark ch. Deerness	1969/72	Brothwell 1977
Tammaskirk, Rendall	1931	Clouston 1932b
St. Margaret's chapel, South Ronaldsay	1979/80	Hedges & Smith 1979; 1981
St. Mary's chapel, Hullion, Rousay	1983	Marwick 1984a
Brettaness chapel, Rousay	1984	Marwick 1984b
St. Ninian's Isle, Shetland	1955/59	O'Dell et al 1959 Small, Thomas & Wilson 1973

APPENDIX 3: PEREGRINATIO PRO CHRISTO AND THE `NORTHERN DESERT´

> "Be alone in a desert place apart in the neighbourhood of a chief monastery, if you distrust in your conscience to be in the company of many."
>
> Rule of Columcille: Haddan & Stubbs 1873,119

The 8th century Rule of Columcille reflects the revival of asceticism in the Irish Church at that time. Asceticism, as Hughes (1972,91) has pointed out, had never completely died out. The voyages of Cormac ua Liathain, who sought without success his `herimum in ociano´ on no less than three occasions, are related in Adamnan´s Life of Columba (p.15 above). A later 6th century context may also be referred to Baitán who, with a group of others, also sought the `desert´:

> "Alio in tempore quidam Baitanus, gente nepos niath Taloirc, benedici a sancto petivit, cum ceteris in mari herimum quaesiturus."
>
> Vita Sancti Columbae, I,20

He too, however, was unsuccessful and eventually returned to Ireland:

> "Idem itaque Baitanus post longos per ventosa circuitus equora herimo non reperta ad patriam reversus."
>
> Vita Sancti Columbae, I,20

It is clear, however, that other voyagers were successful in their quest. `Clerici´, for example, are known to have visited Iceland c.795 (Liber de mensura orbis terrae,VII,11) and Faroe too seems to have been settled by anchorites prior to the period of the Viking raids and settlements. Irish hermits are said to have been settled on Faroe since c.725 (Liber de mensura orbis terrae,VII,15: pp.17-18 above).

These anchorites or hermits constituted the third and most numerous `order of saints´, the pilgrim saints or peregrini, who roamed over land and sea in search of some `desert´ or lonely place wherein to abide and to spend their lives in prayer and meditation. Many, doubtless, stayed and the northern settlements of these eremitic communities have been identified by Raymond Lamb (1973a; 1973b). His identification of these sites has been based largely on an analysis of their location on small islands, isolated rock stacks and on precipitous head-lands. It is also noteworthy that these sites are normally situated in extreme marginal areas. It is equally clear, however, that many of these hermits did not stay in their `desert´ retreats. Cormac and Baitán, for example, seem to have been simply unsuccessful in their quest (Vita Sancti Columbae,I,6;I,20); others were displaced by Viking `pirates´ (Liber de mensura orbis terrae, VII,15: Landnámabók,I) and still others, such as Dicuil´s informants in Liber de mensura VII,11 and VII,14, left for unspecified reasons. Much of our information regarding the northern peregrini, after all, is derived from the accounts of those who departed from their desert retreats.

The relationship of the eremitic monasteries to the early missionary church is not clear. Lamb (1973b,85), for example, has remarked that the movement that founded the eremitic monasteries was "either completely separate from, or else an off-shoot of, the missionary activity". The historical sources do not help us in this matter. They do, however, testify to the maritime achievement of the early Irish peregrini (Bowen 1972,70-91: Marcus 1980,16-32).

APPENDIX 4:

THE `PAPAR´ & THE `PAPA´ PLACE-NAMES: AN ORCADIAN VIEW

This appendix reviews the historical notices for the papar or papae and examines the relationship of the textual to the place-name evidence. This material is considered from an Orcadian point of view and it is suggested that this evidence may throw some new light upon previously held ideas about the papae.

Landnámabók, compiled c.1097 X c.1125 (Palsson & Edwards 1972,5), records the presence of a group of people, whom it calls papar, in Iceland prior to the Norse settlement of that country. The papar were identified as Irish Christians on account of the books, bells and croziers that they left behind. They lived at Papey and Papile:

> "Enn áður Island byggðisk af Norðmonnum voru þar þeir menn er Norðmenn kalla papa. Þad voru menn christner og hyggia menn að þeir vaeri vestan um haf, því að funduz eþter þeim baekur irskar biöllur og baglar og en fleyri lutir þeir eð af mátte skilia að þeir voru vestmenn. Þad fanst i Papey austur i Papile."
>
> Landnámabók, cap.1

A similar account is also contained in Ari Thorgilsson´s Íslendingabók, a text which was compiled 1134 X 1138. Papae are also referred to in the late 12th century Historia Norvegiae, where they are distinguished as one element of the pre-Norse population of Orkney (p.19 above).

The evidence of Landnámabók and Íslendingabók is, to a certain extent, confirmed by the early 9th century writer, Dicuil, whose account of Thule in Liber de mensura VII,7-13 almost certainly represents a description of Iceland (Tierney

1967,115). Dicuil's account was based on information supplied to him by `clerici' who had lived on the island and, given that the island had been previously uninhabited, it is reasonable to assume that these `clerici' were anchorites or hermits. Eremitical groups and individuals seem also to have been established on Faroe prior to the Norse settlement of those islands (Liber de mensura,VII,15: pp.17-18 above) and a case for the establishment of such groups in Orkney and Shetland can also be made (Lamb 1973b: p.18 above). The essential problem, however, is not concerned so much with the question of whether such groups existed, as to whether the historical and toponymic evidence which is employed to illustrate that case actually does. The identification of the papae as Irish hermits or anchorites is made on the basis of these 9th and 12th century documents. The evidence of the papa place-names, on the other hand, which formally at least should be related to the papae, presumably as the sites of their settlements, is, however, at some variance with such an interpretation.

The historical evidence for the papae must be taken in conjunction with the place-name evidence. This has been most recently reviewed by MacDonald (1977) who considered certain distributional and locational aspects of the papa place-names. Twenty-seven papa place-names were listed in the Northern Isles, Caithness and the Hebrides and with reference to their distribution, MacDonald (1977,109) concluded that:

> "a strong eremitical element among the papar seems to be indicated by this emphasis on small islands and extreme marginal areas."

This idea, however, cannot be sustained on the basis, at least, of the Orcadian evidence. It is doubtful, too, whether such an interpretation necessarily applies to the papa place-names of Shetland (Lamb 1973a,86,198).

The papa place-names of Orkney are listed below and the pennyland extent of the holdings thus represented is also provided. These figures are taken from the 16th century rental books (Peterkin 1820).

Papdale, Kirkwall, Mainland.....9 pennylands

Paplay, Holm, Mainland.....(A large district in Holm parish which is not specifically assessed in the Rentals)

Paplay, South Ronaldsay.....9 pennylands

Paplayhouse, Eday.....(No information in 1497-1503 Rental: Eday only briefly mentioned in 1595 Rental)

Papa Stronsay.....12 pennylands

Papa Westray.....c.68 pennylands

Steeven o´ Papy.....(No information: a rock off the coast of North Ronaldsay)

The absence of information with regard to three of these seven place-names should not disguise the fact that the rental values for the four that are recorded are relatively high. Paplay in St. Peter´s parish, South Ronaldsay, for example, was, with Ronaldiswo, the most heavily skatted farm in the parish. Nine farms in the parish comprised 3 pennylands or less and a further 8 amounted to between 3 and 6 pennylands (Peterkin 1503 Rental,1820,19-22). Papdale, in St. Ola parish, near Kirkwall, was a similarly large holding. Papdale, like Cleat and

Work, was a 9 pennyland holding: 30 farms comprised 3 pennylands or less and a further 7 farms amounted to between 3 and 6 pennylands (Peterkin 1595 Rental,1820,20-26). The very high skat values which are placed on the islands of Papa Stronsay and Papa Westray are also significant.

The amount of skat or tax that any farm paid was related to the productive capability of the holding. The skat assessment, in other words, tends to reflect the extent of the holding and/or the quality of its land. The evidence of the Orkney Rentals is thus inimical to MacDonald's contention that the papa place-names are located in extreme marginal areas. This same evidence also contradicts Brøgger's (1929,59-63) belief that many of the papa place-names referred only to rocks and other natural features and that they had no connexion with settlement. On the contrary, the papa place-names of Orkney, and the same seems true for Shetland, are located among the most agriculturally productive areas and as such they can hardly reflect the settlements of eremitical groups and individuals. The same has also been noted by Dr. Lamb (1983c,8) in his work on Papa Westray. The papa place-names, in other words, appear to be related to missionary and not eremitical activity.

APPENDIX 5: KIRBISTER, KIRKABY & KIRK PLACE-NAMES

Two separate but related problems are considered in this appendix. First to be considered is what Marwick (1931,30) has called `The Kirbister Problem´. This is largely a problem of interpretation and chronology. The second area to be examined in this appendix is concerned with the extent to which Kirk place-names refer, spatially, to ecclesiastical sites. This is largely a problem of locating and identifying sites on the basis of the place-name evidence.

The Kirbister Problem

Twenty-five years ago, Wainwright (1962b,160) concluded:

> "we may accept Kirbister-names as good evidence that many Scandinavians in the Northern Isles were Christian before 900."

This idea was based on Marwick´s (1931: 1952a,227-251) work on the Orkney farm-names and his suggestion that a relative chronology for certain generics could be established on the basis of geographical location and the skat evidence of the 15th and 16th century rental documents. The -bister (ON.bólstaðr: farm settlement) names, for example, were considered to refer to relatively early, but nonetheless, secondary Viking settlements (Marwick 1931,30: 1952a,233). A graphic representation of the Orkney place-names sequence, by Bailey (1971,76), is illustrated in Morris´ (1985,fig.10.5) recent survey of Viking Orkney.

It is clear that Marwick (1931,25; 1952a,248), as Morris has noted, proposed "a relative chronology of names on the local level, not an absolute chronology" (1985,230). Even so, it is clear that a series of absolute dates were assigned to some o

the generics, including bólstaðr. These were considered, as a group, and on the basis of the fact that most -bister farms were skatted, to date to the period prior to 900. This was argued on the basis of the Harald Fine-Hair tradition, the man whom Marwick (1952a,211) considered had set about and organized the original imposition of skat.

There are problems with this view. Sawyer (1976a; 1982,13), for example, has stressed that there is no independent evidence for Harald Fine-Hair's western voyage in c.900 and that the story was probably modelled on Magnus Barelegs' later expeditions to the British Isles in c.1100. Sawyer (1976a,105) has argued therefore that the imposition of skat, if originally imposed as a result of a Scandinavian royal authority, should be assigned to a much later period. Parts of the skat system, such as the four and a half pennyland unit known as the skatland, are considered by Sawyer (1976a,109) to date only from the 12th or 13th century. Sawyer's work could have several implications for Marwick's dating of the Orcadian place-name generics and might well indicate that the dates need to be revised upwards. It seems to this writer, however, that this only follows if the imposition of skat were necessarily the result of a `royal action' by a Scandinavian king. The writer is not aware of any evidence which would substantiate that case.

The idea that bólstaðr names, as a group, can be dated to the period before c.900 seems thus to be poorly founded. It is true that the relative place-name sequence may be maintained since it can be demonstrated, independently, by the analysis of

the relative geographical position of the farm-names in the landscape (Marwick 1931: Morris 1985,229-230). The problem, however, is that we can have no idea of when, chronologically, the sequence begins. Marwick (1952a,227,248), like modern place-name scholars (Fellows-Jensen 1984,154-155), for example, was well aware that the first settlements might well have been given topographical names.

There are 10 Kirbister place-names in Orkney (Marwick 1931,30) and 5 in Shetland (Stewart 1987,54-58). Marwick (1931,30; 1952a,234) believed that the Kirbister (ON. kirkjubólstaðr) farms could be regarded as:

> "settlements made by individual Norse settlers who had come into contact with....Christian influences, and laid aside their worship of the old Northern gods, long before the official conversion of the Orkneys to Christianity."

In apparent confirmation of this, Marwick (1931,30-31) noted Landnámabók's account of Ásolfr, a Christian settler from Ireland, who is said to have settled in Iceland at a place called Kirkjubólstaðr in the period prior to the official conversion of Iceland in c.1000 (Benediktsson 1968,Ii,63). The same source also records the land-take of Ketill inn Fiflske, another Christian emigrant, from the Hebrides, who is also said to have settled in Iceland at about the same time at a place which he named Kirkjuboer (Benediktsson 1968,Iii,322-325). This evidence, rather than the chronological assumptions that have been made as a result of the analysis of skat payments, may be of more significance for the early dating of Kirbister place-names.

This relatively early dating scheme can also, to some extent, be supported by analogy with the English Danelaw evidence.

Fellows-Jensen (1978a,355; 1984,156), for example, has suggested:

> "In the Danelaw the Vikings gave names in kirkju-bý to settlements in which they found a church, even before their own conversion"

and has gone on to suggest that:

> "It is possible that the kind of settlement that the Danes referred to as kirkju-bý in the Danelaw would have been referred to as kirkju-bólstaðr by the Norwegian settlers in the Northern and Western Isles."
>
> G. Fellows-Jensen forthcoming

Fellows-Jensen, like Marwick before, have thus both regarded the kirkju-bólstaðr / kirkju-bý place-names as `early´ in the basic settlement sequence. Marwick, however, like Wainwright after him (see above), seems to have considered them as the sites of the churches which were built by first generation Norse converts. Fellows-Jensen on the other hand, has suggested that these were the types of names which were given to settlements with churches in the period prior to their conversion. The Kirbister sites in Orkney and the Kirkabister / Kirkaby sites in Shetland, according to Fellows-Jensen´s view, could thus presumably be considered as potentially Early Christian foundations. Dr. Cant (1984a,175-176), on the other hand, has expressed several reservations about the earliness of the Kirbister names, arguing that the lack of an organized priesthood would have made impossible the founding of churches in pre-11th century Orkney and Shetland.

It is difficult to decide between these different views. The writer, however, is least happy with Cant´s analysis for the simple reason that the very simplicity of the Kirbister and

Kirkaby place-name forms would seem to suggest that the names, to be effective and meaningful, would have had to have been coined at a time when settlements with churches were relatively few in number. This would therefore presumably suggest that the sites were relatively early foundations, founded either by the native Christian or by a small converted Norse population and which were then recognized for what they were by a perhaps predominantly pagan Norse population. The one thing that is certain, of course, is that the names were given by Norse speakers; the sites themselves, however, could refer to native or Norse foundations. There seems, however, to be little to choose between either view and only excavation is likely to enlighten things further. The indications are that the Northern Isles' Kirbister / Kirkaby place-names are relatively early and possibly date to the period prior to the `official' conversion in c.1000. However, firm evidence for this view is lacking.

Kirk Place-Names & the Identification of Ecclesiastical Sites

It seems quite clear that the Kirbister / Kirkaby place-names in Orkney and Shetland refer to ecclesiastical sites on the ground. There are, however, a number of Kirk-names where this may not necessarily apply and several examples of these have been considered in the sites' gazetteer (Volume 2).

It is clear, for example, that the remains at Kirkamires and Kirk in Underhoull (UNST 15 & 16) or at Kirk and Kirkhoull in Gunnister (UNST 12 & 13) cannot be considered as ecclesiastical buildings. The farm-names, however, may suggest that an ecclesiastical site lay nearby and that the crofts were named

with reference to this. We know, for example, that the modern but now ruinous croft called `Kirk Knowe´ in Westing has taken its name from the chapel site (UNST 17) which lies 80 m to the NW. On Papa Westray, meanwhile, there is a building called `Kirkhouse´ at the end of the lane which leads down to St. Boniface´s Church (WESTRAY 11), 400 m distant. The Kirk place-names might therefore be quite some distance from an actual ecclesiastical site.

This problem of location could be even further compounded, as has happened at Kirk Knowe (UNST 17), if the name was to have `moved´, unbeknown to us, a second or a third time. We should at least be wary therefore that the positions in which, as it were, place-names end up could well be at some remove from the sites to which the names originally referred. This problem might be exacerbated even further if the place-name referred, not to a structure, but to Church ownership. Stewart (1987,165), for example, has suggested, that Kirkhus names, although always old, were used of a house near an old chapel, or of property belonging to the Church. Further work in this area would be required to decide which applied in any particular case. However, it should be clear, in summary, that simple Kirk, Kirkhouse or Kirk- names with topographical qualifiers, such as Kirk Knowe or Kirkhoull, are by no means necessarily spatially indicative of ecclesiastical sites on the ground.

APPENDIX 6:

A NOTE ON QUARTZ PEBBLES & THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH ECCLESIASTICAL SITES

The discovery of quartz pebbles in prehistoric funerary contexts is a fairly well-evidenced phenomenon. Several dozen rounded white quartz pebbles were found during Kermode and Herdman's excavation of Bronze Age cists at the Meayll Circle in Rushen in 1893 (Grensted 1926,43). O'Dell, in his excavation of a cremation burial beneath the chapel on St. Ninian's Isle in Shetland, discovered a similar feature, a deposit of quartz pebbles apparently having formed the floor of the cist (Small 1973,5). Many other examples have been listed by Nona Lebour (1914) and Audrey Meaney's (1981,88-90) broader study has noted the frequent occurrence of quartz pebbles in prehistoric burials in the British Isles from the Neolithic period onwards. It has proved tempting to some writers, therefore, to consider the deposition of quartz pebbles in Christian graves as a survival of an ancient ritual (Lebour 1914,134: Grensted 1926,43).

In some ways it is not difficult to establish a <u>prima facie</u> case for survival. It is clear, for example, that quartz pebbles have been found in both prehistoric and Christian (see below) funerary contexts. In a similar vein, St. Columba's contest with the magician, Broichan, and the story of the white pebble:

> "De quo videlicet fluio lapidem attollens candidum, ad comites: `Signate' ait, `hunc candidum lapidem, per quem dominus in hoc gentili populo multas egrotorum perficiet sanitates.'"
>
> <u>Vita Sancti Columbae</u>,II,33: Anderson & Anderson 1961,400

could be considered to reflect an essentially pagan belief in the

efficacy of white stones. Certainly actions such as these were considered to be pagan and were consequently condemned by the later Church. AElfric's homily on the Passion of St. Bartholomew, for example, states:

> "It is not allowed that any Christian man get his health from any stone."
>
> Sermones Catholici: Thorpe 1844,I,474-476

A similar condemnation is also apparent in medieval Icelandic Church Law:

> "Men shall not use stones or charm it (sic), to bind it on man or man's beasts. If a man believe in a stone for his healing or the healing of his cattle, he shall pay a life-ring-garth fine."
>
> The Church Law Title: Vigfusson & York Powell 1905,620

All this, however, represents a rather insubstantial case for survival. White quartz pebbles in both prehistoric and Christian times, for example, may have simply been prized for their colour or `prettiness', and this alone might account for their incorporation into funerary deposits or their use as talismans or curing stones. The search for a `ritual' link or the attempt to define their `significance' thus seems to this present writer to be a rather futile task. Indeed Sir Arthur Mitchell summed up the position very well over a hundred years ago:

> "A great deal has been written about survivals...But in the discussion of them a marvellous credulity is often shown, and something like a voluntary blindness to all explanations except that which suits some theory."
>
> Sir Arthur Mitchell 1884,291

The idea that quartz pebbles were deposited in early prehistoric burials and that this custom continued unbroken down to Christian times, and perhaps with the same ritual significance, is hardly capable of proof. A more fruitful approach might be to consider the occurrence of quartz pebbles on ecclesiastical sites only and to consider whether there are any changes, over time, in the deposition of quartz pebbles in the archaeological site record. This would be an ideal, if limited, objective. There is, however, insufficient good archaeological evidence, at present, with which to work.

The evidence for the discovery of white quartz pebbles on early ecclesiastical sites in Man has recently been reviewed in a note by Crowe (1982). In some cases the pebbles seem to have been deposited at a relatively late period, perhaps as votive offerings such as at Cabbal Druiaght (MAROWN 6: Volume 2) where several dozen were found over or behind the apparently ruinous altar base. Or at Cronk y Killey where they had been piled up in the SE corner of the keeill, beside the altar (Kermode 1911a,10). Several hundred, for example, were found in and around the keeills at Lag ny Keeilly (Kermode 1909,23) and Ballaquinney (MAROWN 8: Volume 2).

Quartz pebbles are also found in association with graves. At Ballavarkish, the graves were covered with a layer of white quartz pebbles and as many as 80 stones were recovered from one of the graves (Kermode 1911a,32,41). In some cases, it is clear that the graves predated the buildings on the site. At St. Patrick's chapel in Jurby and at Sulbrick keeill (SANTON 8: Volume 2) many quartz pebbles were found in graves which underlay

the walls of the later buildings (Kermode 1911a,17; 1935,22). Several burials under the W wall of the old parish church in Lonan were also found to contain quartz pebbles and "a good wheelbarrow-full were collected" (ProcIOMNHAS, 1906-1915,15: Grensted 1926,44). Bruce and Cubbon's (1930,274,284) excavations at Cronk yn Howe, meanwhile, found that white pebbles were associated with burials which both predated and postdated the building on the site. In addition it has been shown that the possible leachta at Ronaldsway, possibly relatively early features on the site (pp.165-168), were full of quartz pebbles and were possibly associated with an external pebble surface (fig.72).

Crowe's (1982,413) review of the Manx material led him to conclude that:

> "we can draw no conclusions as to their frequency...nor can we deduce a date of their deposition, nor a length of time during which their deposition was made."

This, however, is perhaps a little pessimistic. It is clear that we cannot subject the data to any rigorous statistical analysis. We cannot say, for example, that the deposition of quartz pebbles was predominantly a feature of Early Christian interments, that later burials have fewer stones or none at all or that the later deposition of pebbles on the keeill altars succeeded or replaced an earlier funerary practice. We can, however, point to the fact that quartz pebbles were deposited at the keeill sites over what appears to have been a relatively long period of time.

The association of quartz pebbles with ecclesiastical sites is also evident in Ireland. Michael O'Kelly, in his excavation

at Church Island, found as many as 6,800 in all (1958,93) and it seems possible that these may have been deliberately brought to the site from Beginish, which lies on the mainland opposite Church Island. Here, too, many of the stones were found in association with graves. O´Kelly (1958,93) has remarked:

> "There is no doubt that a practice grew up of collecting a number of these stones and throwing them into or on a newly-made grave."

Significantly, however:

> "They were not found with any of the early burials on the west of the island nor with any burial which was demonstrably earlier than the period of the post-monastic shelter builders."

At Reask also, deposits of quartz pebbles were only found in late contexts, associated with the ceallúnach graves, for which a post 12th century date has been suggested (Fanning 1981a,74,138,160). Brannon´s (1980,59) trial excavation at St. John´s Point Church in County Down has also suggested that the deposition of quartz pebbles in graves could be assigned to a relatively late period in the development of that site. In Ireland, therefore, it seems that there is some evidence to suggest that the association of quartz pebbles with ecclesiastical sites is not necessarily an Early Christian phenomenon and that it may well, on the contrary, represent a relatively recent development. We cannot, however, apply these rough dating criteria to the Manx material. Future work, however, on Man and elsewhere should consider the possibility of whether the presence or absence of quartz pebbles on ecclesiastical sites may be of some relevance for chronology.

TABLES

TABLE 1: ECCLESIASTICAL SITES & ORKNEYINGA SAGA

Site	-after Taylor 1938- Chapter	Page	Date	Episode
Christchurch, Birsay	31	189	1048+	Earl Thorfinn builds Christchurch
	32	189	c.1065	Earl Thorfinn buried at Christchurch
	52	212	c.1117	Translation of Magnus´ body to Christchurch; episcopal seat then there
	56	219	c.1128-1136	Miracles at Magnus´ grave
	57	220	1136+	Translation of Magnus´ body to Kirkwall
Church on Egilsay	48	208	c.1117	Magnus goes to church before Haakon lands
	49	209	c.1117	Haakon lands, ransacks church
? St. Magnus Church, Egilsay	51	211	1117+	Interpolation to the effect that a church was later built on the site where Magnus had been murdered
	66	244	1135	Bishop William was at church when Sveinn Asleifarson arrived from Orphir
Church in Kirkwall: ? St. Olaf´s	57	221	1136+	Magnus´ relics translated from Birsay to Kirkwall and set over the High Altar
	92	308	1152	Arni Hrafnsson wedged in doorway of church by his shield which he wore over his shoulder

TABLE 1: continued

Site	-after Taylor Chapter	Page	1938- Date	Episode
St. Magnus Cathedral Kirkwall	76	260	1136	Ground plan of bulding laid and construction commenced
	94	321	1154	Erlend´s men take sanctuary in cathedral
	104	338	1192	Relics of Earl Rognvald translated by Bishop Bjarni
Orphir	66	242	1135	A magnificent church stood facing the door of the hall. Night service held there on Christmas Eve 1135
Pierowall	72	252, 386	1136	Earl Rognvald attends Divine Service at church in village on Westray
? Knarston	77	261, 388	1138	Earl Rognvald with Hrolf, the earl´s chaplain, meets Bishop John of Atholl
Near Wick in Caithness	109	344, 409	1198+	A church was later built on the site where Earl Harald the Younger was killed in 1198

Comments

The identification of St. Olaf´s chapel, Kirkwall, as the site to which Magnus´ body was taken prior to its being established in the cathedral, and as the church in which Arni Hrafnsson became stuck fast, was suggested by Taylor (1938,367). His identification of St. Tredwell´s chapel on Papa Westray as the site to which Earl Rognvald Brusison was probably taken for burial in 1046 (Taylor 1938,367), however, is not accepted. The account merely records the conveyance of the Earl´s body to Papa Westray (Orkneyinga Saga, cap.XXX). He could have been buried in one of three or four sites on the island (see WESTRAY 11-14: Volume 2). The large and important complex at St. Boniface church and Munkerhoose is perhaps a more likely contender for the site of Rognvald Brusison´s interment.

The dating of the translation of St. Magnus´ body from Christchurch, Birsay to Kirkwall is left largely unspecified. The internal chronology of Orkneyinga Saga, however, would suggest a date in 1138 or thereabouts. The exhumation of St. Magnus´ body and his subsequent translation to a shrine over the altar at Christchurch is said to have occurred 21 years after his death in c.1117 (Orkneyinga Saga, cap.LVII). The translation to Kirkwall occurred some time after this.

TABLE 2:

WALL TYPES, WALL WIDTHS & ENTRANCE POSITION: MANX KEEILLS

Wall Type		Wall width (cm): Entrance = *				
		N	S	E	W	Reference
(1) Internal Facing only						
Ballaquinney Moar	Marown	140	130	120	135*	Kermode 1909
Ballavarkish	Bride	105	105	115	135*	Kermode 1911a
Ronaldsway I	Malew	120	120	120	120*	Bruce 1968
(2) Internal & External Facing: Soil & Rubble Fill						
Ballahimmin	German	90	115	105	150*	Kermode 1910
Ballalough	German	90	90	90	90*	Kermode 1926
Pherick-a-Dromma	German	90	90	75	105*	Kermode 1910
Spooyt Vane	Michael	105	100	105	120*	Kermode 1911a
Knoc y Doonee	Andreas	105	105	105	160*	Kermode 1911a
Ballameanagh	Lezayre	-	90	-	90*	Kermode 1915a
Cornaa	Maughold	105	105	100	90*	Kermode 1915a
Barony	Maughold	75	90	120	90*	Kermode 1915a
Sulby	Onchan	120	135	130	120*	Kermode 1935
Ballakilmartin	Onchan	-	120	100	115*	Kermode 1935
Camlork	Braddan	120	100	105	120*	Kermode 1935
Cabbal Dreem Ruy	Arbory	90	90*	90	90	Bruce 1968
(3) Drystone						
Keeill Vreeshy	Marown	100	105*	105	100	Kermode 1909
Glen Moar	Patrick	85	115	130	130*	Survey
Lag ny Keeilley	Patrick	115	115	100	135*	Kermode 1909
Cronk Breck	German	105	90	120	115*	Survey
Eary Moar	German	120	105	120	100*	Kermode 1910
Cronk y killey	Michael	120	90	105	135*	Kermode 1911a
Druidale	Michael	120*	120	120	120	Morris 1983a
Middle keeill	Maughold	60	60	75	75*	Kermode 1915a
East keeill	Maughold	70	60	60	60*	Kermode 1915a
Cardleveg	Maughold	-	-	-	-	Kermode 1915a
Keeill Chiggyrt	Maughold	90	90	90	90*	Kermode 1915a
Ballamillgen	Lonan	75	75	-	-	Kermode 1915a
Cronk yn Howe	Lezayre	120	120	120	120	Bruce & Cubbon 1930
Knoc Rule	Braddan	90	75	90	90*	Kermode 1935
Renshent	Malew	90	90	90	90*	Bruce 1968

TABLE 2: continued

		Wall width (cm): Entrance = *				
		N	S	E	W	Reference
Wall Type						
<u>Indeterminate: Types (2) or (3)</u>						
Keeill Lingan	Marown	130	150*	130	150	Kermode 1909 Oliver 1868
Ballafreer	Marown	140	155	140	135*	Survey
Cabbal Druiaght	Marown	95	120	120	150*	Kermode 1909
Corrody	Lezayre	115*	120	90	120	Survey
Skyhill	Lezayre	75	105*	90	75	Kermode 1915a
Sulbrick	Santon	120	135	120	105*	Survey
(4) <u>Clay- / Lime-mortared Masonry</u>						
Kerroodhoo	Patrick	100	105	105	120*	Kermode 1910
St.Patrick's ch.	German	90	90	90	90*	Kermode 1910
North keeill	Maughold	75	75	85	90*	Kermode 1915a
Ballakilley	Malew	85	85*	85	85	Bruce 1968
St. Michael's Isle		85	85*	85	85	Bruce 1968
Ballanorris	Arbory	-	-	-	-	Bruce 1968
Balladoole		105	105*	105	105	Bruce 1968

Insufficient data to enable classification of wall type:

Site	Entrance	Location
Ballachrink I	Marown	W
Ballachrink II	Marown	W
Raby Moar	Patrick	W
Cabbal ny Cooilley	Bride	W
Keeill Unjin	Malew	W

TABLE 3: MANX ALTAR SETTINGS

Site		Dimensions (m) Length	Width	Height	Ratio (Note 1)	Proportion (Note 2)
Ballalough	German	0.60	0.45	-	4:3	-
Sulby	Onchan	0.80	0.45	-	2:1	32%
Knoc y Doonee	Andreas	0.85	0.45	0.65	2:1	25%
Eary Moar	German	0.85	0.60	-	3:2	39%
Cronk y Killey	Michael	0.90	0.60	-	3:2	31%
Ballafreer	Marown	c1.00	0.45	-	2:1	38%
Skyhill	Lezayre	1.00	0.65	-	3:2	46%
Druidale	Michael	1.00	0.65	-	3:2	50%
Lag ny Keeilley	Patrick	1.05	0.70	-	3:2	39%
Ballaquinney Moar	Marown	1.05	0.75	-	3:2	32%
Sulbrick	Santon	1.05-1.30	0.65	-	-	40-50%
Pherick-a-Dromma	German	1.20	0.60	0.75+	2:1	41%
Cornaa	Maughold	1.20	0.60	-	2:1	41%
Keeill Vreeshy	Marown	1.20	0.65	-	2:1	46%
Cabbal Druiaght	Marown	1.20	0.75	-	3:2	45%
Ronaldsway I	Malew	1.30	0.50	-	5:2	36%
Cronk Breck	German	1.30	0.55	-	7:3	31%
Camlork	Braddan	1.35	0.75	-	2:1	38%
Ballakilmartin	Onchan	1.50	0.60	-	5:2	55%
St.Michael's Isle	Malew	1.50	0.75	-	2:1	34%
Balladoole	Arbory	1.50	0.85	-	5:3	50%
Spooyt Vane	Michael	1.60-2.30	1.00	-	-	41-58%

Traces only remaining:

Keeill Woirrey, Glen Moar,	Patrick
Keeill Vout,	Patrick
Keeill Chiggyrt,	Maughold
Knoc Rule,	Braddan
Renshent,	Malew

Note 1: Ratio signifies the length-width proportion of the altar base. These figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Note 2: Proportion is intended to indicate the proportion of the interior width of the keeill which is occupied by the altar setting (altar length / interior width of keeill x 100).

TABLE 4: MANX ALTAR FRONTALS

Provenance	Cat.No.	Reconstructed Size (m) Length	Height	Thickness	
Calf of Man, Rushen	61(50)	0.40	0.75	0.04	
Ballavarkish,Bride	52(-)	0.70	0.75	0.04	
Ronaldsway II, Malew	164(-)	0.65	0.55	0.03	(*1)
Parish church, Maughold	51(23)	0.80	0.80	0.08	(*2)
Peel Island, German	31(15)	0.30+	0.40+	0.05	

References:

Kermode 1907,107,110,125-127,pls.VIII,IX,XVI; 1912,69-73, figs. 15,16; 1915a,33,figs.30,31: Megaw 1939a,fig.5; 1958: Neely 1940,72,pl.IX.

*1: This stone is complete.
*2: The reconstructed size offered by Kermode (1907,110) was 0.55 x 0.55 x 0.08 m. On the basis of a comparison with the disposition of the cross-form and border on the Ballavarkish panel (52(-)), dimensions of the order of 0.80 x 0.80 x 0.08 m would seem to be more reasonable.

Note:
Two cross-incised stones, 44(-) and 45(-), from the keeill at Ballaquinney Moar (MAROWN 7), have been identified as altar frontals (Thomas 1967b,107,112). The reconstructed sizes of these stones have been given, very tentatively, as 0.30 x 0.60 x 0.01 m and 0.55 x 0.90 x 0.01 m respectively (Kermode 1912,61-62). The stones were in a fragmentary state and were found built into the base of the altar (Kermode 1909,13). There is, however, insufficient evidence to warrant Thomas' identification of these stones as altar panels.

TABLE 5: MANX ALTAR MENSAE

Provenance	Cat.No.	Reconstructed Size (m) Length	Width	Thickness
Peel Island, German	67(46)	?0.50	?0.40	0.05
Ballalough, German	-	0.75	0.60	-
Knoc y Doonee, Andreas	-	0.85	0.45	0.07
Sulbrick, Santon	-	1.30	0.75	-
Ballafurt, Santon	-	0.75	0.40	-
Lag ny Keeilley, Patrick	-	0.85	0.35	0.10

References:

Kermode 1907,119-120,pl.XIV; 1911a,25,fig.24; 1926,469-471; 1935,22,fig.35; Trench-Jellicoe pers.comm and present fieldwork.

TABLE 6: ENTRANCE TYPES: ORKNEY & SHETLAND
(Entrance position noted in brackets)

Splayed & Unrebated		Splayed & Rebated	
Brough of Deerness	(W)	St. Ninian´s Isle	(W)
Framgord (UNST 20)	(W)	St. Olaf´s church, Yell	(S)
		Lundawick (UNST 10)	(W)

Parallel & Unrebated		Parallel & Rebated	
Tammaskirk, Rendall	(S)	Marwick, Birsay	(S)
Linton, Shapinsay	(S)	St. Tredwell´s chapel	(S)
St. Mary´s chapel, Wyre	(W)	(WESTRAY 14)	
Crosskirk (WESTRAY 5)	(S)		

Note: The entrance into the chapel at Peterkirk in Evie is located towards the W end of the S wall. Its form, however, is not known.

TABLE 7: ORCADIAN & SHETLAND ALTARS

(a): Stone Altars

Site	Dimension (m) Length	Width	Height	Ratio (see Table 3)	Proportion
Brough of Deerness	1.10	0.80	1.00	4:3	38%
Tammaskirk, Rendall	0.90	0.90	-	1:1	31%
Brough of Birsay	1.25	0.80	-	3:2	40%
" " " (side altars)	1.00	0.50	-	2:1	-
Orphir Round church	1.30	0.80	-	3:2	-
St. Ninian´s Isle	1.35	0.75	-	2:1	44%
" " " (side altar)	1.15	0.35	-	3:1	-
St. John´s church (UNST 1)	-	-	-	-	-

(b) Timber Altar

Brough of Deerness	0.75	0.40	-	2:1	21%

(c) Altar Frontal

Provenance	Cat.No.	Dimensions (m) Length	Height	Thickness
Island of Flotta	IB.48	1.65	0.80	0.10

References: Allen 1903,23,fig.19: Ritchie 1985a,pl.9.7: Thomas 1971a,187, fig.89

TABLE 8: METROLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ORCADIAN CHAPELS
(after Roussell 1944,133-134 with additions)

Site	Dimensions	`Design Size´ Roman ft.	Greek ft.
Brough of Deerness			
:ext. length	24´ 5" (7.43 m)	25 (-6cm)	23 (+4cm)
:ext. width	17´ 4" (5.28 m)	18 (+3cm)	16 (-8cm)
:int. width	9´ 6" (2.89 m)	10 (+6cm)	9 (+3cm)
St. Tredwell´s chapel, Papa Westray			
:ext. length	29´ 2" (8.88 m)	30 (-3cm)	27 (-11cm)
:ext. width	22´ (6.70 m)	23 (+8cm)	21 (+12cm)
Round Church, Orphir			
:int. radius nave	9´ 7" (2.91 m)	10 (+4cm)	9 (+1cm)
St. Mary´s chapel, Wyre			
:nave ext. length	25´ 4" (7.72 m)	26 (-5cm)	24 (+8cm)
:nave ext. width	18´ 4" (5.58 m)	19 (+2cm)	17 (-6cm)
:chncl.ext.length	10´ 6" (3.20 m)	11 (+4cm)	10 (+5cm)
:chncl.ext. width	12´ 1" (3.68 m)	12 (-14cm)	11 (-11cm)
Linton chapel, Shapinsay			
:nave ext. length	25´ 2" (7.67 m)	26	24 (+13cm)
:nave ext. width	19´ 3" (5.86 m)	20 (+4cm)	18 (-1cm)
:chncl.ext.length	10´ 6" (3.20 m)	11 (+4cm)	10 (+5cm)
:chncl.ext. width	12´ 7" (3.83 m)	13	12 (-7cm)

Note:

Calculations based on Roussell´s Roman and Carolingian-Greek foot measures of 29.5 cm and 32.5 cm respectively. Divergence from `design size´, if any, is expressed in centimetres.

TABLE 9: PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MANX KEEILLS

Site	Parish	Ratio 1	Ratio 2	Ratio3	Ratio 4
Keeill Vreeshy	Marown	3:2	11:6	17:6	1:1
Keeill Pherick	Marown	4:3	7:4	17:6	6:5
Cabbal Druiaght	Marown	7:6	3:2	5:2	4:3
Ballaquinney	Marown	5:4	3:2	7:3	6:5
Keeill Lingan	Marown	6:5	4:3	7:3	3:2
Ballachrink I	Marown	8:5	2:1	3:1	6:7
Ballachrink II	Marown	-	5:3	-	-
Sulbrick	Santon	5:3	2:1	16:5	1:1
Camlork	Braddan	3:2	8:5	5:2	1:1
Knoc Rule	Braddan	3:2	2:1	11:4	7:8
Keeill Abban	Braddan	-	3:2	-	-
Ballagawne	Rushen	-	2:1	-	-
Cabbal Dreem Ruy	Arbory	5:3	2:1	8:3	4:5
Ballaglonney	Arbory	-	5:3	-	-
Keeill Vael, Balladoole	Arbory	7:5	5:3	7:3	1:1
Renshent	Malew	5:3	2:1	13:5	4:5
Ballakilley	Malew	17:9	7:3	3:1	2:3
Keeill Unjin	Malew	3:2	7:4	11:5	4:5
Ronaldsway I	Malew	9:5	7:3	3:1	2:3
St. Michael's chapel	Malew	9:5	15:7	5:2	2:3
N. Keeill,parish church	Maughold	3:2	5:3	9:4	1:1
Mid. " " "	Maughold	3:2	5:3	2:1	5:6
E. " " "	Maughold	5:3	2:1	7:3	3:4
Keeill Chiggyrt	Maughold	3:2	9:5	7:3	5:6
Keeill Woirrey, Cornaa	Maughold	5:4	7:5	2:1	6:5
Keeill Vael, Barony	Maughold	3:2	9:5	5:2	1:1
Ballamillgen	Lonan	5:3	2:1	12:5	1:3
Sulby	Onchan	7:4	13:5	15:4	4:5
Ballakilmartin	Onchan	3:2	2:1	3:1	1:1
Raby	Patrick	-	9:5	-	-
Lag ny Keeilley	Patrick	4:3	3:2	5:2	6:5
K. Woirrey, Kerroodhoo	Patrick	12:7	2:1	5:2	5:7
K. Woirrey, Glen Moar	Patrick	5:3	5:2	16:5	3:4
Keeill Vout	Patrick	3:2	5:3	11:5	8:9
Ballahimmin	German	4:3	5:3	11:4	5:4
K. Moirrey, Ballalough	German	3:2	16:9	11:5	4:5
Cronk Breck	German	3:2	9:5	7:3	7:8
Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma	German	3:2	17:9	13:5	1:1
Eary Moar	German	7:5	11:6	14:5	1:1
St.Patrick's chapel,Peel	German	8:5	17:9	7:3	4:5
Spooyt Vane	Michael	3:2	9:5	12:5	8:9
Cronk y Killey	Michael	8:7	4:3	9:4	3:2
Keeill Vael, Druidale	Michael	4:3	5:3	14:5	4:3
Ballamoar	Ballaugh	-	3:2	-	-
Ballacurry	Jurby	6:5	7:5	2:1	5:4

TABLE 9 continued:

Site	Parish	Ratio 1	Ratio 2	Ratio3	Ratio 4
Ballameanagh	Lezayre	7:5	5:3	7:3	1:1
Corrody	Lezayre	3:2	11:6	8:3	1:1
Cronk yn Howe	Lezayre	7:4	5:2	7:2	4:5
Sky Hill	Lezayre	8:5	15:7	3:1	7:8
Killabragga	Lezayre	-	3:2	-	-
Knoc y Doonee	Andreas	4:3	3:2	7:3	8:7
Ballavarkish	Bride	4:3	8:5	7:3	1:1
Cabbal ny Cooilley	Bride	9:5	11:5	8:3	2:3

Ratios calculated to nearest whole number:

Ratio 1 = exterior length / exterior width
Ratio 2 = interior length / interior width
Ratio 3 = exterior length / interior width
Ratio 4 = exterior width / interior length

References:

Bruce 1968: Bruce & Cubbon 1930: Higham & Jones 1982: Kermode 1909; 1910; 1911a; 1915a; 1935: Kneen 1924: Morris 1983a: OSCI: and personal fieldwork.

TABLE 10:

PROPORTIONAL ANALYSIS OF UNICAMERAL CHAPELS IN ORKNEY & SHETLAND

Site		Ratio 1	Ratio 2	Ratio 3	Ratio 4
ORKNEY					
Marwick	Birsay	7:6	7:5	2:1	5:4
Kirbister	Birsay	-	5:3	-	-
Houseby	Birsay	7:4	5:2	7:2	4:5
Hillside	Birsay	4:3	10:7	2:1	1:1
Etheriegeo	Birsay	1:1	1:1	2:1	2:1
Marykirk	Harray	3:2	2:1	14:5	1:1
Kirk o´Cletton	Harray	2:1	5:2	3:1	3:5
Corston	Harray	-	2:1	-	-
Black chapel	Firth	-	7:3	-	-
Head of Holland	Kirkwall	2:1	12:5	3:1	3:5
Marykirk	Orphir	-	4:3	-	-
Midland	Orphir	-	12:7	-	-
Peterkirk	St.Andrews	2:1	5:2	3:1	3:5
Brough of -,	Deerness	7:5	5:3	5:2	1:1
Cornholm	Deerness	1:1	8:7	9:5	3:2
Tenston	Sandwick	-	2:1	-	-
Lyking	Sandwick	8:7	6:5	8:5	7:6
Ruid chapel	S.Ronaldsay	5:3	2:1	5:2	3:4
Ladykirk, Halcro	S.Ronaldsay	4:3	3:2	2:1	8:9
Windwick	S.Ronaldsay	-	15:7	-	-
St.Tredwell´s	Papa Westray	4:3	3:2	15:7	1:1
Auskerry	Stronsay	4:3	3:2	2:1	1:1
Brims chapel	Walls	5:2	7:2	4:1	1:2
Colm´s kirk	Sanday	4:3	3:2	2:1	1:1
Colliness	Sanday	-	3:2	-	-
SHETLAND (selected sites)					
Bothen	Unst	2:1	3:1	7:2	2:3
Framgord	Unst	3:2	2:1	3:1	8:9
Halliara Kirk	Fetlar	7:5	8:5	2:1	8:9
Kirkhouse	Fetlar	2:1	12:5	3:1	3:5
Gulberwick	Lerwick	3:2	2:1	3:1	8:9
Crosskirk	Northmavine	5:3	2:1	5:2	5:7
Chapel Knowe	Nesting	2:1	8:3	3:1	1:2

(For explanation of Ratios (1) - (4) see note on Table 9).

References:

Clouston 1918a: Fraser 1927: Morris 1977b: OSCI: RCAMS 1946: and personal fieldwork.

TABLE 11: ENCLOSURE TYPES & AREA: ISLE OF MAN

(a) CURVILINEAR ENCLOSURES

Site	Parish	Enclosure size (hectares)
Rhynne	Marown	0.07
Cabbal Druiaght	Marown	0.05
Ballaquinney Moar	Marown	0.07
Ballachrink I	Marown	0.05
Ballacregga	Santon	0.03
Sulbrick	Santon	0.12
Camlork	Braddan	0.04
Surby	Rushen	0.02
Keeill Moirrey	Arbory	0.05
Cabbal Dreem Ruy	Arbory	0.06
Renshent	Malew	0.16
Ronaldsway I	Malew	0.11
Ronaldsway II	Malew	0.21
Scarlett	Malew	0.07
Keeill Chiggyrt	Maughold	0.07
Keeill Vael, Barony	Maughold	0.14
Keeill Woirrey, Gretch	Lonan	0.04
Ballaquine, Amogarry	Lonan	0.02
Skinscoe	Lonan	0.10
Sulby	Onchan	0.06
Lag ny Keeilley	Patrick	0.04
Cronk Breck	German	0.08
Kerrogaroo	German	0.08
Keeill Pherick-a-Dromma	German	0.03
Spooyt Vane	Michael	0.04
St. Patrick's chapel	Jurby	0.06
Keeill Tushtag	Andreas	0.07

(b) INTERMEDIATE CURVO-RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURES

Keeill Lingan	Marown	0.06
keeill Woirrey, Cornaa	Maughold	0.08
Raby	Patrick	0.07

(c) RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURES

St.Trinian's chapel	Marown	0.40
Balnahow	Santon	0.02
Keeill Vael, Balladoole	Arbory	0.02
St. Michael's Isle	Malew	0.18
St. Mary's chapel,Ballure	Maughold	0.11
Keeill Coonlagh	Jurby	0.36

References:

Bersu & Bruce 1972: Bruce 1968: Higham & Jones 1984: Kermode 1909; 1910; 1911a; 1915a; 1915c; 1935: Neely 1940: OS 1869: OSCI: and personal fieldwork and aerial survey.

TABLE 12: ENCLOSURE TYPES & AREA: ORKNEY & SHETLAND

(a) CURVILINEAR ENCLOSURES (see also Chapter 7)

Site		Enclosure size (hectares)
St. Tredwell's chapel	Papa Westray	0.10
Brough of Birsay	Birsay	0.10
Houseby	Birsay	0.08
Marykirk, Grimeston	Harray	0.07
Windwick	S.Ronaldsay	0.06
Kirkaby	Unst	0.05
Uyea	Unst	0.12
Hillswick	Northmavine	0.12
Orbister	Northmavine	0.05
Chapel Knowe, Lunna	Nesting	0.03

(b) RECTILINEAR ENCLOSURES

Crosskirk	Westray	0.11
Brough of Birsay	Birsay	0.09
Marwick	Birsay	0.05
Brough of Deerness	Deerness	0.02
St. Bride's chapel	Sandwick	0.08
Tenston	Sandwick	0.10
Lyking	Sandwick	0.06
Ladykirk, Halcro	S.Ronaldsay	0.10
Brims	Walls	0.02
Norwick	Unst	0.12
Crosskirk	Unst	0.04
Lundawick	Unst	0.09
Colvadale	Unst	0.07
Framgord	Unst	0.11

References:

Cruden 1965: Morris 1976: ONB: OS 1878: OSCI: RCAMS 1946: and personal fieldwork and aerial survey.

TABLE 13:

RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; MAROWN PARISH

(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Total Rent	No. of Quarterlands	Average Rent per Quarterland
Sanbrick	57s 2d	5.5	10s 5d
Ballaterson	46s 9d	4.3	10s 9d
Trollaby	46s 2d	3.5	13s 2d
Ballayeman	44s 8d	3.5	12s 9d
Glenlogh	44s 4d	4.5	9s 10d
Ballanicholas	33s 0d	4	8s 3d
Cardall	23s 10d	3	7s 11d
Garth	9s 0d	1	9s 0d

TABLE 14:

RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; SANTON PARISH

(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Total Rent	No. of Quarterlands	Average Rent per Quarterland
Arrogan	83s 7d	c.4	20s 11d
Knockslemyn	58s 9d	c.3	19s 7d
Grenwick	55s 6d	c.3.5	15s 10d
Bendoill	45s 2d	3.5	12s 11d
How	44s 10d	5	9s 0d
Corbreck	39s 0d	2.5	15s 7d
Meary	39s 0d	3	13s 0d
Knock-y-Loughan	58s 9d	c.3	19s 7d
Sanbrick	28s 6d	3.5	8s 2d

TABLE 15:

RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; ISLE OF MAN

AVERAGE RENT PAID PER TREEN IN DIFFERENT PARISHES
(after Talbot 1924,Marstrander 1937,301 with additions)

	Sheading	Parish	ATRP (see note below)
Northside			
	Glenfaba	Patrick	£3 14s 0d
		German	£2 18s 10d
	Michael	Michael	£3 6s 2d
		Ballaugh	£3 15s 1d
		Jurby	£2 13s 7d
	Ayre	Andreas	£3 5s 5d
		Bride	£3 13s 9d
		Lezayre	£4 9s 0d
Southside			
	Rushen	Rushen	£3 14s 8d
		Arbory	£3 18s 0d
		Malew	£4 17s 5d
	Middle	Santon	£2 8s 0d
		Marown	£2 2s 3d
		Braddan	£3 1s 11d
	Garff	Onchan	£2 9s 1d
		Lonan	£2 7s 6d
		Maughold	£3 7s 10d

Note: ATRP (Average Treen Rent per Parish)

In these calculations, the rents of all treens, comprising more than two quarterlands, have been added up and divided by the number of members. The small treens and their rents have been omitted because there are reasons (see text) for believing that they represent relatively late treen formations. Marstrander (1937,301) added up the total number of quarterlands, divided that figure by a factor of four and then divided the total rent by that figure. Immense variation in average treen rents is apparent whichever method is followed.

TABLE 16:

ANALYSIS OF ABBEYLAND BOUNDARY TRACTS (Part 1)

Boundary Description Types (Categories 1-4 explained in text pp.183-186)

		Category Type			
		1	2	3	4
Boundary Tract					
Malew	abbeylands	10	10	10	4
Lezayre	abbeylands	5	1	0	10
Skinscoe	abbeylands	2	1	3	3
	Totals:	17	12	13	17

TABLE 17:

ANALYSIS OF ABBEYLAND BOUNDARY TRACTS (Part 2)

Basic Classification of Place-Name Types

Boundary Tract	Total no. of place-names	Reference to: Streams	Treens	Farms	Other
Malew	25	3	6	12	4
Lezayre	15	1 - 2	1 - 2	2	10
Skinscoe	7	0	3 - 4	1	2 - 3
Totals:	47	4 - 5	10 - 12	15	16 - 17

TABLE 18: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; ALIA TREENS -
(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Parish	Treen	Keeills	Q'lands	A Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B
Braddan	Gresby	1	6	67s 8d	£3 1s 11d	1.09
	Alia G...	0	2	20s 6d		0.33
Onchan	Begoade	1	4.5	45s 0d	£2 9s 1d	0.92
	Alia B...	0	2.25	32s 0d		0.65
Lonan	Raby	0	3.5	48s 6d	£2 7s 6d	1.02
	Alia R...	1	3.5	50s 8d		1.06
	Colby	1	4.3	43s 8d		0.92
	Alia C...	1	5	65s 2d		1.37
Patrick	Dalby	0	4	77s 7d	£3 14s 0d	1.05
	Alia D...	0	4	79s 0d		1.07
German	Gnebe	0	3.5	50s 10d	£2 18s 10d	0.86
	Alia G...	2	3.3	53s 2d		0.90
Lezayre	Sulby	1	4.75	117s 8d	£4 9s 0d	1.32
	Alia S...	0	4	100s 8d		1.13
Andreas	Leodest	0	4	71s 6d	£3 5s 5d	1.09
	Alia L...	0	3.75	63s 4d		0.97

Average Proportional Rent Total: (COLUMN C)

alia treens: 7.48/8= 0.94
head treens: 8.27/8= 1.03

TABLE 19: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; BEG-MOAR TYPE TREENS
(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Keeills	Q'lands	A Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B
Cornaa Moar	2	3.5	45s 2d	£3 7s 10d	0.67
Cornaa Beg	1	4.5	82s 11d		1.22
Crosby Moar	0	3.75	95s 2d	£3 13s 9d	1.29
Crosby Beg	1	4	72s 4d		0.98
Smeall	1	4	76s 6d	£3 5s 5d	1.17
Smeall Beg	0	3.25	73s 6d		1.12
Cranstall I	1	4	67s 6d	£3 13s 9d	0.92
Cranstall II	0	4	66s 4d		0.90
Cranstall III	1	3.3	51s 4d		0.70
Baldall Brew	0	c.4	73s 10d	£3 1s 11d	1.19
Baldall Cryste	1	4	72s 10d		1.18
Baldall Reynylt	0	4	65s 0d		1.05

Average Proportional Rent Total: (COLUMN C)
(excluding Baldall & Cranstall)

beg treens: 3.32/3 = 1.11
moar treens: 3.13/3 = 1.04

TABLE 20: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515: ALIA & BEG-MOAR TREENS

Analysis of Total Rents paid by `Reconstructed´ Treens

`Reconstructed Treens´	A Total Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B	D No. of Treens	E C/D
`Gresby´ Braddan	£4 8s 2d	£3 1s 11d	1.42	2	0.71
`Begoade´ Onchan	£3 17s 0d	£2 9s 1d	1.57	2	0.78
`Raby´ Lonan	£4 19s 2d	£2 7s 6d	2.09	2	1.04
`Colby´ Lonan	£5 7s 10d	£2 7s 6d	2.27	2	1.13
`Dalby´ Patrick	£7 16s 7d	£3 14s 0d	2.11	2	1.05
`Gnebe´ German	£5 4s 0d	£2 18s 10d	1.77	2	0.88
`Sulby´ Lezayre	£10 18s 6d	£4 9s 0d	2.45	2	1.22
`Leodest´ Andreas	£6 14s 10d	£3 5s 5d	2.06	2	1.03
`Baldall´ Braddan	£10 11s 8d	£3 1s 11d	3.42	3	1.14
`Corna´ Maughold	£6 8s 1d	£3 7s 10d	1.89	2	0.94
`Cranstall´ Bride	£9 5s 2d	£3 13s 9d	2.51	3	0.84
`Crosby´ Bride	£8 7s 6d	£3 13s 9d	2.27	2	1.13
`Smeall´ Andreas	£7 10s 0d	£3 5s 5d	2.29	2	1.14

Average Proportional Rent Total

COLUMN C: 28.12/13 = 2.16
COLUMN E: 13.03/13 = 1.002

TABLE 21: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515; RENN TREENS
(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Parish	No.of Q´lands	A Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B
Renmullen	Rushen	c.1	2s 4d	£3 14s 8d	0.03
Neash	Bride	c.2	22s 10d	£3 13s 9d	0.31
Rencullen	Michael	1	18s 0d	£3 6s 2d	0.27
Rencullen	Maughold	0.5	8s 0d	£3 7s 10d	0.12

Average Proportional Rent Total

COLUMN C: 0.73/4 = 0.18

TABLE 22: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515: SMALL TREENS
(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Parish	No. of Q'lands	A Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B
Crokness	Rushen	1.75	40s 11d	£3 14s 8d	0.55
Scard	Rushen	1	29s 2d	£3 14s 8d	0.39
Le Garre	Rushen	0.5	5s 8d	£3 14s 8d	0.08
Le Calf	Rushen	1	26s 8d	£3 14s 8d	0.36
Testrawe	Arbory	1.5	28s 0d	£3 18s 0d	0.36
Logh	Malew	1	13s 4d	£4 17s 5d	0.14
Garth	Marown	1	9s 0d	£2 2s 3d	0.21
Testro	Braddan	1	12s 0d	£3 1s 11d	0.19
Hoanes	Lonan	0.5	8s 0d	£2 7s 6d	0.17
Glenrushen	Patrick	c.0.5	12s 4d	£3 14s 0d	0.17
Ballaterson	German	c.1	26s 8d	£2 18s 10d	0.45
Ardrenk	Ballaugh	1	6s 8d	£3 15s 1d	0.09
Braust	Andreas	1.25	26s 0d	£3 5s 5d	0.40

Average Proportional Rent Total

COLUMN C: 3.56/13 = 0.27

TABLE 23: RENTAL INFORMATION, 1511-1515: EARY TREENS
(after Talbot 1924, Marstrander 1937 with additions)

Treen	Parish	Keeills	No.of Q'lands	A Rent	B ATRP (Table 15)	C A/B
Ardary	Arbory	0	c.3.25	59s 4d	£3 18s 0d	0.76
Arystynnok	Arbory	1	c.1.75	46s 0d	£3 18s 0d	0.59
Aresteyn	Arbory	1	c.3	69s 6d	£3 18s 0d	0.89
Arernan	Malew	1	1	18s 0d	£4 17s 5d	0.18
Earyrody	German	1	2	21s 4d	£2 18s 10d	0.36
Aryhorkell	Michael	1	`parcel'	7s 8d	£3 6s 2d	0.11

Average Proportional Rent Total

COLUMN C: 2.89/6 = 0.48

TABLE 24: SUMMARY OF AVERAGE PROPORTIONAL RENTS

Comparison of different treen types and average rent totals per treen per respective parish. The figures are total averages taken from Column C: Tables 18,19,21,22 & 23 above. The average rent per treen for all parishes = 1.00.

Treen Type		
Beg	treens	: 1.11
Moar	treens	: 1.04
`Head´	treens	: 1.03
Alia	treens	: 0.94
Eary	treens	: 0.48
`Small´	treens	: 0.27
Renn	treens	: 0.18

TABLE 25:

A PROVISIONAL LIST OF MANX KEEILL SITES WITH POSSIBLE PRE-CHRISTIAN FUNERARY ASSOCIATIONS

(a) MOUNDED KEEILL SITES

Corpus No.	Site	Evidential bases for identification of pre-Christian burial: A	B	C	D
Arbory 4	Ballaglonney	-	-	-	*
Arbory 5	Ballagawne	-	-	-	*
Braddan 3	Ballaoates	-	-	-	-
Bride 6	Cabbal ny Cooilley	-	-	-	*
German 2	Keeill Moirrey	*	*	-	*
German 13	Cronkbane	-	-	-	-
German 14	Ballahimmin	*	*	?*	-
Lezayre 4	Skyhill	-	-	*	*
Lezayre 10	Corrody	*	*	-	-
Malew 12	Kerrowkeil	-	-	-	-
Marown 4	Keeill Vreeshy	-	-	-	-
Maughold 10	Keeill Maloney	-	-	*	*
Maughold 18	Keeill Woirrey, Cornaa	*	*	-	*
Maughold 19	Keeill Vael, Barony	-	-	*	*
Rushen 2	Ballaqueeney	-	*	-	*

(b) NON-MOUNDED KEEILL SITES

Arbory 10	Balladoole	*	*	*	-
Braddan 5	Camlork	*	*	-	-
Jurby 2	St. Patrick's chapel	*	*	-	-
Lonan 2	Kilkillane	*	-	-	-
Malew 5	Scarlett	*	-	-	*
Malew 9	Ronaldsway II	*	*	*	*
Marown 8	Keeill Lingan	*	*	*	*
Marown 9	Ballachrink I	*	*	*	-
Maughold 1	Parish church	*	*	-	*
Michael 2	Keeill Pharlane	*	-	-	-
Onchan 3	Keeill Vartin	*	*	-	-
Onchan 5	Glencrutchery	-	*	-	-
Rushen 4	Gramma	*	-	*	*
Santon 8	Sulbrick	-	*	-	*

Key: Category (A) denotes the presence of `urns' or `pottery'; (B) `charcoal'/`ashes'; (C) `Short cists'. The site's boundary status is noted in Column D

References: Bersu & Bruce 1972: Bruce 1968: Cubbon 1935b: Kermode 1909; 1910; 1911a; 1915a; 1935: Neely 1940: OSCI: Reilly forthcoming (a): Stenning 1935: and personal fieldwork.

TABLE 26: A PROVISIONAL LIST OF ECCLESIASTICAL SITES IN ORKNEY WITH POSSIBLE IRON AGE ASSOCIATIONS

	A	B	C	Topographical Setting
ORKNEY MAINLAND				
Brough of Birsay	*			Island
Houseby, Birsay		*		Lochside
Brough of Deerness			*	Coastal prom.
Newark, Deerness		*		Coastal
Deerness parish church			*	Coastal
Peterkirk, Evie		*		Coastal
Loch of Wasdale, Firth			*	Lochside prom
Burness, Firth	*			Coastal
Kirk of Cletton, Harray		*		Lochside prom
Marykirk, Grimeston, Harray		*		Lochside prom
Harray parish church	*			Inland
Corston / Knowe of Haewin, Harray			*	Inland
Holm parish church		*		Coastal
Tammaskirk, Rendall	*			Coastal
Peterkirk, Campston, St. Andrews			*	Coastal
Ness, Sandwick			*	Lochside prom
Lyking, Sandwick	*			Lochside
Kirkness, Sandwick			*	Inland
Stromness parish church	*			Coastal
ROUSAY				
Brettaness		*		Lochside prom
Peterkirk, Burrian		*		Islet in loch
Knarston			*	Coastal
SANDAY				
Colliness		*		Coastal prom.
Peterkirk		*		Coastal
Arstas	*			Inland
Karny Kirk / Carse of Henzie Hunt			*	Coastal
Lambaness			*	Coastal
Burrian		*		Coastal
Lady parish church			*	Coastal
Cross parish church			*	Coastal
SHAPINSAY				
St. Salvador's chapel			*	-
Sandsend			*	-
Parish church	*			Coastal
Helliar holm	*			Island
SOUTH RONALDSAY				
St. Colm's chapel, Hoxa			*	Coastal

TABLE 26 continued

	A	B	C	Topographical Setting
NORTH RONALDSAY				
Broch of Burrian			*	Coastal prom.
STRONSAY				
Hunton			*	Coastal
Parish church, Peterkirk			*	Coastal
Cleat			*	Inland
PAPA WESTRAY				
St. Tredwell's chapel	*			Lochside prom
St. Boniface church	*			Coastal
WESTRAY				
Peterkirk, Rusland		*		Coastal prom.
Cleat			*	Coastal
Kirkhouse			*	-

A: Chapels at identified Iron Age occupation sites
B: Association probable
C: Association possible

References:

Bell & Carter 1980: Brothwell 1977: Clouston 1918a; 1932b: Firth et al 1975: Fraser 1923; 1924; 1925; 1927; 1928; 1929: Hunter & Dockrill 1982b: Laing 1868: Lamb 1973a; 1980a; 1980b; 1982; 1983c: H.Marwick 1923a; 1924a; 1924c; 1931: J.Marwick 1984b: Morris 1977a: ONB 1880: OSCI: RCAMS 1946,ii: Steedman 1980: and personal fieldwork.

TABLE 27:

A PROVISIONAL LIST OF ECCLESIASTICAL SITES IN SHETLAND WITH POSSIBLE IRON AGE ASSOCIATIONS

	A	B	C	Topographical Setting
SHETLAND MAINLAND				
Nesting parish church	*			Coastal
Chapel Knowe, Lunna, Nesting			*	Coastal
Hillswick, Northmavine			*	Coastal
Orbister, Northmavine			*	Coastal
BRESSAY				
St. Mary´s church, Culbinsbrough	*			Coastal prom.
YELL				
Burravoe	*			Coastal
St. Ninian´s chapel, Papil			*	Coastal
UNST				
Kirkaby			*	Coastal
St. John´s church, Norwick			*	Inland

A: Chapels at identified Iron Age occupation sites
B: Association probable
C: Association possible

References:

Fojut 1985; 1986: MacDonald & Laing 1968: McGibbon & Ross 1896: Muir 1863; 1885: ONB 1878: OSCI: RCAMS 1946,iii: Saxby 1905: and personal fieldwork.

TABLE 28:

Percentage of Chapel Sites in Spatial Association with possible pre-Christian Funerary and Iron Age Domestic Settlement Sites

[Association with:]	percentage of all chapel sites in Isle of Man	Orkney	Shetland
pre-Christian funerary sites	16%	3%	5%
Iron Age domestic settlements	3%	26%	7%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

Antiq.J	Antiquaries Journal
Arch.J	Archaeological Journal
ASC	Anglo Saxon Chronicle
BIHR	Borthwick Institute of Historical Research
BUPNS	Bulletin of the Ulster Place Name Society
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CMCS	Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies
DES	Discovery and Excavation in Scotland
EHR	English Historical Review
fn	foot note
GAJ	Glasgow Archaeological Journal
JBAA	Journal of the British Archaeological Association
JEPNS	Journal of the English Place Name Society
JMM	Journal of the Manx Museum
JRSAI	Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland
Med.Arch	Medieval Archaeology
MM.MS	Manx Museum Manuscript
MM.MS.K (n)	Manx Museum Manuscript Kermode (see Kermode 1909-1918)
NAR	Norwegian Archaeological Review
nd	no date
NMAS	National Museum of Antiquities Scotland (now RMS), Queen St. Edinburgh
NMRS	National Monuments Record Scotland: 6-7, Coates Place, Edinburgh
NSA	New Statistical Account (Scotland) 1842
NTFS	Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap

OCL	Orkney County Library, Kirkwall
ONB	Object Name Books of the Ordnance Survey
OR	Orkney Records: Sites & Monuments Record Orkney: compiled by Dr. R.G. Lamb, 48, Junction Rd. Kirkwall, Orkney
OS	Ordnance Survey
OSA	Old Statistical Account (Scotland) 1791-1799
OSCI	Ordnance Survey Card Index: Sites & Monuments Record Orkney, Shetland & Man compiled by OS Archaeology Division
ProcIOMNHAS	Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History & Antiquarian Society (formerly YLM)
POAS	Proceedings of the Orkney Antiquarian Society
Post.Med.Arch	Post Medieval Archaeology
PPS	Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society
PRIA	Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy
PSAS	Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
RCAMS	Royal Commission on the Ancient & Historical Monuments of Scotland
REO	Records of the Earldom of Orkney (see Clouston 1914)
RHP	Register House Plan (Scottish Record Office)
RMS	Royal Museum Scotland (formerly NMAS) Queen St. Edinburgh
SA	Shetland Archives, Lerwick
SBVS	Saga Book of the Viking Society
SHR	Scottish Historical Review
SRO	Scottish Record Office, Charlotte Square, Edinburgh
TransBNHSR	Transactions of the Buteshire Natural History Society Rothesay

TransDGNHAS	Transactions of the Dumfries & Galloway Natural History & Antiquarian Society
UJA	Ulster Journal of Archaeology
YLM	Yn Lioar Manninagh (now ProcIOMNHAS)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberdeen, W. 1770 A Chart of the Orkney Islands OCL.E29: RHP 6096

Adalbjarnarson, B. 1941 Heimskringla (Islenzk Fornrit XXVI) Reykjavík 1941

Adam of Bremen's History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen:see Schmeidler 1917 & Tschan 1959

Addleshaw, G.W.O. 1973 `The Pastoral Structure of the Celtic Church' BIHR Paper No.43. University of York 1973

Agústsson, H. 1981a `Die isländische Kirche bis 1550' in Ahrens 1981b,263-266

Agústsson, H. 1981b `Isländischer Kirchenbau bis 1550' in Ahrens 1981b,343-348

Agústsson, H. 1981c `Bauten aus Soden und Steinen' in Ahrens 1981b,391-402

Ahrens, C. 1981a `Katalog der frühen Holzkirchen' in Ahrens 1981b,499-631

Ahrens, C. (ed) 1981b Frühe Holzkirchen in nördlichen Europa Hamburg 1981

Aitken, W.G. 1955 `Excavation of a Chapel at St. Ninian's Point, Isle of Bute' Trans.BNHSR, XIV, 1955, 62-76

Alcock, L. 1980 `Populi bestiales Pictorum feroci animo: a survey of Pictish settlement archaeology' in Hanson & Keppie (eds) 1980, 61-95

Alcock, L. & Alcock, E. 1980 `Scandinavian settlement in the Inner Hebrides: recent research on place-names and in the field' Scottish Archaeological Forum 10, 1980, 61-73

Allen, J.R. 1903 The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland Edinburgh 1903

Andersen, P.S. 1983 `To what extent did the balley/balla (baile) names in the Isle of man supplant place-names of Norse origin ?' in Fell et al 1983, 147-168

Anderson, A.O. 1908 Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers London 1908

Anderson, A.O. 1922 Early Sources of Scottish History: AD 500 to 1286 (2 volumes) Edinburgh 1922

Anderson, A.O. & Anderson, M.O. 1961 Adamnan's Life of Columba London 1961

Anderson, J. (ed) 1873 The Orkneyinga Saga Edinburgh 1873

Anderson, J. 1879 Introduction to G. Low's A Tour through the islands of Orkney and Schetland, 1774 Kirkwall 1879

Anderson, J. 1881 Scotland in Early Christian Times (= Rhind Lectures for 1879) Edinburgh 1881

Anderson, M.O. 1973 Kings and Kingship in Early Scotland Edinburgh & London 1973

Archdall, M. 1786. Monasticon Hibernicum Dublin 1786

Arnold, C.J. 1975 `Fragments of bone combs from Papa Westray, Orkney' PSAS, 106, 1974-75, 210-211

Arnold, C.J. & Wardle, P. 1981 `Early medieval settlement patterns in England' Med.Arch 25, 1981, 145-149

Ashley, A. 1958 `The Church in the Isle of Man' BIHR Paper No.13. University of York 1958

Ashmore, P.J. 1980 `Low cairns, long cists and symbol stones' PSAS 110, 1978-1980, 346-355

Bailey, P. 1971 Orkney Newton Abbot 1971

Bailey, R.N. 1980 Viking Age Sculpture (=Collins Archaeology 1) London 1980

Baker, A.R.H. & Butlin, R.A. (eds) 1973 Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles Cambridge 1973

Baldwin, J.R. (ed) 1978 Scandinavian Shetland: An Ongoing Tradition ? Scottish Society for Northern Studies, Edinburgh 1978

Bannerman, J. 1974 Studies in the History of Dalriada Edinburgh 1974

Barber, J. 1982 `Report of Excavations at St. Magnus' church, Birsay, Orkney' Discovery & Excavation in Scotland for 1982, 17

Barber, J. 1983 Interim Report of Excavations at St. Magnus' Church, Birsay CEU Report 005

Barber, J. forthcoming Excavation Report: St. Magnus' Church, Birsay

Barclay, R. 1967 The Court Books of Orkney and Shetland: 1614-1615, Scottish History Society, Edinburgh 1967

Barley, M.W. & Hanson, R.P.C. (eds) 1968 Christianity in Britain 300-700 Leicester 1968

Barrow, G.W.S. 1973 The Kingdom of the Scots London 1973

Barrow, G.W.S. 1983 `The Childhood of Scottish Christianity: A Note on Some Place-Name Evidence' Scottish Studies 27,1983,1-15

Barry, G. 1805 The History of the Orkney Islands Edinburgh 1805

Batey, C.E. & Morris, C.D. 1983 `The Finds' in Hedges 1983, 85-108

Bekker-Nielsen, H.,Olsen, O. & Foote,P. (eds) 1981 Proceedings of the Eighth Viking Congress: 1977 Aarhus 1981

Bell, B. & Carter, S.P. 1980 `Report of Survey at Warebeth Churchyard, Stromness, Orkney' Discovery & Excavation in Scotland for 1980, 22

Benediktsson, J. (ed) 1968 Islendingabók & Landnámabók: 2 volumes (Islenzk Fornrit I) Reykjavík 1968

Benson, H. 1956 `Church orientations and patronal festivals' Antiq.J 36, 1956, 205-213

Berriman, A. 1953 Historical Metrology London 1953

Berry, R.J. 1985 The Natural History of Orkney London 1985

Berry, R.J. & Johnston, J.L. 1980 The Natural History of Shetland London 1980

Bersu, G. 1946 `Celtic Homesteads in the Isle of Man' JMM V, 72-73, 1945-46, 177-182

Bersu, G. 1949 `A promonotory fort on the shore of Ramsay Bay, Isle of Man' Antiq.J XXIX 1949, 62-79

Bersu, G. 1957 `Three Viking Graves in the Isle of Man' JMM VI, 74, 1957, 15-18

Bersu, G. 1968 `The Vikings in the Isle of Man' JMM VII, 84, 1968, 83-89

Bersu, G. & Cubbon, A.M. 1966 `Excavation of the Cashtal, Ballagawne, Garwick 1941´ Proc.IOMHHAS VII,1,1964-66, 88-119

Bersu, G, & Bruce, J.R. 1972 `Chapel Hill: a prehistoric, Early Christian and Viking site at Balladoole, Kirk Arbory, Isle of Man´ Proc.IOMNHAS VII,4,1970-72, 632-665

Bersu, G. & Wilson, D.M. 1966 Three Viking Graves in the Isle of Man (= Society of Medieval Archaeology Monograph No.1) London 1966

Bertelsen, R. 1979 `Farm Mounds in North Norway: a review of recent research´ NAR 12,1,1979, 48-56

Bieler, L. 1950 `Studies on the text of Muirchú´ PRIA 52C, 1950,179-220

Bieler, L. (ed) 1979 The Patrician Texts in the Book of Armagh (= Scriptores Latini Hiberniae, X): Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin 1979

Bigelow, G.F. 1984a Subsistence in Late Norse Shetland: an Investigation into a Northern Island Economy of the Middle Ages PhD Thesis, Cambridge 1984

Bigelow, G.F. 1984b `Two Kerbed Cairns from Sandwick, Unst, Shetland´ in Friell & Watson 1984,115-129

Bigelow, G.F. 1985 `Sandwick, Unst and Late Norse Shetland Economy´ in B. Smith 1985, 95-127

Bigelow, G.F. & McGovern, T. 1980 Interim Reports of Excavations at Sandwick, Unst, Shetland 1980

Binchy, D.A. (ed) 1978 Corpus Juris Hibernici: 6 volumes, Dublin 1978

Black, G.F. 1893 `Scottish Charms and Amulets´ PSAS 27, 1892-93, 433-526

Bonney, D. 1966 `Pagan Saxon burials and boundaries in Wiltshire´ Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine LXI,1966,25-30

Bonney, D. 1979 `Early Boundaries and Estates in Southern England´ in Sawyer 1979,41-51 (See also Sawyer 1976b,72-82)

Bonser, W. 1957 An Anglo-Saxon and Celtic Bibliography: 450-1087 Oxford 1957

Bourke, C. 1980 `Early Irish Hand-Bells´ JRSAI 110,1980,52-66

Bourke. C. 1983 `The Hand-Bells of the Early Scottish Church' PSAS 113,1983,464-468

Bowen, E.G, 1954 The Settlements of the Celtic Saints in Wales Cardiff 1954

Bowen, E.G. 1969 Saints, Seaways and Settlements in the Celtic Lands Cardiff 1969

Bowen, E.G. 1972 Britain and the Western Seaways London 1972

Bowen, H.C. & Fowler, P.J. (eds) 1978 Early Land Allotment in the British Isles British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 48 Oxford 1978

Boyer, R. (ed) 1976 Les Vikings et leurs civilisations: problèmes actuels Paris 1976

Bradbury, J. c.1890 `Ny Shen Reddyn Vannin or the Old Things of Man' MM.MS 2202A

Brand, J. 1701 A Brief Description of Orkney, Zetland, Pightland Firth and Caithness Edinburgh 1701

Brannon, N.F. 1980 `A Trial Excavation at St. John's Point Church, County Down' UJA 43,1980,59-64

Breeze, D. (ed) 1984 Studies in Scottish Antiquity Edinburgh 1984

Broderick, G. (ed) 1973 Chronicle of the Kings of Man and the Isles Edinburgh 1973

Broderick, G. (ed) 1979 Cronica Regum Mannie et Insularum (BL Cotton Julius Avii), Manx Museum & National Trust, Douglas 1979

Broderick, G. 1980 `Irish and Welsh Strands in the Genealogy of Godred Crovan' JMM VIII, 89, 1980, 32-38

Brøgger, A.W. 1929 Ancient Emigrants: a history of the Norse Settlements of Scotland Oxford 1929

Brothwell, D. 1977 `On a mycoform stone structure in Orkney and its relevance to possible further interpretations of so-called souterrains' Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, University of London, 14,1977, 179-190

Brownbill, J. (ed) 1919 The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey Vol II; Part III (Chetham Society), Manchester 1919

Bruce, J.R. 1968 The Manx Archaeological Survey: Sixth Report: Keeills and Burial Grounds in the Sheading of Rushen Manx Museum & National Trust, Douglas 1968

Bruce, J.R. & Cubbon, W. 1930 `Cronk yn How: an Early Christian and Viking Site at Lezayre, Isle of Man' Archaeologia Cambrensis LXXXV, 1930, 267-308

Bruce, R.S. 1933 `The Scattald Marches of Yell, Shetland, in 1667 by Gilbert Neven' Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany IX,1921-1933,140-148

Bulloch, J. 1971 `The Church in Celtic Scotland and the Native Culture' in Meldrum 1971, 25-36

Burleigh,J.H.S. 1960 A Church History of Scotland Oxford University Press London 1960

Bury, J.B. 1905 The Life of St. Patrick and his place in history London 1905

Butler, L.A.S. 1977 `Continuity of Settlement in Wales in the Central Middle Ages' in Laing 1977,61-65

Butler, L.A.S. 1980 `The Churchyard in Eastern England, AD900-1100: some Lines of Development' in Rahtz et al 1980,383-389

Butler, L.A.S & Morris, R.K. (eds) 1986 The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers on history, architecture and archaeology in honour of Dr.H.M. Taylor (=CBA Research Report No.60), London 1986

Buttler, S. 1983a Preliminary Report on Excavations at Cross Geos, Clibberswick, Unst (Privately circulated) Liverpool 1983

Buttler, S. 1983b `Report of Excavations at Clibberswick, Unst, Shetland' Discovery & Excavation in Scotland for 1983, 21-22

Byrne, M.E. 1932 `On the punishment of sending adrift' Eriu XI, 1930-32, 97-102

Calder, C.S.T. 1956 `Report on the discovery of numerous Stone Age house sites in Shetland' PSAS 89, 1955-56, 340-397

Calder, C.S.T. 1963 `Cairns, Neolithic Houses and Burnt Mounds in Shetland' PSAS 96, 1962-63, 37-86

Cant, R.G. 1972 `The Church in Orkney and Shetland and its relations with Norway and Scotland in the Middle Ages' Northern Studies 1, 1972, 1-18

Cant, R.G. 1975 The Medieval Churches and Chapels of Shetland Shetland Archaeological & Historical Society, Lerwick 1975

Cant, R.G. 1984a `Settlement, Society and Church Organization in the Northern Isles' in Fenton & Pálsson 1984, 169-179

Cant, R.G. 1984b `Norse Influence in the Organization of the Medieval Church in the Western Isles' Northern Studies 21, 1984, 1-14

Carney, J. 1983 `A maccucáin, sruith in tíag' Celtica 15, 1983, 25-41

Cassidy, V.H.de P. 1963 `The Voyage of an Island' Speculum XXXVIII, 1963, 595-602

Chadwick, N.K. 1949 `St. Ninian: a preliminary study of sources' Trans.DGNHAS 3rd.Series XXVII,1948-49,9-53

Chadwick, N.K. (ed) 1958 Studies in the Early British Church Oxford 1958

Chadwick, N.K. 1961 The Age of the Saints in the Early Celtic Church Oxford 1961

Chapman, J.C. & Mytum, H.C. (eds) 1983 Settlement in Northern Britain: 1000BC - AD1000 British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 118, Oxford 1983

Charles-Edwards, T.M. 1976 `Boundaries in Irish Law' in Sawyer 1976b,83-87

Cheape, H. 1984 `Recounting Tradition: A Critical View of Medieval Reportage' in Fenton & Pálsson 1984, 197-222

Cherry, B. 1976 `Ecclesiastical Architecture' in Wilson, D.M. 1976c, 151-200

Christie, H. 1983 `Den første generasjon av kirker i Norge' Hikuin 9,1983,93-100,281-282

Clarke, A.E. 1926 `Excursion to Marown' ProcIOMNHAS, II, 1923-26, 17-21

Close-Brooks, J. & Stevenson, R.B.K. 1982 Dark Age Sculpture Edinburgh 1982

Clouston, J.S. 1912 `Odal Orkney' SBVS VII, 1911-12, 85-100

Clouston, J.S. (ed) 1914 Records of the Earldom of Orkney: 1299-1614 (Scottish History Society: Series 2, Vol.7), Edinburgh 1914

Clouston, J.S. 1916 `The Lawrikmen of Orkney' SHR XIV,53,1916, 49-59

Clouston, J.S. 1918a `The Old Chapels of Orkney' SHR XV,58,1918, 89-105 & SHR XV,59,1918, 223-240

Clouston, J.S. 1918b `Two features of the Orkney Earldom´ SHR XVI,61,1918,15-28

Clouston, J.S. 1920 `The Orkney Townships´ SHR XVII,1919-20, 16-45

Clouston, J.S. 1923 `The Orkney Pennylands´ SHR XX,1922-23,19-27

Clouston, J.S. 1924 `The Lawthing and early officials of Orkney´ SHR XXI,1924,101-114

Clouston, J.S. 1925 `The Goodmen and Hirdmen of Orkney´ POAS III, 1924-25, 9-20

Clouston, J.S. 1926a `The Old Prebends of Orkney´ POAS IV, 1925-26,31-36

Clouston, J.S. 1926b `An Early Orkney Castle´ PSAS 60, 1925-26, 281-300

Clouston, J.S. 1926c `Tradition and Fact´ POAS IV, 1925-26, 9-14

Clouston, J.S. (ed) 1927a The Orkney Parishes Kirkwall 1927

Clouston, J.S. 1927b `The Orkney Bus´ POAS V,1926-27, 41-49

Clouston, J.S. 1929 `Three Norse Strongholds in Orkney´ POAS VII,1928-29,57-74

Clouston, J.S. 1931a Early Norse Castles Kirkwall 1931

Clouston, J.S. 1931b `A fresh view of the settlement of Orkney´ POAS IX,1930-31,35-40

Clouston, J.S. 1932a A History of Orkney Kirkwall 1932

Clouston, J.S. 1932b `Tammaskirk in Rendall´ POAS X,1931-32,9-16

Clouston, J.S. 1933 `The Origin of the Halcros´ POAS XI,1932-33,59-66

Cluness, A.T. 1951 The Shetland Isles Edinburgh 1951

Colgan, J. 1645 Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae Dublin 1645

Colgrave, B. & Mynors, R.A.B. (eds) 1969 Bede´s Ecclesiastical History of the English People Oxford 1969

Cotter, Rev. J.M. 1977 St. Sanctain´s Church, Santon, Isle of Man (Pamphlet)

Coucher Book of Furness Abbey: see Brownbill 1919

Coughtrey, M. 1872 `Notes on materials found in a kitchen-midden at Hillswick, Shetland´ PSAS 9,1870-72,118-150

Cox, J.C. & Harvey, A. 1908 English Church Furniture London 1908

Craine, D. 1976 Tynwald: Symbol of an Ancient Kingdom (Pamphlet)

Cramp, R.J. 1976 `Monastic Sites´ in Wilson, D.M. 1976c, 201-252

Cramp, R.J. 1981 The Hermitage and the Off-shore Island Occasional Lecture No.3, National Maritime Museum 1981

Cramp, R.J. 1983 `The Anglian Sculptures from Jedburgh´ in O´Connor & Clarke 1983,269-284

Craven, J.B. 1893 History of the Church in Orkney: 1662-1688 Kirkwall 1893

Craven, J.B. 1901 The History of the Church in Orkney from the Introduction of Christianity to 1558 Kirkwall 1901

Craven, J.B. 1912 The History of the Episcopal Church in Orkney Vol.3 (2nd edition) Kirkwall 1912

Crawford, B.E. 1983 `Birsay and the early Earls and Bishops of Orkney´ in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,97-118

Crawford, B.E. 1984a `The Cult of St. Magnus in Shetland´ in Crawford 1984b,65-81

Crawford, B.E. (ed) 1984b Essays in Shetland History Lerwick 1984

Crawford, B.E. 1987 Scandinavian Scotland Leicester University Press 1987

Crawford, B.E. (ed) forthcoming Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae Occidentalis ab Initio ad Annum 1198

Crawford, I.A. 1967 `The Divide between Medieval and Post-Medieval in Scotland´ Post.Med.Arch 1,1967,84-89

Crawford, I.A. 1974 `Scot (?), Norseman and Gael´ Scottish Archaeological Forum 6, 1974,1-16

Crawford, I.A. 1981 `War or Peace- Viking Colonization in the Northern and Western Isles of Scotland reviewed´ in Bekker-Nielsen et al 1981,259-269

Cregeen, S. 1951 Aspects of Celtic Culture in the Isle of Man M.A Thesis 1950/51: MM.MS 5283C

Cregeen, S. 1970 `Report on Fieldwork & Research: Keeill Crore, Patrick´ ProcIOMNHAS Notes & Queries I,10,1970,119-129

Crellin, A.M. c.1888 `Notes on the Place-Names of Kirk Michael´ MM.MS 5207C

Crellin, A.M. 1901 `The Place-Names of Kirk Michael´ YLM II, 1901,122-126

Crellin, Rev. J. 1774 `Parish of Michael described´ MM.MS 194A

Crellin, M. 1969 `An Early Manorial Roll´ JMM VII,85,1969,98-99

Cronica regum mannie et insularum: see Broderick 1979

Crowe, C.J. 1982 `A Note on white quartz pebbles found in Early Christian contexts on the Isle of Man´ ProcIOMNHAS VIII,4,1982,413-415

Cruden, S. 1958 `Earl Thorfinn the Mighty and the Brough of Birsay´ in Eldjárn 1958, 156-162

Cruden, S. 1965 `Excavations at Birsay, Orkney´ in Small 1965, 22-31

Cruden, S. 1986 Scottish Medieval Churches Edinburgh 1986

Cubbon, A.M. 1966a `Viking Runes: outstanding new discovery at Maughold´ JMM VII,82,1966,23-25

Cubbon, A.M. 1966b `Cross-slabs and related inscriptions found since 1939´ JMM VII,82,1966,26-27

Cubbon, A.M. 1971 `The Medieval Chapel of St. Mary's, Castletown, later the Castletown Grammar School´ ProcIOMNHAS VII,3,1971

Cubbon, A.M. 1973 Prehistoric Sites in the Isle of Man Manx Museum, Douglas 1973

Cubbon, A.M. 1976 `An incised pebble of Early Christian date from Peel´ JMM VII,88,1976,209-210

Cubbon, A.M. 1977 The Art of the Manx Crosses Manx Museum, (2nd edition) Douglas 1977

Cubbon, A.M. 1978 `Some chance finds of archaeological importance in the Isle of Man 1962-1977´ in Davey 1978, 413-428

Cubbon, A.M. 1982 `The Early Church in the Isle of Man´ in Pearce 1982,257-282

Cubbon, A.M. 1983 `The archaeology of the Vikings in the Isle of Man´ in Fell et al 1983,13-26

Cubbon, A.M. & Dolley, M. 1980 `The 1972 Kirk Michael Viking Treasure Hoard´ JMM VIII,89,1980,5-20

Cubbon, W. n.d `Notes concerning the keeills´ MM.MS 1132A

Cubbon, W. 1926a `Saynt Maholde and Saynt Michell: Notes on Christian´s Barony, Maughold´ ProcIOMNHAS II,1923-26, 447-453

Cubbon, W. 1926b `Notes on Marown Church´ ProcIOMNHAS III,1926,13-22

Cubbon, W. 1926c `The Lands of the Monks of Myrosco´ ProcIOMNHAS III,1926,147-151

Cubbon, W. 1930 The Treen Divisions of the Isle of Man in 1511-1515 Douglas 1930

Cubbon, W. 1935a `The White Well´ ProcIOMNHAS IV,1935,133

Cubbon, W. 1935b `Excavations at Ronaldsway, 1935´ ProcIOMNHAS IV,2,1935,151-160

Cubbon, W. 1938 `Was there a keeill in every treen division ?´ JMM IV,54,1938,3-5

Cubbon, W. 1940 `The Barony of St. Trinian in Kirk Marown´ JMM IV,62,1940,175-177

Cubbon, W. 1952 Island Heritage Manchester 1952

Cunliffe-Shaw, R. 1966 `Prolegomena to a Reappraisal of early Christianity in Man relative to the Irish Sea Province´ ProcIOMNHAS VII,1,1964-66,49-84

Cuppage, J. et al 1986 Archaeological Survey of the Dingle Peninsula Dublin 1986

Curle, C.L. 1982 Pictish and Norse Finds from the Brough of Birsay 1934-1974 (Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph Series No.1) Edinburgh 1982

Curle, C.L. 1983 `The Finds from the Brough of Birsay 1934-1974´ in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,67-81

Curphey, R.A. n.d Ancient Centres of Government of the Isle of Man (Pamphlet)

Curphey, R.A. 1982 `Peel Castle´ ProcIOMNHAS IX,1,1980-82, 59-94

Cursiter, J.W. 1886 `Notice of a Wood-Carver´s Tool Box with Celtic Ornamentation, recently discovered in a Peat-Moss in the Parish of Birsay, Orkney´ PSAS 20,1885-86,47-50

Cursiter, J.W. 1887 `Notice of the Bronze Weapons of Orkney and Shetland and an Iron Age deposit found in a cist at Moan, Harray´ PSAS 21,1886-87,339-346

Cursiter, J.W. 1898 `Note on a stone bearing an incised cross, from the site of St. Colm´s Chapel, Walls, Orkney´ PSAS 32,1897-98,50-52

Dahl, S. 1968 `Extracts from a lecture on Kirkjubøur´ in Niclasen 1968,187-192

Dahl, S. 1970 `The Norse Settlement of the Faroe Islands´ Med.Arch 14,1970,60-73

Dahl, S. 1976 `Timber Churches of the Faroes´ Faroe Isles Review 1,2,1976,24-31

Dasent, Sir G.W. 1894 Icelandic Sagas: The Saga of Hacon; the Saga of Magnus (Rolls Series No.88, vol.IV), London 1894

Davey, P. (ed) 1978 Man and the Environment in the Isle of Man British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 54, (2 volumes) Oxford 1978

Davidson, D.A., Lamb, R.G. & Simpson, I. 1983 `Farm Mounds in North Orkney: a preliminary report´ NAR 16,1,1983,39-44

Davidson, D.A. & Jones, R.L. 1985 `The Environment of Orkney´ in Renfrew 1985,10-35

Davies, E. 1941a `The Distribution of Settlements´ in Pye 1941,19-25

Davies, E. 1941b `The Evolution of the present system of land utilization´ in Pye 1941,32-43

Davies, E. 1956 `Treens and Quarterlands: a study of the land system of the Isle of Man´ Trans.Institute of British Geographers 22,1956,97-116

Davies, J.G. 1968 The Secular Use of Church Buildings London 1968

Davies, W. 1982 Wales in the Early Middle Ages Leicester 1982

Dicuil: Liber de mensura orbis terrae: see Tierney 1967

Dietrichson, L. & Meyer, J. 1906 Monumenta Orcadica Christiania 1906

Dodgshon, R.A. 1981 Land and Society in Early Scotland Edinburgh 1981

Dolley, M. 1971 `An English Halfpenny of Edward I from Cronk ny Merriu´ JMM VII,87,1971,175-176

Dolley, M. 1976a Some Irish Dimensions to Manx History Inaugural Lecture, Queen's University, Belfast 1976

Dolley, M. 1976b `A Hiberno-Manx Coinage of the 11th century' Numismatic Chronicle 7th Series XVI (Vol.136),1976,75-84

Dolley, M. 1976c `Two near contemporary findings of Hiberno-Norse coins from Maughold' JMM VII,88,236-240

Dolley, M. 1981 `The palimpsest of Viking settlement on Man' in Bekker-Nielsen et al 1981,173-181

Donaldson, G. 1984 `Some Shetland Parishes at the Reformation' in Crawford 1984b,143-160

Douglas-Lamb, Rev. c.1968 The Book of Unst (MS in possession of Kenneth Ross, The Manse, Baltasound, Unst)

Drury, P.J. (ed) 1982 Structural Reconstruction: approaches to the interpretation of the excavated remains of buildings British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 110, Oxford 1982

Dugdale, D.S. 1980 Early Missionaries in the West (Pamphlet) Andreas, Isle of Man 1980

Dumville, D.N. 1976 `A Note on the Picts in Orkney' Scottish Gaelic Society 12,1976,266

Dunbar, J.G. & Fisher, I. 1973 `Sgòr nam Ban-Naomha (Cliff of the Holy Women) Isle of Canna' Scottish Archaeological Forum 5,1973,71-75

Edmonston, A. 1809 The Ancient and Present State of the Zetland Islands Edinburgh 1809

Edmonston, T. 1872 `Notes on some recent excavations in the island of Unst, Shetland, and of the collection of stone vessels, implements etc. thus obtained for the society's museum' PSAS 9,1870-72,283-287

Eldjárn, K. (ed) 1958 Proceedings of the Third Viking Congress Reykjavik 1958

Eldjárn, K. 1984 `Graves and Grave Goods: Survey and Evaluation' in Fenton & Pálsson 1984,2-11

Fanning, T. 1975 `Excavations at Reask, 1973-75' Journal of the Kerry Archaeological & Historical Society VIII,1975,5-10

Fanning, T. 1981a `Excavation of an Early Christian Cemetery and Settlement at Reask, County Kerry' PRIA 81C,1981,67-172

Fanning, T. 1981b `Early Christian Sites in the Barony of Corkaguiney´ in O Corráin 1981b,240-246

Farrell, R.T. (ed) 1978 Bede and Anglo-Saxon England British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 46, Oxford 1978

Farrell, R.T. (ed) 1982 The Vikings Cornell 1982

Farrer, J. 1862 `The Knowe of Saverough´ Gentleman´s Magazine 13,1862,601-604

Farrer, J. 1868 `Note respecting various articles in bronze and stone found in Orkney´ PSAS 7,1866-68,103-105

Faull, M. & Moorhouse, S. 1981 West Yorkshire: An Archaeological Survey to AD1500 (4 Volumes) Wakefield 1981

Feacham, R.W. 1950 `A New Pictish Symbol Stone in the Lowlands´ PSAS 84,1949-50,206-208,pl.xxiv

Fell, C., Foote, P., Graham-Campbell, J. & Thomson, R. (eds) 1983 The Viking Age in the Isle of Man (=Proceedings of the Ninth Viking Congress) London 1983

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1978a Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands Copenhagen 1978

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1978b `The Manx Place-Name Debate: a view from Copenhagen´ in Davey 1978,315-318

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1978c `A Gaelic-Scandinavian Loan-word in English Place-Names´ JEPNS 10, 1977-78,18-25

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1980 `Common Gaelic Airge, Old Scandinavian AErgi or Erg ?´ Nomina 4,1980,67-74

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1983 `Scandinavian settlement in the Isle of Man and Northwest England: the place-name evidence´ in Fell et al 1983,37-52

Fellows-Jensen, G. 1984 `Viking Settlement in the Northern and Western Isles: The Place-Name Evidence as seen from Denmark and the Danelaw´ in Fenton & Pálsson 1984,148-168

Fellows-Jensen, G. forthcoming `The Vikings´ Relationship with Christianity in the British Isles: the evidence of place-names containing the element kirkja´ (Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress)

Fenton, A. 1978 The Northern Isles: Orkney and Shetland Edinburgh 1978

Fenton, A. & Pálsson, H. (eds) 1984 The Northern and Western Isles in the Viking World: Survival, Continuity and Change Edinburgh 1984

Fernie, E. 1976 `The ground-plan of Norwich cathedral and the square root of two' JBAA 129,1976,77-86

Fernie, E. 1978 `Historical Metrology and Architectural History' Art History I,4,1978,383-399

Finlay, I. 1979 Columba London 1979

Firth, J.T., Bichan, M. & Spence, S. 1975 Harray: Orkney's Inland Parish Stromness 1975

FitzGibbon, G. 1985 `A Note on the Medieval Chapels of Fetlar' Shetland Life 54,1985,18-20

Flanagan, D. 1979 `Common elements in Irish place-names: ceall, cill' BUPNS Series 2,2,1979,1-8

Flateyiarbók: see Unger & Vigfusson 1868

Fletcher, M. & Reilly, P. forthcoming `Viking Settlers in the Isle of Man: some simulation experiments'

Fojut, N. 1980 The Archaeology and Geography of Shetland Brochs PhD Thesis: (3 volumes) Glasgow University 1980

Fojut, N. 1981a A Guide to Prehistoric Shetland Lerwick 1981

Fojut, N. 1981b `Is Mousa a broch ?' PSAS 111,1981,220-228

Fojut, N. 1983 `Towards a Geography of Shetland brochs' GAJ 9,1983,38-59

Fojut, N. 1985 `Some thoughts on the Shetland Iron Age' in Smith 1985,47-84

Fojut, N. 1986 A Guide to Prehistoric and Viking Shetland Lerwick 1986

Foote, P. & Strømback, D. (eds) 1971 Proceedings of the Sixth Viking Congress London 1971

Foote, P. & Wilson, D.M. 1970 The Viking Achievement London 1970

Fowler, D. 1982 `Temporary works, their construction and archaeology' in Drury 1982,125-130

Fox, C. & Dickins, B. (eds) 1950 The Early Cultures of North West Europe: H.M.Chadwick Memorial Studies Cambridge 1950

Fraser, J. 1909 `Donations to NMAS' PSAS 43,1908-1909,176-178

Fraser, J. 1923 `Some Antiquities in Harray Parish' POAS I,1922-23,31-37

Fraser, J. 1924 `Antiquities of Sandwick Parish' POAS II,1923-24,23-29

Fraser, J. 1925 `Antiquities of Birsay Parish' POAS III,1924-25,21-30

Fraser, J. 1926 `Antiquities of Stenness Parish' POAS IV,1925-26,17-24

Fraser, J. 1927 `The Antiquities of Firth Parish' POAS V,1926-27,51-57

Fraser, J. 1928 `The Antiquities of Rendall Parish' POAS VI,1927-28,69-73

Fraser, J. 1929 `The Antiquities of Evie Parish' POAS VII,1928-29,41-46

Freke, D.J. 1983-85 Peel Castle Excavations: 1st-3rd Interim Reports Peel 1983-1985

Freke, D.J. 1984 `Celts and Vikings at Peel' Popular Archaeology 5,No.8,14-18

Friell, J.G.P. & Watson, W.G, (eds) 1984 Pictish Studies: Settlement Burial and Art in Dark Age Northern Britain British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 125, Oxford 1984

Garrad, L.S. 1978 `Excavation of a lintel grave cemetery at Glentraugh, Santon, Isle of Man' in Davey 1978,245-250

Gelling, M. 1970 `The Place-Names of the Isle of Man: part 1' JMM VII,86,1970,130-139

Gelling, M. 1971 `The Place-Names of the Isle of Man: part 2' JMM VII,87,1971,168-174

Gelling, M. 1978 `Manx and Gaelic in Medieval Man: the place-name evidence' in Davey 1978,251-264

Gelling, P.S. 1952 `Excavation of a promontory fort at Port Grenaugh, Santon' ProcIOMNHAS V,3,1952,307-315

Gelling, P.S. 1957 `Excavation of a promontory fort at Scarlett, Castletown, Isle of Man' ProcIOMNHAS V,5,1957,571-575

Gelling, P.S. 1958a `Close ny Chollagh: an Iron Age fort at Scarlett, Castletown, Isle of Man' PPS XXIV,1958,85-100

Gelling, P.S. 1958b `Recent excavations of Norse houses in the Isle of Man' JMM VI,75,1958,54-57

Gelling, P.S. 1959 `Excavation of a promontory fort at Cass ny Hawin, Malew, Isle of Man' ProcIOMNHAS VI,1,1959,28-38

Gelling, P.S. 1961 `Shielings in the Isle of Man' JMM VI,77,1960-61,123-126

Gelling, P.S. 1963 `Medieval Shielings in the Isle of Man' Med.Arch 6-7,1962-63,156-172

Gelling, P.S. 1964 `The Braaid Site: a re-excavation of one of the structures' JMM VI,80,1964,201-205

Gelling, P.S. 1968 `Excavation of a promontory fort on Ballanicholas, Kirk Marown, Isle of Man' ProcIOMNHAS VII,2,1966-68,181-191

Gelling, P.S. 1969 `A metalworking site at Kiondroghad, Kirk Andreas, Isle of Man' Med.Arch 13,1969,67-83

Gelling, P.S. 1970 `A Norse homestead near Doarlish Cashen, Kirk Patrick, Isle of Man' Med.Arch 14,1970,74-82

Gelling, P.S. 1977 `Celtic Continuity in the Isle of Man' in Laing 1977,77-81

Gelling, P.S. 1984 `The Norse Buildings at Skaill, Deerness, Orkney, and their immediate predecessor' in Fenton & Pálsson 1984,12-39

Gelling, P.S. 1985 `Excavations at Skaill, Deerness' in Renfrew 1985,176-182

George, T.J. 1912 A Catalogue of the Collection....made by the late Sir Henry Dryden, Bart... Northampton 1912

Gifford, T. 1879 An Historical Description of the Zetland Islands, 1733 Edinburgh 1879

Gjerset, K. 1922 History of Iceland London 1922

Glare, P.G.W. (ed) 1982 Oxford Latin Dictionary Oxford 1982

Goodier, A. 1984 `The Formation of Boundaries in Anglo-Saxon England: A Statistical Study' Med.Arch 28,1984,1-21

Gordon, E.V. 1978 Introduction to Old Norse (2nd edition) Oxford 1978

Gorrie, D. 1868 Summers and Winters in the Orkneys (2nd edition) London Edinburgh & Kirkwall 1868

Goudie, G. 1877 `On two monumental stones with ogham inscriptions recently discovered in Shetland´ PSAS 12,1876-1877,20-32

Goudie, G. 1881 `Notice of a sculptured slab, from the Island of Burra, Shetland´ PSAS 15,1880-1881,199-209

Goudie, G. 1884 `Revenues of the Parochial Benefices of Shetland in the beginning of the Seventeenth Century´ PSAS 18,1883-1884,291-305

Goudie, G. 1904 The Celtic and Scandinavian Antiquities of Shetland London 1904

Goudie, G. 1912 `The Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Southern Parishes of Shetland´ Trans.Scottish Ecclesiological Society III,3,1911-12,279-293

Goudie, G. 1915 Introduction to G. Low´s `A Tour through the North Isles and part of the Mainland of Orkney in the year 1778´ Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany 8,1915,131-153 (Also published as an offprint, pp.1-20)

Graham-Campbell, J. 1980 `The Scandinavian Viking-age burials of England: some problems of interpretation´ in Rahtz et al 1980,379-382

Gray, J.A. n.d A Short History of Marown Old Church (Pamphlet)

Grensted, Canon 1926 `A White Stone´ ProcIOMNHAS II,1923-26,43-46

Grierson, P. 1972 English Linear Measures: an essay in origins (The Stenton Lecture for 1971) University of Reading 1972

Guðmundsson, F. 1965 Orkneyinga Saga (Islenzk Fornrit XXXIV) Reykjavík 1965

Gullick, F.R. n.d St.Michael´s Church, Kirk Michael, Isle of Man (Pamphlet)

Gwynn, L. 1915 `The Reliquary of Adamnan´ Archivium Hibernicum 4,1915,199-214

Haddan, A.W. & Stubbs, W. 1873 Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland Vol.II Oxford 1873

Hafstrom, G. 1971 `Atlantic and Baltic Earldoms´ in Foote & Strømback 1971,61-67

Hakonar Saga: see Vigfússon 1887a and Dasent 1894

Hamilton, J.R.C. 1956 Excavations at Jarlshof, Shetland Edinburgh 1956

Hamilton, J.R.C. 1962 `Brochs and Broch Builders´ in Wainwright 1962c,53-90

Hamilton, J.R.C. 1968 Excavations at Clickhimin, Shetland Edinburgh 1968

Hamlin, A. 1984 `The Study of Early Irish Churches´ in Ni Chathain & Richter 1984,117-126

Hannerberg, D. 1976 `Models of medieval and pre-medieval territorial organization´ Journal of Historical Geography 2,1976,21-34

Hanson, W.S. & Keppie, L.J.F. (eds) 1980 Roman Frontier Studies British Archaeological Reports (International Series) 71, Oxford 1980

Harbison, P. 1970 `How old is Gallarus oratory ?: a reappraisal of its role in early Irish architecture´ Med.Arch 14,1970,34-60

Harbison, P. 1982 `Early Irish Churches´ in Löwe 1982,618-629

Hare, M. & Hamlin, A. 1986 `The study of early church architecture in Ireland: an Anglo-Saxon viewpoint´ in Butler & Morris 1986,131-145

Harman, M. 1977 `An incised cross on Hirt, Harris´ PSAS 108,1977,254-258

Harrison, M.W. 1926 `Ballure Church´ ProcIOMNHAS II,4,1926, 453-459

Harrison, W. (ed) 1879 An Account of the Diocese of Sodor and Man and St. German´s Cathedral plus records of the bishops of Sodor and Man (=Manx Society XXIX) Douglas 1879

Hedges, J.W. 1978 `A long-cist at Sandside, Graemsay, Orkney´ PSAS 109,1977-78,374-378

Hedges, J.W. 1983 `Trial excavations on Pictish and Viking Settlements at Saevar Howe, Birsay, Orkney´ GAJ 10,1983,73-124

Hedges, J.W. 1985 `The Broch Period´ in Renfrew 1985,150-175

Hedges, J.W. 1987 Bu, Gurness & the Brochs of Orkney (3 Volumes) British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 163-165, Oxford 1987

Hedges, J.W. & Bell, B. 1980a `The Howe´ Current Archaeology 73,1980,48-51

Hedges, J.W. & Bell, B. 1980b `That tower of Scottish prehistory -the broch´ Antiquity 54,No.211,1980,87-94

Hedges, J.W. & Smith, B. 1979 `Report of excavations at St.Margaret´s Hope, South Ronaldsay´ Discovery and Excavation in Scotland for 1979, 26-27

Hedges, J.W. & Smith, B. 1981 `Report of excavations at St.Margaret´s Hope, South Ronaldsay´ Discovery and Excavation in Scotland for 1981, 26

Heimskringla; Olafs Saga Tryggvasonar: see Adalbjarnarson 1941 & Laing, S. n.d

Henderson, G. 1910 The Norse Influence on Celtic Scotland Glasgow 1910

Henry, F. 1957 `Early monasteries, beehive-huts and drystone houses in the neighbourhood of Caherciveen and Waterville, Kerry´ PRIA 58C,1956-57,45-166

Hibbert, S. 1822 Description of the Shetland Isles London 1822

Higham, M.C. 1978 `The Erg Place-Names of Northern England´ in Davey 1978,347-355

Higham, N. & Jones, B. 1982 `Manx Archaeology from the Air´ Popular Archaeology 3,No.9,8-13

Higham, N. & Jones, B. 1984 `From Ronaldsway to Ramsay: Aerial Survey in Man´ Popular Archaeology 5,No.8,7-13

Historia Norvegiae: see Storm 1880,69-124

Hodges, R. 1982 Dark Age Economics: The Origins of Towns and Trade AD 600-1000 London 1982

Hogarth, A.C. 1973 `Structural Features in Anglo-Saxon Graves´ Arch.J 130,1973,104-119

Hood, A.B.E. (ed) 1978 St.Patrick: his writings and Muirchu´s Life London 1978

Hope-Taylor, B. 1977 Yeavering: an Anglo-British centre of early Northumbria London 1977

Huggins, P.J. 1981 `Yeavering measurements: an alternative view´ Med.Arch 25,1981,150-153

Huggins, P.J., Rodwell, K. & Rodwell, W. 1982 `Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian building measurements´ in Drury 1982,21-66

Hughes, K. 1966 The Church in Early Irish Society London 1966

Hughes, K. 1970 Early Christianity in Pictland Jarrow Lecture for 1970

Hughes, K. 1972 Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the sources New York 1972

Hughes, K. 1980 Celtic Britain in the Early Middle Ages (=Studies in Celtic History II) Woodbridge 1980

Hughes, K. 1981 `The Celtic Church: is this a valid concept ?' CMCS 1,1981,1-20

Hughes, K. & Hamlin, A. 1977 The Modern Traveller to the Early Irish Church London 1977

Hunt, J. 1866 `Report on Explorations into the Archaic Anthropology of the Islands of Unst, Brassay (sic) & the Mainland of Shetland' in Memoirs Read before the Anthropological Society of London II,1865-66,294-338

Hunter, J. (ed) 1978 Introduction to G. Low's A Tour through the Islands of Orkney and Schetland, 1774 Inverness 1978

Hunter, J.R. 1982 `Survey on Muckle Skerry' RESCUE News 29,1982,7

Hunter, J.R. 1983 `Recent Excavations on the Brough of Birsay' in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,152-170

Hunter, J.R. 1984a Fair Isle Survey: Interim Report Bradford 1984

Hunter, J.R. 1984b `Excavations at Pool, Sanday, 1983' Archaeology Extra No.1, Spring 1984 (Undergraduate School of Archaeological Sciences) Bradford 1984

Hunter, J.R. 1985 `Excavations at Pool, Sanday, 1984' Archaeology Extra No.2, Spring 1985 (Undergraduate School of Archaeological Sciences) Bradford 1985

Hunter, J.R. 1986a Rescue Excavations on the Brough of Birsay, 1974-1982 (Society of Antiquaries Monograph Series No.4) Edinburgh 1986

Hunter, J.R. 1986b `Excavations at Pool, Sanday, 1985' Archaeology Extra No.3, Spring 1986 (Undergraduate School of Archaeological Sciences) Bradford 1986

Hunter, J.R. & Dockrill, S.J. 1982a `The Island of Muckle Skerry, Orkney' PSAS 112,1982,518-524

Hunter, J.R. & Dockrill, S.J. 1982b `Some Norse Sites on Sanday, Orkney' PSAS 112,1982,570-576

Hunter, J.R., Dockrill, S.J. & McKinley, J.I. 1982 The Sites and Monuments of Fara, Orkney (Bradford University School of Archaeological Sciences Occasional Papers No.1) Bradford 1982

Hunter, J.R. & Morris, C.D. 1981 `Recent Excavations at the Brough of Birsay, Orkney' in Bekker-Nielsen et al 1981,245-258

Hunter, J.R. & Morris, C.D. 1982 `Excavation of Room 5 Cliff-top Settlement, Brough of Birsay 1973-74' in Curle 1982,124-138

Hurley, V. 1982 `The Early Church in the South West of Ireland: settlement and organization' in Pearce 1982,297-332

Hutton, C.F. 1875 `Treen chapels' MM.MS 955/5B

Innes, C.N. (ed) 1850-55 Origines Parochiales Scotiae: Volume II (Bannatyne Club)

Irvine, J.T. 1885 `Notes on excavations and discoveries on the Tafts of Bayann, below Sellafirth, on Bastavoe, Yell, Shetland' PSAS 7,1884-85,385-387

Islendingabók: see Benediktsson 1968

Jackson, A. 1984 The Symbol Stones of Scotland: A Social Anthropological Resolution to the Problem of the Picts Stromness 1984

Jackson, K.H. 1953 Language and History in Early Britain Edinburgh 1953

Jackson, K.H. 1955 `The Pictish Language' in Wainwright 1955b, 129-166

Jakobsen, J. 1936 The Place-Names of Shetland London and Copenhagen 1936

Janssen, W, 1976 `Some Major Aspects of Frankish and Medieval Settlement in the Rhineland' in Sawyer 1976b,41-60

Jenkinson, H.I. 1874 Practical Guide to the Isle of Man 1874

Jocelin of Furness: Life of St. Patrick: see Messingham 1624 & Swift 1809

Jóhannesson, J. 1974 A History of the Old Icelandic Commonwealth: Islendinga Saga University of Manitoba Press 1974

Jóhansen, J. 1971 `A Paleobotanical Study indicating a Previking Settlement at Tjørnuvík, Faroe Islands' Frodskaparrit 19,1971,147-157

Jóhansen, J. 1978 `Cereal Cultivation in Mykines, Faroe Islands AD 600´ Danmarks Geol Unders Arbog 1978,93-103

Johnsen, A.O. 1969 `Payments from the Hebrides and the Isle of Man to Norway, 1153-1263´ SHR 48,1969,18-34

Johnsen, A.O. 1979 'The Age of Ordination to the Priesthood in the North Atlantic Islands in the 12th century´ SBVS XX,1-2,1978-79,24-30

Johnston, A.W. 1903 `Notes on the Earl´s Bu (or Bordland) at Orphir, Orkney, called Orfjiara in the sagas and on the remains of the round Church there´ PSAS 37,1902-03,16-31

Johnston, A.W. 1904 `The Round Church of Orphir or the Earl´s Bu and Kirk in Orfjara´ SBVS 3,1902-04,174-216

Johnston, A.W. 1910-1912 `Scattald Marches of Unst in 1771´ Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany 1910,III,100-102,162-163,217-219; 1911,IV,33-36,91-93,192-193; 1912,V,125-129

Johnston, A.W. 1933 `Notes on the fiscal antiquities of Orkney and Shetland´ Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany 1921-33,IX,53-72,133-139,234-252

Johnston, A.W. (ed) 1940 The Church in Orkney: miscellaneous records of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries Kendal 1940

Johnston, D.E. (ed) 1977 The Saxon Shore (=CBA Research Report, No.18) 1977

Johnston, J.B. 1934 Place-Names of Scotland (3rd. edition) London 1934

Jones, G.R.J. 1965 `Early Territorial Organization in northern England and its bearing on the Scandinavian Settlement´ in Small 1965,67-84

Jones, G.R.J. 1973 `Field Systems in North Wales´ in Baker & Butlin 1973,430-479

Jones, G.R.J. 1979 `Multiple Estates and Early Settlement´ in Sawyer 1979,9-34 (See also Sawyer 1976b,15-40)

Jones, G. 1968 A History of the Vikings London 1968

Keiller, I. 1983 `Kirkjubøur, Faroe´ Northern Studies 20,1983, 38-44

Kenney, J.F. 1929 Sources for the Early History of Ireland Vol.I New York 1929

Kermode, P.M.C. 1894 A List of Antiquities of the Isle of Man exclusive of the sculptured and inscribed stones Douglas 1894

Kermode, P.M.C. 1901a `A List of Manx Antiquities´ YLM II,1901,153-193

Kermode, P.M.C. 1901b `A Provisional List of the Antiquities of Michael´ YLM II,1901,127-128,187-189

Kermode, P.M.C. 1907 Manx Crosses London 1907

Kermode, P.M.C. 1909-1918 `Excavation Note Books´ MM.MS K(ermode) I-XXIII

Kermode, P.M.C. 1909 The Manx Archaeological Survey: First Report; Parishes of Marown & Patrick Douglas 1909

Kermode, P.M.C. 1910 The Manx Archaeological Survey: Second Report; Parishes of Patrick & German Douglas 1910

Kermode, P.M.C. 1911a The Manx Archaeological Survey: Third Report; Parishes of MIchael, Ballaugh, Jurby, Andreas, Bride & Lezayre Douglas 1911

Kermode, P.M.C. 1911b `Note on the Ogam and Latin Inscriptions from the Isle of Man and a recently found bilingual in Celtic and Latin´ PSAS 45,1910-11,437-450

Kermode, P.M.C. 1912 `Cross-slabs recently discovered in the Isle of Man´ PSAS 46,1911-12,53-76

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915a The Manx Archaeological Survey: Fourth Report; Parishes of Lezayre, Maughold & Lonan Douglas 1915

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915b `Introduction to the study of church buildings in the Isle of Man earlier than the eleventh century´ ProcIOMNHAS I,8,1906-1915,421-426

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915c `St. Trinian´s (Chapel)´ ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-1915,328-332

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915d `Further discoveries of cross-slabs in the Isle of Man´ PSAS 50,1915,50-62

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915e `The Celtic Tribal System in the Isle of Man´ ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-1915,477-483

Kermode, P.M.C. 1915f `Peel Island and the Shrine of St. Mochonna´ ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-1915,585-591

Kermode, P.M.C. 1919 `Manx Dedications: Studies in Church History in relation to the Isle of Man´ MM.MS 131A

Kermode, P.M.C. 1921 `Cross-slabs in the Isle of Man brought to light since December 1915' PSAS 55,1920-21,256-260

Kermode, P.M.C. 1926 `Cronk Keeillane in the parish of German' ProcIOMNHAS II,4,1926,467-471

Kermode, P.M.C. 1929a `More cross-slabs from the Isle of Man' PSAS 58,1928-29,354-366

Kermode, P.M.C. 1929b `The Ancient Monuments of the Isle of Man: Presidential Address' Archaeologia Cambrensis LXXXIV, 1929,167-178

Kermode, P.M.C. 1930 List of Manx Antiquities Douglas 1930

Kermode, P.M.C. 1931 `Note on early cross-slabs from the Faeroe Islands' PSAS 65,1930-31,373-378

Kermode, P.M.C. 1935 The Manx Archaeological Survey: Fifth Report; Parishes of Onchan, Braddan & Santon Douglas 1935

Kermode, P.M.C. & Herdman, W.A. 1914 Manx Antiquities (2nd edition) Liverpool 1914

Kewley, J. 1893 `Antiquities in the Parish of Arbory' YLM II, 1893,103-106

Killip, M. 1978 `The Development of the Manx 19th century field pattern' in Davey 1978,401-412

Killip, M. 1983 `Two Aspects of Manx Traditional Life' in Fell et al 1983,81-84

Kinvig, R.H. 1958 `The Isle of Man and Atlantic Britain: a study in historical geography' Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 25,1958,1-27

Kinvig, R.H. 1975 The Isle of Man: a Social, Cultural and Political History (3rd edition) Liverpool 1975

Kirkness, W. 1921 `Notes on the discovery of a coped monument and an incised cross-slab at the graveyard, St. Boniface church, Papa Westray, Orkney' PSAS 55,1920-21,131-134

Kjølbye-Biddle, B. 1986 `The 7th century minster at Winchester interpreted' in Butler & Morris 1986,196-209

Kneen, J.J. 1923 `The Ancient Land Divisions of Mann' Unpublished Lecture 17.3.1923 MM.MS 314C

Kneen, J.J. 1924 'An early reference to Manx ecclesiastical antiquities' ProcIOMNHAS II,4,1924,440-446

Kneen, J.J. 1926 `Manx Fairs and Festivals´ ProcIOMNHAS III,1,1925-26,38-82

Kneen, J.J. 1937 Manx Personal Names Oxford 1937

Kneen, J.J. 1979 The Place-Names of the Isle of Man with their origin and history (Republished as one volume by the Manx Gaelic Society 1979: originally published as six volumes 1925-1929)

Knox, S.A. 1985 The Making of the Shetland Landscape Edinburgh 1985

Kolsrud, O. 1913 `The Celtic Bishops in the Isle of Man, the Hebrides and Orkney´ Zeitschrift für Celtische Philogie IX, Part 1,1913,357-379

Krogh, K.J. 1967 Viking Greenland Copenhagen 1967

Krogh, K.J. 1975 `Seks kirkjur heima á Sandi´ Mondul 2,1975,21-54

Krogh, K.J. 1983 `Gard og Kirke´ Hikuin 9,1983,231-244,287-288

Laing, L. 1974 Orkney and Shetland: An Archaeological Guide Newton Abbot 1974

Laing, L. 1975 The Archaeology of Late Celtic Britain and Ireland c.400-1200AD London 1975

Laing, L. (ed) 1977 Studies in Celtic Survival British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 37, Oxford 1977

Laing, S. 1868 `On the age of the burgs or `brochs´ and some other prehistoric remains of Orkney and Caithness´ PSAS 7,1866-68,56-79

Laing, S. n.d Heimskringla: The Olaf Sagas by Snorre Sturlason Everyman, London

Lamb, R.G. 1973a Coastal Fortifications and Settlements of North Atlantic Britain PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham 1973

Lamb, R.G. 1973b `Coastal Settlements of the North´ Scottish Archaeological Forum 5,1973,76-98

Lamb, R.G. 1974 `The Cathedral of Christchurch and the Monastery of Birsay´ PSAS 105,1972-74,200-205

Lamb, R.G. 1976 `The Burri Stacks of Culswick, Shetland and other paired stack-settlements´ PSAS 107,1975-76,144-154

Lamb, R.G. 1979 Church Archaeology in Orkney and Shetland (Privately circulated)

Lamb, R.G. 1980a The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Sanday and North Ronaldsay, Orkney (=RCAMS List No.11), Edinburgh 1980

Lamb, R.G. 1980b Iron Age Promontory Forts in the Northern Isles British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 79, Oxford 1980

Lamb, R.G. 1980c `A Stack Site off Stronsay, Orkney´ PSAS 110,1978-80,517-519

Lamb, R.G. 1981 `The Hall of Haflidi´ The Orcadian 23.7.1981

Lamb, R.G. 1982 The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Rousay, Egilsay and Wyre, Orkney (=RCAMS List No.16), Edinburgh 1982

Lamb, R.G. 1983a `The Cathedral and the Monastery´ in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,36-45

Lamb, R.G. 1983b `The Orkney Trebs´ in Chapman & Mytum 1983, 175-184

Lamb, R.G. 1983c The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Papa Westray and Westray, Orkney (=RCAMS List No.19), Edinburgh 1983

Lamb, R.G. 1984 The Archaeological Sites and Monuments of Eday and Stronsay, Orkney (=RCAMS List No.23), Edinburgh 1984

Lamb, R.G. 1985 `Sumburgh: Prehistory under sand´ in Smith 1985,27-46

Landnámabók: see Benediktsson 1968: Pálsson & Edwards 1972

Lang, J.T. 1974 `Hogback monuments in Scotland´ PSAS 105,1972-74,206-235

Larson, L.M. 1935 The Earliest Norwegian Laws, being the Gulathing Law and the Frostathing Law Columbia University Press 1935

Latham, R.E. (ed) 1965 Revised Medieval Latin Word List from British and Irish Sources London 1965

Leask, H.G. 1955 Irish Churches and Monastic Buildings: Volume 1 The First Phases and the Romanesque Dundalk 1955

Lebour, N. 1914 `White Quartz Pebbles and their Archaeological Significance´ TransDGNHAS 3rd. Series,II,1913-14,121-134

Lewis, C.T. & Short, C. (eds) 1879 Latin Dictionary London 1879

Liden, H.E. 1969 `From Pagan Sanctuary to Christian Church: the excavation at Maere church, Trondelag' NAR 2,1969,3-32

Low, G. 1774(1879) A Tour through the Islands of Orkney and Schetland,1774 (Edited by J.Anderson 1879) Kirkwall 1879

Low, G. 1774(1978) A Tour through the Islands of Orkney and Schetland,1774 (Edited by J.Hunter 1978) Inverness 1978

Low, G. 1778(1915) `A Tour through the North Isles and part of the Mainland of Orkney in the year 1778' (Edited by G. Goudie 1915) Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany 8,1915,131-153. (Also published as an off-print,pp.1-20)

Lowe, C.E. 1981 An Examination of the Keeill Sites and Burial Grounds in the Parish of Kirk Michael, Isle of Man M.A Dissertation: University of Durham 1981

Lowe, C.E. 1983 `The problem of keeills and treens' (Appendix to Morris 1983a) in Fell et al 1983,124-126

Lowe, C.E. 1984 Archaeological Survey of St. Mary's Church & the Wirk, Skaill, Rousay, Orkney with a catalogue of architectural Fragments from Skaill and Eynhallow Interim Report, Durham 1984

Lowe, C.E. & Reilly, P. forthcoming `Keeills in a Landscape'

Löwe, H. (ed) 1982 Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter (2 volumes) Stuttgart 1982

Lucas, A.T. 1956 `Wattle and Straw Mat Doors in Ireland' Studia Ethnographica Upsaliensia 11,1956,16-35

Lucas, A.T. 1965 `Irish-Norse relations: time for a reappraisal?' Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society 71,1965,62-75

Lucas, A.T. 1967 `The plundering and burning of churches in Ireland, 7th-16th century' in Rynne 1967,172-229

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1973a `Two major early monasteries of Scottish Dalriata: Lismore and Eigg' Scottish Archaeological Forum 5,1973,47-70

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1973b, `Annat in Scotland: a provisional review' Scottish Studies 17,1973,135-146

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1977 `Old Norse Papar names in N and W Scotland' in Laing 1977,107-111 (Also published in Northern Studies 9,1977,25-30)

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1979 `Gaelic cill (kil(l)-) in Scottish place-names' BUPNS Series 2,2,1979,9-19

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1981 `Notes on monastic archaeology and the Annals of Ulster, 650-1050' in O Córrain 1981b,304-319

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1982 `Notes on terminology in the Annals of Ulster, 650-1050' Peritia 1,1982,329-333

MacDonald, A.D.S. 1984 `Major Early Monasteries: some Procedural Problems for Field Archaeologists' in Breeze 1984,69-86

MacDonald, A.D.S. & Laing, L. 1968 `Early Ecclesiastical Sites in Scotland: a Field Survey- Part I' PSAS 100,1967-68,123-134

MacDonald, A.D.S. & Laing, L. 1970 `Early Ecclesiastical Sites in Scotland: a Field Survey- Part II' PSAS 102,1969-70,129-145

MacDonald, G. 1936 `Note on Jo. Ben and the Dwarfie Stane' PSAS 70,1935-36,230-236

MacGibbon, D. & Ross, T. 1896 The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland. Edinburgh 1896

MacGregor, A. 1974 `The Broch of Burrian, North Ronaldsay, Orkney' PSAS 105,1972-74,63-118

MacGregor, L.J. 1984 `Sources for a study of Norse settlement in Shetland and Faroe' in Crawford 1984b,1-17

MacKenzie, M. 1750 Orcades Sea Atlas Edinburgh 1750

MacKinley, J.M. 1910 Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland (Vol. 1: Scriptural Dedications) Edinburgh 1910

MacKinley, J.M. 1914 Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland (Vol. 2: Non-Scriptural Dedications) Edinburgh 1914

MacQueen, J. 1956 `Kirk- and Kil- in Galloway place-names' Archivum Linguisticum 8,1956,135-149

MacQueen, J. 1979 `Pennyland and Davoch in South-western Scotland: a preliminary note' Scottish Studies 23,1979,69-74

Magnusson, M. & Pálsson, H. (eds) 1960 Njals Saga Penguin, Harmondsworth 1960

Magnusson, M. & Pálsson, H. (eds) 1976 The Vinland Sagas: the Norse Discovery of America Penguin, Harmondsworth 1976

Manx Traditionary Ballad: see Manx Society XXI,25-45 and Thomson 1961; 1963

Marcus, G.J. 1980 The Conquest of the North Atlantic Woodbridge 1980

Margeson, S. 1983 `On the Iconography of the Manx Crosses' in Fell et al 1983,95-106

Marstrander, C.J.S. 1932 `Det norske Landnam pa Man' NTFS 6,1932,40-386

Marstrander, C.J.S. 1934 `Remarks on the Place-Names of the Isle of Man' NTFS 7,1934,287-334

Marstrander, C.J.S. 1937 `Treen og keeill et førnorsk jorddelingsprinsipp på de Britiske Øyene' NTFS 8, 1937,287-431

Marwick. E.W. 1975 The Folk Lore of Orkney and Shetland London 1975

Marwick, H. 1922 `A Rune inscribed stone from Birsay, Orkney' PSAS 56,1921-22,67-71

Marwick, H. 1923a `Antiquarian Notes on Sanday' POAS I,1922-23, 21-29

Marwick, H. 1923b `The Place-Names of North Ronaldsay' POAS I,1922-23,53-64

Marwick, H. 1923c `Celtic Place-Names in Orkney' PSAS 57,1922-23,251-265

Marwick, H. 1924a `Antiquarian Notes on Rousay' POAS II,1923-24, 15-21

Marwick, H. 1924b `A Description of Orkney 1773: An Account of an unpublished manuscript of Rev. George Low, Minister of Birsay 1774-1795' POAS II,1923-24,49-58

Marwick, H. 1924c `Two sculptured stones recently found in Orkney' PSAS 58,1923-24,295-299

Marwick, H. 1925 `Antiquarian Notes on Papa Westray' POAS III,1924-25,31-47

Marwick, H. 1927 `Antiquarian Notes on Stronsay' POAS V,1926-27,61-83

Marwick, H. 1929 The Orkney Norn Oxford 1929

Marwick, H. 1931 `Orkney Farm-Name Studies' POAS IX,1930-31,25-34

Marwick, H. 1932 `Notes on Viking Burials in Orkney' POAS X,1931-32,27-29

Marwick, H. 1935 `Leidang in the West' POAS XIII,1934-35,15-29

Marwick, H. 1939 `Old time weights and measures' POAS XV,1937-39,9-14

Marwick, H. 1947 The Place-Names of Rousay Kirkwall 1947

Marwick, H. 1949 `Naval Defence in Norse Scotland´ SHR XXVIII, 1949,1-14

Marwick, H. 1951 Orkney London 1951

Marwick, H. 1952a Orkney Farm Names Kirkwall 1952

Marwick, H. 1952b Ancient Monuments in Orkney Edinburgh 1952

Marwick, H. 1970 The Place Names of Birsay (Edited & introduced by W.F.H. Nicolaisen) Aberdeen 1970

Marwick, J. 1984a `Summary report of excavations at Church Knowe, Rousay, Orkney´ Discovery & Excavation in Scotland for 1984, 19-20

Marwick, J. 1984b `Summary report of excavations at Brettaness, Rousay´ Discovery & Excavation in Scotland for 1984, 20

McErlean, T. 1983 `The Irish Townland System of Landscape Organization´ in Reeves-Smyth & Hamond 1983,315-340

McKerral, A. 1944 `Ancient Denominations of Agricultural Land in Scotland´ PSAS 78,1943-44,39-80

McKerral, A. 1950 `Land Divisions in the West Highlands of Scotland: a comparison with those of Man´ ProcIOMNHAS V,2,1946-50,12-20

McKerral, A. 1951 `Lesser Land and Administrative Divisions in Celtic Scotland´ PSAS 85,1950-51,52-64

McNeill, P. & Nicholson, R. 1975 An Historical Atlas of Scotland c.400-c.1600 Edinburgh 1975

McRoberts, D. 1961 `The Ecclesiastical Significance of the St. Ninian´s Isle Treasure´ PSAS 94,1960-61,301-313

McSweeney, P.L. n.d `Proportional Principles in Early Irish Church Architecture´ Irish Architect and Contractor (Paper in 5 sections: I- pp.24-25: II- pp.24-25: III- pp.24-25: IV- pp.18-19: V- pp.14-15 & 22)

Meaney, A.L. 1981 Anglo-Saxon Amulets and Curing Stones British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 96, Oxford 1981

Megaw, B.R.S. 1937 `Weapons of the Viking Age found in Man´ JMM III,53,1937,234-236

Megaw, B.R.S. 1938 `An ancient cemetery at Balladoyne, St. John´s: new discoveries near Tynwald Hill´ JMM IV,1938,11-14

Megaw, B.R.S. 1939a `Seven crosses and an unusual carved slab found since 1932' JMM IV,61,1939,163-164

Megaw, B.R.S. 1939b `The Age of the Celtic Saints' (Unpublished Lecture: 4.2.1939) MM.MS 112C

Megaw, B.R.S. 1940 `The Ancient Village of Ronaldsway: A Summary of Recent Investigations' JMM IV,62,1940,181-182

Megaw, B.R.S. 1949 `The Barony of St. Trinian's in the Isle of Man' TransDGNHAS 3rd.Series 27,1948-49,173-182

Megaw, B.R.S. 1950 `The Monastery of St. Maughold' ProcIOMNHAS V,2,1946-50,169-180

Megaw, B.R.S. 1955 `St. Patrick and the Isle of Man' (Unpublished Lecture: 8.6.1955) MM.MS 5566C

Megaw, B.R.S. 1958 `The Calf of Man Crucifixion' JMM VI,75, 1958,57-58

Megaw, B.R.S. 1964 `Who was St. Conchan?: a reconsideration of Manx Christian origins' JMM VI,79,1964,187-192

Megaw, B.R.S. 1978 `Norseman and Native in the Kingdom of the Isles: a re-assessment of the Manx evidence' in Davey 1978,265-314 (Also published in Scottish Studies 20,1976,1-44)

Megaw, B.R.S. 1979 `Note on Pennyland and Davoch in South-Western Scotland' Scottish Studies 23,1979,75-77

Megaw, B.R.S. & Megaw, E. 1950 `The Norse Heritage in the Isle of Man' in Fox & Dickens 1950,143-170

Megaw, E. 1976 `The Cult of St. Leonard and Manx Medieval Hospitals' JMM VII,88,1976,225-231

Megaw, E. 1978 `The Manx Eary and its significance' in Davey 1978,327-346

Meldrum, E. (ed) 1971 The Dark Ages in the Highlands Inverness Field Club 1971

Melia, D.F. 1982 `The Irish Church in the Irish Laws' in Pearce 1982,363-378

Mellor, T. & Ashworth, J.A. 1938 The Isle of Man: a regional survey (2 volumes) MM.MS 1193A

Messingham, T. 1624 Florilegium insulae sanctorum: Vita Sancti Patricii Archiepiscopi, Primatis et Apostoli Hiberniae Iocelini Monachi de Furnesio Paris 1624

Miles, D. 1986 `Lechlade Saxon Cemetery' RESCUE News 38,Winter 1985-86,3

Miller, R. 1976 Orkney London 1976

Mitchell, A. 1884 `On White Pebbles in connexion with pagan and Christian burials' PSAS 18,1883-84,286-291

Mitchell, A. & Clark, J.T. (eds) 1908 Geographical Collections relating to Scotland, made by Walter MacFarlane Vol.III (=Scottish History Society Series 1, Vol.52) Edinburgh 1908

Moar, P. 1952 `Two Shetland Finds' PSAS 86,1951-52,206

Moar, P. & Stewart, J. 1944 `Newly discovered sculptured stones from Papil, Shetland' PSAS 78,1943-44,91-99

Monasticon Hibernicum: see Archdall 1786

Monteith, R. 1845 Description of the Islands of Orkney and Zetland Edinburgh 1845

Mooney, J. 1933 `Laurence Abbot: no Cistercian monastery in Orkney' POAS XI,1932-33,27-29

Mooney, J. 1976 Eynhallow: the Holy Island of the Orkneys (2nd edition) Kirkwall 1976

Moore, A.W. 1890 `Bull of Pope Gregory IX to the Bishop of Sodor' EHR XVII,1890,101-107

Moore, A.W. 1900 A History of the Isle of Man (2 volumes) Reprinted Douglas 1977

Moore, A.W. 1901 `The Early Land System of the Isle of Man' YLM II,1901,40-44

Moore, D. (ed) 1972 The Irish Sea Province in Archaeology and History Cardiff 1972

Morris, C.D. 1976 Excavations on the Brough of Deerness: 1975 Interim Report Durham 1976

Morris, C.D. 1977a `The Brough of Deerness: a new survey' Archaeologia Atlantica 2,1977,65-79

Morris, C.D. 1977b Excavations on the Brough of Deerness, 1976-1977 Interim Report Durham 1977

Morris, C.D. 1979 `The Vikings and Irish Monasteries' Durham University Journal 71,1979,175-185

Morris, C.D. 1981a `Keeill Vael, Druidale, Michael, Isle of Man; survey and excavation 1979-1980: Interim Report' Universities of Durham & Newcastle Archaeological Reports for 1980 4,41-44, Durham 1981

Morris, C.D. 1981b `Viking and Native in Northern England: a case study' in Bekker-Nielsen et al 1981,223-244

Morris, C.D. 1982 `The Vikings in the British Isles: some aspects of their settlement and economy' in Farrell 1982,70-94

Morris, C.D. 1983a `The Survey and Excavations at Keeill Vael, Druidale in their context' in Fell et al 1983,107-132

Morris, C.D. 1983b `Excavations around the Bay of Birsay' in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,119-151

Morris, C.D. 1985 `Viking Orkney: A Survey' in Renfrew 1985,210-242

Morris, C.D. forthcoming a Report of Excavation & Survey on the Brough of Deerness, Orkney (=PSAS 116,1986,301-374)

Morris, C.D. forthcoming b Report of Excavation & Survey at Keeill Vael, Druidale, Isle of Man

Morris, C.D. & Pearson, N.F. 1984 `Burials in Birsay, Orkney' in Friell & Watson 1984,135-143

Morris, J. (ed) 1980 Nennius: British History & the Welsh Annals (=Arthurian Period Sources No.8) London 1980

Morris, R. 1983 The Church in British Archaeology (=CBA Research Report No.47) London 1983

Morris, R.W.B. 1979 The Prehistoric Rock Art of Galloway and the Isle of Man Poole 1979

Morrison, I. 1985 Landscape with Lake Dwellings: the Crannogs of Scotland Edinburgh 1985

Muir, T.S. 1861a Characteristics of Old Church Architecture in Scotland Edinburgh 1861

Muir, T.S. 1861b Ecclesiological Sketch of Caithness and Orkney Edinburgh 1861

Muir, T.S. 1862 Shetland: an Ecclesiological Sketch Edinburgh 1862

Muir, T.S. 1863 Shetland Revisited: an Ecclesiological Sketch Edinburgh 1863

Muir, T.S. 1885 Ecclesiological Notes on some of the islands of Scotland Edinburgh 1885

Munch, P.A. 1860 `Diplomatiske Bidrag til Erkebiskop Jens Grands Levnets-historie´ Annaler for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie 1860,No.4,62-189

Mykura, W. 1976 British Regional Geology: Orkney & Shetland Edinburgh 1976

Mytum, H. 1982 `The Location of Early Churches in northern County Clare´ in Pearce 1982,351-362

Neale, J.M. 1848 Ecclesiological Notes on the Isle of Man, Ross, Sutherland and the Orkneys London 1848

Neely, J.H. 1940 `Excavations at Ronaldsway, Isle of Man´ Antiq.J XX,1940,72-86

Neil, N.R.J. 1985 `Excavations at Howe, Stromness´ in Renfrew 1985,205-209

New Statistical Account of Scotland Edinburgh 1842

Ni Chatháin, P. & Richter, M. (eds) 1984 Irland und Europa: Die Kirche im Frühmittelalter Stuttgart 1984

Niclasen, B. (ed) 1968 Proceedings of the Fifth Viking Congress Tórshavn 1968

Nicolaisen, W.F.H. 1976a Scottish Place Names London 1976

Nicolaisen, W.F.H. 1976b `Scandinavian place-names in Scotland as a source of knowledge´ Northern Studies 7/8,1976, 14-24

Nicolaisen, W.F.H. 1982 `The Viking settlement of Scotland: evidence of place-names´ in Farrell 1982,95-115

Nicolson, J.R. 1978 Traditional Life in Shetland London 1978

Nicolson, J.R. 1981 Shetland Folklore London 1981

Nieke, M.R. 1983 `Settlement Patterns in the First Millenium AD: a case study of the island of Islay´ in Chapman & Mytum 1983,299-326

Njal´s Saga: see Sveinsson 1954 and Magnusson & Pálsson 1960

Nørlund, P. 1924 `Buried Norsemen at Herjolfsnes: An Archaeological and Historical Study´ Meddelelser om Grønland 67,1924

Nørlund, P. 1936 Viking Settlers in Greenland London & Copenhagen 1936

Nørlund, P. & Roussell, A. 1930 `Norse Ruins at Gardar: the episcopal seat of Mediaeval Greenland´ Meddelelser om Grønland 76,1930,1-170

Nørlund, P. & Stenberger, M. 1934 `Brattahlid´ Meddelelser om Grønland 88,1,1934

Obolensky, D. 1971 The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500-1453 London 1971

O´Connor, A. & Clarke, D.V. (eds) 1983 From the Stone Age to the ´Forty-Five: Studies presented to R.B.K. Stevenson Edinburgh 1983

O Corráin, D. 1981a `The Early Irish Churches: some aspects of organization´ in O Corráin 1981b,327-341

O Corráin, D. (ed) 1981b Irish Antiquity: Essays & Studies presented to Professor Michael O´Kelly Cork 1981

O´Dell, A.C. 1939 The Historical Geography of the Shetland Isles Aberdeen 1939

O´Dell, A.C. 1959 `Excavations at St. Ninian´s Isle´ Scottish Geographical Magazine 75,1959,41-43

O´Dell, A.C. 1960 St. Ninian´s Isle Treasure (=Aberdeen University Studies No.141) Aberdeen 1960

O´Dell, A.C. et al 1959 `The St. Ninian´s Isle Silver Hoard´ Antiquity XXXIII,1959,241-268

O´Donovan, J. & O´Curry, E. 1865-1901 Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland (6 volumes) Dublin 1865-1901

O´Kelly, M. 1958 `Church Island, near Valencia, Co. Kerry´ PRIA 59C,1957-58,57-136

O´Kelly, M. 1973 `Monastic Sites in the West of Ireland´ Scottish Archaeological Forum 5,1973,1-16

(Old) Statistical Account of Scotland: 1799(1978): see Sinclair 1791-1799 (See also Clouston 1927a)

Oliver, J.R. 1868 `Ancient Churches in the Isle of Man prior to the Middle Ages´ Manx Society XV,1868,60-91

Olsen, M. 1928 Farms and Fanes of Ancient Norway: the place-names of a country discussed in their bearings on social and religious history Oslo 1928

Olsen, O. 1966 Hørg, hov og kirke: Historiske og arkeologiske vikingetidsstudier Copenhagen 1966

Olsen, O. 1986 `Is there a relationship between pagan and Christian places of worship in Scandinavia?´ in Butler & Morris 1986,126-130

O´Neill, H.E. 1964 `Excavation of a Celtic hermitage on St. Helen´s, Isles of Scilly´ Arch.J CXXI,1964,40-69

O´Riain, P. 1972 `Boundary association in Early Irish society´ Studia Celtica 7,1972,12-29

Orkneyinga Saga: see Gudmundsson 1965: Anderson 1873: Taylor 1938: Pálsson & Edwards 1978

O´Sullivan, D.M. 1980 A Reassessment of the Early Christian Archaeology of Cumbria MPhil Thesis: University of Durham 1980

Oswald, H.R. 1860 `Vestigia Insulae Manniae Antiquiora´ Manx Society V, Douglas 1860

Owen, O.A. 1982 Report of Excavations at Tuquoy, Westray, Orkney: 1982 Interim Report Durham 1982

Owen, O.A. 1983 Report of Excavations at Tuquoy, Westray, Orkney: 1983 Interim Report Durham 1983

Owen, O.A. & Lowe, C.E. forthcoming Excavation of a Multi-period Settlement at Kebister, Shetland

Page, R.I. 1980 `Some thoughts on Manx Runes´ SBVS XX,3,1980,179-199

Page, R.I. 1983 `The Manx Rune Stones´ in Fell et al 1983,133-146

Pálsson, H. & Edwards, P. (eds) 1972 The Book of Settlements (Landnámabók) University of Manitoba 1972

Pálsson, H. & Edwards, P. (eds) 1978 Orkneyinga Saga: the history of the Earls of Orkney London 1978

de Paor, L. 1955 `A Survey of Sceilg Mhichil´ JRSAI 85,1955, 174-187

Pearce, S.M. (ed) 1982 The Early Church in Western Britain and Ireland: Studies presented to C.A. Ralegh Radford British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 102, Oxford 1982

Peterkin, A. 1820 Rentals of the Ancient Earldom and Bishoprick of Orkney Edinburgh 1820

Peterkin, A. 1822 Notes on Orkney and Shetland Edinburgh 1822

Peterkin, A. (ed) 1839 Booke of the Universall Kirk Edinburgh 1839

Petrie, G. 1845 The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland Dublin 1845

Picard, J.M. 1982 'The Purpose of Adomnan's Vita Columbae' Peritia 1,1982,160-177

Plummer, C. (ed) 1910 Vita Sanctorum Hiberniae Oxford 1910

Plummer, C. (ed) 1922 Bethada Naém nErenn: Lives of Irish Saints (2 Volumes) Oxford 1922

Polson, S.S. 1987 'Looking at Unst- History of Medieval Times (Part 5): The Church in the Viking Age' Shetland Life 79,May 1987,12-15

Pye, N. 1941 The Land of Britain: the report of the Land Utilization Survey of Britain: Part 44- The Isle of Man London 1941

Quine, J. 1896 'Treens, with special reference to Lonan for illustration' YLM III,1896,95-102

Quine, J. 1915a 'Historical Note on St. Trinian's (Chapel)' ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-15,332-335

Quine, J. 1915b 'St. German's (Cathedral)' ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-15,350-353

Quine, J. n.d 'The Saints to whom the Manx churches are dedicated' MM.MS 131A

Radford, C.A.R. 1935 'Tintagel: the Castle and the Celtic monastery' Antiq.J XV,1935,401-419

Radford, C.A.R. 1942 'The Early Christian Monuments of Scotland' Antiquity XVI,1942,1-18

Radford, C.A.R. 1949 'Excavations at Whithorn, 1949' Trans DGNHAS 3rd.Series XXVII,1948-49,85-126

Radford, C.A.R. 1950 'The Excavations at Chapel Finnian, Mochrum' TransDGNHAS 3rd Series XXVIII,1949-50,28-40

Radford, C.A.R. 1955 'Two Scottish Shrines: Jedburgh and St. Andrews' Arch.J 112,1955,43-60

Radford, C.A.R. 1959 The Early Christian and Norse Settlements, Birsay HMSO, Edinburgh 1959

Radford, C.A.R. 1962a 'Art and Architecture: Celtic and Norse' in Wainwright 1962c,163-187

Radford, C.A.R. 1962b `The Celtic Monastery in Britain´ Archaeologia Cambrensis CXI,1962,1-24

Radford, C.A.R. 1965 `The Church in Celtic Britain´ Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Archaeologia Cristiana Ravenna 1965,43-50

Radford, C.A.R. 1967 `The Early Church in Strathclyde and Galloway´ Med.Arch 11,1967,105-126

Radford, C.A.R. 1971 `Christian origins in Britain´ Med.Arch 15,1971,1-12

Radford, C.A.R. 1977 `The Earliest Irish Churches´ UJA 40,1977,1-11

Radford, C.A.R. 1983 `Birsay and the Spread of Christianity to the North´ in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,13-35

Rahtz, P. 1968 `Sub-Roman Cemeteries in Somerset´ in Barley & Hanson 1968,193-196

Rahtz, P. 1973 `Monasteries as Settlements´ Scottish Archaeological Forum 5,1973,125-135

Rahtz, P. 1978 `Grave Orientation´ Arch.J 135,1978,1-14

Rahtz, P., Dickinson, T. & Watts, L. (eds) 1980 Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 82, Oxford 1980

Reeves-Smyth, T. & Hamond, F. (eds) 1983 Landscape Archaeology in Ireland British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 116, Oxford 1983

Reilly, P. 1985 `The Use of Stereoscopy as an Aid in Interpreting Survey Data: a burial ground on the Isle of Man´ Science & Archaeology 27,1985,24-26

Reilly, P. forthcoming a `A Forgotten Keeill Excavation at Scarlett, Malew´ ProcIOMNHAS forthcoming

Reilly, P. forthcoming b A New Computer Based System Relating the Manx Land System to the Archaeological Landscape PhD Thesis to be submitted to the Research Centre for Computer Archaeology, North Staffordshire Polytechnic

Reilly, P. & Halbert, A. forthcoming `Using Computer Graphics to Analyse Archaeological Survey Data from the Isle of Man´

Reilly, P. & Zambardino, R. 1985 `Boundary Associations and the manipulation of ancient boundaries: a computerized approach´ in Voorrips & Loving 1985,15-30

Reilly, P. & Zambardino, R. 1987 `A Computer-Based System for the Organization and Processing of Site-Location and Boundary Data´ Computers and the Humanities 21,1987, 177-191

Renfrew, C. (ed) 1985 The Prehistory of Orkney: 4000BC-1000AD Edinburgh 1985

Renfrew, C. & Buteux, S. 1985 `Radiocarbon dates from Orkney´ in Renfrew 1985,263-274

Rigby, A. 1915 `Ruined chapel on S. Michael´s Island´ ProcIOMNHAS I,1906-1915,415-420

Rigold, S.E. 1977 `Litus Romanum: the Shore Forts as mission stations´ in Johnston 1977,70-75

Ritchie, A. 1972 `Painted Pebbles in early Scotland´ PSAS 104,1971-72,297-301

Ritchie, A. 1973 `Empty islands or integration?: an archaeological estimate of the Norse impact on the Northern Isles´ Northern Studies 1,1973,23-25

Ritchie, A. 1974 `Pict and Norseman in Northern Scotland´ Scottish Archaeological Forum 6,1974,23-36

Ritchie, A. 1977 `Excavation of Pictish and Viking-age farmsteads at Buckquoy, Orkney´ PSAS 108,1976-77,174-227

Ritchie, A. 1983 `Birsay around AD800´ in W.P.L. Thomson 1983,46-66

Ritchie, A. 1985a `Orkney in the Pictish Kingdom´ in Renfrew 1985,183-204

Ritchie, A. 1985b Exploring Scotland´s Heritage: Orkney and Shetland HMSO, Edinburgh 1985

Ritchie, A. & Ritchie, J.N.G. 1978 The Ancient Monuments of Orkney HMSO, Edinburgh 1978

Ritchie, A. & Ritchie, J.N.G. 1981 Scotland: Archaeology and Early History London 1981

Ritchie, J.N.G. 1985 Pictish Symbol Stones: A Handlist 1985 RCAMS Edinburgh 1985

Robinson, A. 1981 `Murdoch MacKenzie and his Orcades Sea Atlas´ The Map Collector September 1981: Issue 16,24-27

Rodwell, W. 1986 `Anglo-Saxon Church Building: Aspects of Design and Construction´ in Butler & Morris 1986,156-175

Roussell, A. 1936 `Sandnes and the Neighbouring Farms' Meddelelser om Grønland 88,2,1936

Roussell, A. 1944 `Farms and Churches in the Medieval Norse Settlements of Greenland' Meddelelser om Grønland 89,1,1941-44

RCAMS 1911 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Caithness Edinburgh 1911

RCAMS 1928 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of the Outer Hebrides, Skye and the Small Isles Edinburgh 1928

RCAMS 1946 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Orkney and Shetland (3 volumes: Vol.i- Introduction; Vol.ii- Orkney; Vol.iii- Shetland) Edinburgh 1946

RCAMS 1971 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Argyll: Volume I Kintyre Edinburgh 1971

RCAMS 1975 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Argyll: Volume II Lorn Edinburgh 1975

RCAMS 1980 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Argyll: Volume III Mull, Tiree, Coll and Northern Argyll (excluding Iona) Edinburgh 1980

RCAMS 1982 Inventory of the Ancient Monuments of Argyll: Volume IV Iona Edinburgh 1982

Rynne, E. (ed) 1967 North Munster Studies Limerick 1967

Savage, E.B. c.1880 `Notes on Manx Antiquities' MM.MS 78A

Sawyer, P.H. 1976a `Harald Fairhair and the British Isles' in Boyer 1976,105-109

Sawyer, P.H. (ed) 1976b Medieval Settlement: Continuity and Change (See also Sawyer 1979) London 1976

Sawyer, P.H. (ed) 1979 English Medieval Settlement London 1979

Sawyer, P.H. 1982 Kings and Vikings: Scandinavia and Europe AD700-1100 London 1982

Saxby, J.M.E. 1904 `Find of a Viking Cup and Fire Burial Mound' SBVS 3,1902-04,21-23

Saxby, J.M.E. 1905 `Sacred Sites in a Shetland Isle' The Antiquary XLI,1905,133-138 (Also published in SBVS IV,1904-05,24-35)

Saxby, J.M.E. 1932 Shetland Traditional Lore Edinburgh 1932

Schmeidler, B. (ed) 1917 Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum Hanover & Leipzig 1917

Scott, A.B. 1912 `S. Moluag, his work and influence' Trans Scottish Ecclesiological Society III,3,1911-12,294-309

Scott, A.B. 1918 The Pictish Nation: its People and its Church Edinburgh 1918

Scott, A.B. 1926 `The Celtic Church in Orkney' POAS IV,1925-26,45-56

Scott, A.B. 1927 `The Brito-Celtic Church on the Northern Mainland and Islands' Trans. Gaelic Society of Inverness XXXIII,1925-27,327-355

Scott, H. 1870 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae Edinburgh 1870

Shaw, * 1877 Picturesque Tourist's Guide to the Isle of Man (4th edition) 1877

Shepherd, I.A.G. 1983 `Pictish Settlement Problems in North East Scotland' in Chapman & Mytum 1983,327-356

Sherwood, R. 1899 Manx Law Tenures London 1899

Shetelig, H. 1925 `Manx Crosses relating to Great Britain and Norway' SBVS 9,1920-25,253-274

Sibbald, R. 1711 The Description of the Isles of Orkney and Shetland by Robert Monteith of Egilsha & Gairsa in 1633 Edinburgh 1711

Simpson, J.Y. 1862 `Notes on some Scottish Magical Charm-stones, or Curing-stones' PSAS 4,1860-62,211-224

Simpson, W.D. 1935 The Celtic Church in Scotland: a study of its penetration lines and art relationships (=Aberdeen University Studies No.111) Aberdeen 1935

Simpson, W.D. 1940 St. Ninian and the Origins of the Christian Church in Scotland Edinburgh 1940

Simpson, W.D. 1949 `The Ninianic Controversy' TransDGNHAS 3rd. Series 27,1948-49,155-162

Simpson, W.D. 1958 `The Bishop's Palace at Kirkwall' in Eldjarn 1958,101-106

Simpson, W.D. 1961 The Castle of Bergen and the Bishop's Palace, Kirkwall (=Aberdeen University Studies No.142) Aberdeen 1961

Sinclair, J. (ed) 1791-1799 The (Old) Statistical Account of Scotland, 1791-1799: Vol. XIX- Orkney & Shetland (Facsimilie reprint, with introduction by W.P.L. Thomson and J.J. Graham, 1978)

Skinner, F.G. & Bruce-Mitford, R.L.S. 1940 'A Celtic Balance Beam of the Christian Period' Antiq.J XX,1940,87-102

Small, A. (ed) 1965 Proceedings of the Fourth Viking Congress Edinburgh 1965

Small, A. 1973 'The Site: its History and Excavation' in Small et al 1973,1-7

Small, A., Thomas, A.C. & Wilson, D.M. (eds) 1973 St.Ninian's Isle and its treasure (=Aberdeen University Studies No.152) 2 volumes Oxford 1973

Smith, B. 1984 'What is a Scattald?: Rural Communities in Shetland 1400-1900' in Crawford 1984b,99-124

Smith, B. (ed) 1985 Shetland Archaeology: New Work in Shetland in the 1970's Lerwick 1985

Smith, J.T. 1982 'The validity of inference from archaeological evidence' in Drury 1982,7-20

Smyth, A.P. 1975 Scandinavian York and Dublin: The History and Archaeology of Two Related Viking Kingdoms: Volume I Dublin 1975

Smyth, A.P. 1979 Scandinavian York and Dublin: The History and Archaeology of Two Related Viking Kingdoms: Volume II Dublin 1979

Smyth, A.P. 1984 Warlords and Holy Men: Scotland AD80-1000 London 1984

Spence, J. 1920 'The Kirk o' Kirkgoe and the Picky Dykes of Birsa, Orkney' Viking Society Old Lore Miscellany VIII,1915-20,86-94

Spence, M. 1904 'Deerness Kirk' SBVS 3,1902-04,312-314

Steedman, K.A. 1980 The Archaeology of the Deerness Peninsula, Orkney (2 volumes unpaginated) B.A. Dissertation: University of Durham 1980

Steinnes, A. 1948 'Ikring Historia Norvegiae' Historisk Tidsskrift 34,1946-48,1-61

Steinnes, A. 1959 'The Huseby System in Orkney' SHR 38,1959,36-46

Stenning, E.H. 1935 `Ancient Structures uncovered at Derbyhaven, May 1935´ ProcIOMNHAS IV,2,1935,145-151

Stevenson, R.B.K. 1952 `Celtic Carved Box from Birsay´ PSAS 86,1951-52,187-190

Stevenson, R.B.K. 1955a `Pictish Art´ in Wainwright 1955b,97-128

Stevenson, R.B.K. 1955b `Pins and the Chronology of the Brochs´ PPS 21,1955,282-287

Stevenson, R.B.K. 1970 `Review of Hamilton´s (1968) Clickhimin Report´ Antiq.J 50,1970,123-125

Stevenson, R.B.K. 1981 `Christian Sculpture in Norse Shetland´ Fródskaparrit 28 & 29,1981,283-292

Stevenson, R.B.K. forthcoming `The Anglo-Saxon Penny in its context´ in Morris forthcoming a

Stewart, J. 1965 `Shetland Farm Names´ in Small 1965,247-266

Stewart, J. 1968 `Place-Names of Fetlar´ in Niclasen 1968,174-185

Stewart, J. 1987 Shetland Place-Names Lerwick 1987

Storm, G, 1880 Monumenta Historica Norvegiae Christiana 1880

Strømback, D. 1975 The Conversion of Iceland (Viking Society Text Series,VI) London 1975

Sveinsson, E. 1954 Brennu-Njáls Saga (Islenzk Fornrit XII) Reykjavík 1954

Swann, D.L. 1983 `Enclosed Ecclesiastical Sites and their Relevance to Settlement Patterns in the First Millenium AD´ in Reeves-Smyth & Hamond 1983,269-294

Swift, E.L. (ed) 1809 The Life and Acts of St. Patrick by Jocelin of Furness Dublin 1809

Swynnerton, F. 1910 `Manx Keeills and Paganism´ MM.MS 5215C

Talbot, T. 1924 The Manorial Roll of the Isle of Man, 1511-1515 Oxford 1924

Taylor, A.B. 1931 `Some Saga Place-Names´ POAS IX,1930-31,41-45

Taylor, A.B. 1932 `The Death of Earl Rognvaldr´ POAS X,1931-32,21-25

Taylor, A.B. 1933 `Studies in the Orkneyinga Saga´ POAS XI,1932-33,45-49

Taylor, A.B. 1934a `The Orkneyinga Saga: its relation to other saga literature' POAS XII,1933-34,59-62

Taylor, A.B. 1934b `The Orkneyinga Saga: its place of composition' POAS XII,1933-34,63-64

Taylor, A.B. 1938 The Orkneyinga Saga: A New Translation with Introduction and Notes London 1938

Taylor, H.M. 1973 `The Position of the Altar in early Anglo-Saxon churches' Antiq.J 53,1973,52-58

Thomas, A.C. 1959 `Imported Pottery in Dark Age Western Britain' Med.Arch 3,1959,89-111

Thomas, A.C. 1966 `Ardwall Isle: the Excavation of an Early Christian Site of Irish Type, 1964-65' TransD NHAS 3rd Series XLIII,1966,84-116

Thomas, A.C. 1967a `An Early Christian Cemetery and Chapel on Ardwall Isle, Kirkcudbright' Med.Arch 11,1967,127-188

Thomas, A.C. 1967b Christian Antiquities of Camborne St. Austell 1967

Thomas, A.C. 1971a The Early Christian Archaeology of North Britain Oxford 1971

Thomas, A.C. 1971b `Rosnat, Rostat and the Early Irish Church' Eriu 22,1971,100-106

Thomas, A.C. 1973a `Sculptured Stones and Crosses from St. Ninian's Isle and Papil' in Small et al 1973,8-44

Thomas, A.C. 1973b Bede, Archaeology and the Cult of Relics Jarrow Lecture 1973

Thomas, A.C. 1976 `Imported Late-Roman Mediterranean Pottery in Ireland and Western Britain: Chronologies and Implications' PRIA 76C,1976,245-253

Thomas, A.C. 1978 `Hermits on Islands or Priests in a Landscape?' Cornish Studies 6,1978,28-44

Thomas, A.C. 1981 Christianity in Roman Britain to AD500 London 1981

Thomas, A.C. 1982 `East and West: Tintagel, Mediterranean Imports and the Early Insular Church' in Pearce 1982,17-34

Thomas, A.C. 1983 `The Double Shrine A from St. Ninian's Isle, Shetland' in O'Connor & Clarke 1983,285-292

Thomas, A.C. 1986a `Recognizing Christian Origins: an Archaeological and Historical Dilemma' in Butler & Morris 1986,121-125

Thomas, A.C. 1986b Celtic Britain London 1986

Thomas, F.W.L. 1876 `Did the Northmen extirpate the Celtic inhabitants of the Hebrides in the 9th century?' PSAS 11,1874-76,472-507

Thomas, F.W.L. 1884 `What is a Pennyland? or Ancient Valuation of Land in the Scottish Isles' PSAS 18,1883-84,253-285

Thomas, F.W.L. 1886 `Ancient Valuation of Land in the West of Scotland: Continuation of What is a Pennyland?' PSAS 20,1885-86,200-213

Thompson, E.A. 1958 `The Origin of Christianity in Scotland' SHR 37,1958,17-22

Thomson, R.L. 1958 `The Date of the Traditionary Ballad' JMM VI,75,1958,53-54

Thomson, R.L. 1961 `The Manx Traditionary Ballad (Part 1)' Etudes Celtiques, 1960-61,IX,521-548

Thomson, R.L. 1963 `The Manx Traditionary Ballad (Part 2)' Etudes Celtiques, 1962-63,X,60-87

Thomson, R.L. 1978 `The Interpretation of some Manx Place-Names' in Davey 1978,319-326

Thomson, R.L. 1983 `The Continuity of Manx' in Fell et al 1983,169-174

Thomson, W.P.L. 1981 The Little General and the Rousay Crofters Edinburgh 1981

Thomson, W.P.L. (ed) 1983 Birsay: A Centre of Political and Ecclesiastical Power (=Orkney Heritage Volume 2) Kirkwall 1983

Thomson, W.P.L. 1985 `The Crofting Pioneer Fringe in Nineteenth Century Shapinsay, Orkney' Northern Studies 22,1985, 28-39

Thorpe, B. (ed) 1844 Sermones Catholici (2 Volumes) London 1844

Thorsteinsson, A.E. 1976 `The Testimony of Ancient Architecture' Faroe Isles Review 1,1,1976,11-19

Thorsteinsson, A.E. 1981 `On the development of Faroese settlements' in Bekker-Nielsen et al 1981,189-202

Thwaites, W. 1863 Isle of Man: its Civil & Ecclesiastical History, Antiquities etc Sheffield 1863

Tierney, J.J. (ed) 1967 Dicuili Liber de Mensura Orbis Terrae (=Scriptores Latini Hiberniae VI) Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, Dublin 1967

Traill, W. 1883 `Donations to NMAS' PSAS 17,1882-83,136-138

Traill, W. 1890 `Results of Excavations at the Broch of Burrian, North Ronaldsay, Orkney' Archaeologia Scotica V,1890,341-364

Trench-Jellicoe, R.M.C. 1980 `A new Chi-Rho from Maughold, Isle of Man' Med.Arch 24,1980,202-203

Trench-Jellicoe, R.M.C. 1983 `The cross-slabs from Keeill Vael' (Appendix 2 to Morris 1983a) in Fell et al 1983,126-128

Trench-Jellicoe, R.M.C. 1985 A Re-definition and Stylistic Analysis of P.M.C Kermode's `Pre-Scandinavian' Series of Manx Sculptured Monuments (4 Volumes: i- Text; ii- Catalogue; iii- Drawings & Bibliography; iv- Plates) PhD Thesis Lancaster University 1985

Tschan, F.J. (ed) 1959 Adam of Bremen's History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen New York 1959

Tudor, J.R. 1883 The Orkneys and Shetland: their Past and Present State London 1883

Unger, C.R. & Vigfússon, G. (eds) 1868 Flateyiarbók Christiana 1868

Vebaek, C.L. 1968 `The Church Topography of the Medieval Norse East Settlement in Greenland' in Niclasen 1968,37-54

Victory, S. 1977 The Celtic Church in Wales London 1977

Vigfússon, G. (ed) 1887a Icelandic Sagas: Hakonar Saga & Magnus Saga (Rolls Series No.88: Vol.2) London 1887

Vigfússon, G. 1887b `Notes on Tynwald and Sheading' Manx Note Book 3,1887,174-175

Vigfússon, G. 1888 `Northmen in the Isle of Man' EHR III,1888, 498-501

Vigfússon, G. & York Powell, F. (eds) 1905 Origenes Islandicae: Volume 1 Oxford 1905

Vita Sancti Albei: see Plummer 1910

Vita Sancti Columbae: see Anderson & Anderson 1961

Voorripps, A. & Loving, S.H. (eds) 1985 To Pattern the Past: PACT No.11 Amsterdam 1985

Wainwright, F.T. 1955a `Houses and Graves´ in Wainwright 1955b, 87-96

Wainwright, F.T. (ed) 1955b The Problem of the Picts London & Edinburgh 1955

Wainwright, F.T. 1962a `Picts and Scots´ in Wainwright 1962c, 91-116

Wainwright, F.T. 1962b `The Scandinavian Settlement´ in Wainwright 1962c,117-162

Wainwright, F.T. (ed) 1962c The Northern Isles London 1962

Walker, J.R. 1883 `Holy Wells in Scotland´ PSAS 17,1882-83,152-210

Wallace, (Rev.) J. 1693 A Description of the Islands of Orkney Edinburgh 1693

Wallace, J. 1700 An Account of the Islands of Orkney London 1700

Walsh, P. (ed) 1920 Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne Dublin 1920

Waterman, D.M. 1967 `The Early Christian Churches and Cemetery at Derry, County Down´ UJA 30,1967,53-75

Waterman, D.M. 1976 `Banagher church, County Down´ UJA 39,1976, 25-41

Watt, D.E.R. 1969 Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae Medii Aevi St.Andrews 1969

Wheeler, P.T. 1964 The Island of Unst, Shetland Geographical Field Group Regional Studies No.11. Nottingham University 1964

Whitelock, D. (ed) 1955 English Historical Documents: c.500-1042 Volume 1 London 1955

Whittington, G. 1973 `Field Systems of Scotland´ in Baker & Butlin 1973,530-579

Whittle, A. 1986 Scord of Brouster: An Early Agricultural Settlement on Shetland: Excavations 1977-1979 (=Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph No.9) Oxford 1986

Wieland, F. 1906 Mensa und Confessio: Studien über den Altar der altchristlichen Liturgie: Der Altar der vorkonstantinischen Kirche Munich 1906

Wieland, F. 1912 Altar und Altargrab der christlichen Kirchen im 4 Jahrhundert: Neue Studien über den Altar der altchristlichen Liturgie Leipzig 1912

Wilson, D. 1851 Prehistoric Annals of Scotland (2 volumes) Edinburgh 1851

Wilson, D.M. 1967 `The Viking's Relationship with Christianity in Northern England' JBAA 30,1967,37-47

Wilson, D.M. 1969 Reflections on the St. Ninian's Isle Treasure Jarrow Lecture for 1969

Wilson, D.M. 1971 `Manx Memorial Stones of the Viking Period' SBVS XVIII,1-2,1970-71,1-18

Wilson, D.M. 1973 `The Treasure' in Small et al 1973,45-148

Wilson, D.M. 1974 The Viking Age in the Isle of Man: the Archaeological Evidence Odense 1974

Wilson, D.M. 1976a `The Scandinavian Settlement in the North and West of the British Isles: an archaeological point of view' Trans. Royal Historical Society 26,1976,95-113

Wilson, D.M. 1976b `The Scandinavians in England' in Wilson, D.M. 1976c,393-403

Wilson, D.M. (ed) 1976c The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England Cambridge & London 1976

Wilson, D.M. 1978 `The Art and Archaeology of Bedan Northumbria' in Farrell 1978,1-22

Wilson, D.M. 1983 `The Art of the Manx Crosses of the Viking Age' in Fell et al 1983,175-187

Wilson, D.M. & Klindt-Jensen, O. 1966(1980) Viking Art London 1980

Wilson, J. (ed) 1915 The Register of the Priory of St. Bees (Surtees Society CXXVI) 1915

Windwick, J.P. 1928 `The Ladykirk Stone' POAS VI,1927-28,55-58

Woods, J. 1867 A New Atlas and Gazetteer of the Isle of Man London 1867

Wright, M.D. 1982 `Excavation at Peel Castle 1947' ProcIOMNHAS IX,1,1980-82,21-58

Young, G.V.C. 1981 The Isle of Man and the Faroe Islands: Two similar countries Peel 1981

Zimmer, H. 1891 `Über die frühesten Berührungen der Iren mit den Nordgermanen´ Sitzungsberichte der (Königlich) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1891,279-317