Hiberni reversuri

M Miller*

At the end of his account of the Third Pictish War, Gildas tells us that in consequence of the Brittonic victory the Picts retired and their Irish allies went home, post non longum tempus reversuri.¹ In a previous discussion of this passage (Miller 1975a), I suggested that ‘expecting to return after no long time’ would be a legitimate translation. However, even if this suggestion holds, it is also true that Gildas might not have mentioned the matter if the expectation had not been fulfilled. The following discussion is concerned with evidence for this fulfilment.

While Gildas’ First and Second Pictish Wars can be fairly closely dated on external evidence² for the Third we only know that at its crisis the Britons appealed (vainly) to Agitio ter consuli. From Bede’s time onwards Agitius has usually been identified with Aetius, who was third time consul in 446, and could have been so addressed at any time up to his murder in 454.³ The Brittonic victory and the withdrawal of the Picts, together with the evacuation by the Irish of the lands between the two walls, are therefore probably dateable sometime in the 450s; and if Gildas knew of an Irish return, this must of course have happened before he was writing or publishing in 545 to 549 (Miller 1975c). The implication of Gildas’ reference is that after the Third Pictish War, the Picts and Scots acted independently, no longer in alliance as before. What we are looking for therefore is any assertion about Irish attacks on Britain after about 460 and before 545.

The relevant written sources are of three ascertainable kinds: historical (at least by intention) legendary or pressed to legendary use; and pseudo-historical; there is also one source as yet unclassified. Of these, only the historical can (if it survives criticism) provide evidence that the return was an event in fact; the rest tell us that, whether fact or fiction, it was famous in literature. Each account comes from a different area: the historical from Ulster and perhaps Dalriada, the legendary from Anglesey, the pseudo-historical from Meirionydd, and the unclassified from Man through Gwynedd. It is a question how far they are independent: their particularism has to be weighed against the fact that all are, or closely depend on, pedigree material.⁴ A survey of the sources may usefully precede discussion of the external evidence for historicity.

ULSTER

The major, if not the only, intendedly historical source is an anagraphic poem on the provincial kings of Ulster of the Christian period down to 1165–6. It exists in two editions, of which the earliest manuscripts are the Book of Uí Maine (late 14th century) and Dublin RIA Stowe B iv 2, written in 1628.⁵ Taken together with the annals,⁶ this gives us an annotated pedigree.

Professor Byrne lists five other treatments of the provincial king-list of Ulster, either independent or contained in Synchronisms. These were apparently known to the present poet,
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TABLE 1
Early Ulaid kings from the Dál Fiatach

1. Muiredach Red-neck, first Christian king, reigned 25 or 27 years [obit 479 AFM, 490 ATg]

2. Eochaid, reigned the same length of time [obit 507 ATg]

3. Cairell, reigned 25 years; ravaged Man and died in Arran [obit 526 AFM]

4. Eochu of the Cruithin Dal nAraide; 26 yrs [obit 553 AUc]

5. Fergnae, nephew of Muiredach (?) 4 yrs. [obit 557 AUc]

6. Demmán, reigned 14 years [obit 572 AUc] 7. Báetán, reigned 20 years [obit 581 AUc] [577 AUc: attack on Man]

8. Aed the Black of the Cruithin: 7 yrs [obit 588 AUc]

9. Fiachnæ Lurgan (g.son of 4.) 30 yrs [obit 626 AUc]

10. Fiachnæ Lurgan (g.son of 4.): 30 yrs [obit 626 AUc]

11. Congal Claen (g.son of 9.): 10 yrs.

12. Dunchad, reigned 9 years; raged against Man [obit 643 AFM]

Seventeen generations

66. Eochaid 1158-1166

but he commanded better sources than those extant: he is the only surviving authority for Cairell's campaign in Man and death in Arran. Báetán's Manx activities however are known not from this source, but from the annals and genealogical collections: the latter report that he 'cleared the gaill out of Man', but that it was abandoned in the second year after his death. The Manx war of Dúncadh is apparently, like that of Cairell, unique to this poem.

It is obvious that no confidence can be placed in the reign-lengths assigned to the first four reigns, with their sequence of 25/27, the same, 25, and 26 years respectively, too regular and too long. Consequently (assuming the accuracy of the pedigree) Cairell's death is likely to be later than 526. It is clear however that the historians of the Dál Fiatach believed that Cairell, Báetán, and Dúncadh had led attacks on Man over a considerable period, and that Cairell had also reached the Firth of Clyde.

DALRIADA

When we turn to the Clydeside powers of this period, we find that the records of Brittonic Strathclyde do not reach reliably so far back, but the royal pedigree of Dalriada has what may be useful details.

Modern scholarship holds that the first kings of this pedigree settled in Kintyre, and that the advance into Cowal (reaching the west coast of the Firth of Clyde) took place under Comgall, who is regarded as the eponym (Skene 1847, xciii; Watson 1926, 121; Anderson & Anderson 1961, 38). Once more, the variability of the dates makes them unreliable, but for our purposes the modern contention is of interest, in that this Dalriadic expansion is placed somewhere within 506 to 545, and therefore is approximately contemporary with Cairell (whose date 501 to 526 is, as we have seen, too early).

The nature of our extant sources is such that we cannot tell if this modern contention was
Table 2

Early kings of Dalriada

1. Fergus, (first) king of Scots in Britain, obit 498 AFM, 501 ATg

2. Domangart
   obit 506 ATg, 507 AUc

3. Comgall
   obit 538, 542, 545 AUc

4. Gabrán
   obit 558, 560 AUc

5. Conall
   obit 571 AUc

6. Aedán obit 606 AUc
   campaigned in Orkney 580 AUc
   campaigned in Man 582 AUc,
   584 AC, 583, 504 AUc

7. Eochaid, obit as ‘king of Picts’ 629 AUc

8. Connad Cerr
   obit 627, 628 ATg 629 AUc

9. Domnall Brecc
   obit 642, 686 AUc

anticipated by medieval learning, nor whether any such anticipation was independent of the Dál Fiatach story of Cairell.anticipated by medieval learning, nor whether any such anticipation was independent of the Dál Fiatach story of Cairell. It should however have been the case that, before the activities of Columba of the Ui Neill, the kings of Dalriada were subordinate to those of Ulster, so that the king of the two Dalriadas would owe service and be owed protection or furtherance of his interests: Cairell of Ulster in Arran and Comgall of Dalriada in Cowal are therefore a plausible conjuncture.

ANGLESEY

The relevant material from Anglesey comes to us in the form of the foundation-legend of the kindred of the poets Meilyr Brydydd (c 1100–37), his son Gwalchmai (c 1130–80) and grandson Einion (c 1203–23). This foundation-legend is an annotation to the pedigree, and tells us that Meilyr ap Gwron ap Cunedda was with his cousin Cadwallon ab Einion ap Cunedda when the latter defeated the Irishman Serigi at Llam y Gwyddel in Anglesey. This Meilyr is listed as the eighteenth ancestor of Meilyr Brydydd.

The obit of Cadwallon is placed at 534 in the Annals of Redon, and seems to have been the date from which the author of the Historia Brittonum (or his source) reckoned back (exactly) 146 years to the foundation of Gwynedd on the death of Maximus in 388. We can therefore apparently trace Cadwallon and his obit-date as established by 830, and add that – since consular dating appears in Gwynedd on an epitaph of 540 (Nash-Williams 1950, no 104) – the date could well be true and taken from a similar epigraphic source. The notice of the obit in the Annals of Redon is: occisus est Cavallonus rex fortissimus Majoris Britanniae, and this may be a reference to his Anglesey war (fortissimus). Unfortunately we do not know when this entry (and four others) were prefixed to the Annals proper, which begin with the foundation of Redon in 832.

It looks therefore as though we have here a good historical source pressed into service as a foundation-legend by Meilyr Brydydd or his progeny. However, we should not expect Meilyr ap Gwron, as nineteenth ancestor of Gwalchmai (c 1130–80) so closely to parallel Cairell, as twentieth ancestor of Eochaid (1158–66), and if the parallel is evidence of intercommunication, then also the Welsh and Irish narratives may not be wholly independent.
If now we compare the information of the three apparently historical bodies of source-material, we obtain:

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gwynnedd</th>
<th>Dalriada</th>
<th>Dál Fiatach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Padarn: SECOND PICTISH WAR (7398-)</td>
<td>Fergus</td>
<td>Muiredach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edern</td>
<td>Domangart</td>
<td>Eochaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunedda: THIRD PICTISH WAR</td>
<td>Einion</td>
<td>CAIRELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadwallon</td>
<td>Owain</td>
<td>COMGALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obit 534</td>
<td></td>
<td>obit 538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maelgwn</td>
<td>Cynlas</td>
<td>Gabrán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gildas'</td>
<td>(Gildas'</td>
<td>obit 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maglocune)</td>
<td>Cuneglase)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died 549</td>
<td>Einion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhun</td>
<td>Beli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iago</td>
<td>Conall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obit 616</td>
<td>obit 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cadfan</td>
<td>Aedán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obit 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eochaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obit 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin of Northumbria in Anglesey and Man</td>
<td>Cadwallon</td>
<td>Domnall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obit 633</td>
<td>obit 627</td>
<td>obit 642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DUNCHAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obit 644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BÁETÁN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obit 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already noted, the dates for the Dalriadic and Dál Fiatach kings before 550 are far from reliable, while that for Cadwallon's obit may be early and good. It will follow that, if the narratives attached to the names of Cairell and Cadwallon, and the eponymy of Comgall, are approximately acceptable, then the Irish attacks on Man, Arran, Cowal, and Anglesey are to be dated before 534, but not long before.

We come now to a much more dubious source, pseudo-historical in its extant version.¹⁷

**MEIRIONYDD**

In Geoffrey of Monmouth's tale of Gurguint Barbruce¹⁸ we apparently have pseudo-history allied to pedigree lore and legend. Geoffrey's hero's name is that of Gwrin Cut-beard, a member of the Meirionydd lineage of HG 18, where the eponym Meirion (Gwrin's grandfather) is said to have been son of Cunedda. In HG 32 however Meirion is made son of Tybion and grandson of Cunedda.¹⁹ Such pedigree variations often mark the point at which a genealogical canon has been disturbed, and in this case we have the older evidence in Historia Brittonum chapter 62 (Mommsen 1898) that Cunedda's sons were eight in number, whereas HG 32 makes them nine. We may suspect therefore that Meirionydd was recognised in one period of learning as an
independent kingdom, and only later was accepted as a constituent of Gwynedd whose princes
must be descended from Cunedda.

Even in HG 32 however Meirion is made contemporary with Cunedda's sons, so that the
situation as given is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early generations in Meirionydd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gwynedd</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunedda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadwallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obit 534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maelgwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>died 549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of Marchell and her saintly sister of Tywyn appear in the list of Brychan's
dughters in *De Situ Brecheniauc*, a copy dated c 1200 of a text which has been held to be 'at
least as old as the 11th century'. The Meirionydd entries are not, it would seem, the youngest
in the list, for they are separated from one another by an apparently intrusive block of names
of wives and mothers of Northcountry heroes. Another indication of some age is that there is
apparently no other trace, in literature or toponymy, of Cerddych of Tywyn.

It would therefore seem likely - as his epithet also suggests - that Gwrin was of old-
established fame in the lore of Meirionydd. There is however also the story that Maelgwn proved
his paramountcy over the other princes of Wales on the shore of the Dovey estuary, the southern
border of Meirionydd. This geography means that Maelgwn was in the thirteenth century
credited with the conquest and annexation of Meirionydd: we may recall his contemporary's
report that there were rulers whom he had expelled or killed. Gwrin's glorious reign seems
therefore to have reputedly ended by (or soon after) 534.

In this context, Geoffrey's assertion that Gwrin had a fleet and warred to the north, where he
encountered a wandering band of Basclenses under a leader Partholan, and directed them to
Ireland, is probably something more than his own pure fantasy. No doubt he obtained Partholan's
name from the *Historia Brittonum*, and he has simplified the Irish foundation-legend given there
into a single event (and turned the Spaniards into the more exotic Basques), but it seems likely
that his opportunity for all this nonsense was some tale of an encounter with Irish at sea, when
Cadwallon was fighting them in Anglesey.

Overall, and with the necessary cautions for the acceptance of such retrospective assertions,
it seems that evidence of various kinds converges to support, as a believed fact, an Irish assault
on Britain somewhere around 530, under the leadership of Cairell of the Dál Fiatach of Ulster.
If so, we might hope that the crucial evidence would come from Man: which brings us to our
unclassified source.
MAN

This consists in the main of a pedigree of one of the patrilineages claimed as ancestral to the Second Dynasty of Gwynedd, first extant in a source of c 1100, copying a collection made by c 955. This patrilineage is nowhere in our sources said to be Manx; the attribution is modern and based on

(1) an Irish verse (of unknown date and authorship) incorporated in the *Annals of Ulster* at the obit of Rhodri Mawr in 878AUc, which calls him Ruaidri Manann, 'Rhodri of Man'.

(2) the 12th-century Welsh 'prophetic' poem, *Cynoesi*, which asserts that Rhodri's father Merfyn (founder of the Second Dynasty of Gwynedd) came from the land of Manau. Undoubtedly this assertion stresses the parallel between the First Dynasty's origin in Manau of Gododdin, and the Second Dynasty's in Man; but this emphasis of itself does not necessarily invalidate the reports: it may rather presuppose them. It is perhaps more serious that Merfyn's derivation is said to be from the land, rather than from the island, of Manau, but perhaps a prophetic text should not be pressed for such detail.

(3) the *Crux Guriat* at Maughold, not closely dated, has been said to commemorate Rhodri's grandfather Gwriad (Lloyd 1911/1939, 323; Macalister 1945, no 1066; Megaw & Megaw 1950, 146, note 2).

(4) Rhodri's seventh ancestor, Merfyn the Great, is identified with the Mermin whose death in Mano is reported at 682AUc.

It seems therefore that the location in Man of some six or seven generations of this lineage is given by evidence which just about attains adequacy, and we may set out the whole as in Table 5.

The reign of Merfyn the Great, who died c 682, will have begun sometime about or most probably after the attack on Man by Dúchnad of the Dál Fiatach within 634–43. Merfyn's greatness was no doubt the reason why this king of Man was – exceptionally – noticed by the Irish annals, and perhaps his achievement principally lay in the reversal of the direction of sea-power which had usually been aggressive eastwards for some three centuries up to Dúchnad's time. This reversal seems to be evidenced in mainly Irish records:

678: Britons defeat Ferchar Fota of Lorn, king of Dalriada, in Tiree.
682: Brittonic raid on Dál nAraide in Ulster
684: raid by Ecgfrith of Northumbria on Brega, reported by (among others) Bede, without giving a reason; reason is still lacking, but a context is now suggested. (688–1081) Connailli of Louth rule an autonomous realm.
697: Brittonic raid on Louth
702: Brittonic raid on Brega
703: Brittonic raid on Dál Fiatach
709: Brittonic mercenaries active in Leinster

The above list includes the emergence of the Connailli as autonomous, in part because they seem to be the only Irish to benefit from these activities (and at least towards the end of the period there is strong suggestion that the raiders had Irish paymasters), and in part because earlier Irish settlers in Man may have been of the Connailli, if the Early Christian inscriptions are rightly interpreted (Marstrander 1937; Macalister 1945, no 504; Byrne 1965).

It therefore appears that an Irish and British Christian population of Man about 500 was by c 650 under a Brittonic dynasty when the direction of aggressive sea-power turned westward.
TABLE 5

The pre-Viking Britons of Man

Maxim: replaced by Maxen in JC 19

Anhun: replaced by Dunod in JC 19

Ednyfed: common ancestor in various texts of Dalriada, Strathclyde, and St Llawddog of Bardsey

Tudwal

Dingad

Senyllt: himself 'the generous', and one of the three generous heroes of the Northcountry, JC 19

Neithon

Rhun

Tudwal

Anllech

Cynyn: omitted (? by scribal error) in HG 4

Merfyn the Great: died 682AUc, in Mano

Anarawd, 'sturdy hawk'

Tudwal, called tudclyd in JC 19, transferring this epithet from a king of Strathclyde

Idwal

Celenion married Sandde

Eldir

Esyllt of Gwynedd m. Gwriad: ? Crux Guriat in Maughold

Merfyn Frych: founder of Second Dynasty of Gwynedd, reigned 826-44

Rhodri Mawr 844-878

For our present purposes the chief implication is perhaps that the tales of Cairell, BÁETÁN, and DÚNECHAD may have been exaggerated, but are not likely to have been invented, after 650.

The attachment of St Llawddog to a pedigree stating his descent from Ednyfed of this patrilineage shows – as do our texts themselves – the situation of Manx history in 12th-century and later Gwynedd. This is dynastic historiography, and we should probably note, as relevant to this construction, the report of a royal abbot of Bardsey late in the 12th-century, in the person of Cadwallon ab Owain Gwynedd.27 His appointment probably marks the time at which Bardsey was definitively accepted into the Gwynedd establishment.

When we turn to the Manx royal pedigree before Merfyn the Great, it is disappointing to find that no information is attached to the names in the period of our present interest; Merfyn’s sixth ancestor is the next name to be annotated, as that of Senyllt Hael, one of the three generous heroes of the Northcountry. Senyllt is also famed for his hospitality in the Gododdin (Jackson 1969, A 47), but in extant Welsh material he is usually replaced by Nudd, said to be his son.28 This Nudd however is almost certainly mythical, being the Brittonic form of the Irish Nuadu of the Silver Hand.29
If the pedigree is accurate as a record of the number of generations, Senyllt would have been active in the neighbourhood of 500 before the attacks on Man attributed to Cairell, Bætán, and Ó Dúnchad, and approximately of the time of the Andreas bilingual inscription, in ogam and British Latin. It is possible therefore that the lack of record for the five intervening generations is deliberate: certainly the Second Dynasty of Gwynedd would not wish to advertise that Bætán had ‘cleared the gaili out of Man’ (see p 306 above), if these foreigners included their ancestral Brittonic dynasty. It is by no means clear whether the Dál Fiatach attacks found a pretext in the presence of Irish in Man: if these Irish were in fact Connailli, their kinsmen on the mainland would stand to Dál Fiatach provincial kings much as did the Dalriadan kings in Kintyre. By Bætán’s time however the situation may have been very different: Aedán of Dalriada and Columba of the Ó Néill attempted to act against Bætán; and after Bætán’s death Aedán is reported to have campaigned victoriously in Man. It may be that various scraps of pseudo-history derive ultimately from accounts of this restoration, but none appear attached to the present pedigree.

The silence of the pedigree and its notes on the three Dál Fiatach attacks on Man may therefore not be evidential; but in addition it has been supposed that the earliest generations of the dynasty were not located, factually or allegedly, in Man, and for several reasons. One is that Senyllt is said to have belonged to the Northcountry, which otherwise does not seem to include Man: there is however no early evidence, it would seem, one way or the other. Again, Senyllt’s father Tudwal has been identified as the wicked king of that name who harassed Ninian at Whithorn, and so placed on the Galloway coast: but Whithorn is almost within sight of Man, so again the argument against his location in Man lacks cogency. It is true that the emperor Maximus cannot be placed in Man, but we do not know when he was put at the head of this pedigree, except that it was probably before 826, when the Second Dynasty of Gwynedd was founded.

On the other hand (while we are in this highly speculative area) the use of Ednyfed’s name for Dalriada, Strathclyde, and Bardsey suggests that the twelfth-century Welsh at least thought of this ancestor as proper for people of the seaways, and certainly implies that they had no clear notion of any particular mainland to which he should be fixed. This is as much as to say that Manx dynastic lore once went back only to the time of (approximately) Tudwal and the Third Pictish war – and allowed, in the Gwynedd version, no intermissions due to the Dál Fiatach thereafter. Consequently it would appear that the basis of HG 4 is historical in kind from Tudwal onwards, and that its pruning and elaboration are not so much pseudo-historical as candidly propagandist, on behalf of the Second Dynasty of Gwynedd.

In Table 6 the various results of the previous discussions are brought together, and there is added part of the Strathclyde pedigrees from HG 5–7, because Strathclyde would certainly be affected by the Dalriadic annexation of Cowal, and because the proper names at this period suggest close connections – real or alleged – with the dynasty of Meirionydd.

Comparison of the Manx pedigree and that of the First Dynasty of Gwynedd suggests that two more generations (Ednyfed and Anthun/Dunod) besides that of Maximus were added to overtop Padarn in seniority – and no doubt to put Maximus at the right date too, for it is a rule of good propaganda to be, if not true, then at least accurate. And we may note how, outside Man and Gwynedd, but in both Britain and Ireland, the claimed historical horizon falls in the second half of the 5th century, about the time of the ending of the Third Pictish War. We may recall also that realistic, though not yet historical, Pictish reign-lengths begin in the oldest list at 456, and the first Christian king’s accession is dated to 460 (Miller 1979). We can scarcely hold that such convergence and agreement comes to us from the particularist preservation of
each local record for between five and ten centuries before our extant sources begin: rather there was – probably in immediately pre-Viking scholarship – international learned agreement throughout the British Isles on the acceptable post-Roman horizon. Moreover, it is difficult to doubt that such agreement was due to the acceptance and propagation of Gildas’ testimony by Bede, reinforcing earlier more local synchronisms (such as, in the present case perhaps, the connections of Fergus, Muiredach, and Ceredig – that is, Dalriada, Ulster, and Strathclyde – with Patrick). If then we accept this horizon, at least we now know that in doing so we accept

**Table 6**

Comparison of Pedigree Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAN</th>
<th>GWYNEDD</th>
<th>DÁLRIADA</th>
<th>Dál FiaTACH</th>
<th>MEIRIONYDD</th>
<th>STRATHCLYDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthun</td>
<td>Padarn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ednyfed</td>
<td>Edern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudwal</td>
<td>Cunedda</td>
<td>Fergus</td>
<td>Muiredach</td>
<td>Tybion</td>
<td>Ceredig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingad</td>
<td>Einion</td>
<td>Domangart</td>
<td>Eochaid</td>
<td>Meirion</td>
<td>Cynwyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senyllt</td>
<td>Cadwallon</td>
<td>Comgall</td>
<td>Cairell</td>
<td>Cadwaladr</td>
<td>Dynfwal Hen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neithon</td>
<td>Maelgwn</td>
<td>Gabrán</td>
<td>Gwrin</td>
<td>Clynog</td>
<td>Cynfelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhun</td>
<td>Rhun</td>
<td>Conall</td>
<td>Demmán</td>
<td>Clydno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudwal</td>
<td>Iago</td>
<td>Aedán</td>
<td>Baetan</td>
<td>Gwyddno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anllech</td>
<td>Cadfan</td>
<td>Eochaid</td>
<td>Fiachnai</td>
<td>Idris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynyn</td>
<td>Cadwallon</td>
<td>Domnall</td>
<td>Dunchad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merfyn</td>
<td>Cadwaladr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarawd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudwal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwriad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merfyn Frych</td>
<td>826–844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodri Mawr</td>
<td>844–878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a conclusion of multi-national 8th-century learning, and are not deluding ourselves about the
naive results of a fantastically accurate oral tradition cultivated by the folks concerned.

If then our immediate sources are fragmentations – due presumably to the destructions of
the Viking age – of a once coherent historiographic view, and particularist developments after
this breakdown, the convergence of the surviving records of Dál Fiatach, Dalriada, Gwynedd,
and Meirionydd on Irish assaults under the leadership, or after the example, of Cairell about
530 is less surprising. In this context the records of Man and Strathclyde also fall into place:
Senyllt the generous (and therefore the wealthy) would represent the good times remembered
before Cairell’s assault; the branching of the Strathclyde pedigree would represent the turmoil
within the defeated. It is difficult, in this context, to avoid the conclusion that Gildas’ reference
to the *Hiberni reversuri* had (rightly or not) been recognised as referring to an event known to
dynastic lore, and that the learned versions of the local histories (which are our sources) were
moulded within the discipline of this doctrine. In other words, in so far as the preceding discus-
sions are well-grounded, they merely rediscover what was commonplace to Insular historical
learning about AD 800. It will follow (on the same condition) that the convergence of our sources
is certainly historiographic but only probably historical; *they do not confirm one another’s
historicity*. If however future work shows their general or approximate acceptability, then these
statements may for us explain Gildas’ *reversuri* of the Irish unaccompanied by the Picts, as well
as his reference to the valour of brave men not otherwise mentioned in his historical sketch.

A most interesting question is raised by this hypothesis: the action taken by the dynasty
of the Déisi in Dyfed about 530, founded by Irish immigrants a century or more before. There
is no trace of any support for the new assault, even in Gildas’ denunciation of Voteporix; and
that prince in his bilingual epitaph boasts the Roman title or epithet of Protector (which first
appears in his pedigree two generations earlier).37 Aergol is praised (as Voteporix’ father) by
Gildas, and also remembered in the *Book of Llandaf* as the founder of the court chaplaincy of
Dyfed, with the help of St Teilo.38 All this seems to mean that by about 530 the Déisi of Dyfed,
at least officially, felt themselves British (though not yet Brittonic), and provided no assistance
to the invaders.

*The external evidence of pots and inscriptions*

Fully independent and external evidence for our period is to be found mainly in archaeology
and epigraphy, neither of which witnesses directly to the persons and events of the literary record.
We cannot even assume that the testimony of this material is directly relevant. Since however
both the pots and the inscriptions are contemporary, they can properly be considered together
as evidence for routes and communications; and these results can then be compared to the written
sources – in principle.

The last two words need to be stressed, almost to the extinction of the statement they
modify, at least at the present stage of knowledge. The imported Mediterranean pottery is evi-
denced on Insular sites by sherds only: no complete vessels are known. Recognition is conse-
quently recent (Radford 1956), classification often tentative, and distribution-maps in the forma-
tive stage (Thomas 1959; Alcock 1971, map 6). Correspondingly, an inscription *in situ* may be
too wet and windswept to encourage the use of the minuter museum techniques, while those
which have wandered have of course lost some part of their evidential value. Nevertheless, after
some pioneering (Macalister 1945), and some more advanced (Nash-Williams 1950), studies, they
have received surprisingly close dating (Jackson 1953), which it is not for a non-epigraphist to
question.39 The following discussion should therefore be read with adequate reservation: it is
not a pessimistic view of the present state of knowledge.
We may begin with the pottery, for some classes of the Insular fragments have now received firm contexts in the study of their wares in their homelands (Hayes 1972). This work has revealed that the Red Slip wares which have been put together in Insular import Class A are of two different origins. The earlier Insular A material is Late Roman C Form 3; the later Insular A is African Red Slip Ware of Form 103 or 104, and stamp-style E. The third kind of table-ware, Insular import D, was manufactured in the Bordeaux area and is not so well dated in its homeland. Insular import Class B consists of amphorae, wine-jars imported for their content, and dateable only within rather wide limits (except of course when stratification or associations are available at specific sites).

The earliest of the import fragments is apparently a dish from Dinas Powys dateable 460 to 490 (Hayes 1972, 357); other sherds of Late Roman C 3 come from Garranes in Munster, Cogyan in Dyfed, and Tintagel, Gwithian, Lydford, Congresbury and Cadbury in the Westcountry (Hayes 1972, maps 15 & 40). In the Mediterranean, and in the period 450 to 550, Late Roman C 3 extends from Sicily and South Italy all round the eastern coastlands and through Egypt to Libya (Hayes 1972, map 33). The nearest provenance for the Insular imports is thus Sicily–South Italy, while the insular distribution at present is restricted to the Westcountry, South Wales, and Munster, the area of the Déisi and Ui Liatháin. It is to be noted also that only Tintagel has been taken as an ecclesiastical site. But the insular distribution as at present known may well be extended by future finds.

These pots then had been carried from at least Sicily/South Italy before they reached the islands: they must have been well-stowed and were apparently rarely traded at intermediate points, although the boats presumably had to pay at least watering and harbourage dues at some places en route. The pots were probably therefore part of mixed cargoes, and (to judge from their rarity) neither a large part nor brought on every voyage. The distribution in Munster and on both sides of the Severn Sea suggests that there was no attempt to round Land's End, but that the boats went direct from NW Spain to Ireland, then to the Severn eastwards, retracing their route on the return journey.

The amphorae of Insular import Class B are reported at Garranes in Munster and recently (as Professor Alcock tells me) at Clogher in Louth, and at 15 sites in the Severn area and Westcountry, but also at Castell Degannwy and Dinas Emrys in Gwynedd (Alcock 1971, map 6), and now at Dumbarton in Strathclyde (Alcock 1976). The absence as yet of firm relative or absolute dating means that this material is to a considerable extent historically mute, except for the implications of its distribution. Its appearance in Munster for example together with the earlier Class A material may suggest the same shippers; a wider market for wine than for fine table-ware may be shown by the relative numbers of sites in the Severn area; but the extension to Gwynedd and Strathclyde probably means continuance to a later date than the imports of Late Roman C.

The African Red Slip Ware is wholly of the 6th century; the transition to Form 104 begins about 530; stamp-style E is pervaded by 'a strongly Christian flavour' (Hayes 1972, 166, 221–2). It has been found (at present) only at Tintagel and Iona (Hayes 1972, map 29); the Iona sherd is dated to the last third of the 6th century; the Tintagel sherd does not seem to be dated.

Insular Class D, manufactured in the Bordeaux area, shows some overlaps in its homeland both in stamp-styles and in distribution, with the African Red Slip Ware (Hayes 1972, 143–4). It has been found at Tintagel, Cadbury, Congresbury and Dinas Powys in the Severn area, and at Mote of Mark in Galloway and Dunadd in Argyll: none, as yet, occurs in Ireland (Alcock 1971, map 6).

The general impression at the moment is therefore that for some years – perhaps a genera-
tion – on either side of 500, shipping from the Mediterranean did not venture N of the Munster–Severn line, while before 597 at least one ‘ship from Gaul’ reached Dalriada. In considering this situation, we have of course to reckon with wars and pirates, but probably harbour and transit dues, and goods acceptable in exchange, were far more important to the people engaged in the trade, while the further N the voyages extended, the more they would be dependent on local pilots. For the northern extensions especially, the dearth of Manx archaeology may distort our notions appreciably.

We have seen that the earliest of these voyagers seem to have avoided Land’s End: and we may now note similarly that some inscriptions suggest the use of transpeninsular routes in Dyfed and Gwynedd, avoiding the dangerous waters round the headlands.

A memorial at Llanaelhaearn, a terminus of the Gwynedd transpeninsular route, is provided by ECMW 87, dated to the late 5th century (Jackson 1953, 570, 192, note 2). It commemorates a man described as Elmietiaco, ‘of Elmet’, most probably the cantref of Elfed on a Dyfed transpeninsular route. Conversely, and perhaps earlier (Jackson 1953, 619), ECMW 126 is a memorial in Dyfed of an Ordovician, Ordovis, from Meirionydd or its general area. Also in Dyfed, in the later 5th century (Jackson 1953, 610), is ECMW 315, a memorial of a man with a purely Celtic name, whose father is described as Paulini Marini Latio. We do not know the precise significance of the name of Latium at this time (and in this context), nor whether Marini is part of Paulinus’ name or designates his trade.

These inscriptions may suggest that, at the time when Mediterranean shipping did not venture N of the Munster–Severn line, some local movement N and S used the transpeninsular routes and the safer waters between. If so, such movements would not be of heavy goods in great bulk: for example, if we think of the northward movement of wine from the amphorae at all at this time, we should probably suppose it repacked in skins or kegs, suitable for ponies or porters on land, and small boats at sea.

In the ‘early to mid-6th century’ (Jackson 1953, 193), at Capel Anelog in Gwynedd, there is ECMW 78 which contains a contraction of presbyter said to be characteristic of North African and Spanish scribal habits. This inscription is itself therefore evidence that books or other documents, or literate men, were being imported from the same region or by the same boats as African Red Slip Ware of ‘a strongly Christian flavour’. The multitudo fratrum of ECMW 78 probably implies a monastic community, like those at (?) Tintagel and Iona which used the ware.

The Insular import Class D ware from SW France is paralleled in part by ECMW 33, at Llantrisant (Aberffraw, Anglesey), of the early 6th century (Jackson 1953, 446), commemorating apparently a bishop who came from the Andecavi on the Loire. At Penmachno in Gwynedd there is ECMW 104, self-dated to the consulship of Iustinus, who was recognised in southern France, in 540. These inscriptions are useful because Class D pots have not yet been recognised in Gwynedd, though they appear not only in the Severn area, but at Mote of Mark in Galloway and Dunadd in Argyll. Similarly at Kirkmadrine in the Rhinns of Galloway, the Viventius and Mavortius inscription is said, in its hooked chi-rho, to show Gaulish influence of the early 6th century.

If then in the 5th century we can as yet envisage long-distance shipping no further N than the Munster–Severn line, the Class B amphorae of Gwynedd and Dumbarton probably show through-cargoes at a later date, and this is supported by the Class D (Bordeaux) sherds in Galloway and Argyll, and the African Red Slip sherd at Iona – and perhaps by the Capel Anelog, Penmachno, Llantrisant, and Kirkmadrine inscriptions. The Penmachno inscription may suggest that the through-routes had reached Gwynedd by 540.

Another group of inscriptions may be relevant to our problems: those which have Irish
names in monolingual texts, and the ogam and Latin bilinguals. These include the Andreas bilingual in Man, dated around 500, and the following in Gwynedd:

ECMW 10 (lost): Llanfaelog, Anglesey: perhaps an Irish name, perhaps of the 5th century (Jackson 1953, 329: MAILISI?)

ECMW 176: Clocaenog, Dyffryn Clwyd: bilingual, late 5th century (Jackson 1953, 172: SIMILIN)

Bodedern: Irish name, 5th to 6th century (White 1972, ERCAGNI)

ECMW 9: Llanfaelog, Anglesey: Irish name, beginning of 6th century (Jackson 1953, 172: CVNOCVSI)

ECMW 39: Penrhos Llugwy, Anglesey: Irish name, early to mid-6th century (Jackson 1953, 172: MACCUDECETTI)

ECMW 106: Treflys, Eifionydd: bilingual, 6th century: IACONVS

ECMW 84: Bryncir, Eifionydd: bilingual, mid-late 6th century (Jackson 1953, 172: ICORI)

The absence of bilinguals in Anglesey, and their presence in two other parts of Gwynedd, is of course capable of more than one explanation (and chance is a good candidate). The dating of ECMW 39 may be before or after 530, the likely approximate time for Cadwallon’s war. It is possible therefore that MACCUDECETTI was not an enemy of Cadwallon, though Irish names in Anglesey inscriptions cease with his (for what this fact is worth in so small a number of survivals). But ograms are in use in Eifionydd, as in Dyfed, certainly later than Cadwallon: again, possibly not of enemy Irish – Gildas’ description (DEB 31) of Aergol of the Déisi of Dyfed as a good man (with a worthless son, Voteporix) shows that the Britons (at least, some ecclesiastical Britons) of the mid-6th century had no blanket anti-Hibernian feeling.

At the present stage of knowledge therefore the pottery and inscriptions seem to distinguish an early period when through-route voyages did not advance beyond the Munster-Severn line, and northward communications in Wales preferred transpeninsular routes. The extension of the through-route sailings to places N of Wales apparently happened in the 6th century, but it is not clear exactly when; while Columba’s ship from Gaul belongs, probably, not merely to the last third of the 6th century, but to the period after Aedán’s victory in Man in 582/4. It is likely that the pilot of this Gallic boat was either Manx or Dalriadic.

It is not improbable that the Munster-Severn line was only one of a series of maritime frontiers in being at various times; the two Dalriadas on either side of the North Channel no doubt provided another, and Man is admirably placed to draw either a N-S line to Galloway and Anglesey, or an E-W line to the Cumberland coast or to Heysham in Lancashire. As more pottery evidence emerges, it may be possible to trace such frontier-lines, and so better to understand some of the mainland events in both the major islands.

At the moment two questions seem important. The first is the problem of when the through-routes reached Man, and what the Manx did in consequence. Was there, for example, a time when the through-route stopped at Man, and goods for northward destinations were repacked and transhipped there? Certainly Senyllt might have grown wealthy (and generous) on such a situation, and Cairell have had an interest in changing it, but the pottery (as at present known) does not suggest that, if there was ever anything of the kind, it was as early as this. Such matters however might well be relevant to Baetán.

The second question is that of the goods which paid for the wine and pots. They were probably either heavy (such as metal), or bulky (such as textiles, hides, and especially slaves). Any conquering ‘Heroic’ Dark Age king would need to be assured of, or to find, a market for enslaved war-captives, and – since these would often be of better quality than the trickle of criminals and outlaws coming more constantly into the same market – he would generally have
few commercial worries.\textsuperscript{49} In a general sense this must have been true for Aedán in the Hebrides, for Urien Rheged and his allies against the Saxons,\textsuperscript{50} for Aethelfrith in turn against the Britons; and it no doubt goes some way to explain Aedán's curious expedition of 603. The important aspect of this problem is therefore whether the ending of the traceable Mediterranean voyages was connected with some reorganisation of the slave-trade consequent upon, or as part of, changes in political and ecclesiastical situations, perhaps far from the islands.

One of the more mysterious events of the early 7th century is the establishment, by Edwin of Northumbria, of some close connection with Man (as well as Anglesey). This can hardly be dissociated from his annexation of Elmet at the eastern end of the Aire gap, which opened the easiest route, by way of Heysham, from Man to York. If then there is any reason to suspect, in the 620s, that routes from Man N or S were difficult, it can be seen that the Manx would be only too pleased to make contact with the Anglo-Saxon or Frisian commercial sphere of operations which no doubt by this time included York.\textsuperscript{51} Subsequently it could also be understood why Cadwallon of Gwynedd refused to abide by Christian rules of war: he would in such circumstances need a good supply of captives for any attempt to reopen the through-routes in the W.\textsuperscript{52}

Consideration of the relevant archaeological and epigraphic evidence is at present known offers us therefore nothing immediately relevant to Gildas' \textit{Hiberni reversuri}, but very strongly suggests that a great deal of illumination can be expected from archaeology in the near future, especially if this includes substantial exploration in Man.

A question is the general effect of the Irish assault (assuming it actually happened) upon the situation in Britain, which S of the Humber appears at this time to have been governed (if Gildas is rightly understood) by the existence of a \textit{divortium} or partition, with autonomous Germanic settlement to the E of the line. This is however complicated, to an unknown degree, by Gildas' characterisation of several Brittonic kings as \textit{usurpers}: we should probably not suppose that they had usurped their individual kingdoms, but rather certain aspects of sovereignty which in Gildas' view belonged separately to none of them, but either to all in concert, or to some power to whom they should owe alliance or obedience. It is conceivable therefore that the Irish war not merely prevented the kind of convention at which agreed policies could be formulated, but also created considerable differences of interest between the rulers in the front line of the Irish attack, and those on the borders of the \textit{divortium}. It appears, for example, from the English pedigree material, that Anglian and Saxon kingdoms began to be formed towards the middle of the 6th century (Miller forthcoming a): as they came into being and disappeared or extended and consolidated, we should expect their kings to conduct some classes of business directly with the Brittonic kings on their borders, and to force them to take decisions without overmuch consultation of kings engaged in Irish matters. Such piecemeal decisions might not only be deplored on legitimist grounds: they would create precedents, which the western kings might find irreversible when their attention was no longer distracted by the Irish. Such a situation might be a major element in the disorder which Gildas reports as growing at the time of writing.

In so far as the preceding discussion is on the right lines, it has shown that modern enquiries have not yet assembled a sufficient, or sufficiently precise, body of evidence to match and criticise the historiographic doctrines of the late 8th century. But perhaps a fuller appreciation of the dimensions of those doctrines leads to a more focused view of what still has to be done.

\textbf{POSTSCRIPT}

In his \textit{Life of Columba} (iii 17), Adomnán records a miraculous event in \textit{Hinba} (perhaps Jura) when Columba was host to four Irish abbots. The purpose of the meeting is not given
(though, as we shall see, the names of the participants suggest something of the agenda). In ii 42, Columba and one of the four abbots are concerned with a voyage to Orkney, Bridei I of the Picts, and the *regulus* of Orkney; in the Latin Life of Comgall (Plummer 1910, ii 18), Columba and two others of the abbots visit king Bridei. It seems therefore that there was a group of stories (Anderson & Anderson 1961, 22; Anderson, MO 1965) about Columba and other, visiting, abbots in *Hinba* and their joint or several relationships with Bridei I, and that these stories referred to the period between Columba's arrival in Britain in 563 and Bridei's death c 587. The abbots concerned are: Columba of the Northern Úi Néill: resident in Dalriada and active in Pictland and the Isles;

Cormac of the Úi Liatháin: a member of Columba's foundation at Durrow, in Southern Úi Néill territory; kinsman(?) of the Úi Liatháin of Munster and Severnside, active in Orkney under the protection of Columba and Bridei I. In Scotland cult-sites attributed to Cormac are of course most dubious because the name was common: they are the parish of North Knapdale (between Kintyre and Argyll proper), Kirkcormack in Kirkcudbright, and Ardeonaig in Kenmore on Loch Tayside: they do not form a geographical group (Innes 1854, ii 39–40; MacKinlay 1914, 91–2).

Cainnech moccu Dálon: founder (late in life?) of Aghaboe in Osraige among the Southern Úi Néill. In the Isles he is eponym at Inch Kenneth in Mull (Innes 1854, ii 36), Kilchainie at Soroby in Tiree (Innes 1854, ii 327), Kilchainie in Coll (Innes 1854, ii 331), Kilchainie at Howmore in South Uist (Innes 1854, ii 368), as well as at Kilchenzie in Kintyre (Innes 1854, ii 20). His other mainland cult-centres may be later than 842: if so there should be implications for the staffing and territories of new, specifically Scottish (as distinct from Scoto-Pictish) churches after the conquest.

Brendan moccu Altai, the Navigator, of Clonfert, culted at Braddan in Man, and in the Isles in the parish of Kilbrandon (the islands of Seil, Iniscapel, etc: Innes 1854, ii 102), and at Elachnave in the Garvellochs (Innes 1854, ii 276); doubtfully at Kilbirnie, Ayrshire. His obit at 577/83 places his visit to Columba in Hinba before that date.

Comgall moccu Aridi, of the Cruithin, founder of Bangor: his house in Tiree apparently did not survive. He had a *keill* in the parish of Lonan in Man, and the hagiographers suggest that Cattán and Bláán were his associates. Cattán is reported for Kilchattan in Kintyre (Innes 1854, ii 9), the parish of Kilchattan including Luing and other islands (Innes 1854, ii 100), Kilchattan in Bute (Innes 1854, ii 210), Kilchattan in Gigha (Innes 1854, ii 257), the parish of Kilchattan including Colonsay and Oronsay (Innes 1854, ii 280), and Stornoway in Lewis (Innes 1854, ii 381). Bláán is especially founder of the monastery and bishopric of Kingarth in Bute, and also reported at mainland sites.

Whether formally on the agenda at Hinba or not, the fortunes of the Úi Néill would be of interest to Columba, Cormac, and Cainnech, while Pictish and Isles affairs (unless the cult-sites are all post-conquest or post-Viking) would be of concern to Columba, Cormac, Cainnech and Brendan: the practical organisation of these matters would involve ecclesiastical spheres of influence and discipline. Cormac and Brendan had special sea-faring interests, and both are credited with ocean voyages, but Cormac in Orkney and Brendan in Man suggest that they may have specialised in different areas, while the obits place Cormac, on the whole, in the generation after Brendan.

The common interests of Columba and Comgall were probably political as well as ecclesiastical. Comgall's people, the Cruithin of Ulster, were at this time in process of finding a single king to unite their communities. The first strong man to emerge, Aed the Black was cursed by
Columba failed to found a dynasty. The second attempt by Fiachnæ Lurgan after 588 was successful: he was of Comgall’s own kindred, the Araidi. Thus Columba and Comgall together appear to have secured for the Cruithin a dynasty not as obnoxious to the Ui Neill as Aed the Black, who had killed an Ui Neill king.

Columba and Comgall are also both in some association with the kindred of the moccu Min: Sinlan was Comgall’s second successor as abbot of Bangor and died in 610 (Kenney 1929, no 55) while Lugbe was Columba’s envoy to Rhydderch of Strathclyde and his companion in the reception of the ‘ship from Gaul’. Nothing otherwise seems to be known of the moccu Min, but Lugbe may have been Columba’s interpreter, and Sinlan ‘learned by rote the computus from a certain learned Greek’. They are contemporaries of Columban who, leaving Bangor about 590, also shows Bangor’s interest in foreign parts and, perhaps, linguistic aptitude.

If we bear in mind this reasonably clear and well-evidenced ecclesiastical material, the secular reports of the same period are perhaps less dubious. Columba was in some sense on good terms with Bridei I of the Picts: it should follow that if Aedán was ever enemy of the Picts, this would be at earliest after Bridei’s death, and perhaps not before Columba’s death; conversely, his Orkney campaign in c 580 should have been fought as a Pictish ally. This would accord with Orcadian hostages at Bridei’s court, and with Columba’s request that Cormac should be well-received if he came to the islands. It also accords with the highly authoritative double dating of Columba’s arrival: in 563 in Irish sources, in 565 in Bede from a Pictish source; the latter can be taken as the date of the Pictish confirmation of the grant of Iona.

Now if land-grants by the Dalriadic king in the 560s required Pictish confirmation, it is necessary to give much weight to the entry in the Irish annals of 559 or so, which report a Dalriadic defeat by Bridei; and to suppose that this initiated a period of subjection. The Irish status of the Dalriadic king was also low at this time: his superior was the provincial king of Ulster, above whom the Ui Neill kings claimed status. But in the Convention of Druimm Cete in 575 this was changed: Aedán became directly subordinate (in levying and hosting) to the Northern Ui Neill, while the taxes of Irish Dál Riata went to the Scottish king, who apparently also kept the fleet. We could suppose that after this the situation of Dalriada in Pictish law was also revised – that Aedán became more of an ally than a subject of Bridei, and was so acting in 580 in Orkney.

On the Irish side, this change would of course earn the enmity to Dál Riata of the rejected provincial king of Ulster, Baeán, who would (we may suppose) now find his landward frontiers menaced by the Ui Neill or their protégés, and his northern seaward frontier blocked by Aedán’s fleet, holding the North Channel between Kintyre and Antrim. In the year after Druimm Cete a costly battle in Kintyre is recorded, and was probably Baeán’s opening campaign against his rebellious subject: other conflicts are legendary and may never have been on a comparable scale because of the Ui Neill threat. We may therefore tentatively hold that for some years from 575 onwards Aedán’s fleet held the North Channel frontier, and that through communications southwards went west-about, by friendly Ui Neill havens in Connacht to the Munster of Brendan and Cormac, and there linked up with the route to western France.

Baeán is said to have attacked Man in 577, and to have driven out the gaill, which must seemingly include the Brittonic dynasty. Aedán in 582/4, after Baeán’s death, is said to have won a bellum Manonn, which the Welsh annals certainly take to be in Man. Welsh pedigree learning made Aedán an honorary Briton, as well as tracing the Manx dynasty without interruption. Tentatively therefore we could suppose that the Brittonic dynasty of Man was restored by an alliance between Aedán and his Brittonic neighbours in Strathclyde and southwards, thus reopening the North Channel frontier by about 583.
The situation thus created could have remained in existence for some time, during which Fiachnae Lurgan established his dynasty, and Aedán in 603 mounted his attack, no doubt with Brittonic help, on Aethelfrith of Bernicia: probably the defeated allies fell out, and Aedán then earned his Brittonic nickname of *bradawg*, the treacherous.\(^6^6\)

It could therefore be that the final stage in opening through-routes from western France to the Orkneys was the *bellum Manon*, and that the saints who met in Hinba had consistently pressed towards this development. Since they would need wine for the mass, they had of course a permanent interest in the seaways, quite apart from books, computi, and other matters of less urgency or regular demand from the S, and furs and amber from Scandinavia and the Baltic.\(^6^7\)

**Notes**

1. Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, chapter 21 (Mommsen 1898, 36 lines 16–17)
3. Gildas DEB 20. The Aetius who was consul in 454 was a different man.
4. We badly need a technical term for those innumerable insular verses, tracts, and memoranda which list people and things whether in asyntactical form, in prose, or in verse. Consequently *anagraphic* may be suggested, meaning ‘in the form of a list, catalogue, schedule, or register’, widely used in ancient historiography for lists of rulers, Olympic (and other) victors, thalassocracies, philosophers, or anything else needed as ancillary to scholarship, in any form, and annotated or not. In Wales, the mnemonic Triads are the chief examples of anagraphic compositions of one kind; in both Wales and Ireland the pedigree collections are another. In Ireland (as in Greece) anagraphic verse was widely employed, and merits a thorough study in its own right as a genre: linguistic and stylistic detail may be useful in helping to determine period and school of composition and consequently to some degree the historical value of any such poem. In the present material, it is useful to be able to say that nearly all the evidence is anagraphic.
5. Byrne 1964: text, translation, introduction, and commentary, with genealogical tables, and absolute dates from the annals. The poem is anonymous, but of the same generation as, and similar linguistic habits to, the poems on the kings of Connacht and Leinster by Gilla na Naem Ua Duinn, who died in 1160 as *fer leiginn* of Inis Clothran on Loch Ree.
6. There are not yet adequate editions of AU [Annals of Ulster], AT [Annals of Tigernach], or AFM [Annals of the Four Masters], and none of the dates can be pressed to the year. Nevertheless, for clarity’s sake, the years marked AUc are from AU corrected for the omission (by scribal error) of a year in the 480s. AT has no absolute dating in its text, and the years are guessed by moderns comparing sequences and year-sections with AU: so the fact that these figures are guessed is indicated by ATg. The problems of our sources’ archival procedures in the construction of a provincial king-list (in which we should expect many interregna and overlaps, from the nature of the institution) cannot be analysed until there are adequate editions of all the relevant material. The *Annales Cambriae* (AC) in their oldest extant version are beautifully edited by Phillimore 1888.
7. Anderson 1922, i, 88: from the *Book of Lecan*, written 1416–18, copying an exemplar of unknown date.
8. The association in the poem of Muirdach and Eochaid with Comgall and Bangor may or may not refer to events after the mid-6th century: if it does, the pedigree is at fault. But the reference is probably an anachronism: Byrne 1964 82, note to stanza 10.
9. We do not yet know when the king-list of Dalriada was first compiled in any anagraphic text, oral or written, though the problems are much more defined now that the texts are available and discussed by Anderson 1973.
10. I take these dates from D Simon Evans 1964, xxvi–vii, where the bibliography of publication and study is given. It is perhaps to be presumed that the references in Triad 62 (Bromwich 1961/1978), and the pedigrees (see next note), arise from the 12th-century lore of this family.
12. Migne 1952, column 1323: from Avranches 213, a transcript of an abstract from the *Annals* made by or for Robert of Torigny. in the 12th century.
Historia Brittonum chapter 62, (Mommsen 1898) discussed by Miller 1978.

The Welsh anagraphic genres did not include king-lists, so that such an origin is unlikely.

Though the direction of the dependence (if there was such) might be questioned. The latest substantial opportunity was perhaps given by the exile of Cynan ab Iago of Gwynedd in Ireland in the mid-eleventh century.

For this version of the Gwynedd pedigree see Miller 1978, 1979.

I omit here, as being not yet closely enough dated, two bodies of material which may become relevant as work proceeds. One is archaeological: the grass-marked pottery of sites in W Somerset, W Cornwall, and the Scillies, which may be of the 6th century, and may evidence connections with Ulster. The other is toponymic: the kil- names of Galloway, which are perhaps older than the kirk names of the same area, and might possibly be as old as the 6th century (in some cases). The most optimistic current view of these materials is expressed by Thomas 1972.

Historia Regum Britanniae iii, 11-12 (Griscom 1929, 291ff).

HG 18 in Bartrum p 11; HG 32 at p 13. (The Harleian Genealogies were compiled by c 955 and are extant in a manuscript of c 1100.)

Bartrum 1966, 14–16, entries 12 (13) & (17).

Unless the old guess that her name is represented in Llangedris near Tywyn still holds.

Printed (from a 13th-century source) (Bromwich 1961–78, 439f).

Gildas DEB chapter 33.

HG 4; more informatively in JC 16 (Bartrum 1966, 46), which in this section is a modernising rendering of a collection of the ancestral lines of Rhodri Mawr (844–878): a generally late 9th-century origin would, not however guarantee details.

For detail of the annalistic sources see Anderson 1922, sub annis; for lists of these activities Watson 1926, 193 (assuming that the Britons were of Strathclyde) and Mac Niocail 1972, 112–13, 114, identifying the Britons as of Man. The list is not complete: the 11th- or 12th-century Life of Findchúa of Bri Gobann (Whitley Stokes 1890, 235) reports sea-borne raids on territories of the Southern Ul Néill in the saint’s time (his obit is 664 AFM) and that of king Sechnussach, giving the enemy an anachronistic Viking colour. No doubt there are other references too.

‘Lineages of the Northcountrymen’ (BGG) 8–12, ‘Lineages of the Saints’ (ByS) 18, and Buchedd Llawddog, all in Bartrum 1966. According to the Book of Llandaf, Bardsey was desolate at the time of the hermit Elgar, whose visions authenticated the relics of Dyfrig, translated to Llandaf in 1120. Pilgrimages to Bardsey are first mentioned by Meilyr Brydydd (c 1100–37), for whom see above under Anglesey.

ABT 2b (first extant c 1475: Bartrum 1966, 97). Other more ecclesiastical connections between the Manx and the Welsh may be earlier in origin though later in record. There is for example a small group of ‘children of Peul Hen of Man’ reported by Gruffudd Hiraethog (ByS 77 [1544 to 1565] Bartrum 1966, 65): Peulan (eponym of Llanbeulan in Aberffraw), disciple of St Cybi: Gwynogeneu (eponym of Chapel Gwynogeneu in the parish of Caergybi); and their sister Gwenfaen, culted in Ynys Gybi, all in Anglesey. Another group, located in Man, is reckoned among the children of Brychan (De Situ Brecheniauc 11 (5) & (6), 12 (11); extant c 1200: Bartrum 1966, 15–16), named Papay, Cynon, and Bethan, while Brychan himself is said to be buried in Ynys Brachan quae est iuxta Manniam (perhaps the rock Ellan Vretyn off Langness: Kneen 1925, i, 108). Of these, Cynon is said to be ‘in the western part of the island’, which looks specific enough to be knowledgeable—perhaps this Cynon is the Coninri or Conindrus of Irish sources, the second ‘Patrician’ bishop of Man.

These two groups of Manx saints in Welsh sources are attached to Caer Gybi, and perhaps (through Marchell and Cerddych, daughters of Brychan) to Tywyn in Meirionydd: since neither seems to have been specially close to the Second Dynasty, we may perhaps suppose that they were not imported by Merfyn Frych, but had independent origins in ecclesiastical relations between Manx and Welsh churches. The date of these interconnections is wholly unknown, except that Welsh claims for Manx saints are perhaps not likely to be of the Viking age or soon after: an early or rather late date is therefore suggested. In the native Manx record of cults (which begins no earlier than the 16th-century), none is found—at least in the list which can be abstracted from Marstrander (1937): he gives 71 parishes and treen cults, of which 11 are of unidentified saints. The only (recognisably) Brittonic name is that of Santan, also a saint of the Cumberland coast: Miller 1975d. This, with Miller 1975e and 1978 should be corrected by Kenney 1929, 583 (p 727),...
who dates the hymn or *lorica* ascribed to Santan as of the 9th-century. Scribes of the St Gall Priscian (Kenney 1929, 583ii, p 674) claim to be members of *Inis Madoc*, which was allegedly founded by Santan's reputed brother Madog. The codex was written in 845 to 856, and may have reached St Gall through Sedulius Scottus or one of his associates. All this may suggest that Santan and Madog, or at least their institutions, were important in the first half of the 9th-century and perhaps a little earlier: at this time therefore we can suppose good communications between Cumberland, Man, Gwynedd, and Ireland (especially Clonard, where Santan tarried, and Ynys Madog).

28 Except in BGG 6 (Bartrum 1966), where a Nudd is son of Ceidio and brother of the Gwenddoleu who was killed at Arthurret in 573AC. The name of the alleged third brother Cof may in origin have been an epithet, cf Cynin Cof in DSB 12 (4): Bartrum 1966, 73.

29 Bromwich 1961–78, 428. The *Nudus* of the Yarrowkirk inscription may be the same man as Gwenddoleu's brother, but not as Senyllt's son.

30 Macalister 1945, 500. Perhaps we should add the Latin inscription from Santan: Macalister 1945, 505.

31 At first in his exclusion from the convention of Druimm Cete in 575: Anderson & Anderson 1961, 40f; legend spoke of many battles between Aedán and Bætán.

32 In the Irish annals and *Annales Cambriae sub annis* 582–4: see further below and Postscript.

33 Eg the treatment in Welsh sources of Aedán as an honorary Briton [BGG 11 & DSB 12 (12): Bartum 1966] with different pedigree conventions; Fordun's assertion (iii 28: Skene 1872) that Brendinus, *regulus* of Man, was Aedán's sister's son.

34 If we ignore modern guesses that one or another mention of Manau confuses Man with Manau of Gododdin – for if such confusion was possible, both may have been regarded as in the North-country. There is of course no objection to the supposition that the Manx may, from time to time, have been overlords in some sense of coastal strips in Cumbria, Galloway, or Brega.

35 The reason for this inference is that the early claims to descent from Maximus are confined to the Second Dynasty itself and to the Powys line into which Merfyn married (his wife was Nest, sister of the Cyngen who claimed Maximus as ancestor on the *Pillar of Eliseg* before 854: Bartrum 1966); and the Dyfed line into which Hywel Dda married, as in HG 2. It may be added that a claim to imperial descent and status would help to explain the extraordinary lack of recorded opposition to the rapid extension of power of the Second Dynasty in the 9th-century.

36 A law-book as extant c 1200 has the story of Maelgwn's son Rhun and his enemy Clydno, identified as Clydno Eidyn ap Cynfelyn and associated with other Northcountry heroes (text in Owen 1841, i, 104; translation and discussion Bromwich 1961/1978, 501f). Williams 1968, 105 rightly remarks that the presence of the *tri hael* in the story 'is sufficient almost in itself to prove that this is not plain history', and we may comment also that for a southern army to pause for regrouping before crossing the Forth to attack the Northcountry Britons is an insane geography. It seems much more likely that the Clydno of the story at an earlier stage was Gwrin's son of Meirionydd, and that the northern heroes are due to error based on some dim notion of a connection between Meirionydd and Strathclyde at this period.

37 Miller 1978c. The title may have been conferred or usurped at the time of the conquest or the conversion of the Deisi.

38 *Book of Llandaf*, Teilo 125b. The mention of Teilo does not of course date the saint, but this story, as well as the possibility that Voteporix' memorial was placed near a church perhaps (later?) of Teilo, suggests that at some period before the end of the dynasty its patron was Teilo rather than David.

39 See however the doubts raised in Foster & Daniel 1965, 200–2; and Alcock 1971, 242–5.

40 The ecclesiastical nature of the site has however been strongly doubted: Burrow 1973.

41 The strays at Ceuta (Hayes 1972, 415, note 2, 431, sv) and Bracara Augusta (Hayes 1972, 415, note 5, 432 sv) may indicate the havens used.

42 It seems likely that the Class B amphorae ceased to be used as the wine trade became more substantial and regular, and were replaced by casks: Adomnán, writing c 690, speaks (*Columba ii 50 ad fin*) of wine oozing from a cask.

43 Hayes 1972, 422f & 166. We may have a record of its arrival, in Adomnán's 'ship from Gaul': *Columba i 28*. On the other hand, the boat from Alexandria financed by the patriarch John the Almoner (611–619) brought corn and returned with tin, so that no archaeological record would presumably survive: Jones 1964, 869f.

44 Perhaps Elmet in western Yorkshire, or Elvet near Durham, are less likely.
Perhaps it is relevant to note that the eponym Meirion is not to be placed earlier than c. 475 at the outside: see Table 6.

It may be noted too that Dunragit, which may have given its name to, or received it from, the kingdom of Rheged, is at the end of a short transpeninsular route which avoids the most dangerous of the headlands, the Mull of Galloway.

This name is also found as that of a saint culted at Angers (cf Nash-Williams 1950, 33) as a guardian against Saxons: Lot 1915.

In connection with the northern seaways we should look again at Adomnán’s reports of Columba’s connections with Cormac’s voyage to Orkney, and other Irish voyages of the time: see Postscript below.

But there may have been some cases: if, for example, Báetán hoped to dispose of Manx captives in 577–8, he might have found the southern markets glutted with Ceawlin’s captives from the ‘three chesters’ of Severnside: ASC sub anno.

The Deiran slave-boys seen by Gregory in Rome before 590 (if they existed) might conceivably represent a part of Urien’s income.

(The earlier Irish raids in the Roman period were, at least on Patrick’s evidence, concerned to acquire slaves in large numbers for domestic Irish use. The purpose of these vast imports – which, if they were to be useful, would have to be fed – is apparently unexplored.)

A relevant discussion of south-western Saxon sea-borne trade is to be found in Vierck 1970; and of Frisian activity in the Baltic in Zak 1962 – I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr L Koczy, of the General Sikorski Historical Institute Library, Glasgow. On the Irish side, the legends of Flanchne Lurgan and Mongan need to be examined.

Welsh ecclesiastical lore (extant in the Life of Beuno) at Clynnog Fawr supports Bede’s characterisation of Cadwallon (HE ii 20) and alleges that he confiscated land in Gwynedd. This may also suggest straitened ‘finances’. It is chronologically possible that Dunchad’s attack on Man had some connection with Cadwallon’s restoration, or his death.

Cainnech’s cult was favoured by the celi Dé about 800: Anderson 1974, i. Other Cainnech sites are alleged for Iona (chapel); Kil Kenneth in Colonsay; Kil Kenneth (castle) at Maybole, Ayrshire; Laggan in Inverness (‘traditionally’ late); St Andrews; Kennoway; Mackinlay 1914, 61–3.

Innes 1854, i, 92. Other sites are said to be Tiree; St Kilda; Barra; Kilivranan in South Uist; chapel in Kilninian, Mull; in Kilarrow, Islay; Boyndie in Banff; Dunlaing and Glwnlyon in Perthshire; Birnie in Moray; Mackinlay 1914, 66–9.

Plummer 1910, ii, 11. Other sites which might be associated with saints of this not unusual name (or Brittonic equivalents) are Inchinnan and Eastwood in Renfrewshire, a chapel near Paisley, Cumnock and Ochiltree in Ayrshire, Rutherglen in Lanarkshire – a fairly compact grouping; and Tibermore, Perthshire: Mackinlay 1914, 188–9.

Anderson 1922, i, 176f; Vita in Breviary of Aberdeen ii 3, 77, August 10th.

Kirkmahoe and Caerlaverock on the Solway; Southend in Kintyre; Inverary, Lochcarron, and Dunblane: Watson 1926, 164, 278. The last three are on a main east-west route; the last became a diocese and its foundation is in all probability later than 842.

Perhaps we should consider whether the Penitential of the Synodus Aquilonalis Britanniae has any relevance to these matters: Bieler 1963. In any case, while much has been uncritically inferred from cult-sites and toponymy in the past and is to be rejected, it remains true that these details are evidence for something, and perhaps by this time it is safe to ask what that something is.

Adomnán i, 36.

Adomnán i, 15.

Adomnán i, 28.

Older modern scholarship assumed enmity; Anderson & Anderson 1961, 44 doubt the historicity of the campaign.

Dr Anderson however tells me that she takes the Irish notice to be a late (perhaps 10th-century) addition to a simple obit, and that it may be an anachronism, since (1) the Scots may not have reached Mull or Iona by the 560s; and (2) the self-exiled Columba may have deliberately chosen a non-Irish site in which to spend the years of his pilgrimage.

Note however that the ‘west and north coasts [of Ireland] would be avoided by merchants’ since access to the interior from the large number of havens is difficult: Warner 1976, 284–5. But temporary special, or political, situations might make such voyages worth while.
Anderson & Anderson 1961, 42–3 hold that the bellum Manonn is to be identified with the battle against the Miath mentioned by Adomnán i, 8, in which two of Aedán’s elder sons were killed. The major reasons are: (1) that the Miath bear the same name as the Maeatae mentioned as residing in 197 to 211 near the Wall; (2) that the toponyms Dumyat NE of Stirling, and Myot Hill S of Stirling, may derive from the tribal name; (3) that these place-names (near the Antonine Wall), being between Clackmannan and Slamanan, are within the district of Manau of Gododdin, which is therefore the Mano of the bellum Manonn. There are however difficulties: (1) nearly 400 years between the Maeatae and the Miath is a very long time in a disturbed frontier region, and identical tribe-names can occur in widely-separated places; (2) early forms of Dumyat and Myot seem to be lacking (Watson 1926, 58–9 gives none); (3) by Adomnán’s time, or even Aedán’s, the people of Manau of Gododdin were certainly Christian, while Adomnán calls the Miath barbare, which must, I think, mean that they were heathen (though Adomnán’s usual word for heathen is gentiles: i, 37; ii, 33, 34; ii, 11; iii, 14; gentiles barbari in ii, 27 – Dr Anderson has supplied these references); (4) while not too much weight can be put upon the belief of the fallible compiler of the Annales Cambriae that Aedán fought in Man, the evidence of the Irish that Báetán campaigned in Man and that it was lost to Ulster after his death, has rather more weight, especially when taken with the treatment of Aedán by the Welsh pedigree experts.

Dr Anderson notes that AUc 577 and 578 name Eufania, Eumania, AUc 582 Manonn, but points out that since the annals are composite, this difference is inconclusive.

The balance of the evidence at present available seems therefore to suggest that the bellum Manonn was fought in Man, but until at least early forms of the toponyms, and the texts of the Irish annals, are fully accessible, certainty is far from attainable. Dr Anderson (1973, 13, 31) leaves the choice between Man and Manau wide open. We also need a thorough study of the growth of the Aedán legend in Irish material.

The Welsh Triad 54 (Bromwich 1961–78) and Fordun iii 30 (Skene 1872) have different accounts (neither trustworthy) of what happened, but agree that the Scottish forces were undisciplined.

The difficulties of this survey of highly uncertain material of various kinds have been both diminished and brought into focus by the tireless help and advice of Professor Alcock and Drs M O Anderson and D N Dumville, to whom my debt of gratitude is very great.
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