

# Consolidated Endnotes

## A Re-evaluation of the Evidence of Anglian-British Interaction in the Lincoln Region

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy  
Thomas Green  
Exeter College, University of Oxford  
Trinity, 2011

### Introduction (pp. 1–20)

- 1 Without wishing to deny that ethnic and cultural identity in this period was both fluid and complex (with people able to switch their primary ethnic identity and simultaneously hold several different identities at once), or to assert that either the Britons or the Anglo-Saxons possessed a monolithic and unvarying culture in these centuries, it is felt that the terms Anglo-Saxon and Briton/British continue to be useful when considering the post-Roman era. Certainly, contemporary and near-contemporary authors, such as Gildas (Winterbottom, 1978), believed that there was a genuine distinction to be drawn between Britons and Anglo-Saxons, and this distinction is to a large degree reflected in both the archaeological evidence relating to material culture in this period and the linguistic evidence too.
- 2 Freeman, 1871: 28–9.
- 3 See, for example, Stubbs, 1913: 1–3, where he allows a degree of intermarriage, especially in the west of England, but little else, with the culture of the ‘English’ remaining untainted by the surviving ‘remnant of their predecessors’.
- 4 Elton, 1992: 3, who has the Anglo-Saxons not mixing ‘significantly’ with the Britons and instead pushing them ‘back into the western and northern uplands’ over two generations of conflict.
- 5 See, for example, Coates, 2007, who believes that the linguistic evidence can only be explained by the sort of large-scale population replacement envisaged by Victorian historians, with the Britons largely being killed or expelled from eastern Britain. For a discussion of this position, see below, especially pp. 96–8 and the associated notes.
- 6 Higham, 1992, makes this case at length, as do a number of other authors, including Hodges, 1989, and Arnold, 1984.
- 7 For example, see Dark, P. 1996, and Murphy, 1994. See further below, pp. 41–3, 98–9.
- 8 Scull, 1995, especially pp. 77–9; Hamerow, 2005: 264–9; Härke, 2003. See also Woolf, 2007.
- 9 Weale *et al.*, 2002; Thomas *et al.*, 2006. See below, pp. 99–100 and the associated notes.
- 10 Welch, 1993; Dumville, 1995: 180–3; Yorke, 2003a: 395–401; White, 2007, especially pp. 197–201; Snyder, 1998: 225–32; Dark, 2000: 144–9; Woolf, 2003.
- 11 See especially Yorke, 1993b, for a good overview of these sources.
- 12 Yorke, 2003a: 381–2, and see further Dumville and Lapidge (edd.), 1984; Higham, 1994; and Sims-Williams, 1983.
- 13 As does Scull, 1995: 75–6, for East Anglia.

- 14 Leahy, 1993: 36–7; Jones, 1993: 25–6; Eagles, 1989: 207; Sawyer, 1998: 226–30. This is discussed at length below, pp. 59–62.
- 15 See Foot, 1993. The name *Lindissi* is here used for the Anglo-Saxon kingdom more commonly known as ‘Lindsey’, in order to distinguish this pre-Viking polity from the modern district of Lindsey (the northern half of the pre-1974 county of Lincolnshire). Although the two names are related, the district-name Lindsey is usually agreed to be only indirectly derived from *Lindissi*, and it is moreover argued here that *Lindissi* actually encompassed a much larger area than does the modern district of Lindsey. See, for example, Cameron, 1991: 2–7; Gelling, 1989: 31–2; and below, pp. 116–25. As such, it seems best to avoid the name ‘Lindsey’ for the kingdom, despite its frequent usage in modern research, and instead return to the earliest recorded form of the kingdom-name.
- 16 Yorke, 1993a: 141, 143; Bassett, 1989a: 7.
- 17 Leahy, 2007a: 6; Leahy, 2007b: 48; Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004. Bassett, 1989a: 8, fn. 40, suggests that the immigrants could have arrived in the Lincoln region as mercenaries, but says no more than this. Yorke, 1993a: 142, similarly suggests that a period of controlled settlement is ‘possible’.
- 18 Bassett, 1989b; Scull, 1993: 72–9; Hamerow, 2005: 271–88. Cf. Yorke, 2003a, especially pp. 396–401.
- 19 Yorke, 2003a, especially pp. 396–401; also Yorke, 2000: 82–6. See further below, pp. 147–51.
- 20 See especially Yorke, 1993a: 141–2, and Chapter Four, below.
- 21 Scull, 1995: 78; Thomas *et al*, 2006; Härke, 1992a; Härke, 1992b; Loveluck, 1996: 30–2; Hamerow, 2005: 265–6, 269–70.
- 22 Dark, 2000: 71–3, 75–8; Härke, 1992a; Härke, 1992b.
- 23 Hamerow, 2005: 265.
- 24 Faull, 1977; Lucy, 2000a; Härke, 1992b; O’Brien, 1999; Scull, 1985; Loveluck, 1996: 30–1.
- 25 For example, Leahy, 2007b: 85–6; Drinkall and Foreman (ed.), 1998: 358–9. The paucity of recently excavated and published inhumation cemeteries from the Lincoln region (see further below) limits the availability of such evidence, unfortunately.
- 26 Cameron, 1998: 135, 127, 128; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; Insley, 2003: 375; Insley, 2002: 164; Jackson, 1953: 244, n.3; Stafford, 1985: 87.
- 27 The exceptions here are Eagles, 1989: 207, and Yorke, 1993a: 145, who briefly discuss some possible evidence for British Christian continuity in Lincoln.
- 28 Bassett, 1989b, offers a detailed outline of these ideas.
- 29 Lane and Hayes, 1993: 68–9; Hayes, 1988: 325.
- 30 Leahy, 1993: 36; Leahy, 2007b: 48–9; Dickinson, 2004: 24–5. See also Eagles, 1989: 211.
- 31 See Hines, 1990, especially pp. 28, 34–6. Dark, 2000: 11 and 49, offers an updated version of these maps.
- 32 Dark, 2000: 71–3, 75–8, for example, argues against this material being purely indicative of immigrant groups moving into new territories.
- 33 Martin, 1976; Williamson, 1993: 71–2. Cf. Brooks, 1989b: 164.
- 34 Ekwall, 1960: 298–9; Myres, 1986: 199; Sawyer, 1998: 47. See further Chapter Six.
- 35 Notable instances include Williams *et al*, 1991; Crawford (ed.), 1994; and Koch, 1997.
- 36 For example, Eagles, 1989; Jones, 1993; Leahy, 1993; Fisher, 1995; Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004; Leahy, 2007a; Leahy, 2007b.
- 37 Williams, 2004: 113; Williams, 2002: 344–5.
- 38 See Fig. 27 and the Gazetteer on the Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of the region. By way of comparison, Leahy, 1993, identified 54 cemetery sites in Lindsey and North Kesteven (not South Kesteven) in 1993, and Sawyer identified 75 from across the whole of Lincolnshire in 1998.
- 39 Lane, 1992; Hayes and Lane, 1992.
- 40 For example, Taylor, 2003; Steane, 2006.
- 41 See, for an illustration of this ‘spread’, the phased maps in Hines, 1996: 262–3, and the discussions in Chapters Two and Five.

- 42 With regard to both the PAS and HER data, the dataset on which the present analysis is based was finalized towards the end of 2009, although significant finds made after this time have also been included here. Where archaeological material is unpublished and is referred to specifically in the text or notes below, it is usually cited by either a Historic Environment Record/Sites and Monuments Record number or a Portable Antiquities Scheme number. The HER databases are available online at [www.heritagegateway.org.uk](http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk), and the PAS database at [finds.org.uk/database](http://finds.org.uk/database).
- 43 Bruce-Mitford, 1993; below, pp. 64–5 and notes.
- 44 Vince, 2001. See below, Chapter Five, fn. 79, on this.
- 45 Leahy, 2007a, and Drinkall and Foreman (ed.), 1998.
- 46 Thomas, 1887.
- 47 See below, pp. 175–6 and associated notes; Trollope, 1887: 98–100; Creasey, 1825: 106–07.
- 48 Dudley, 1949: 224–6.
- 49 See, for example, Härke, 2003, and Hamerow, 2005: 265. Issues surrounding the Britons’ post-Roman archaeological invisibility are discussed in Chapters One and Five.
- 50 See further pp. 59–64. The 2007 total for the brooches is that of Kevin Leahy plus the two Type G brooches from the Sleaford inhumation cemetery – Leahy, 2007b: 83; Dickinson, 1982: 48, 50, 52 and figs. 1–4.
- 51 Beginning with his *Place-Names of Lincolnshire I*, published in 1985.
- 52 Cameron, 1998. Ekwall, 1960, is the original national place-name dictionary and is still very useful, especially when used alongside Cameron’s work and the more recent national dictionaries authored by Mills (1991) and Watts (2004).
- 53 Coates, 2000; Coates, 2005a; Coates, 2005b; Coates, 2008; Coates, 2009.
- 54 Insley, 2000b; Insley, 2002; Insley, 2003; Insley, 2006; Insley and Eggers, 2001.
- 55 See Fig. 27 and the Gazetteer.
- 56 These specific ‘gaps’ in the cemetery evidence are discussed at length below, pp. 57–8 and 163–71. On notable place-names in these areas, see pp. 92–3, 126–7, 156–7, 159–60, 164.
- 57 Dodgson, 1977; Cox, 1972–3; Kuurman, 1974–5; Gelling, 1988a; Gelling, 1988b.
- 58 See Fig. 28 for the distribution of names involving British and Latin elements, based largely on the works of Cameron, Insley and Coates cited above, along with Schram, 1950. It should be noted, for example, that four Lincolnshire place-names have their origins in Old English *wīchām*, a name which derives from Latin *vicus* and is believed to have its origins in the fifth or sixth centuries – see further below, pp. 133–4 and 159–60, and (for example) Gelling, 1977a: 14, and Gelling, 1988b: 67–74, 245–9.
- 59 See Fig. 19 for the modern boundaries of the three main divisions of Lincolnshire: Lindsey, Kesteven, and Holland.
- 60 For example, Cameron, 1998: 81; Sawyer, 1998: 44; Yorke, 1993a: 143.
- 61 Below, pp. 52–3 and associated notes. The second element in the underlying British tribal- and territory-name (*\*Lindēs*) became *-wys* in later Welsh; the description of *-wys* as a ‘kingdom suffix’ is that of John Koch, see p. 67, fn. 11.
- 62 On the place-names, see below, pp. 92–3, and (for example) Cameron, 1998: 135; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; and Insley, 2003: 375. On the name *Cædbæd* in the genealogy of the kings of *Lindissi*, see pp. 87–9 and Jackson, 1953: 244, n.3, and Koch (ed.), 2006: 60.
- 63 See below, pp. 101, 164, 202, and 207.
- 64 For example, Sawyer, 1998: 111–13, and generally Gelling, 1988b, and Gelling, 1997: 15–18.
- 65 See Cameron, 1998: 85, for the etymology of Maltby, and the Gazetteer for the small early Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery that was probably located here. The Middle Saxon metalwork from Maltby near Louth has been recorded by Scunthorpe Museum.
- 66 Cameron, 1998: 110; Owen and Coates, 2003; Coates, 1988: 35–9.
- 67 See below, pp. 52–3 (and fn. 11) and 212–14 on this. With regard to Celtic philology and the chronology of the mutation of British into Old Welsh, Jackson, 1953, remains indispensable, although it needs to be paired with more recent research such as Sims-Williams, 2003. See also, for example, Sims-Williams, 1990b; Sims-Williams, 1991; and Schrijver, 1995.
- 68 See, for example, Snyder, 1998: 29–49.

- 69 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, for example at III.11, III.24, III.27, IV.3, IV.1; Dumville, 1989c. See further below, for example pp. 125–7, 152–71.
- 70 Colgrave, 1956: 108–11; see especially Graham Jones in Koch (ed.), 2006: 857.
- 71 See, for example, Foot, 1993; Yorke, 1993a; Stafford, 1985; and Sawyer, 1998.
- 72 Koch, 1988: 33; see further below, pp. 82–6.
- 73 For some discussion of this source and the import of this reference, see below (pp. 54, 76–81) and Green, 2007, especially 210–15.
- 74 Williams (ed), 1938; Koch, 1997. See especially below, pp. 82, 109–10, on the dating of the poem and the stanza in question.
- 75 Dumville, 1986; Higham, 2002: 119–69; Green, 2007: 15–26, 30–8.
- 76 For example, finds of British Class 1 penannular brooches in Lincolnshire are discussed briefly in Leahy, 2007b, in a short section on ‘sub-Roman/British survival’ (pp. 83–4), but they are largely left to stand on their own, with little analysis of their potential context or implications.
- 77 Below, pp. 163–9, 198, 206 and Fig. 33.

## Chapter One (pp. 25–45)

- 1 Wachter, 1995: 17–18, 87; Mann, 1998; Jones, 2003: 124; Thomas, 1981: 197.
- 2 Jones, 2003: fig 7.69b and pp. 130–4; Jones, 2002: 124–6; Dobney *et al*, 1996: 2–4, 57–61; Dobney *et al*, 1998. On empire-wide urban trends leading to a decline in public buildings in all areas, including Britain, see for example Ward-Perkins, 1984, and Esmonde-Cleary, 2004: 418–9. Cf. Faulkner, 1998, for another Late Roman provincial capital which remained prosperous late into the fourth century.
- 3 Jones, 2003: 133–4; Jones, 2002: 124, 126; Esmonde-Cleary, 1989, especially chapter 4; Esmonde-Cleary, 1993.
- 4 Jones, 2003: 133–6; Jones, 2002: 125–9 – see below, pp. 59–62, on the usage of the *forum*.
- 5 Jones, 2003: 97–8, 130, 136; Jones, 2002: 124, 127. The evidence of continuing urban life from Lincoln in the second half of the fourth century and into the fifth obviously suggests that Reece’s concept of fourth-century towns as essentially non-urban does not apply here, although Faulkner’s ‘post-classical urbanism’ may be relevant to the last late fourth-/early fifth-century stage, as Jones has observed: Reece, 1992; N. Faulkner, 1994; Jones, 2003: 125–7, 135.
- 6 See Esmonde-Cleary, 1989, especially chapter 4, and Esmonde-Cleary, 1993, on how the collapse of the Roman market economy and withdrawal of the Roman army would have led to the rapid and final decline of towns as economic and residential *foci*.
- 7 See generally Taylor, 1983; Dark and Dark, 1997.
- 8 Jones, 1988: 21; Leahy, 2007b: 21.
- 9 Van de Noort and Ellis, 1998; Lane, 1992; Whitwell, 1992: xxvi–xxviii; Owen, 1984: 46–9. This is also the situation in southern Lincolnshire: Hayes and Lane, 1992; Hayes, 1988.
- 10 Esmonde-Cleary, 1995: p. 17; Esmonde-Cleary, 1989.
- 11 Millett, 1995: 67–74; Dark and Dark, 1997: 43–51.
- 12 See, for example, Potter, 1979.
- 13 Whitwell, 1992: xxix–xxxi.
- 14 Whitwell, 1988: 59; Jones and Whitwell, 1991; Leahy, 2007b: 30–1, 33; Leahy, 2007c.
- 15 Caistor and Horncastle are the only surviving examples, but it seems plausible that there was a walled fort at Skegness too: see John Leland’s *Itinerary* (Hearne, 1770: VII, 152) and Whitwell, 1992: 51–3 on Skegness. The place-name *Tric* (< Latin *traiectus* ‘crossing point, ferry’) recorded at Domesday presumably applied to this lost settlement/fort at Skegness: Coates, 1988: 35–9; Owen and Coates, 2003: 42–4.
- 16 Field and Hurst, 1983: 85–7 and tables 6–7; Clay, 2010: 41; Leahy, 1993: 29.
- 17 Field and Hurst, 1983: 85.

- 18 As suggested by Whitwell, 1981: 77. See particularly Cotterill, 1993, and Fulford and Tyers, 1995, on the origins of the ‘Saxon Shore’ forts, which probably have more to do with Carausius (286–93).
- 19 Leahy, 2007b: 111–14.
- 20 See, for example, Cox, 1994–5, and also Oliver, 2006.
- 21 For differing views as to the degree and date of ‘decline’ in Britain, see for example Esmonde-Cleary, 1989; Dark, 1994; De la Bédoyère, 1999; Faulkner, 2000; Esmonde-Cleary, 2004: 424–5; Ward-Perkins, 2005: 123–4 and fig. 6.1; White, 2007, especially pp. 177–94 and table 8.1.
- 22 Ward-Perkins, 2000.
- 23 Thompson, 1990; Wood, 1991; and Esmonde-Cleary, 1989. In support of ‘unrest’ as a partial explanation are perhaps the large number of later fourth-century coin hoards from Lincolnshire: Higginbottom, 1980.
- 24 May, 1996: II, 637–8; Whitwell, 1988; Whitwell, 1995; Whitwell, 1992: xxxi. See also below, pp. 62–4, on post-Roman British Class 1 brooches; three of these have been found on the site of Kirmington ‘small town’.
- 25 Whitwell, 1988: 60; Whitwell, 1992: xxxv. See further Faulkner, 1996, especially 87, and White, 2007: 180, with regard to the difficulty of locating Late Roman timber structures without very careful excavation of an extensive area.
- 26 Esmonde-Cleary, 1989: 138–9.
- 27 Whyman, 1992; Dark, 1996: 58; Rahtz, 2000: 1; Dark, 2000: 53–7; White, 2007, especially pp. 20–9. Hilary Cool’s demonstration that very late fourth- to fifth-century assemblages differ in composition and character from those of earlier periods may offer a partial solution to this problem: Cool, 2000; Cool, 2006: 222–38.
- 28 See, for example, Dark, 2000: 56–7, who has some sensible points to make here; cf. Esmonde-Cleary, 2004: 418–9, 424–5, on ‘decline’ versus ‘change’ in fourth-century British towns.
- 29 Esmonde-Cleary, 1989, chapter 4; Esmonde-Cleary, 1995; Dark, 1996a; Ward-Perkins, 2005, especially pp. 123–4, 128 and fig. 6.1.
- 30 Esmonde-Cleary, 1989, especially pp. 157–8; Dark and Dark, 1997: 136–7; Dark, 1993.
- 31 See, for example, Rahtz, 1977; Rahtz, 1982; Aston, 1994: 222; Ward-Perkins, 2005: 104, 108, 117–20. This ‘invisible’ material culture continues into the tenth century and even beyond in some areas.
- 32 Dark, 2000: 150–202; Dark, 1994; Snyder, 1998, especially pp. 225–32.
- 33 Attempts to deny that there was a significant migration to eastern Britain are unconvincing – see, for example, Scull, 1995. For the role played by immigrants from Scandinavia, see Hines, 1984.
- 34 See Gelling, 1993, and below (p. 101) on the place-name evidence for when British/Welsh began to die out as a spoken language in lowland Britain.
- 35 For example, Foot, 1993; Sawyer, 1998: 44–52; Leahy, 2007b. See Brooks, 1989a: 160–2 on Mercia.
- 36 Dumville, 1976; Foot, 1993: 129–35.
- 37 Dumville, 1989c. See further below, pp. 147–51, on the character and date of the ‘Tribal Hidage’.
- 38 Campbell, 1986a: 86, 88; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, for example at III.11, III.24, III.27, IV.3, IV.12. See below, pp. 53–4, 215–17, on the group-name *Lindisfaran*.
- 39 Foot, 1993: 136–7.
- 40 Stenton, 1971a: 129–31; Foot, 1993: 133–5, especially p. 135. For further discussion of this genealogy, see below pp. 87–9.
- 41 Dumville, 1989c: 226–7, 229; Davies and Vierck, 1974: 233–6, 283; Hayes, 1988: 324–5; Crowson *et al*, 2005: figs. 1–2a and pp. 99, 265–6, 297, but cf. Sawyer, 1998: 47, 220–1, and below, p. 172.
- 42 Hayes, 1988: 324–5; Crowson *et al*, 2005: figs. 1–2a and pp. 286, 298–9.
- 43 Dumville, 1989c: 226–7, 229; Dumville, 1989a: 130–1; Rollason, 1978: 89; Roffe, 1993.

- 44 Vince and Williams, 1997; Huggett, 1988.
- 45 Vince, 2003: 143; Blackburn, 1993: 83; Ulmschneider, 2000.
- 46 Everson, 1993: 93; Taylor, 1983: chapter 7. Even such a detailed and systematic field-survey as the Fenland Project apparently saw early to middle Anglo-Saxon pottery misidentified as Roman: Jane Young, personal communication.
- 47 Leahy, 2007b: 58, 127–8; Leahy, 1993: 31–2; Leahy, 2007a: 9.
- 48 Leahy, 2007b: 16–19, 58; Van de Noort and Ellis, 1998; Hayes and Lane, 1992; Hayes, 1998. However, see pp. 156–71 below on the Fenland. Whilst marine transgressions and the expansion of the freshwater fen in southern Lincolnshire would have undoubtedly led to the abandonment of some Late Roman settlements, the scale of this desertion can be vastly overestimated.
- 49 As also noted by, for example, Everson, 1993: 92–3.
- 50 There is a full discussion of this situation, and its implications, in Chapter Five, pp. 164–9; the points made there apply throughout the region. On British burial rites, see for example Rahtz, 1977; Rahtz, 1982.
- 51 Ward-Perkins, 2000a, has some good discussion, especially his quotation from E. A. Freeman. See Welch, 1992: 107, for a modern argument that the Anglo-Saxons inhabited ‘a relatively empty landscape’ and Wachter, 1995: 411–16, on plague. Against the notion of plague as a credible motor for fifth-century decline and population collapse, see especially Todd, 1977, and Esmonde-Cleary, 1989: 174–5.
- 52 Dark, 1996; Rackham, 1986: 75–85; Murphy, 1994; Rippon, 2009: for example pp. 166, 168–9.
- 53 See especially Murphy, 1994: 37. It ought to be noted here that another oft-deployed argument in favour of a massive post-Roman population collapse – the supposed contrast between the estimated population in the fourth century and at Domesday – is just as methodologically flawed as that based on a comparison of supposed settlement density in the Romano-British and early Anglo-Saxon periods. One recent estimate for the population of Late Roman Britain is around 4 million (Millett, 1995: 44–6), whilst that for late eleventh-century England is perhaps 2–2.5 million (see, for example, Moore, 1997), suggesting a major population fall. However, it must not be forgotten that we are not comparing like with like: Millett’s figures are, on fuller examination, figures for Roman-era England, Wales, Scotland *and* Ireland. If we remove from the calculation those living outside of England then the Late Roman settled population is estimated to be around 1.5 to 2 million, which obviously removes the necessity to postulate any such massive reduction in the population between *c.* 400 and 1086.
- 54 Rackham, 1986: 67; Rippon, 2009: 166–7.
- 55 See Williamson, 1988; Williamson, 1993: 24–5; Bassett, 1985; Rippon, 2009: 156–67.
- 56 Scull, 1997; Vince, 2003; Steane and Vince, 1993.
- 57 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16. On Blæcca’s status and potential links to the royal family of *Lindissi*, see below (pp. 93–4, 126–7) and, for example, Bassett, 1989a: 11–12, and Leahy, 2007b: 114–15.
- 58 Leahy, 2007a; Leahy, 1993: 33, 36; Leahy, 2007b: 35–56.
- 59 See further pp. 55–6, 188–96 below; Leahy, 1993: 36; Leahy, 1999: 129–30; Leahy, 2007b: 49; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Williams, 2002.
- 60 Stocker, 1993; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.3.

## Chapter Two (pp. 49–67)

- 1 Esmonde-Cleary, 1989: 136–61; see, however, Wood, 2004, for the suggestion that at least some Britons continued to see themselves as part of the Roman world well into the fifth century.
- 2 Morris, 1973; Welch, 1993; Dumville, 1995: 180–3.

- 3 Dumville, 1995; Yorke, 2003a: 395–401; White, 2007, especially pp. 197–201; Snyder, 1998: 225–32; Dark, 1994: 144–9.
- 4 See the discussion in Yorke, 2003a: 382–5; Hamerow, 2005, especially pp. 281–6; Bassett, 1989b.
- 5 For example, Yorke, 2003a: 396; Brooks, 1989a: 57–8; Bassett, 1989b: 24.
- 6 *The Earliest Life of St Gregory*, chapter 18 – Colgrave (ed. and trans.), 1968: 69, 102; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Preface, II.16 etc.; Haddan and Stubbs, 1869–79: III, 362; and, for example, ‘Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’ MS A, s.a. 838, 873 and 874.
- 7 Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, chapters 45 and 46, *Lindesig/Lindissig* – Stevenson (ed.), 1904: 34; ‘Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’ MS D, s.a. 838, *Lindesige*. Note, the interest is in the use of this form for the pre-Viking kingdom, not for the post-Viking and medieval district of Lindsey. See further Chapter Four, pp. 115–25, on the question of the relationship between *Lindissi*’s borders and the boundaries of the district of Lindsey, and also on what the form *Lindesig/Lindissig* can tell us with regard to this (especially fn. 10). That *Lindesig/Lindissig* is a separate form from *Lindissi*, with the name ‘Lindsey’ deriving from *Lindesig/Lindissig* rather than from *Lindissi*, is accepted by all recent commentators, including Cameron, 1991: 2–7 (who includes a selection of the attested forms of *Lindissi/Lindesig*); Gelling, 1989; and Watts, 2004: 374.
- 8 Sawyer, 1998: 9–10; Stevenson (ed.), 1904: 242; Cox, 1994b: 54–6; Coates, 2008: 80; Watts, 2004: 374; and Green, 2008: 2, fn. 6. Cf. Bassett, 1989a, and Gelling, 1989. With regard to why the name *Lindissi* was connected with *-īg*, beyond its unintelligible second element, see below, p. 143, fn. 10.
- 9 Jackson, 1953: 332, 543; Cameron, 1991: 2–7; Rivet and Smith, 1979: 393.
- 10 See Jackson, 1953: 543; Jackson, 1945: 48; Koch, 1997: 133.
- 11 See, for example, Koch (ed.), 2006: 1158, and 1498, where Koch refers to ‘the *-wys* kingdom suffix’; see Bassett, 1989a: 7–8, for the rejected suggestion that *\*Lindēs* might refer only to the people who lived in Lincoln.
- 12 A comparison might usefully be made here with the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent, the name of which similarly had its origins in the British past: Brooks, 1989a, especially pp. 57–8. With regard to *Lindissi*, it should be noted that Richard Coates has suggested that, rather than an uncertain Old English suffix being added to *Lindis-* (for Late British *\*Lindēs* > Old English *Lindis-*, compare Leeds – *\*Lātenses* > *\*Lōdēs* > *Loidis* in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II. 14, see Jackson, 1946), the entire kingdom-name *Lindissi* should potentially be seen as British in origin, deriving from *\*Lindēssi*, ‘place/territory of *\*Lindēs*’ (Coates, 2008: 80–2). On the whole I would consider this unlikely, given the difficulty in finding appropriate parallels for such a construction and the plentiful evidence for *-ēs/-wys* names standing on their own as territory- and group-names. Indeed, having a British place-name suffix used to form – extremely infrequently – district-names added to a name which was already implicitly a district-name would not only be unparalleled but also perhaps a little odd. On the other hand, the suggestion at least has the merit of fully explaining the form *Lindissi* without relying on an uncertain Old English suffix.
- 13 See Insley and Eggers, 2001: 475, and below, p. 215. *Lindisware* is almost certainly a false creation intended to bring the *Lindissi* group-name into line with others of the type *X-ware*: for example, the *Meanware* of east Hampshire and the *Cantware* of Kent. The notion that *Lindisware* is the original form and *Lindisfaran* the false one, somehow borrowed from the name *Lindisfarne* (Coates and Breeze, 2000: 243–6), is both far-fetched and untenable, being utterly out of accord with the evidence we actually possess for this group-name and, moreover, relying upon a ‘Celtic’ origin for the name *Lindisfarne*, which is itself an extremely dubious proposition: see further below, pp. 212–20, on the origin of the name ‘*Lindisfarne*’ and its relationship to the group-name *Lindisfaran*.
- 14 See particularly T. Charles-Edwards and P. Wormald, ‘Addenda’ in Wallace-Hadrill, 1988, pp. 207–43 at pp. 234–5; Green, 2008: 3–4; and especially below, pp. 216–17. With regard to Gelling’s suggested etymology for *Lindisfaran*, ‘the people who resort to a place named *Lindis-*’ (Gelling, 1989: 32), this ceases to be at all credible once we (1) reject Bassett’s

- hypothesis that the names *\*Lindēs* and *Lindesig/Lindissi* were all restricted originally to Lincoln alone, rather than being the genuine territory-/kingdom-names they clearly were (see above), and (2) give a more detailed consideration to the potential meaning of Old English *faran* in such a group-name.
- 15 *Historia Brittonum*, chapter 56, in Morris (ed. and trans.), 1980: 76; Koch and Carey, 2003: 299. See on the date and provenance Dumville, 1974 and 1986.
  - 16 Green, 2008: 5; Jackson, 1945: 47–8.
  - 17 Old Welsh *Linnuis* cannot be derived from Old English *Lindissi/Lindesig*, and no *\*Lindēs* other than that which underlies the pre-Viking kingdom-name *Lindissi* is known from Britain for *Linnuis* to develop from. All other suggestions, when not philologically impossible, are purely hypothetical with no evidence of their real existence outside of the *Historia Brittonum*, and most that have been made despite this fall foul of the fact that ‘folk-names in *-wys* [*<* Old Welsh *-uis <* Archaic Welsh/Late British *\*-ēs*] are not formed from minor localities’ (Koch, 1997: 133).
  - 18 Jackson, 1945: 48; Koch and Carey, 2003: 299. Compare the usage of this term for various kingdoms – including Gwynedd – in the *Historia Brittonum*, for example in chapter 40.
  - 19 See Leahy, 2007a; Scull, 1995.
  - 20 Leahy, 1999: 129; Welch, 1993; Hines, 1990: 21–2.
  - 21 Leahy, 1993: 36; Leahy, 2007b: 48. See generally on the role of cremation cemeteries as early Anglo-Saxon ‘central places’, Williams, 2002, and Williams, 2004.
  - 22 Leahy, 2007b: 49; Leahy, 2007a: 6; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Eagles, 1989: 211; Everson, 1993: 98; Williams, 2002. See also below, Chapter Five; for a comparable situation in Norfolk, see Williamson, 1993: 68, 102–4.
  - 23 Everson, 1993: 96–8; Leahy, 2007b: 49, 95–6; Leahy, 2007a: 6. Leahy suggests that Caenby may well have been a royal burial and notes that its mound (excavated in 1849) was larger than that which covered the famous Sutton Hoo ship burial.
  - 24 See below, pp. 191–2 and Fig. 37; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Cameron, 1996a: 25–6; Owen, 1997b: 263; Owen, 1997a.
  - 25 Thompson, 1956: 190.
  - 26 Leahy, 2007b: 49, 114; Leahy, 2007a: 6; Everson, 1993: 98.
  - 27 Leahy, 1993: 36–7; Sawyer, 1998: 44; Leahy, 2007b: 50 and fig. 8; Leahy, 2007a: 11.
  - 28 Leahy, 1993: 36–7; Leahy, 2007b: 50; Sawyer, 1998: 44; Leahy, 2007a: 11. This avoidance of Lincoln by the large cremation cemeteries is replicated by the distribution of all pre-c. 525 Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, inhumation and cremation, something which helps to confirm its reality; see Hines, 1996: 262–3 (figs. 17.1–2), and below. See also below on the fact that cemeteries in the Lincoln region remain tiny throughout the early Anglo-Saxon period when compared with those in the areas where the cremation cemeteries were founded, which is again a significant point in this context (see Fig. 27 for a density map of all early Anglo-Saxon cemetery evidence from Lincolnshire).
  - 29 Leahy, 2007b: 50, 59; Leahy, 1993: 37; Sawyer, 1998: 46; Leahy, 2007a: 10–11; Hines, 1996: 262–3 (figs. 17.1–2); Vince, 2003: 145–6, 152. See also Fig. 27. In addition to the three cemeteries near Lincoln cited here, there may well have also been another very small inhumation cemetery at North Hykeham (to the south of Lincoln). The evidence for this consists of four or five metal-detected brooches, a pin and a girdle-hanger, which are indicative of perhaps two female graves (Adam Daubney, personal communication, and, for example, Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-DB6F46, LIN-DB1483). Although one of the women was buried with a mid-fifth-century brooch, all of the other associated finds are later in date, indicating that this was an heirloom piece. Taken together, the assemblage as a whole suggests that the two burials had probably taken place by the middle of the sixth century.
  - 30 Jones, 1994: 328–30 and fig. 5; Jones, 2003: 127–9, 137; Steane, 2006: 192; Jones, 2002: 127; *pace* Gilmour, 2007.
  - 31 See Jones, 1994; Steane, 1990–1; Jones, 2003: 127–9, 137; Jones, 2002: 127–9; Green, 2008: 19–20. Sawyer, 1998: 226–30 offers the theory of a seventh- to eighth-century date for the second church, on which see further Green, 2008: 19–20, especially fn. 85; Vince, 2003: 150–

1. It should be noted that this theory, somewhat bizarrely, would still have the *first* church as a Late Roman or post-Roman British church, as Alan Vince has noted (2003: 149). Gilmour's (2007) suggestion of a mid-sixth-century *de novo* start for the church-stage of the site seems less plausible than the scenario supported here, especially given both the points made below and the fact that British \**Lindēs* probably came to end around this time (below, pp. 105–06).
- 32 Jones, 2003: p. 129 and fig.7.70; Steane, 1990–1; Jones, 1993: 25; Eagles, 1989: 207, *pace* Gilmour, 2007. See the excellent visualization in Jones, 2002: 128.
- 33 Sample number 34, see Gilmour, 2007: 247–9, 252; Steane, 2006: 157; Jones, 2003: 129; Sawyer, 1998: 230.
- 34 Sample numbers 30, 29 and 26 – see Steane, 2006, especially pp. 160–1; Gilmour, 2007: 249, 252.
- 35 Gilmour, 2007: 248–50, 252–3. See below, fn. 36, on the calibrated date ranges of these burials.
- 36 The three post-church burials have date ranges, at the 95.4% confidence level, of cal AD 420–690 (sample 30), cal AD 450–770 (sample 29), and cal AD 390–680 (sample 26), according to the recently published excavation report (Steane, 2006: 161, 210; see Gilmour, 2007: 247, for a recalculation of these, which adjusts them slightly). It should be noted that, whilst each post-church burial on its own could conceivably date from after AD 600 on the basis of the above date ranges, all three would need to post-date 600 in order for the apsidal church to have been in use after the end of the sixth century, and this is where issues over 'joint probability' come into play. My thanks are due here to Alex Bayliss, the Head of Scientific Dating at English Heritage, for constructing a preliminary Bayesian model of the St Paul in the Bail site to look at this issue for me, and for her analysis and advice with regard to the radiocarbon dates and chronology of this site. The exact figures for the probability of the church being demolished before AD 600 are known, but are withheld at the request of Alex Bayliss pending a full Bayesian modelling of this site, although the preliminary results are believed to be almost certainly in the right area. See also Jones, 2003: 129; Vince, 2003: 150; Jones, 2002: 129; Jones, 1994: 332–3, 344; Steane, 1990–1: 30–1. Note, Gilmour, 2007: 248, has a revised diagrammatic representation of the probability of each grave being buried in any specific year.
- 37 Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, ed. and trans. Winterbottom (1978).
- 38 Jones, 1994; Jones, 2003: 127–9, 137; Thomas, 1981: 197; Leahy, 2007b: 117.
- 39 Bassett, 1992a; Bassett, 1992b; Yorke, 1993a: 145; Jones, 2003: 137.
- 40 See Laycock, 2008: 173 for a recent plot of fifth-century Anglo-Saxon sites, which updates Dark, 2000: 11, fig. 1.1; see also Hines, 1990: 34. S. Youngs, 2007: 96, gives the distribution of Class 1 brooches, as does Dark, 2000: 131.
- 41 On the Lincolnshire examples and the dating of Class 1 penannular brooches (Fowler's type F/F1), see Leahy, 2007b: 83–4, 106; Green, 2008: 24–5, 27 and fn. 101; Dark, 2000: 132; Graham-Campbell, 1991; Collins, 2010; however, cf. Youngs, 2007: 82. As a group, Class 1 brooches are usually dated to the fifth and sixth centuries and this is followed by Kevin Leahy for the Lindsey finds (see Leahy, 2007b: 106, for an illustration of some Class 1 brooches from Lindsey assigned to the sixth century). Similarly, Ken Dark dates them generally from the fifth to seventh centuries and is sceptical as to whether the one example from Britain thought to potentially pre-date c. 400 actually does so (2000: 132). With regard to date, see also below, pp. 91 and 111 (fn. 45), on some Lincolnshire examples found in sixth-century contexts; the hybrid British Type G/Class 1 brooch from Norton Disney (Portable Antiquities Scheme, DENO-DD5FA4) may be of some significance here too. Most recently, Rob Collins has argued that an analysis of northern finds of Class 1 brooches supports the view that they are a post-Roman class, perhaps first emerging in the mid- to late fifth century (Collins, 2010, especially pp. 72–3). In addition to the fourteen Lincolnshire examples of Class 1 brooches noted by Green, 2008, and Leahy, 2007b, we can now add an additional find from Folkingham (PAS LIN-1AB297; this was found at a different site from the first example), one apparently found in the Louth area (Geoff Hill, personal communication), and another located to the south of Lincoln, just outside of the county (see Fig. 12; Susan Youngs, personal

- communication). A fragment of a probable Class 1, to judge from the decoration and implied diameter, has also been recently found near Miningsby, south-east of Horncastle (PAS NCL-1D90A3; Rob Collins, personal communication).
- 42 Youngs, 2007: 96, and personal communication. Note, the Portable Antiquities Scheme database was checked for all British finds of Class 1 brooches, not just those from Lincolnshire.
  - 43 Leahy, 2007b: 84 and personal communication; Youngs, 2007: 86–9; Dark, 2000: 133; Collins, 2010. See also Niecke, 1993, and Janes, 1991.
  - 44 Green, 2008: 26–8; Hedeager, 1992, especially figs. 53–5 and pp. 299–300. See also, for example, Halsall, 1992, especially fig. 49 and p. 275. Susan Youngs would similarly see these brooches as being made for and worn by British elites living in Lincolnshire, and she additionally considers that the vast majority of the Lincolnshire examples are likely to have been made locally rather than imported from the west, emerging from a local British tradition of wearing penannular brooches (personal communication; Youngs, 2007).
  - 45 There are now more of these known from Lincolnshire than from any other part of early Anglo-Saxon England: see Dickinson, 1982: 48, 52 and figures 1–4; Portable Antiquities Scheme, NLM1052, LIN-7866F3, DENO-DD5FA4 and perhaps NLM6301; and compare the national distribution of these brooches in Fig. 11 and Youngs, 2007: 96.
  - 46 Bruce-Mitford, 1993; Youngs, 2001: 216–20; Leahy, 2007b: 84–5 and p. 106 for a distribution map of fifteen of the bowls from Lindsey, to which need to be added two from Flixborough (Youngs, 2001, and Kevin Leahy, personal communication) and Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-75B9C3 (Lissington), NLM6251 (Winterton), NLM-3D8081/NLM-A6E546 (Binbrook), LIN-B86833 (Blyborough), and NLM-C057A6 (Swinhope). Note that the find-spots of the hanging bowl rim and escutcheon from Willoughton are sufficiently widely separated to necessitate that they be considered representative of two different bowls: see Lincolnshire Historic Environment Records 50941 and 50942. For the south of Lincolnshire, the following need adding to Bruce-Mitford’s total: Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 60962 (Bracebridge Heath) and Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-E64595 (Walcot), NLM948 (Ancaster), NLM716 (Bourne), LVPL-300957 (Boothby Graffoe), LIN-836777 (Osournby), and LIN-36AFB5 (Morton and Hanthorpe). Yet another hanging bowl mount has been recently found just outside the south-eastern county boundary, at Whatton: DENO-E207B6.
  - 47 Youngs, 2001: 219–20; Dark, 2000: 132–3; Bruce-Mitford, 2005, especially pp. 32, 34–40; Susan Youngs, personal communication. On the use of these bowls in Anglo-Saxon graves, see Geake, 1999.
  - 48 In general, Anglo-Saxon interest in these bowls is chiefly a seventh-century phenomenon: Geake, 1999.
  - 49 Bruce-Mitford, 2005: 26.
  - 50 See further pp. 135–6, below.

### Chapter Three (pp. 73–109)

- 1 See further Green, 2008: 27–9.
- 2 Leahy, 2007b: 111–14; Cox, 1994–5; Cameron, 1991: 8. See also Green, 2008: 30, fn. 120.
- 3 That the immigrant Anglo-Saxon groups were thus in some way used to fill a military and defensive role previously filled by the Romans may be further indicated by some recent work by Adam Daubney. He considers fourth-century gold coins in Lincolnshire to be indicative of the final phase of Roman military activity in the region, and in this context it is interesting to note that the distribution of these coins seems to similarly form a ring around Lincoln: Daubney, 2010, especially p. 71; A. Daubney, ‘The use of precious metals in Late Roman Lincolnshire’ (unpublished lecture, *End of Roman Lincolnshire* conference, 20 March 2010) and personal communication. Although this ‘ring’ extends much further to the south of

- Lincoln than does that formed by the Anglo-Saxon cremation cemeteries (to the Spalding-Bourne area), in the north the coins often seem to be found in the same general area as the later cremation cemeteries and Daubney has suggested that the Anglo-Saxon ring of cemeteries may actually reflect a contraction of an earlier, late fourth-century, defensive system focussed on Lincoln.
- 4 Dumville, 1986; Higham, 2002: 119–69; Green, 2007: 15–26, 30–8.
  - 5 Alcock, 1971; Morris, 1973; Phillips and Keatman, 1992.
  - 6 See especially Green, 2007, particularly pp. 8–130, 177–201; Padel, 1994. The change in dominant academic attitudes to Arthur from credulity to scepticism can be largely dated from 1977, when a seminal paper by David Dumville was published (Dumville, 1977a).
  - 7 Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, chapters 25–6, ed. and trans. Winterbottom, 1978.
  - 8 Green, 2007: 204–16.
  - 9 Padel, 1994: 16–18, quotation at 17; Wood, 1999: 34–8.
  - 10 Padel, 1994: 21; Bromwich, 1975–6: 171–2; Green, 2007: 62–7, 84–5, 119–21, 207–9, 214.
  - 11 See Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16.
  - 12 See Green, 2007: 213–15, and 2008: 8–10, for some discussion of this point.
  - 13 Jackson, 1953–8; Gelling, 1988a: 60–1; Green, 2007: 213; and Owen, 1997b: 257, 262. Cf. Coates, 2008: 41–3 for an alternative view of this name. Although there have been no detailed archaeological investigations within the parish, an Anglo-Saxon sword pommel dated to *c.* 450–500 has been found which may or may not be relevant here: Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 43147. Note, the second element, Old English *burh*, indicates that there was a fortification of some sort at Baumber in the Anglo-Saxon period at least.
  - 14 Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, 26.1.
  - 15 Yorke, 2003a: 397–9. See also White, 2007: 197–9. Fig. 16 compares the fourth-century British provinces as reconstructed in Mann, 1998: 340, with the distribution of Anglian and Saxon brooches of *c.* 450–500 (after Higham, 1992: 163) and Anglian cremation-predominant cemeteries (after Williams, 2002: 344, with additions).
  - 16 Williams (ed), 1938; Koch, 1985–6; Koch, 1991; Koch, 1997. John Koch’s work on the dating and textual history of *Y Gododdin* has been the subject of much discussion amongst Celticists, but as Oliver Padel observes in his detailed review, ‘linguistically we feel safe in his [Koch’s] hands’: Padel, 1998: 45; see also Caerwyn Williams, 1998 – who considers it to be, linguistically, ‘scholarship of the highest standard’ (291) – and Green, 2007: 47–8, 50–2, 251–2. Padel’s main criticism with regard to Koch’s *Gododdin* is that he does not separate out stanzas dated on good linguistic grounds clearly enough from those dated using other, more debatable, methods, such as textual history (see Isaac, 1999: 55–78, for another sceptical review of Koch’s suggested textual history of *Y Gododdin*). In this context, it is important to note that the stanza we are concerned with below is one of those which appear to contain some Archaic Welsh features indicative of a written origin in the seventh or eighth centuries, though Koch does argue that this dating should be narrowed to the mid-seventh century on the basis of his understanding of the textual history of *Y Gododdin*: Koch, 1997: 189–90.
  - 17 Koch, 1997: xxxv–xlii; Cessford, 1995.
  - 18 Cessford, 1997: 220–1; Koch, 1997: xliii–xlii
  - 19 Koch, 1997: xxv, 67. On Koch’s dating, see above, fn. 16, and Koch, 1997: 189–90; see Cessford, 1997: 220, for the alternate reading of ‘an evil people’.
  - 20 See Koch, 1988: 33; Cessford, 1997: 220–1; Green, 2008: 11–12.
  - 21 See *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* (University of Wales Dictionary of the Welsh Language), s.v. *Enwir*<sup>1</sup>. If the positive description of these *meibyon godebawc* as ‘the rightful faction’ is still to be preferred, despite the fact that they look to have opposed the Gododdin war-band (see further Koch, 1997: xxv, on the *meibyon godebawc* here), this might be explained as resulting from this stanza being a summarizing interpolation composed after the text of *Y Gododdin* left the north and came into Wales, where members of the *meibyon godebawc* were probably to be found in the mid-seventh century: Koch, 1997: xxiii–xxvi, 189–190.
  - 22 Koch, 1997: xxx–xxxi.

- 23 Cessford, 1997: 220–1; Green, 2008: 11–13. Whilst it is certainly likely that much of the defence of \**Lindēs* was undertaken by the Anglo-Saxon groups settled at strategic points around the periphery of the territory, as discussed above, it does not necessarily follow that the British population of \**Lindēs* was entirely civilian. Indeed, that there were at least some British warriors in \**Lindēs* is, of course, implied by the *Historia Brittonum*'s reference to Anglian-British battles fought c. 500 in *regione Linnuis* and the fact that the Britons were actually able to control Anglo-Saxon activity in the Lincoln region through into the sixth century.
- 24 Cessford, 1997: 221; Green, 2008: 12–13.
- 25 Above, pp. 57–62.
- 26 Chapter Six discusses the evidence for this movement in detail. See also Dark, 2000: 206–07.
- 27 See further pp. 231–2.
- 28 Dumville, 1976; Foot, 1993: 133–5.
- 29 Stenton, 1971a: 129–31; Foot, 1993: 133; Kelly (ed.), 1998: 54.
- 30 Foot, 1993: 133–5, especially p. 135.
- 31 Jackson, 1953: 244, n.3; Stafford, 1985: 87; Koch (ed.), 2006: 60; and Dumville, 1977b: 90, *pace* Stenton, 1971a: 129, who thought *Cædbæd* might be an Anglian-British hybrid. Although Stenton's idea is now often dismissed as a possibility, it has recently been revived by John Insley (Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477); however, his chief reason for doing so – a disbelief that a name \**Catuboduos* could exist – is undermined by Koch's observation that the name \**Catuboduos* is probably also the root of the attested Old Breton name *Catuodu*: Koch (ed.), 2006: 60.
- 32 Dumville, 1977a: 90; Foot, 1993: 132; Sawyer, 1998: 49.
- 33 Dumville, 1976: 30–7; Foot, 1993: 132. See Stenton, 1971a: 128, for the latter viewpoint.
- 34 See Foot, 1993: 132–3, who argues convincingly against the concerns of Stenton, 1971a: 128–9; see also Leahy, 2007b: 98. On the Lincolnshire connections of the Northumbrian elite, see Chapter Six below, and for the suggestion that Biscop (and Bede) was descended from the royal *Lindisfaran*, see Campbell, 2004, and Thacker, 2006: 40.
- 35 Leahy, 2007b: 98. Note, the suggestion that the Lindsey genealogy was in fact standardized to (or had) the suspicious fourteen generations to Woden and then saw three removed due to the addition of generations below Woden to that genealogy in the 'Anglian Collection' seems implausible and is further undermined by the testimony of the genealogies appended to the twelfth-century chronicle of John of Worcester: Forester (trans.), 1854: xii-xiii, 440. There we are given the Lindsey genealogy without the generations below Woden but still with only eleven generations to him, whilst the form of the name Aldfrið (*Ealdfrith*) found there suggests an origin for this genealogy separate to that of the 'Anglian Collection' (via a West Saxon source? See Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477, 478).
- 36 Stenton, 1971a: 128.
- 37 Stafford, 1985: 87; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; Green, 2008: 15; Dumville, 1977a: 90. The exception is the unwarranted hyper-scepticism of Sawyer, 1998: 50. An interesting comparison might be made here with the West Saxon royal genealogy, which similarly seems to include at least one 'Celtic' name in its lower reaches: Coates, 1990; Parsons, 1997; Koch (ed.), 2006: 392–3.
- 38 Leahy, 1993: 36; Leahy, 2007b: 48–9; Leahy, 2007a: 6; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Everson, 1993: 98; Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004; and Chapter Five below (especially pp. 188–96).
- 39 Leahy, 2007b: 93–6; Everson, 1993: 97–8; Sawyer, 1998: 52–3.
- 40 Sandred, 1987: 235–6; Cox, 1994: 48; Mills, 1991: 187; Watts, 2004: 33; Cameron, 1998: 69; Cameron, 2001: 184.
- 41 Stenton, 1971a: 128; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; Cameron, 1998: 141.
- 42 Gelling, 1988b: 111–12.
- 43 Dumville, 1977a: 91.
- 44 See Coates, 2005: 33–4.
- 45 Incidentally, the fact that the Sheffield's Hill and Osbournby contexts for these brooches are both sixth-century (or, in the case of the latter, just possibly seventh-century) helps confirm

that Class 1 brooches do indeed belong to the fifth and sixth centuries (see above, pp. 62, 70 fn. 41). Note, neither of the two Class 1 brooches from Folkingham comes from the sixth-century metal-detected cemetery in the parish.

- 46 Above, pp. 63–4.
- 47 See further Green, 2008: 27–9.
- 48 Cameron, 1998: 135; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; Insley, 2003: 375; Insley, 2002: 164.
- 49 Coates, 2008: 50–1; Cameron, 1998: 127.
- 50 Cameron, 1998: 128; Insley and Eggers, 2001: 477; Insley, 2002: 163; Watts, 2004: 622. The earliest spelling of Torksey (*æt Tureces iege*, c. 900) implies that the place-name derives from a personal name *\*Turoc* rather than *\*Turc*, but all other spellings from the later tenth century onwards point instead to *\*Turc* (for example, *æt Turces ige*, in *Turcesige*), which suggests that the earliest form is probably an error.
- 51 Leahy, 2007b: 115; Bassett, 1989a: 11–12; Gilmour, 2007: 252–3.
- 52 See Steane, 2006; Gilmour, 2007: 248, fig. 15. Note, David Stocker has suggested (in Stocker (ed.), 2003: 157–8) that we cannot rule out the possibility that the earliest burials at this site were all ‘final phase’ – seventh- to eighth-century – pagan Anglo-Saxon interments, which could account for the seemingly-Christian lack of burial goods and the east-west orientation. However, this interpretation seems unlikely, particularly in light of the fact that the cemetery is universally agreed to follow on from an apsidal church and that the site was subsequently a Christian focus in the city. In addition, it ought not to be forgotten that a re-evaluation of the radiocarbon data actually indicates that the cemetery very probably began in the sixth century rather than the seventh: see above, pp. 59–60.
- 53 See above, fn. 52 and p. 60, on the dating of the graveyard. If the apsidal church did manage to survive into the early seventh century, then the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon rulers of *Lindissi* to Roman-style Christianity by Paulinus might provide a plausible context for the demolition of the church and Paulinus’s building of a new stone church in the city (Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16). Certainly Steven Bassett has suggested that British ecclesiastical organization continued in the West Midlands until the seventh century, when the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon rulers there led to the silent replacement of British bishops with Anglo-Saxon ones: Bassett, 1992.
- 54 Brooks, 1984: 20; above, fn. 53, and p. 61.
- 55 Yorke, 1993a: 145; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16.
- 56 Jones, 1986; Yorke, 1993a: 142. See Jackson, 1953: 309, and Ekwall, 1960: 163, for *Alauna* > *Ellen*.
- 57 For example, the great Victorian medieval historian E. A. Freeman wrote of the Britons in the late nineteenth century that ‘we may be sure that we have not much of their blood in us, because we have so few of their words in our language’: Freeman, 1871: 28.
- 58 See especially Bryan Ward-Perkins’ excellent study, ‘Why did the Anglo-Saxons not become more British?’ (Ward-Perkins, 2000); Charles-Edwards, 1995, particularly pp. 729–33; Woolf, 2007; Filppula *et al*, 2008; and Tristram, 2007. Cf. Coates, 2007, for an unconvincing attempt to reassert the Victorian position, which allows no validity to evidence other than linguistic, fails to engage properly with Ward-Perkins’ points or proposed analogues, and is potentially undermined at its core by Filppula *et al* and Tristram’s discussions of the evidence for Late British influence on the English language. For another analogue to the lack of British influence on Old English, see the recent and seemingly definitive decoupling of an apparently complete language change from theories of migration/population replacement, in this case relating to the arrival of Common Celtic (the ancestor of British/Welsh) in Britain: McEvoy *et al*, 2004. For the pre-existing low social and political status of Brittonic/Welsh and how this helps explain the extent of the linguistic acculturation of the Britons, see Charles-Edwards, 1995: 729–36. For the Italian post-Roman material culture collapse, see Ward-Perkins, 2000: 354–5 (also p. 325 of the same volume), Christie, 1995, and Ward-Perkins, 2005, especially pp. 123–4 and fig. 6.1 – needless to say, such a rapid culture collapse in eastern Britain cannot but have had a concomitant destabilising effect on all aspects of post-Roman lowland British culture and identity. For further probable factors in the linguistic acculturation of the Britons,

- see for example Ward-Perkins, 2000, especially pp. 527–30, and Charles-Edwards, 1995: 732–3.
- 59 Freeman, 1871: 28; note, he allows that the British men might have left behind a few of their womenfolk, who would have been – in his view – made into slaves or forced to marry their new masters.
- 60 Above, pp. 42–3. See also, for example, Härke, 2003: 16–17.
- 61 Ward-Perkins, 2000: 522–3. See also Jones, 1996: 8–9, 26–8, 266–8.
- 62 Weale *et al*, 2002: 1008–21, is a good example of such a flawed study, which was characterized by a small and very restricted sample set and a remarkable degree of historical naivety which resulted in poor models of events and a lack of awareness of how circumstances over the intervening 1500 years might have affected the results they took. So, for example, no awareness is shown of the fact that their two Welsh ‘control’ sites are in areas which medieval texts claim saw major post-Roman immigration from Ireland and southern Scotland (see, for example, Koch, 1997: xcvi–xcix; Koch, 2003); they allow for a single post-Roman migration event with Britons and Anglo-Saxons thereafter breeding at the same rate, both of which assumptions are implausible (see Thomas *et al*, 2006); their central England site is at the meeting point of six eighteenth- and nineteenth-century coaching roads and thus likely subject to much population churn, which they show no awareness of; and their east of England sites are all from areas where mass-migration is readily admitted anyway and, furthermore, where there was a second major immigration from the continent (the Vikings) in the intervening period. See also McEvoy *et al*, 2004: 699, for some further points.
- 63 Thomas *et al*, 2006; see also Woolf, 2007, and Charles-Edwards, 1995: 732–3.
- 64 Leahy, 1993: 38; Leahy, 2007b: 82–3. It should be noted that some, at least, of the ‘Anglo-Saxons’ buried in these cemeteries are likely to have been Britons who *had* already acculturated before the mid-seventh century, see further below.
- 65 See Cameron, 1980; Gelling, 1993: 54; and Gelling, 1988b: 95–6 – with regard to the dating of such names, a key point is that the second elements are indicative of these compound-names being formed ‘in the mid to late eighth century’ (Gelling, 1993: 54, see also Cameron, 1980: 33–4). See for the Lincolnshire examples, Balkwill, 1993: 11; Cameron, 1991: 30; Cameron, 1992: 172; Cameron, 1998: 134, 135; Mills, 1991: 99; Schram, 1950: 431; and Crowson *et al*, 2005: 298.
- 66 Felix, *Life of St Guthlac*, ed. and trans. Colgrave, 1956: 108–11. Such an interpretation of this passage has been most recently advocated by Graham Jones in Koch (ed.), 2006: 857. See also Vince, 2003: 143; Stocker, 1993: 101, 106.
- 67 Scull, 1995: 78; Thomas *et al*, 2006; Härke, 1992a; Härke, 1992b; Härke, 1997.
- 68 Everson, 1993: 91; see below, pp. 164–8.
- 69 Leahy, 2007b: 85–6. See also O’Brien, 1999.
- 70 Stocker and Everson, 2002. See further Chapter Four, pp. 136–7, and Fig. 20.
- 71 See Dark, 1996b: 58–9, for the pot from one of the Swanpool kilns. See Leahy, 2007b: 52–3 and 86, and Leahy, 2007a: 126–7, on the Cleatham urns.
- 72 Field, 1984; Green, 2008: 23–4.
- 73 Compare, for example, Whyman, 1992.
- 74 Dickinson, 1982: 48, 50, 52 and figs. 1–4 for the two Sleaford brooches; the Keelby and Osbournby examples are probably also from early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries.
- 75 Susan Youngs, personal communication; Youngs, 1997: 192–4, and Youngs, 1993. See also Ulmschneider, 1998: II, 363, and Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-3702B0 (an enamelled cruciform brooch from Baston) and NLM4745 (an enamelled head of a cruciform brooch from Tathwell). See further below, pp. 135–6.

## Chapter Four (pp. 115–43)

- 1 Stenton, 1971a: 133–4; Foster and Longley (ed), 1924. See above, pp. 51–2, on the relationship between the names ‘Lindsey’ and *Lindissi*.
- 2 The southern limits of the British *\*Lindēs* are best defined by the distribution of the cremation cemeteries and the Class 1 and Type G brooches – the most southerly of which come from Folkingham – given that it was argued in previous chapters that these all belong to the peripheral regions of *\*Lindēs*. Indeed, all but two of the Lincolnshire hanging bowls and all of the Old English *-ingas* group-names formed from British personal-names fall within this area too, and ‘Kesteven’ itself appears to be a Scandinavianized British district-name deriving from British *\*cēto-*, ‘wood’. For the latter, see Cameron, 1998: 72; Green, 2008: 35 and fn. 132, and on the extent of post-Roman *\*Lindēs* see also fn. 131.
- 3 For example, Green, 2008: 35 and fn. 133; Eagles, 1989: 211; Yorke, 1993a: 142. See above, pp. 89–91, on the royal family of *Lindissi* perhaps having their origins in the population-group focussed on the Cleatham cemetery.
- 4 Stenton, 1971a: 132–5; Leahy, 2007b: 11–14; Sawyer, 1998: 45; Roffe, 2000a.
- 5 Stenton, 1971a: 134.
- 6 Stocker and Everson, 2002; Everson and Stocker, 2003.
- 7 Bassett, 1989a: 2–3; Yorke, 1993a: 142–3, 147–8.
- 8 Roffe, 2000a; Sawyer, 1998: 149–53.
- 9 The final conquest of *Lindissi* by Mercia probably took place in 679: Foot, 1993: 135. Although the diocese of *Lindissi* was first created in 678, this was an act of Northumbrian overlordship and it is likely that the boundaries of this diocese under Mercian rule would have only been finally established after the division and reorganization of the Mercian see c. 690: Keynes, 1994; Keynes, 2000: 7; Keynes, 2005: 56–7.
- 10 Roffe, 2000a; the available evidence suggests that Lissingleys was an important pre-Viking ‘central place’/meeting place of some sort, but not necessarily that it was used as the meeting-place of the whole of Lindsey before the late ninth century: see below, pp. 128–9. If the Lindsey place-names involving Old English *burh* (‘fortress’) really did all date from early in the seventh century and represent a coherent defensive network for Lindsey, then this too might support the notion that Lindsey and *Lindissi* were coterminous (Cox, 1994, especially 54 and 56). However, this hypothesis seems both unlikely and implausible: Sawyer, 1998: 84–6; Blair, 2005: 250 – note, Cox actually missed at least one *burh* name in Kesteven (a lost site, east of Sleaford), and in light of this his ‘network’, if it existed in a meaningful way, might be thought to have extended down the Kesteven Fen Edge in any case. A more plausible argument may be found in the fact that *Lindesig/Lindissig* looks to be an unhistorical form of the kingdom-name *Lindissi*, created when the final element of *Lindissi* was wrongly connected with the Old English word for island, *-īg* (above, p. 52; Sawyer, 1998: 9–10). This connection between *Lindissi* and *-īg* most credibly results from the then island-like properties of the district of Lindsey (see Stenton, 1971a: 134) and, as such, the new name *Lindesig/Lindissig* is most likely to have been created only after the name *Lindissi* had become restricted to the district of Lindsey. However, as the first instance of the name *Lindesig/Lindissig* being used for *Lindissi* occurs in the late ninth century, this can tell us little more than that – once again – the loss of northern Kesteven to *Lindissi* is likely to have occurred before the late ninth century.
- 11 See, for example, Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16, on Lincoln’s centrality to *Lindissi*.
- 12 See Stocker and Everson, 2002, especially p. 275 for a summary of the evidence; Fig. 20.
- 13 Dumville, 1989c: 226–7, 229; Cameron, 1998: 14, 65–6; Davies and Vierck, 1974: 233–6, 283. See further Chapter Five.
- 14 See Sawyer, 1998: 49, 220–1, and further below, p. 172.
- 15 The low assessment of the *Bilmigas* in the ‘Tribal Hidage’ (600 hides compared to *Lindissi*’s 7000) combined with the Fen Edge focus of the *Billingas* place-names suggest that it is most unlikely that the *Bilmigas/Billingas*, if they existed, covered the whole of northern Kesteven;

- see further Chapter Five on the likely extent of the *regio* of the *Billingas*, which can be defined with a reasonable degree of confidence due to an unusual coincidence of evidence.
- 16 Recent studies have challenged the very notion that most of the smaller population-groups which occur in the ‘Tribal Hidage’ and other documents, such as the *Bilmigas*, were originally independent ‘peoples’ and polities rather than merely distinct but always subordinate population-groups which existed within the borders of larger kingdoms like *Lindissi*: Yorke, 2000: 82–6; Yorke, 2003a, especially p. 401; Woolf, 2000. This question is discussed further below, pp. 147–51.
  - 17 Parker, 1992; *The Earliest Life of St Gregory*, § 18 – Colgrave (ed. and trans.), 1968: 102–03; Campbell, 1986a: 86–7.
  - 18 See Parker, 1992, on the extent of the *regio* of Hatfield.
  - 19 Dumville, 1989c: 226–7; Parker, 1992: 46.
  - 20 As also observed by Yorke, 1993a: 142–3; Sawyer, 1998: 72–3; Parker, 1992: 46–9; and David Roffe, personal communication. Such a situation is also implicit in Bassett, 1989a: 2.
  - 21 Higham, 1993: 87–9; Davies and Vierck, 1994: 281.
  - 22 Parker, 1992: 46–8, 60.
  - 23 Van de Noort, 2004: 129; Dark, 2000: 11; Lucy, 2000b: 141–3.
  - 24 *Earliest Life of St Gregory*, § 18 (Colgrave, 1968: 102–03, 151), written by a monk of Whitby. The event is said to have occurred ‘in the days of their [the Mercian’s] king Æthelred’ (p. 103), who ruled from 675–704. Colgrave (p. 47) suggests that it must have occurred after 680 as the ‘Life’ also dates the event in relation to Eanflæd (Edwin’s daughter), who took control of Whitby with her daughter Ælfflæd when Hild died in 680. However, the ‘Life of St Gregory’ only actually says that the event in question happened ‘while Eanflæd was still living and in the monastic life’ (p. 103), which she probably was from the death of her husband in 670 (Yorke, 2003b: 32), and Colgrave himself considers the reference later in the chapter to Whitby as the monastery of Ælfflæd to be the Whitby author’s own comment, not part of the tale he was relating (Colgrave, 1968: 47–8).
  - 25 See Parker, 1992: 45–6, on the location of Edwin’s body.
  - 26 May, 1996: II, 638–44; May, 2001.
  - 27 Snyder, 1998: 232; Yorke, 2003a: 396–7; Laycock, 2006; Laycock, 2008.
  - 28 With regard to when northern Kesteven was actually split off from the core territory of *Lindissi*, see further below pp. 185–8.
  - 29 Yorke, 1993a: 141–2, see also Blair, 2005: 271–2. On the British origins of Deira and Elmet, see Gruffydd, 1994; Higham, 1993: 81; Koch, 1997: xxxi–xxxii, xl.
  - 30 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16 and II.18 (see *HE*, II.14, for York’s stone church being still unfinished at the time of Edwin’s death).
  - 31 Jackson, 1953, especially p. 309.
  - 32 Wacher, 1995: 17–18, 87.
  - 33 Cameron, 1985: 1–3.
  - 34 Gilmour, 2007: 252–3; Leahy, 1993: 36. On Blæcca and the possibility that he was a member of the ruling family of *Lindissi*, see above pp. 93–4; as Kevin Leahy (2007b: 115) rightly points out, we possess a genealogy rather than a king-list for *Lindissi* and so the absence of Blæcca’s name from this genealogy does not mean that he was not in fact the king of the *Lindisfaran* during Edwin’s overlordship, only that Aldfrið was not descended from him.
  - 35 Sawyer, 1998: 51; Bassett, 1989a: 11–12; Leahy, 2007b: 115; Eagles, 1989: 210.
  - 36 See further Hinton, 2000, especially pp. 103–04, 114.
  - 37 Sawyer, 1998: 51, 84, 108, 113–14; see also below, pp. 177–8.
  - 38 Leahy, 2007b, p. 59 and plates 13 and 16, for the early Anglo-Saxon finds (see also NLM-B895B4 from Thimbleby), and pp. 131, 144–45 and 159, for the Middle Saxon; see Härke, 1992b, on the status-symbolism of Anglo-Saxon ‘military’ items.
  - 39 Cameron, 1998: 66.
  - 40 Roffe, 2000a.
  - 41 Roffe, 2000a; see also the map in Roffe, 2001. Roffe argues that the Ridings may be pre-Viking in origin too, but this is not necessary for Lissingleys to have had pre-Viking

- significance, as noted above, and a pre-Viking origin for them has been in any case doubted (as Sawyer, 1998: 137–9).
- 42 Keith Kelway, personal communication; DCMS, 2003: 49; DCMS, 2004: 66–7; Portable Antiquities Scheme, LIN-75B9C3. On ring-swords, see Stuer, 1987, and Evison, 1967.
  - 43 Keith Kelway, personal communication; Adam Daubney, unpublished finds report; Wessex Archaeology, 2008.
  - 44 Wessex Archaeology, 2008: 2, 10, 17; Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 55173; Adam Daubney, unpublished finds report.
  - 45 Adam Daubney, unpublished finds report; Keith Kelway, personal communication; Wessex Archaeology, 2008: 2–3; Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 55193; Portable Antiquities Scheme NLM-5FBEB7, NLM-5DF5D6 and SWYOR-6429A2; Daubney, forthcoming, catalogue numbers 8 and 62. Note, a sceptre foot is also known from this area (LIN-A7EF01), as is a small figurine of Mercury (LIN-3A2272). On Mars Toutatis and Lincolnshire, see Daubney, forthcoming; Daubney, 2007.
  - 46 Keith Kelway, personal communication.
  - 47 Cameron, 1998: 81.
  - 48 That the first element is *\*Lissa* is apparent from the early forms; see Ekwall, 1960: 30; Coates, 2008: 82. See, however, Gelling and Cole, 2003: 237, on the second element of ‘Lissingleys/Lissinglea’ having the potential meaning ‘pasture, meadow’ rather than ‘clearing, wood’, which might fit well with its historical character.
  - 49 Ekwall, 1960: 300; Cameron, 1998: 81. Coates, 2008: 82, very tentatively offers *\*Lindis(s)ing-leas/\*Lindis(s)ing-tun*, ‘the clearings/village associated with the [polity of] Lindsey’, as an alternative; however, as he notes, *\*Lindis(s)-* would require a very drastic reduction to get to *\*Liss-* and is thus unlikely.
  - 50 Watts, 2004: 375.
  - 51 Jackson, 1953: 285; *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* (University of Wales Dictionary of the Welsh Language), s.v. *Llys*. On the potential names ‘the clearing/village associated with the *\*Liss*’, compare Toynton All Saints and Toynton St Peter, *Totintun* and *Totingtun*, arguably ‘the estate/village associated with the *tōt*, the look-out hill’: Mills, 1991: xvii, 333; Green, 2008: 30, fn. 120. Kirmington (*Chernitone*, *Chirningtun*) may well provide a comparable example of a British place-name compounded with *tūn*, see Coates, 2005: 33–4. Cf. also perhaps Penistone in South Yorkshire (*Pengestone*, *Peningestone*), which appears to derive from Archaic Welsh *penn* (Mills, 1991: 256).
  - 52 See below, pp. 183–4, on Sleaford. On Caistor, see Stocker, 1993: 117; Leahy, 2007b: 125–6, 205.
  - 53 Balkwill, 1993; Yorke, 2003a: 396; Gelling, 1977a; Gelling, 1988b: 67–74, 245–7; Gelling, 1977b: 1–5; Oosthuizen, 1998: 95–6.
  - 54 See Leahy, 2007a, and pp. 192–3 on Cleatham-Kirton in Lindsey, and see also Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004. On Hibaldstow, see Whitwell, 1995: 98–9 (Hibaldstow ‘town’ covers over half a square mile). Note that Anglo-Saxon ‘pagan’ pottery has been recorded from the site of the town itself, and that there is notable evidence of British-Anglian continuity from this area: see Green, 2008: 24 and 28, fn. 114.
  - 55 Williams, 2002: 347–50. See also perhaps the Roman fort at Skegness, whose name appears to have survived into the eleventh century: Owen and Coates, 2003; Coates, 1988: 35–9.
  - 56 Cox, 1994–5; Leahy, 2007b: 111–14; above, pp. 74–5. On cremation cemeteries as ‘central places’, see Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004; and further below, pp. 188–96.
  - 57 Whitwell, 1995: 100–02; Leahy, 2007b: 84; Coates, 2005: 33–4; above, pp. 29–30.
  - 58 Susan Youngs, personal communication; Youngs, 1997: 192–4, and see also Youngs, 1993.
  - 59 See Youngs, 2001: 216–17, and Geake, 1999: 3 and 4, for the fifty bowls known from Anglo-Saxon graves to 1999, to which we should add the recent find from Bracebridge Heath (Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 60962); a disproportionate 20% of the total known from all funerary contexts across the whole of Anglo-Saxon England come from Lincolnshire graves.

- 60 See, for example, the probably fifth-century hanging bowl found in what seems to be a seventh-century grave at Sleaford: Geake, 1999: 13.
- 61 See Bruce-Mitford, 1993, for some examples of probably seventh-century British hanging bowls from the region. See also the enamelled cruciform brooches mentioned above, p. 113, fn. 75.
- 62 See Stocker and Everson, 2002; Everson and Stocker, 2003.
- 63 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16, III.11; Leahy, 2007b: 114–15, 117; Sawyer, 1998: 57, 58.
- 64 Foot, 1993: 135; Sawyer, 1998: 57; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.3; Tyler, 2005.
- 65 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.12, IV.21; Foot, 1993: 135; Sawyer, 1998: 58.
- 66 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.12. See, for example, Stancliffe, 1995: 55; Higham, 2006: 400.
- 67 *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.12, IV.12; Thacker, 1995: 99; Parker, 1992.
- 68 Sawyer, 1998: 18.
- 69 See Huggett, 1988: 64–5; Drinkall and Foreman, 1998: 262; Vince, 2006: 527; and Chapter Five, below.
- 70 See especially below, pp. 185–8.
- 71 Parker, 1992: 46–7.
- 72 See Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16.
- 73 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16, II.18; Higham, 1995: 59.
- 74 See below, pp. 222–29.
- 75 Campbell, 2004; Thacker, 2006: 40. It should perhaps be noted here that there is place-name evidence suggestive of the kings of *Lindissi* considering themselves an *Inguionic* dynasty, deriving from continental Anglian *Inguiones*, a claim which may also be embodied in the Bernician royal genealogy: see below p. 238, fn. 54, and Miller, 1980: 213; North, 1997: 42–3; and Sandred, 1987: 234–5. An alternative possibility – that the Bernician kings considered the pagan god *Ing* to have been their divine patron and that the cult of *Ing* was an important one within early Anglo-Saxon *Lindissi* (see above, p. 90) – would, of course, be equally intriguing. However, in either case we do need to be cautious with regard to how much can be read into the Bernician pedigree, given the differing versions of this which survive and the evidence for tampering/invention in the generations below Ida (see p. 237, fn. 35 below).

## Chapter Five (pp. 147–99)

- 1 Opinion on the origins of at least some parts of the ‘Tribal Hidage’ do, needless to say, vary enormously, but a seventh-century Mercian one is still clearly the majority interpretation: Davies and Vierck, 1974: 226–7; Dumville, 1989a: 132–3; and Hamerow, 2005: 282. See Featherstone, 2001: 28–9 on the hidations.
- 2 Hart, 1971; Davies and Vierck, 1974; Featherstone, 2001: 28.
- 3 See especially Hamerow, 2005: 271–88, and Scull, 1993: 72–9.
- 4 Bassett, 1989b, especially pp. 17–18, 26; Scull, 1993; Hamerow, 2005, especially p. 282.
- 5 Yorke, 2000: 82–6; Yorke, 2003; Woolf, 2000.
- 6 See especially Blair, 1999: 456, and Kirby, 2000: 9, on a composite origin; see also Keynes, 1995: 21–5. I would agree with James Campbell (1986a: 88, 90), D. P. Kirby (2000: 8–9), Barbara Yorke (2000: 74) and others that Middle Anglia was probably a genuine large early Anglo-Saxon kingdom, not one ‘invented’ in the mid-seventh century, on the basis of Bede’s references to them as a genuine early Anglo-Saxon *gens* (Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.21). Chadwick, 1924: 7–10, though now rarely read, includes a very useful survey of the evidence for Middle Anglia as a real kingdom and the ‘Tribal Hidage’ groups as sub-units of this.
- 7 As Hamerow, 2005: 284.
- 8 See Yorke, 2003a, especially pp. 396–401, and also, for example, Higham, 1993: 80–1, on Deira and Bernicia; Bassett, 1989b: 24, on Essex; Brooks, 1989b: 57–8, on Kent; and Warner,

- 1996: 148, and Oosthuizen, 1998: 89–90, on East Anglia. See also Laycock, 2008: 197–236, especially p. 204 onwards.
- 9 Yorke, 2003a, especially from p. 400; see Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V.10 on the Old Saxons.
  - 10 Hines, 1999: 136–44, quotation at p. 144.
  - 11 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III. 20, IV.6 and IV.19. See Potts, 1974, for the argument that the seventh-century estate of *Medeshamstede* was equivalent to the territory of the North *Gyrwe*.
  - 12 Davies and Vierck, 1974: 231; Dumville, 1989a: 130–1; Rollason, 1978: 89; Roffe, 1993: 82–3.
  - 13 Dumville, 1989a: 130–1. Barbara Yorke has suggested that the reason why the *Gyrwe* may have had some autonomy, whilst most other small population-groups did not, may be because of their unusual geographical situation (see their name, ‘the fen dwellers’): Yorke, 2000: 83–4.
  - 14 Chadwick, 1924: 9.
  - 15 Campbell, 1986a: 86; Chadwick, 1924: 9; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.13, and V.19.
  - 16 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, IV.6; Yorke, 2000: 74–5; Campbell, 1986a: 86–7.
  - 17 Campbell, 1986a: 89; note, *princeps* is in fact translated as *ealdorman* in the Old English translation of Bede: T. Miller (ed.), 1890–98: I, 316.
  - 18 Dumville, 1989a: 131.
  - 19 See Kirby, 2000: 8–9, and Chadwick, 1924: 7–10, on the kingdom of Middle Anglia; if it was a kingdom before Peada, as suggested, then we should expect there to have been a pre-Peada dynasty too. Note, *Tondberct*’s death is placed, in the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*, at some point between 652 – the year of his marriage – and 654–5; could his death have been linked somehow to Peada’s takeover of Middle Anglia? If so, it might support the case for seeing him as a member of a lost Middle Anglian dynasty. With regard to the notion that he could have been a member of the Mercian or Northumbrian dynasties, it is interesting to note that the first element of his name (*Tond-*) has been described as a ‘characteristically Northumbrian’ name-element (Insley, 1999: 230), though this circumstance might alternatively be explained in terms of the links between the *Gyrwe* and Northumbria discussed in Chapter Six (below, pp. 224–5).
  - 20 Colgrave (ed. and trans.), 1956: 2, 86–7, 142–5 – see especially Colgrave’s comments on p. 2 with regard to the reference to Crowland being in Middle Anglia; Insley, 1999: 231; Chadwick, 1924: 9–10. Cf. Hines, 1999: 144.
  - 21 With regard to the *Gyrwe*’s southern frontier, we do know that in a tenth-century charter, *Gyruwan fen* formed part of the boundary of Conington, Huntingdonshire, around 35 kilometres south-east of Peterborough, which would tend to confirm that the vast majority of the *regio* of the *Gyrwe* lay south of Crowland: Davies and Vierck, 1974: 231. Although the *Liber Eliensis* suggests that the lands of the South *Gyrwe* included or were equivalent to the island of Ely, and John Hines (1999: 144; see also Courtney, 1981: 95–6) has considered such an identification to be ‘highly plausible’, this may well be a late invention and speculation by the author of the *Liber Eliensis* rather than a reflection of seventh-century reality: see especially Hart, 1971: 143, and Yorke, 2003b: 32–3.
  - 22 Davies and Vierck, 1974, for example pp. 232, 234, 285.
  - 23 Mills, 1991: 304; Watts, 2004: 564.
  - 24 Hayes and Lane, 1992; Hayes, 1988; Crowson *et al*, 2005: figs. 1–2a, pp. 18–48, 211, 214–15. Note, although it has been suggested that the early and middle Anglo-Saxon settlements discovered by the Fenland Survey in the Lincolnshire Fenland were seasonal rather than permanent in nature, recent archaeological work indicates that this position is untenable: Ulmschneider, 2000: 70–1; Crowson *et al*, 2005: 217–18, 228, 261–2, 293.
  - 25 Cameron, 1998: 114; Mills, 1991: 303. Old English *\*spald* is cognate with Old High German *spalt*, ‘a ditch, trench’. See also Courtney, 1981: 97.
  - 26 Hayes and Lane, 1992, especially pp. 213–15, 257; Crowson *et al*, 2005: figs. 1–2a.

- 27 Hayes, 1988: 324–5; Lane and Hayes, 1993: 66, 68; Crowson *et al*, 2005: 277–80, 283, 285–6. See further below on the date of nucleation in Holland.
- 28 Hayes, 1988: 323–4; Crowson *et al*, 2005: 215; Hayes and Lane, 1992: 249, 252.
- 29 On the debate over the reality of this estate, see Salway, 1970: 10; Millett, 1990: 120–3; Lane and Hayes, 1993: 65; Rippon, 1999: 113–17. See also Potter, 1989: 172, on the Fenland probably being administered from several centres. In this context it is perhaps worth recalling that Ptolemy places a centre called *Salinae*, ‘saltworks’, near the coast of the Wash; in the past, this has been seen as a mistake, but given the considerable evidence for Iron Age and Romano-British saltworking discovered by the Fenland Survey in the Spalding region, there now seems to be no good reason to reject Ptolemy’s testimony: Hayes and Lane, 1992: 218–29; Lane and Hayes, 1993: 64–5; Whitwell, 1992: xxviii; Lane, 2001: 463. Strang, 1997: 23, identifies *Salinae* with the probable fort at Skegness, but place-name evidence suggests rather that this was called *Traiectus* (Owen and Coates, 2003) and Ptolemy puts *Salinae* in the territory of the *Catuvellauni*, whilst Skegness is most credibly associated with the *Corieltavi*.
- 30 See especially Campbell, 1986b: 113 here; also Yorke, 2000: 84–5. See, for example, Sawyer, 1998: 49, for support for the idea that Spalding ‘may well have been a centre of some local importance’ in the pre-Viking period.
- 31 Whitwell, 1992: 48; Hallam, 1965: 111–13; Hayes and Lane, 1992: 171–2, 257; Malone, 2010: 8. See also below, p. 170 and 203 (fn. 68), for its survival into the post-Roman period, but perhaps not as late as has been claimed (twelfth century).
- 32 Cameron, 1998: 145; Gelling, 1988b: 246.
- 33 On the date of *wīchām* names, see for example Gelling, 1977a: 14. Spalding is another name from this area which seems likely to have its origins in this period, and the same may possibly be true too of the name Quadring (the ‘fen *Hæferingas*’), if it refers to a sub-group within the *Spaldingas/Spalde*. See Cameron, 1996b: 71, on *-ingas* group-names necessarily pre-dating the name of the settlement to which they eventually become attached and probably mostly belonging to the late fifth to seventh centuries.
- 34 Gelling, 1977a; Gelling, 1988b: 67–74, 245–9, especially pp. 70–1; Gelling, 1977b: 1–5; Cameron, 1996b: 42; Yorke, 2003a: 396; Balkwill, 1993, especially p. 11. See also Oosthuizen, 1998: 95–6.
- 35 See especially Balkwill, 1993; Yorke, 2003a: 396; Gelling, 1988b: 71–4.
- 36 As they are in Lane and Hayes, 1993: 68, and Hayes, 1988: 325.
- 37 Note, the different dates of settlement-nucleation on the Fen Edge and the siltland have been used as evidence for the *Spalde* being a semi-independent tribe, apparently on the basis that the Fen Edge communities were fully conquered in the seventh century and forced to nucleate, whilst the *Spalde* of the siltland retained ‘a fair degree of independence’, so they did not nucleate and instead became a buffer-state between East Anglia and Mercia (Lane and Hayes, 1993: 68–9; Hayes, 1988: 325). Needless to say, there is absolutely no necessity to posit such complex political machinations lying behind the nucleation/lack of nucleation observed. That the two areas represent distinct settlement units with their own histories and trajectories is clear, but it is impossible to say anything more than this on the basis of this evidence alone without veering off into the realms of pure speculation. At best, the above scenario relies fully on the presumption of the *Spalde*’s original independence before it can even begin to have any credibility; it certainly cannot be used to prove this independence.
- 38 See above, pp. 116–25.
- 39 Blair, 1999: 456, and above, pp. 147–51.
- 40 See especially Roffe in Crowson *et al*, 2005: 285–6, also p. 298; Hart, 1971: 144; Colgrave (ed. and trans.), 1956: 2, 86–7, 168–9. Note, the group-names here are the nominative plural forms (for example, *Wixan*); the forms in the ‘Tribal Hidage’ (for example, *Wixna*) are genitives – the same applies, incidentally, to the group-name *Spalde* (‘Tribal Hidage’ *Spalda*).
- 41 Hayes and Lane, 1992: 172.
- 42 Rippon, 1999: 113–17; Potter, 1989: 171–2; Lane and Hayes, 1993: 65; Whitwell, 1992: xxviii.

- 43 Welch, 1989: 78, faces a similar situation with the *Hæstingas* of Sussex, who look to be a pre-Viking population-group and *regio* but who are located in a region without any early Anglo-Saxon burials; his suggestion is that they emerged in the Middle Saxon period, a solution which doesn't seem to be available in this case, given the presence of both early Anglo-Saxon pottery and settlements on the siltland and the place-name Wykeham.
- 44 It might be suggested that the lack of cemeteries indicates that the siltland settlements were seasonal rather than permanent, belonging to people normally living on the uplands. However, as noted above (p. 200, fn. 24), the excavation results from these settlements indicate that this is not the case and that they were instead used year-round as permanent settlements. Hallam, in Phillips (ed.), 1970: 294, notes a possible 'Saxon' cremation cemetery at Donington (in Holland), but if one follows up the references this is clearly a case of mistaken identity, with a possible cemetery from Donington on Bain (in Lindsey) noted in 1834 being wrongly assigned to the Fenland in the gazetteer due to 'on Bane' being omitted in an intermediate source used to create it.
- 45 On British burial rites see, for example, Rahtz, 1977; Rahtz, 1982; Härke, 2003: 19. See above, pp. 96–103, on Britons within *Lindissi*; also Leahy, 2007b: 82–3. It would seem that even acculturated Britons buried within early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries were not accorded the full normal Anglo-Saxon burial rites: see Härke, 1992a and 1992b, and also, for example, Brooks, 1991: 10, for the frequent suggestion that 'Anglo-Saxon' burials without grave-goods were those of Britons living within Anglo-Saxon communities.
- 46 For example, Dark, 2000: 97–103, and Baker, 2006.
- 47 Colgrave (ed. and trans.), 1956: 108–11; such an interpretation of this passage has been most recently advocated by Graham Jones, in Koch (ed.), 2006: 857. For the names, see Schram, 1950: 431, and Crowson *et al*, 2005: 298; see generally Cameron, 1980, and Gelling, 1993: 54, on names involving *walh* and similar being suggestive of the presence of Welsh-speakers into perhaps the mid-late eighth century. In addition, H. C. Darby has some possible evidence for there still being 'Britons' in the Fenland as late as the Late Saxon period: Darby, 1934: 192–4.
- 48 Coates, 2000: 162–4; Coates, 2007: 181; Coates, 2008: 83; Coates, 2009: 85–7; Schram, 1950: 430; Coates, 2005. For the Glen/Baston Ea (Edyke) in the medieval period and after, see Hayes and Lane, 1992: 161; Cameron, 1998: 50. Something similar to the Glen/Baston Ea situation can perhaps also be seen in the fact that there seem to be two district-names for the Lincolnshire Wash Silts: Holland and *\*Spald*. Schram also notes a lost *ad Cricum* in Freiston on the Wash Silts, which may also be relevant here as it contains the Archaic Welsh *cruc*, 'hill, mound, barrow' (Schram, 1950: 430; cf. Coates, 2007: 181, and Gelling and Cole, 2003: 159–63). See also the place-name Wykeham, above.
- 49 Hayes, 1988: 324.
- 50 On environmental change in the Fenland and its effects, see for example Crowson *et al*, 2005: 10, and Hayes and Lane, 1992: 213. On the end of the Roman state, compare Murphy, 1994: 37, on East Anglia; de-intensification may have played a particular role if the Fenland remained an imperial estate to the end of the Roman period.
- 51 For example, Hayes, 1988: 324, who refers to an abrupt and universal 'discontinuity between Roman and Saxon' (a 'profound discontinuity') which cannot be explained as a 'simple response to environmental change'. He further contends that the frequent close proximity of Saxon and Roman sites in the Fenland is not evidence for continuity but instead merely results from coincidence. This notion of a landscape 'mostly abandoned' by the Britons at the end of the Roman period has influenced later commentators, including Jones, 1996: 200, fn. 45, and Crowson *et al*, 2005, especially pp. 291–2.
- 52 See above, pp. 40–1.
- 53 See the discussion in Chapter One, above, pp. 41–3. See also, for example, Higham, 1992: 111–13 on a similar situation in Suffolk.
- 54 Everson, 1993: 93; Taylor, 1983: chapter 7. The difficulty in identifying Anglo-Saxon material from Romano-British sites has been an issue across the East Midlands, and one which has only really been fully addressed in recent years; thus if we look to neighbouring

- Leicestershire, it is striking that in the last 20 years there are numerous instances of Romano-British sites with ‘Anglo-Saxon’ material coming from them recorded in the *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society*, but if we examine the finds recorded in the 1970s and 1980s in the same journal, hardly any are noted. Note, with regard to the problems of misidentifying early Anglo-Saxon pottery as Romano-British or Iron Age, a subsequent examination of some of the Fenland Survey finds suggests that this project, despite its careful design, was certainly not immune from issues of misidentification: Jane Young, personal communication.
- 55 Indeed, Somerset appears to have remained aceramic from the end of the Roman period right through until the tenth century, whilst Devon is aceramic until the eleventh, causing significant issues in terms of identifying early medieval settlements in these areas: Rippon, 2009; Aston, 1994: 222.
- 56 See Chapter Three, above; Härke, 1992a; Härke, 1992b; Härke, 2003: 23; and Gelling, 1993, who suggests that there were still Welsh-speakers in eastern England in the mid-late eighth century on the basis of the place-name evidence. Darby, 1934: 192–4, details hints of post-Viking Britons in the Fenland, though we should be right to be sceptical here.
- 57 See, for example, Hamerow, 1991, on pre-Viking settlement drift; the examples are, obviously, all Anglo-Saxon, but we have no good reason to think the same imperatives wouldn’t have led to a similar drifting of post-Roman British sites in eastern England too. Certainly many of the early-middle Anglo-Saxon sites on the Fens are close-by Romano-British ones.
- 58 Hayes, 1988: 325; Crowson *et al*, 2005: 292, 293.
- 59 Crowson *et al*, 2005: 14, 211–16; the ‘by the early ninth century’ dating is given on p. 293.
- 60 One might compare here the situation on the heavy clays of Suffolk, where it has been suggested that the Britons who lived here only really began to acculturate in the eighth and ninth centuries: Härke, 2003: 23.
- 61 For example, Coates, 2008: 83; Coates, 2000: 163. Note also, to the east of Holland, the names Nene and (King’s) Lynn (see Coates, 2005: 317, on the Nene).
- 62 *Historia Brittonum*, chapter 56, ed. and trans. Morris, 1980: 73.
- 63 Jackson, 1945: 46; Green, 2007: 214–15; pp. 76–81, above. See Fig. 26 for the mouth of the Glen in the early Anglo-Saxon period. On the origins and date of Anglian settlement north of Hadrian’s Wall, see below, pp. 221–3.
- 64 For the cremation cemetery, see Mayes and Dean, 1976, on the excavation and Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 33387 on the full extent of this cemetery having been discovered. On the inhumation cemetery, see Williams, 2002: 350–2 (who also considers that the cremation cemetery may have originally been larger but destroyed by quarrying), and the Portable Antiquities Scheme. The two mid-fifth-century brooches, both of which consist only of the lower portions, are Portable Antiquities Scheme, NLM960 and NLM959. See also NLM975 for a fragment of a fifth-century great square-headed brooch which comes from another site in Baston; note, there are indications of two additional small burial sites in the parish.
- 65 If the two cemeteries are not to be associated with the *Spalde* then they might be alternatively – and very tentatively – linked to either the North *Gyrwe* or the *Wideriggas* (below, fn. 69). See, for example, Williams, 2002: 350–2, who relates the cemeteries to other evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity in the area around the junction of these Roman roads, suggesting that they belong in a south Kesteven context.
- 66 That neither cemetery appears to contain seventh-century burials is interesting; it is possible that the Anglo-Saxons of the *Spalde* could have ceased to use their distinctive rite by the seventh century under the influence of their British neighbours. Certainly this seems to have occurred in other areas where Anglo-Saxons lived alongside very large numbers of Britons, such as in the West Midlands, where it is suggested that the Anglo-Saxons abandoned their burial rite at the end of the sixth century as a result of them being converted to Christianity by the Britons: Sims-Williams, 1990: 64–83.
- 67 Crowson *et al*, 2005: 277–80, 283, 285–6.

- 68 The case for this road – the Baston Outgang – surviving into the medieval period has been made in Hallam, 1965: 111–13, but has been seriously challenged in Hayes and Lane, 1992: 172, who argue that the supposed references to it in the twelfth century and afterwards are illusory. However, whilst the evidence for it still existing in the twelfth century has been called into question, there is no especial reason to think that the road would not still have been used and maintained in the immediately post-Roman period, particularly given the evidence for the continued maintenance of the Roman and pre-Roman causeway roads across the Witham Fens and the location of the important names Spalding and Wykeham at the apparent siltland endpoint of the road.
- 69 It is possible that Stamford and its immediate vicinity belonged to the probably Middle Anglian *Wideriggas* – assessed at 600 hides in the ‘Tribal Hidage’ – if this population-group is correctly associated with the place-name Wittering (variously *Witheringaeige*, *Witheringham* and *Witeringa*) which is found only three miles to the south of Stamford, just over the county boundary: Dumville, 1989c: 226–7; Davies and Vierck, 1974: 233, 234, 292; Hart, 1971: 134, 152–3; Mills, 1991: 366. The most detailed discussion of this group is in Foard, 1985: 195–6 and fig. 5, where it is tentatively associated with Rutland and the adjacent parts of Northamptonshire and southern Lincolnshire.
- 70 For the names and forms, see Cameron, 1998: 14, 65–6, and Mills, 1991: 35, 178; an origin for all three of these names in a population-group called the *Billingas*, ‘the people of *Billa*’ – with *Billa* being either a personal-name or Old English *bill*, ‘sword’ – certainly seems far more credible than Victor Watts’ (2004: 56) suggestion that they were all independently generated from a place-name *\*Billing*, ‘place at/by the ridge’. For the link between this group and the *Bilmigas* of the ‘Tribal Hidage’, see for example Davies and Vierck, 1974: 234–6. On the boundaries of *\*Lindēs/Lindissi*, see above, pp. 116–25 and Fig. 20.
- 71 Davies and Vierck, 1974: 292; Sawyer, 1998: 221 – note, the MS C versions are given in the nominative plural form.
- 72 Sawyer, 1998: 49, 220–1; Rumble, 1994: 23.
- 73 Davies and Vierck, 1974: 239; David Roffe in Crowson *et al*, 2005: 280.
- 74 Yorke, 2000: 84–5; Davies and Vierck, 1974: 239–40; Fellows-Jensen, 1995: 69; Bassett, 1989b: 18–19, 21–3; Bailey, 1989: 114–19; Blair, 1989; Dumville, 1989a: 133–4; Dodgson, 1977: 36–7.
- 75 See Bassett, 1989b: 19 and 22, and Blair, 1989: 99 and 104, for maps of the likely extent of some of these *regiones* bearing *-ingas* names.
- 76 On the basis that Loveden Hill, Ancaster and Quarrington cremation cemeteries were all probably within the peripheral zone of *\*Lindēs*, as were probably Folkingham and Threkingham: above, pp. 116, 143 (fn. 2).
- 77 Note, the surviving *Hæstingas* place-names similarly seem to be located on the margins of their territory – Welch, 1989: 78.
- 78 Dickinson, 2004: 24–5; Davies and Vierck, 1974: 274.
- 79 I have followed, in producing this map, the methodology set out by Kevin Leahy in creating his gazetteer of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries from Lindsey: Leahy, 1993: 39–42. The non-metal-detected cemeteries to the south of Loveden Hill are missing from Leahy’s gazetteer and map (pp. 31–2), but this is because he was only concerned with Lindsey and the most northerly sites in Kesteven; however, this distribution has been carried over into other publications concerned with the whole of Lincolnshire or just with Kesteven, producing a somewhat skewed view of the archaeology of the region: Vince, 2001: 23; Dickinson, 2004: 25.
- 80 See above, p. 56, and especially Williams, 2002, and Williams, 2004. See Williams, 2004: 114–15, on the relationship between the large and small cemeteries in these territories. Note, it might well be wondered if some, at least, of these smaller and probably subordinate cemeteries didn’t include the burials of acculturating Britons: see Härke, 1992a and 1992b, on Britons in other parts of the country not being assigned the full normal Anglo-Saxon burial rites even after acculturation, and compare Scull, 1995: 78. Another group which might have been buried in such small cemeteries rather than the central urnfield might be any of John

- Hines' 'second wave' of late fifth-/early sixth-century Scandinavian immigrants (see Hines, 1984) who moved into already established Anglian territories.
- 81 The three cremation cemeteries (that is, those where cremation predominated rather than where it was a minority rite, as it is at a number of inhumation cemeteries) are Loveden Hill, Ancaster and Quarrington: Leahy, 1993: 31. See on Sleaford as a soke-centre and the focus of a large and probably Middle Saxon estate, Roffe, 1979, particularly 15–17 and fig. 7; Roffe, 2000b; and Pawley, 1988. Note that an estate at Sleaford is mentioned in a genuine Middle Saxon charter (S 1140) of 852: Sawyer, 1998: 231; Robertson, 1939, no. 7.
- 82 Leahy, 1993: 41; Sawyer, 1998: 217; Trollope, 1887: 98–100, especially p. 99. Trollope indicates both that cremations predominated and that, although the gravel pit where the finds were initially made (see Creasey, 1825: 106–07) lay to the north of the Sleaford-Grantham road, the cemetery extended 'over some portion of the field on the other [southern] side of that road' too. See also Dickinson, 2004: 42–3, who identifies two possible gravel pits north of the road which may be that referred to; whichever is the correct one, the implication is of a very sizeable cemetery. A second cemetery ('Quarrington II'), containing 15 inhumations, was excavated around 400 yards to the west in 2000–2001; this is likely to be either a separate site or a separate inhumation-only cluster of the original cemetery, see Dickinson, 2004: 42.
- 83 Leahy, 1993: 41; Sawyer, 1998: 217; and Geake, 1999: 13, who argues for at least one grave belonging to the early seventh century. See further on this cemetery Thomas, 1887, and Mike Turland's unpublished paper 'The Anglian Cemetery at Sleaford'. On the size, Thomas excavated 242 graves containing 247 bodies along with 6 cremations, and estimated that he had excavated less than one third of the cemetery which therefore contained 'at least six hundred': Thomas, 1887: 385. It should be noted here that there are also various other graves from Sleaford which may suggest additional burial clusters, helping to confirm the centrality of this locality: see the Gazetteer of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. Quite why this exceptionally large cemetery existed just to the east of a probably similarly large and contemporary cremation cemetery is a matter of speculation (perhaps based around the two groups mentioned in fn. 80), but its existence does offer additional strong support for the Sleaford-Quarrington area being an extremely significant social/sacred/funerary focus for the region.
- 84 Potentially beginning early in the fifth century too. Not only is cremation an early rite, but just to the north of Sleaford there has been found a 'heavy bronze cicada shaped mount, probably of Germanic type and of late 4th–5th century date': Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record, 65301.
- 85 Roffe, 1979, particularly 15–17 and fig. 7; Roffe, 2000b; Pawley, 1988; Pawley, 1997: 68–9; Sawyer, 1998: 231; Robertson, 1939, no. 7. What the exact relationship is between the sokes and the Sleaford estate mentioned in the charter is open to debate.
- 86 Roffe, 2000c; Roffe, 1977, especially p. 31.
- 87 Roffe, 1986. Such an estate could have been created at the supposed first foundation of the site in honour of St Æthelthryth in the late seventh century, or perhaps most credibly when King Æthelred of Mercia entrusted the site to St Werburg, his niece, at some point before the end of the seventh century (she died c. 700 in this community): see Roffe, 1986, and further below, p. 187.
- 88 Blair, 1989: 102–05; Blair, 2005: 154–5.
- 89 Huggett, 1988: 64–5; Arnold, 1997: 103–05.
- 90 Huggett, 1988: 68–71; Arnold, 1997: 105.
- 91 Arnold, 1997: 121; Huggett, 1988: 89, 91; Hamerow, 2005: 285.
- 92 Huggett, 1988: 64–6, 91; Hamerow, 2005: 285; Arnold, 1997: 123.
- 93 Roffe, 1979, particularly fig. 7; Roffe, 2000b; Daubney, 2009. My thanks to Adam Daubney for allowing me access to the unpublished text of his 2009 lecture to the CBA; page numbers cited below are taken from the printout of this. The location of the 'South Lincolnshire' findspot has been previously narrowed down to the 'Sleaford area' in Leahy, 2007b: 130.
- 94 See especially Ulmschneider, 2000: 64; Leahy, 2007b: 130.
- 95 Ulmschneider, 2000: 63–5 (she records 90 coins in total, some of which are not *sceattas*); Vince, 2006: 527; Daubney, 2009: 3, and personal communication. For examples, see

- Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-DEC3F4 (Series C, c. 680–710); LIN-EEFB05 (Series E, variant D, c. 700–735); LIN-B3D8D0 ('Saroaldo' group, c. 705–715); LIN-DEE7D1 (a copper alloy copy of a Series E *sceatta*, c. 680–710); and LIN-DE6F30 (Series J, c. 710–750).
- 96 Daubney, 2009: 1–2, 6. See Cameron, 1998: 49, for the early forms (*Gerewic*, *Gerewik*, *Gerwyk*) – he sees the first element as a personal name (*\*Gæra*) rather than Old English *gāra*, 'triangular plot of land', and treats *wīc* as having one of its other meanings. The first is certainly very possible (cf. the trading settlement at Ipswich: *Gipeswic*, 'the *wīc* belonging to *\*Gip*'), though Adam Daubney argues for a derivation from *gāra* on the basis of the shape formed by the surrounding parish boundaries; on the meaning of *wīc*, the revelation that Garwick is the location of the 'South Lincolnshire Productive Site' makes it virtually certain that it has the meaning 'trading settlement, trading centre' here (compare *Hamwic*, Southampton, and the other *wīc* sites). Ekwall, 1960: 192, lists the site as 'Garrick' and suggests the first element is *gāra*, noting that the attested spellings of this element would indicate that the place-name has been 'Scandinavianized' at some point.
- 97 Daubney, 2009: 2, notes ten *tremisses* plus one additional recent find (July 2009) via personal communication; the Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds (EMC), based at the Fitzwilliam Museum (<http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/dept/coins/emc/>), lists the gold shilling – 2000.0537 – and twelve *tremisses*, not including the most recent find, hence the total given here (note, one of the coins may have been minted in Ipswich rather than on the continent: 2000.0069); Sawyer, 1998: 258, lists the gold blank flan. See also Vince, 2006: 527, and Abdy and Williams, 2006: 44–5, 49, 52, 53, 55, 61. Leahy, 2007b: 158, notes two gold shillings and eight *tremisses* from Lindsey; using Sawyer's list, the EMC, the PAS and Abdy and Williams, the total of *tremisses* from Lindsey can be increased to twelve, including one *tremissis* of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice, 582–602 (Portable Antiquities Scheme LVPL-9C93A2).
- 98 Style I die: Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-4F6CE7; Daubney, 2009: 2. Other finds include a sword pommel (Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-7B7528) which was possibly originally gold-plated.
- 99 Abdy and Williams, 2006: 54; Vince, 2006: 527; Ulmschneider, 2000: 64, 70. The gold *tremissis* is Corpus of Early Medieval Coin Finds item 1998.0041; this database also lists 11 eighth-century *sceattas*, one ninth-century *styca*, and two coins of Offa from 'near Sleaford'.
- 100 For example, Hamerow, 2005: 285.
- 101 See above, Chapters Two and Three, especially pp. 104–06.
- 102 With regard to the Sleaford-Quarrington district, not only do we have a probably sizeable cremation cemetery and associated territory located some considerable distance from Lincoln, but all three types of post-Roman British metalwork – Class 1 brooches (Folkingham and Osbournby), Type G brooches (Sleaford and Osbournby) and hanging bowls (Sleaford, Walcot, and Osbournby) – are found in this region. See further pp. 62–5 for the implications of these items.
- 103 Above, pp. 91, 92–3, 101, 113 (fn. 74). Is there some link between the two Class 1 brooches from Folkingham; the group-name which underlies Threekingham and almost certainly pre-dates c. 600 given the origins of its first element; the Welsh-speakers referenced in the place-name Walcot and the escutcheon from a sixth-/seventh-century hanging bowl found there; and the Class 1 brooch, Type G brooch, and hanging bowl fragment found at Osbournby, given that all four parishes abut each other? This is certainly an extremely intriguing coincidence of evidence, if nothing else. The other two British brooches from Anglo-Saxon graves in this region are from the Sleaford cemetery, as is the other hanging bowl: Dickinson, 1982: 48, 50, 52 and figs. 1–4; Bruce-Mitford, 2005: 26, 34–5, 212–14.
- 104 Elsdon, 1997, especially pp. 39, 76.
- 105 Wachter, 1995: 40; Yorke, 2003a: 396–7.
- 106 Based on Ben Whitwell's map (Whitwell, 2001: 15), on the assumption that most Romano-British 'small towns' in Lincolnshire are now known and thus an analysis of likely territories for these 'towns' using Thiessen polygons is legitimate; as Helena Hamerow observes, in

- such circumstances territories reconstructed using these techniques can correspond well with reality: Hamerow, 2002: 101–02.
- 107 Daubney, 2009: 7. Sawyer, 1998: 258, lists two ‘stater’ coins, the third is the recent find Portable Antiquities Scheme LIN-F4A8B4. It is tempting to compare the finds of Late Iron Age gold coins, evidence for a Romano-British votive shrine, and the presence of a sixth-century cemetery, with the Iron Age/Romano-British/Anglo-Saxon site at Lissingleys discussed above, pp. 128–32. The chief difference seems to be the use the site was put to subsequently: a ‘wīc’ here and a meeting-place at Lissingleys. There is also more Romano-British material currently known from the latter site, though Roman and Iron Age material continues to be found at Garwick.
- 108 See further above, pp. 116–25.
- 109 A date of separation before c. 690 would also be helpful with regard to explaining why York never claimed ecclesiastical authority south of the Witham, see pp. 118, 143 (fn. 9).
- 110 Maddicott, 2005, especially 16–21; Cowie, 2001, especially p. 195. The documentary *terminus ante quem* for the re-establishment of full Mercian control over *Lundenwic* comes in 733, when Æthelbald of Mercia granted remission on tolls due on one ship ‘*in portu Lundeniae*’ to the Bishop of Rochester.
- 111 Leahy, 2007b: 159. Ulmschneider, 2000: 78; Blackburn, 1993: 83.
- 112 Daubney, 2009: 3; Maddicott, 2005: 9–10 – of course, Middle Saxon coins are almost certainly easier to recover from the Garwick site than they are from *Lundenwic*.
- 113 Ulmschneider, 2000: 63–5, 66; Daubney, 2009: 4.
- 114 Maddicott, 2005: 9–10; Ulmschneider, 2000: 66.
- 115 Ulmschneider, 2000: 63–5 (especially fig. 6), 67–9; Leahy, 2007b: 129–30.
- 116 Whether Garwick ever made the move from being a ‘trading site’ to being a permanent trading settlement – as found at London, Ipswich and Southampton – is impossible to say without detailed field-walking and excavation; there is a significant quantity of lead melt, spindle whorls and weights from the site, but the Fen Edge location and lack of subsequent significant settlement may suggest that it did not. On the whole, Garwick appears to be an unusually tightly controlled market on a marginal site, rather than a true trading settlement.
- 117 Pawley, 1988; Pawley, 1997: 69. See also Roffe, 2000b. On the name Quarrington, see Cameron, 1998: 99, and Mills, 1991: 266.
- 118 As to why there is no evidence for Garwick continuing to function as a major regional trading site after the middle of the eighth century, various explanations seem possible (Daubney, 2009: 4–5); one additional possibility is that, if this was a royal Mercian site, then the kings of Mercia may have simply begun to favour *Lundenwic* once they had established full control over it (by 733).
- 119 Leahy, 1993: 36; Leahy, 2007b: 48–9; Leahy, 2007a: 6; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Everson, 1993: 98; Williams, 2002; Williams, 2004.
- 120 On Thiessen polygons, compare Dark, 1994: 113–15, and Hamerow, 2002: 101–02. It might also be wondered whether Skegness/*Tric* ought to have its own polygon too, on account of its probable Late Roman fort and the place-name evidence discussed in Owen and Coates, 2003; note also the recent find of a late sixth- to mid-seventh-century gold *tremissis* – EMC 2001.0741 – and the significant quantity of eighth- and ninth-century metalwork from ‘near Skegness’ (Ulmschneider, 2000: 65).
- 121 Above, pp. 55–8, 73–5.
- 122 Sawyer, 1998: 84, 125–6, 134–6, 138; Leahy, 2007b: 49, 113; Hadley, 2006: 90–2; Insley, 2006: 251; and especially Turner, 2000.
- 123 Cf. Balkwill, 1993.
- 124 Williams, 2002: 352–5; Thompson, 1956: 189–92, especially p. 190.
- 125 Everson, 1993: 98; Roffe, 2001; Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 43906.
- 126 Roffe, 2001: 39; Cameron, 1998: 82; Cameron, 1996a: 26.
- 127 Green, 2008: 16, fn. 72; Sawyer, 1998: 51; Cameron, 1996a: 25–6; Owen, 1997b: 263, 267; Owen, 1980; Owen, 1997a. I would thus consider Ludborough wapentake to be a late creation, carved out of Louthesk, as its size and relationship to the northern boundary of

- Louthesk would suggest; similarly, it is not implausible that the parts of the wapentake of Calcewath north of Meers Bank were an addition to this wapentake: see further Fig. 37 and Roffe, 2001: 39, for the wapentake boundaries.
- 128 It is perhaps worth observing here that although Louth takes its name from the river Lud (*\*hlūde*, ‘the loud one’), North Cockerington (*Cocrinton* at Domesday) is located further downstream and seems to preserve the British name for the river in its etymology, ‘the village, *tūn*, associated with the (river) Cocker’, as Cocker is a Celtic river-name: Cameron, 1998: 32, 82. Given that place-names involving *tūn* are now considered to be chiefly of a mid-eighth-century or later date (see Cox, 1976), this suggests that both the British and Old English names for the river were in use throughout much of the pre-Viking period. In this context it is similarly interesting to note that a spring dedicated to St Helen lies in the heart of the town and that one of the tributaries of the Lud – the Crake, which runs along Welton le Wold parish boundary – appears to bear a Celtic river-name (Ekwall, 1928: 261, 101-02). See the Cleatham cemetery for another major cremation cemetery which has potential evidence for post-Roman Britons living in its immediate vicinity: Green, 2008: 24, 28 and fn. 114.
- 129 Leahy, 2007b: 111–14; Cox, 1994–5; above, pp. 74–5. It is certainly conceivable that Yarborough Camp could have always been the meeting-place for the Elsham group, particularly as the cemetery site is not topographically distinct, unlike those at (for example) Loveden Hill, West Keal and Louth. Although not within modern Lincolnshire, the Newark Millgate cemetery is also relevant here as it forms part of the ‘ring’ of cremation cemeteries around Lincoln. The evidence from here accords well with the relationship described above between cremation cemeteries and wapentakes, with Newark being the centre of an Anglo-Scandinavian wapentake. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that the wapentake of Newark was actually independent of Nottinghamshire before *c.* 950 and possibly attached to Lincolnshire: D. Roffe, 1987/2002: chapter 8, fn. 21.
- 130 Leahy, 2007a: 6; Leahy, 2007b: 49; Roffe, 2001: 39.
- 131 See Everson, 1993: 97–8.
- 132 Leahy, 2007b: 93–6; Everson, 1993: 97–8; Sawyer, 1998: 52–3.
- 133 See especially above, pp. 173–85 and also Pawley, 1988: 37. The northern half of Aveland wapentake also looks to have been originally dependent upon Sleaford-Quarrington, though this relationship may have been severed by the probable carving up of the *regio* of the *Billingas* in the late seventh century by the Mercian rulers (above, pp. 185–8).
- 134 On the location, see Williams, 2002: 355, and Williams, 2004: 111, 119–20.
- 135 Hines, 1996: 262–3 (figs. 17.1 and 17.2), phases the early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries known to the mid-1990s into those which were certainly in existence by *c.* 525 and those which were certainly in existence by *c.* 560. An examination of the finds from the most recently discovered sites (listed in the Gazetteer) gives us no good reason to dispute this conclusion; although there are a very small number of individual ‘early’ items from the north and south of the cemetery group, these may well be heirloom pieces (see above, p. 69, fn. 29, on the North Hykeham brooch) and the early cemeteries are still all in this central zone, with Loveden itself being the most obvious example. In terms of the early Anglo-Saxon centrality of Loveden Hill, it may also be relevant that there seem to have been some very high-status burials in this cemetery in the seventh century, as indicated by finds of a Coptic bowl and a sceptre: Williams, 2004: 123–4; Page, 1986; Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 30280.
- 136 Williams, 2004: 123–4; Williams, 2002: 353.
- 137 For the probable meeting-place of Threo wapentake, Spellar Wood (first recorded in the early twelfth century), see Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record 35331; Roffe, 2001: 39, maps the medieval wapentake boundary here.
- 138 Portable Antiquities Scheme NLM6073 and NLM963; Williams, 2002: 356–7; Williams, 2004: 121. See also Williams, 2004: 114 and fig. 5.7, on pyre sites.
- 139 See Leahy, 2007a: 12, for the argument that we are now aware of most – if not all – significant cremation cemeteries in the region; as such, the Great Ponton pyre site seems likely to be associated with Loveden Hill to the north (although there is a mixed cremation

- and inhumation cemetery at Woolsthorpe, this is still a significant distance from Great Ponton and it is likely to have only served a local community).
- 140 See, for example, Courtney, 1981: 94, on the general issues with assuming that all ‘cemetery groups’ relate to only a single population-group.
- 141 This expansion is discussed above, pp. 57–8. See above, p. 193 and fn. 135, on the phasing and dating of cemeteries in this region. All of these cemeteries fall to the north of Loveden wapentake, which may be significant (see Roffe, 2001: 39).
- 142 One possible problem with treating these southern cemeteries as a single coherent ‘group’ focussed on Loveden Hill is that the small Ancaster cremation cemetery, containing 40 or so burials, has been considered indicative of an early Anglo-Saxon ‘central place’ in its own right: Williams, 2002: 347–50. However, this cemetery does seem to have been far smaller in scale than that at Loveden Hill and it could perhaps therefore be treated as a subordinate cemetery within the eastern edge of Loveden Hill’s territory, potentially laying claim to the Roman fort there. One might compare here the small cremation cemetery of Wold Newton (containing 20 or so burials) which probably lay on the northern edge of the territory dependent upon South Elkington-Louth, and the possible small cremation cemetery just to the north of Hibaldstow Roman ‘small town’ which was almost certainly within the territory of Cleatham-Kirton in Lindsey.
- 143 See Davies and Vierck, 1974: 239; David Roffe in Crowson *et al*, 2005: 280. On the date of the *-ingas* names, see Cameron, 1996b: 71.
- 144 Cameron, 1998: 2 (Alvingham), 53 (Grayingham), 88 (Messingham), and 133 (Waddingham). As was noted already (pp. 172–73), we can only really be confident in seeing an *-ingas* group as having more than local import when we have several instances of it in place-names or a documentary reference to a *regio* named after it. The three *Billingas* names are the only clearly convincing case of this from within *Lindissi*, although the two neighbouring *Wintringas* place-names (Winteringham and Winterton) are potentially interesting given the coincidence of the name *Wint(r)a* in the *Lindissi* royal genealogy (above, pp. 90–1). Whilst we do have two settlements or estates named after groups called the *Willingas* (Cherry Willingham and South Willingham), they are around twelve miles apart and a coincidence cannot be easily discounted. Similarly, there are two settlements or estates linked to groups called the *Wifelingas* (Willingham by Stow and North Willingham), but these are eighteen miles apart and the *Wifelingas* in both instances are perhaps better treated not as early Anglian ‘population-groups’ but rather as *Kultverbände* under the leadership of pagan priests (Old English *\*Wifel*): Insley, 2000b: 426, but cf. Fellows-Jensen, 2004.
- 145 See Chapter Four, pp. 125–35, above. There does, for example, seem to be an unusual amount of evidence for the survival of the names of (Romano-)British ‘central places’ in the Lincoln region. Thus the name Lincoln derives directly from the Late British *\*Lindgolun*; the first element of the name Horncastle directly translates the first element of the British name of this site (Old English *horn-*, British *banno-*); Lissingleys looks to derive from Late British/Archaic Welsh *\*liss-* (see Welsh *llys*: ‘court, hall, parliament, gathering of nobles, etc.’); the name of the fort at Skegness looks to have been preserved in the eleventh-century place-name *Tric* (< Latin *Traiectus*); and the name Kirmington may well derive from the British name of Kirmington ‘small Roman town’. It is also perhaps worth noting here that Caistor Roman fort and town has a *wīchām* (< Latin *vicus*) close-by it, which is equally suggestive.
- 146 Potter, 1989: 171–2; see, for example, Courtney, 1981: 96, for the suggestion that Peterborough lay at the heart of at least the North *Gyrwe*.
- 147 Above, pp. 182–3, 206 (fn. 103).
- 148 Bishop, 2000: 1–2. On this *regio*, see above, pp. 121–23.

## Chapter Six (pp. 211–34)

- 1 An early instance is found in Gervase of Tilbury's *Otia Imperialia*, II.25, edd. and trans. Banks and Binns. 2002: 528–9, where he tries to solve the apparent similarity by claiming that Lincoln was once called Lindisfarne.
- 2 See above, pp. 53–4 and Green, 2008: 3–4 and fn. 15; T. Charles-Edwards and P. Wormald, 'Addenda' in Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 207–43 at pp. 234–5; Ekwall, 1960: 298; Watts, 2004: 374; Coates and Breeze, 2000: 247–8.
- 3 See, for example, Watts, 2004: 374; Koch (ed.), 2006: 1158; Cox, 1976: 24; Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 234.
- 4 See Koch (ed.), 2006: 1158; *Historia Brittonum*, chapters 63 and 65, ed. and trans. Morris, 1980: 79, 80; Coates and Breeze, 2000: 241–2; and Breeze, 2005.
- 5 Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 234.
- 6 As in Watts, 2004: 374; Koch (ed.), 2006: 1158.
- 7 Watts, 2004: 374.
- 8 See below, p. 221; Jackson, 1953: 696.
- 9 The *-nd-* stage 'is only found in eastern names that may easily have been borrowed well before 500': indeed, it had already become *-nn-* in the British-loan place-name (King's) Lynn (< \**lindon*), which can scarcely have been first encountered by Anglian immigrants much after 500: Sims-Williams, 1990b: 247; Sims-Williams, 2003: 283; Jackson, 1953: 513. Compare, for example, the diphthongisation of Late British/Archaic Welsh *-ē-* to *-ui-*, which was only complete in Welsh writing by the second half of the eighth century, but must have occurred orally in the early sixth century: Sims-Williams, 1990b; Sims-Williams, 2003, especially pp. 281–90.
- 10 Coates and Breeze, 2001: 243–59.
- 11 The group-name *Lindisware* occurs in 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' MS E, s.a. 678, ed. Irvine, 2004: 33, and trans. Whitelock *et al*, 1961: 22.
- 12 Insley and Eggers, 2001: 475; Green, 2008: 3–4, fn. 15.
- 13 See, for example, Brooks, 1989a: 68, 69, 72; Dumville, 1989a: 127.
- 14 Gelling, 1989: 31–2, especially 32; Coates and Breeze, 2000: 243–4.
- 15 As with Gelling, 1989: 32, whose etymology seems to have been the product of desperation rather than conviction, and is not credible for this and other reasons (above, p. 68, fn. 14)
- 16 See especially the discussion by Charles-Edwards and Wormald in Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 235; also above, pp. 53–4, and Green, 2008: 3–4. The key point is that *farán* can certainly refer to people who undertake or have undertaken temporary journeys after which they return/returned to their homes, but it can also refer to people who have undertaken permanent journeys (migrations) too: Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 235. See, for example, the 'Laws of Ine', ed. and trans. Attenborough, 1922: 56, 57; the 'Vespasian Psalter', 10.2, ed. Sweet, 1885: 198, 461; and the 'Old English *Exodus*', line 555. In light of its meaning and the continental cognates cited below, the name is likely to have been a very early coinage, perhaps either as a general collective name for the immigrants engaged by the Britons of \**Lindēs* to defend their territory (note, there is evidence for links between the Lincolnshire cremation cemeteries from the earliest phases of these sites: Leahy, 2007b: 50–1; Leahy, 2007a: 127–8) or, alternatively, as that of a single immigrant group which later took control of \**Lindēs* and so had their name more widely adopted (*i.e.* the group which provided the royal line of *Lindissi*, see above pp. 89–91).
- 17 'Chronicle of Fredegar', IV.41, 44 and 55, ed. and trans. Wallace-Hadrill, 1960; Murray, 1983: 89–97; Innes, 2006: 72; Lupoi, 2000: 81; Halsall, 1998: 151; Goffart, 1989: 114.
- 18 See, for example, Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 235; Herlihy, 1985: 45–6; Goffart, 1980: 252–8; Murray, 1983: 89–97; Althoff and Carroll, 2004: 30; Tabacco, 1989: 93–4; Burns, 1984: 167–8.
- 19 Malone, 1962: 24. Note, however, that whilst this might offer further evidence in support of *farán* as a credible and legitimate group-name element, it probably has a different meaning from 'the people who migrated, moved permanently' in this instance.

- 20 Coates and Breeze. 2000: 242.
- 21 Perhaps, like New York, the site was ‘so good they named it twice’? (Gerard Kenny, *New York, New York*, RCA 1978).
- 22 Coates and Breeze, 2000: 249–55, partly inspired by the etymological speculations of Symeon of Durham in the twelfth century (*Libellus de Exordio*, II.5).
- 23 See Coates and Breeze, 2000: 250–5, for some acknowledgement of these and other issues. Here it is admitted that the name *\*Lindis-feranna* is – if it ever existed – likely to be ‘unique, created in a special way’ and the reader is invited to decide whether the supposed necessity for and plausibility of the etymology proposed can justify such ‘specialness’ (p. 252). If there ever was a stream called *Lindis*, then its name is surely more likely to simply derive from that of the island than *vice versa*, particularly given that *Lindis* as a standalone stream-name is etymologically dubious.
- 24 Coates and Breeze, 2000: 243. With regard to the plural ‘domains, territories’ (*feranna*), this is required in order to construct an hypothetical Archaic Irish form which would produce the recorded Old English forms with a final *-a* (Coates and Breeze, 2000: 254–5), but one struggles to see why *ferann* (‘domain, territory’) would be plural in this hypothetical place-name other than for the convenience of the etymologist, despite Richard Coates’ speculations (pp. 252, 254).
- 25 Needless to say, this rejection of an Irish etymology for Lindisfarne is a further argument against the theory that we can somehow have the group-name *Lindisfaran* as derivative of the place-name Lindisfarne, as this theory depends upon there being a credible non-Old English etymology for the island-name. Note, Coates’ proposed Irish etymology for the Farne Islands (Coates and Breeze, 2000: 255–6) cannot be used in support of his Lindisfarne etymology, as it is derived from it, and if the latter is rejected then so must the former be too; however, his suggestion that their name means simply the islands ‘of (Lindis)farne’ may be worth consideration, whatever the origins of the name Lindisfarne.
- 26 This Old English etymology has been frequently suggested and discussed, although its implications have not usually been followed through: Ekwall, 1960: 298–9; Mills, 1991: 211; Watts, 2004: 374; Sawyer, 1998: 47; Bassett, 1989a: 8 and 30. The only real case to be offered against it has been that of Coates (in Coates and Breeze, 2000: 241–59), which depends fundamentally upon the group-name *Lindisfaran* having never really existed and instead being falsely derived from the place-name Lindisfarne, a position rejected above; otherwise there are only some very minor possible issues with a few variants of the name Lindisfarne (discussed in Coates and Breeze, 2000: 246, 253), and these are of debatable significance and meaning.
- 27 For example, Ekwall, 1960: 299, and Bassett, 1989a: 30, for this treatment of *Lindisfaran* within the name Lindisfarne; see also Watts, 2004: 374, who offered ‘the island of the travellers to and from Lindsey’ as an alternative to his British etymology of Lindisfarne.
- 28 Bassett, 1989a: 30, speculates that frequent voyaging to and fro as a result of trading activity might explain this, but this doesn’t really seem very credible given the early period we are here concerned with (if the name Lindisfarne derives from an Old English population-group name *Lindisfaran*, it seems unlikely to have had its origins after 635, when the island was given to Bishop Aidán for a monastery: Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.3).
- 29 Charles-Edwards and Wormald in Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 234–5; Ekwall, 1960: 298–9.
- 30 On the Lindisfarne region, see, for example, Scull, 1992, especially pp. 60–1; Miket, 1980; Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 1–9, 103–6; Cramp, 1983; Scull and Harding, 1990; Dark, 2000: 205–7; Ziegler, 2001. The evidence for sixth-century activity in this area derives from both mortuary and settlement archaeology. Whilst there is some debate over whether the earliest stages at Yeavinger were British or Anglian (although Scull’s argument for an Anglian origin appears persuasive), both models have the site as an Anglian settlement in the mid- to late sixth century: Scull, 1992: 60; Hope-Taylor, 1977: 150–8, 310–13. Although such debates about origins are, due to the nature of the evidence from these sites, possible for other early Bernician settlements too – for example, the sixth-century site at Thirlings –, the presence of *Grubenhäuser* at these settlements is (as Scull has pointed out) indicative of Anglian

- occupation: Scull, 1992: 61. On the nature of the Anglo-Saxon activity around Hadrian's Wall, see Dark, 1992; Dark, 2000: 193–200; Snyder, 1998: 168–73. With regard to the early Anglo-Saxon material found in the area between the Lindisfarne region and the Wall, the 15 inhumations at Howick Heugh (Northumberland) can be no more closely dated than the early Anglo-Saxon period generally and are unlikely to antedate the seventh century (Miket, 1980: 293, 295, 298), and the same is probably true too of the handful of burials from Great Tosson (Northumberland): Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 2; Cramp, 1983: 269; Miket, 1980: 294, 298; though cf. Lucy, 1999: 34–5, 39.
- 31 This is suggested in Higham, 1993: 82; Higham, 1986: 254, 256–60.
- 32 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.3, III.6, III.12, and III.16. Bede makes it clear that he considered Bamburgh (named, he says, after an early Bernician queen of c. 600) to have been 'the royal city' of seventh-century Bernicia – both an *urbs* and a *ciuitas* – and his notice of the granting of neighbouring Lindisfarne to the Ionan missionaries who were closely associated with the Bernician royal house implies that this island was also a significant royal possession in the early seventh century. Wood, 2006: 76, 79–80, 83, sees the Lindisfarne-Bamburgh area as the earliest Northumbrian centre, with the Wall/Tyne area becoming key in the latter part of the seventh century, taking over from Bamburgh. Interestingly, Bede also names two important Bernician 'royal palaces', Yeavering and *Maelmin*, both of which seem to have been located just inland of Lindisfarne and Bamburgh: *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.14. For the *Historia Brittonum* references, see chapters 61 and 63, ed. Morris, 1980: 37, 38, 78, and 79).
- 33 On Yeavering, see Hope-Taylor, 1977, and Scull, 1992. See especially Ziegler, 2001, on Bamburgh (with a potential total of around 1000 burials), and Smith, 1991, on Sprouston as a late sixth-/early seventh-century Anglian royal centre with a cemetery containing at least 380 burials. Miket, 1980, and Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 1, discuss the other known Bernician cemeteries, which are far smaller in scale; Norton is one of the largest, with 120 burials, but it is located well to the south of Hadrian's Wall.
- 34 It should be noted here that Higham, 1993: 82, has suggested that the statement in *Historia Brittonum* that a mid-sixth-century Bernician king named Ida *iunxit Dinguayrði guurth Berneich*, 'joined Bamburgh to Bernicia' (§61: Morris, 1980: 37, 78) means that the core of Bernicia lay elsewhere, and therefore that Ida was expanding into this region from southern Bernicia. However, even if this ninth-century legend could be relied on to recount events which occurred three hundred years earlier, this is by no means a necessary conclusion. For example, the statement could mean rather that Bamburgh was part of Ida's original territory and from it he conquered the British kingdom of *Berneich*, so that he thus could be said to have 'joined Bamburgh to *Berneich*'. Indeed, even if it does mean that Bamburgh was a secondary possession, then the 'original' core to which Ida – if he existed – was adding could simply be the island of Lindisfarne. In the light of all this, any attempt to overturn this rejection of a land-based migration from the Wall on the basis of this statement in *Historia Brittonum* is unlikely to be credible.
- 35 This is particularly the case given that Bede places the origins of the Bernician kingdom in the mid-sixth century and associates it with Ida: Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V.24. See also the Northumbrian king-list found in the 'Moore Memoranda', which seems to confirm this dating: Blair, 1950. Whilst a mid-ninth-century chronicle fragment says that Ida's grandfather, Oesa/Oessa, was the first to come to Britain, too much has sometimes been made of this. Even if we had complete confidence in our accounts of Oessa and Ida and the historicity of these annals, this chronicle couldn't be used to argue that (contrary to the archaeological evidence) Bernician settlement began two generations before Ida, only that Ida's ancestors arrived somewhere in Britain – not at all necessarily Northumbria – c. 500. However, it might well be suspected that this is not a 'genuine' Bernician legend at all, never mind an accurate historical record. The name Oesa/Oessa can hardly be separated from the name Oese/Ossa that occurs as a spelling of the name Oisc, the ancestor of the *Oiscingas* rulers of Kent, around whom 'first migrant' traditions certainly were gathered. In consequence, this supposed grandfather of Ida needs to be viewed with considerable suspicion, and such a borrowing would fit in with other apparent attempts to tie Bernician

- origins in with Kentish ones, as seen in the *Historia Brittonum*, chapters 38 and 56. See further Dumville, 1973; Higham, 1993: 77; Brooks, 1989a: 59–60, 63.
- 36 See Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III.6, III.12, and III.16, on Bamburgh and its status, and above, fn. 32.
- 37 J. N. L. Myres is one of the few who have explicitly recognized this implication of a derivation of *Lindisfarnae/Lindisfarena ea* from *Lindisfaran* + *ēg*: Myres, 1986: 199. Ida is first named as the ultimate ancestor of the Bernician royal dynasty in Bede's early eighth-century *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V.24.
- 38 It is occasionally suggested that the *Idingas* could have come to Lindisfarne-Bamburgh from the kingdom of Deira – as by Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 9 – but there is no early evidence in favour of this proposition, in contrast to the notion that the *Idingas* were *Lindisfaran*.
- 39 Rollason, 2003: 50–1; Wood, 2006, especially pp. 79–80, 83–4.
- 40 Wood, 2006, especially pp. 71–3; Blair, 2005: 88.
- 41 Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, V.21; Insley, 2000a: 38.
- 42 Above, pp. 152–5.
- 43 Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 1, 3; Smith, 1991: 280–1; Ziegler, 2001; Miket, 1980: 295, for Howick Heugh. On the boundary between Bernicia and Deira, see Blair, 1984: essay V; Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 6; and Wood, 2006: 77–9. The number of people buried in this cemetery may have been greater than reported, if antiquarian records of at least one body (with artefacts) being found in this area in the early nineteenth century relate to this cemetery: Brewster, 1829: 10.
- 44 As noted by Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 9.
- 45 Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 9 and fig. 1, for the location of the cemetery relative to Billingham; Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de Exordio*, ii.5–6, iii.20, ed. and trans. Rollason, 2000: 92–4, 98–9, 198–200; Rollason also notes – p. 94 – an eighth- and a ninth-century grave-marker from Billingham church). On place-name chronologies, see for example Cox, 1972–3; Kuurman, 1974–5; and Gelling, 1988b: 111–12.
- 46 As Mills, 1991: 35, and Ekwall, 1960: 43, *pace* Watts, 2004: 56.
- 47 Above, pp. 172–88. See, for example, Woolf, 2000, on sub-groups within larger groups being able to have their own identities.
- 48 Sherlock and Welch, 1992: 105.
- 49 Higham, 1993: 66–7; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.13; Loveluck, 1996: 29–30. See also Williams, 2002.
- 50 Higham, 1993: 67; Loveluck, 1996: 29. The links between the cemeteries have been recently discussed by Kevin Leahy in Leahy, 2007b: 50–1, 101, and 2007a: 127–8. See also Myres, 1937, and Arnold, 1983.
- 51 Ekwall, 1960: 432–3; Mills, 1991: 175, 303–04. Spalding Moor was drained in the eighteenth century and it is now chiefly remembered by the place-name Holme on Spalding Moor: Strickland, 1812: 29, 199; Sheahan and Whellan, 1856: I, 576 and 584. It was partially mapped by John Cary on his map of the East Riding of Yorkshire, published in Cary, 1787.
- 52 Above, pp. 156–71. It is certainly tempting to wonder whether the Sancton-Baston links might not help to explain and/or reflect the presence of *Spaldingas* in the Sancton area.
- 53 We might also mention here the place-name Wintringham in North Yorkshire, found only around two miles to the south-west of the significant early Anglo-Saxon settlement and cemetery complex at West Heslerton, which seems to refer to a settlement of the *Wintringas* (Ekwall, 1960: 525; Mills, 1991: 364 – note, whilst the name Wintringham is likely to have been coined in the early Anglo-Saxon period, Heslerton probably belongs to a later period, see Cox, 1976 and above). The personal-name *Wintra* occurs more than once in an Anglo-Saxon context and so an independent coinage of the group-name *Wintringas* in Deira is certainly not impossible; however, if the *Wintringas* mentioned in the Lincolnshire place-names Winteringham and Winterton were indeed a significant group within *Lindissi* (see above, pp. 90–1), then this would constitute yet another intriguing coincidence to add to those discussed previously. See also below, fn. 70.

- 54 The suggestion, derived from the Bernician royal genealogy, that the Bernician kings considered the pagan god *Ing* to have been their divine patron – or considered themselves to be an *Inguionic* dynasty, deriving from continental *Inguiones* – may also be of relevance here (Miller, 1980: 213; North, 1997, especially pp. 42–3; Sandred, 1987: 234–5). This is due to the fact that the most northerly of the four occurrences of the place-name Ingham is in *Lindissi*, three miles from the richest barrow burial in the kingdom (at Caenby), and this name means either ‘the estate of the devotees of the deity *Ing*’ or ‘the estate of the *Inguione*’, a tag to mark places as the royal property of a king who claimed to be of an *Inguionic* dynasty (Cameron, 1998: 69; Cameron, 2001: 184; Sandred, 1987: 235–6).
- 55 Campbell, 2004; Thacker, 2006: 40; above, p. 142.
- 56 See above, pp. 152–5 on the *Gyrwe*; Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III. 20, IV.6 and IV.19. The link between the two might also explain Bede’s exceptional interest in St Æthelthryth, given that she was once married to a ruler of the South *Gyrwe* named *Tondberct* and later founded the monastery of Ely on what is often thought to have been South Gyrwean lands (above, pp. 155, 200 (fn. 21)).
- 57 Above, pp. 137–9. In light of the above, it may also be worth reconsidering J. N. L. Myres’ suggestions with regard to the origins and significance of the name *Humbrenses*, which is used for the Northumbrians in the seventh century (Myres, 1986: 174–6; Myres, 1935, cf. Wallace-Hadrill, 1988: 226–8).
- 58 Note, this would, of course, require that the Britons of *\*Lindēs* not only exercised a degree of control and influence over the Anglo-Saxon groups within their borders but also those beyond them too, such as the *Spalde* and the *Gyrwe*. However, this does not seem necessarily implausible, particularly if Anglian settlement as a whole was initially controlled from Lincoln (see above, pp. 80–1). We might also note, tentatively, the claim of British military success on the river Glen *c.* 500, discussed above, p. 169.
- 59 Dark, 1992; Dark, 2000: 193–200; Proudfoot and Aliaga-Kelly, 1996.
- 60 On Lindisfarne and Bamburgh having originally lain within Gododdin territory, see for example Dumville, 1989b: 217; Dark, 2000: 205; Kirby, 2000: 58.
- 61 Dark, 2000: 206–7. For the interpretation of the Anglo-Saxons of the Lindisfarne-Bamburgh region as ‘a band of pirates’, see Blair, 1977: 43–4; cf. Dumville, 1989b: 218.
- 62 Above, pp. 82–6; Koch, 1997: xviii–xxi, xxxviii–xxxix, xli.
- 63 For example, Myres, 1986: 185; Martin, 1976; Williamson, 1993: 71–2. Cf. Brooks, 1989: 164.
- 64 Sims-Williams, 1990a: 32; Hooke, 1990: 125–9, 167–9, 190–3; Ekwall, 1960: 120, 365, 514; Watts, 2004: 154.
- 65 Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle, 1999: 390–2.
- 66 Mills, 1991: 271; Rumble, 1977; Dornier, 1977: 158. On *Spalde/Spaldingas*, see above, pp. 156–7.
- 67 Kirby, 2000: 8; Welch, 2001: 147.
- 68 Watts, 2004: 501; Cameron, 1998: 102; Crowson *et al.*, 2005: 297.
- 69 A relationship in the opposite direction has been invoked to explain the presence of place-names involving the group-name *Hwicce* in Middle Anglia (Rutland and Northamptonshire), given that the *Hwicce* are far better known as a people and kingdom recorded in the West Midlands from the seventh century: Sims-Williams, 1990a: 30; Hart, 1971: 138; Stenton, 1971b: 269–70. However, it should be noted that recent work has considerably strengthened the place-name evidence for the *Hwicce* in Rutland, suggesting that A. H. Smith’s interpretation of the *Hwicce* as a Middle Anglian group who moved westwards may be worthy of reconsideration: Insley and Scharer, 2000: 288–9; Cox, 1994a: xxv–xxvi, 55–6, 61, 221–2; Smith, 1965a: 60–2; Smith, 1965b: 42.
- 70 See DCMS, 2004: 83 (a high-status gold sword pommel of the sixth century found in Ripplingale parish in November 2002) and also Crowson *et al.*, 2005: 56–69, 297; Portable Antiquities Scheme NLM997, NLM4277. It should be noted that the group-name *Hreope/Hrype* is also present in the place-name Ripon (*Hrypum*, *Hreopum*) and related names in North Yorkshire (Watts, 2004: 501; Rumble, 1977: 170–1 – note especially Riponshire,

*Ripeshire*). If the *Hrepingas* of Rippingale are indeed to be linked to the *Hreope/Hrype/Hrepingas* of Repton, with the Repton group being an offshoot of the Lincolnshire group, then the same interpretation should almost certainly be applied to the *Hreope/Hrype* of Ripon too. Certainly a Lincolnshire origin for this Northumbrian population-group would have a very good context in the evidence discussed above. In addition, this scenario for explaining the relationship between the Ripon and the Repton *Hreope* might well be thought to be more plausible than the notion that the group in the Mercian heartlands was an offshoot of the Deiran group, as suggested by Watts (2004: 501) and Stenton (1971b: 270).

## Conclusion (pp. 241–6)

- 1 Harden (ed.), 1956, is an obvious example of the name ‘Dark Age’ being used for this period by twentieth-century academics, but there are many more recent academic books which feature the term too, such as Hodges, 1982; Williams *et al*, 1991; Crawford (ed.), 1994; and Koch, 1997.
- 2 As in Young, 2009: 14.
- 3 See, for example, Mommsen, 1942.
- 4 Hamerow, 2005: 271–88; Bassett, 1989b; Scull, 1993: 72–9.
- 5 See Yorke, 2003, especially pp. 396–401; Yorke, 2000: 82–6; and above, pp. 147–51.
- 6 See further above, pp. 73–5, 104–06. This does, of course, suggest that the traditional Gildasian model of the Anglo-Saxon arrival and conquest of eastern Britain may deserve more consideration than it is sometimes granted.
- 7 See, for example, Dark, 2000: 97–103, on such British polities in southern and eastern Britain.
- 8 This is in contrast to earlier studies – such as Hodges, 1989, chapter two – which tended to treat a large-scale Anglo-Saxon migration and a large-scale British survival as mutually exclusive scenarios for post-Roman Britain.
- 9 This applies equally to conclusions on supposedly ‘British’ burial rites in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. Without making any judgements as to whether ‘crouched burial’ – which occurs chiefly in seventh-century graves – is a British rite or not, the specific argument that ‘it seems nonsensical to suggest that such practices can... represent ‘native survival’, as crouched burial is not found to any great extent during the preceding two centuries’ (Lucy, 2000a: 14), seems problematical in light of the above; indeed, given that many Britons arguably didn’t acculturate until the seventh century or after, the above might actually be an argument in *favour* of it having British origins.