

# Naming Early Monasteries: The Significance of *Burh* in East Anglia

By ELLIE RYE<sup>1</sup> and TOM WILLIAMSON<sup>2</sup>

THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN medieval and earlier fortifications and place names incorporating the Old English word 'burh' is well known. This article examines another use of burh and suggests, on the basis of an analysis of East Anglian examples, that in many cases the term may refer to monasteries, perhaps expressing a sense of their enclosed character. This is consonant with recent reassessments of the use of burh in place names, which stress the sense of 'enclosure' as uniting the various applications of the element. We suggest that place names featuring burh might, both here and in other areas, thus serve as a useful indicator of early monastic sites.

## INTRODUCTION

In Old English (OE) texts, the term *burh* has a range of meanings, principally 'stronghold, fortress', 'fortified dwelling, estate' and 'town'.<sup>3</sup> There is general agreement that it was used in similar ways in place names, referring to prehistoric fortifications, Roman towns or forts, and military strongholds established during the Anglo-Saxon period. However, the additional meanings of 'monastery' and 'fortified dwelling' and/or 'estate' — similarly referencing the concept of enclosure by physical boundaries — have also been noted.<sup>4</sup> The purpose of this paper is to suggest, on the basis of an analysis of East Anglian examples, that *burh* as a place-name element may carry the meaning 'monastery' rather more often than is usually assumed, and that, in consequence, it can provide a useful indication of the sites of early monastic establishments.

## THE USE OF BURH IN PLACE NAMES

As early as 1943, Frank Stenton suggested that *burh* was often used as a term for a monastery, partly because there were known examples of the interchange of the elements *burh* and *mynster* in place names.<sup>5</sup> Westbury-on-Trym (Gloucestershire) is recorded in 11th-century and earlier documents in forms (eg *Uuestburg* AD 793x96; S 139) which make it clear

that the generic is OE *burh*.<sup>6</sup> Eleventh-century copies of a document of AD 804, however, refer to the place as *æt Wæst mynster* and *æt west mynstre* (alongside *æt Westbyri* in one of the versions).<sup>7</sup> The early forms of Tetbury (Gloucestershire) all indicate the generic *burh*, with the exception of a single charter of 681, which contains the phrase *prope Tettan* [or *Tectan*] *Monasterium*: this, however, survives only in 14th-century copies of dubious authenticity, S 71 and S 73.<sup>8</sup> Fladbury (Worcestershire) is described as a *monasterium* in an 8th-century endorsement to a charter of AD 697x99 re-establishing monastic life, although this too survives only in a later and dubious copy.<sup>9</sup> In addition, Stenton noted that the personal names which formed the qualifying elements of some *burh*-names were female: individuals more likely, he suggested, to be associated with monastic foundations than with fortifications.<sup>10</sup> Examples discussed included Bucklebury (Berkshire, OE *Burghild*), Bibury and Tetbury (Gloucestershire, OE *Bēage* and *Tette*), Queniborough (Leicestershire, OE *\*Cwēne*), Adderbury (Oxfordshire, *Ēadburh*), Alberbury (Shropshire, *Ealhburh*), Harbury (Warwickshire, *Hereburh*), Heytesbury and Alderbury (Wiltshire, *\*Hēahbrȳþ* and *\*Æpelwaru*) and Fladbury (Worcestershire, OE *\*Flæde*). Subsequent scholarship has revised the interpretations of some of these names, although not for the most part in ways that are detrimental to Stenton's argument.<sup>11</sup> There are, however, a number of more general objections to his suggestions and interpretations.

Firstly, even if the charter evidence relating to Fladbury, Tetbury and Westbury was all reliable and early, it remains possible — as John Baker and Stuart Brookes have argued in the case of Westbury — that the variant terms may in fact refer to different aspects or functions of the place in question. *Burh* may thus have had an entirely secular and defensive significance, quite distinct from any additional monastic role a settlement may have possessed.<sup>12</sup> Secondly, with regard to the female personal names attached to *burh* names, it is possible that in many cases these date to a time long after the places in question were first established, part of a more general pattern noted by Margaret Gelling and others.<sup>13</sup> Bibury (Gloucestershire) (*Began byrg* 899) is a case in point.<sup>14</sup> There is an 11th-century record of the leasing of an estate by the river Coln to Leppa and his daughter Beage sometime between 718 and 745, which is thought genuine (S 1254), and it is this Beage who probably features in the first element of the name. For Gelling, Bibury was prime evidence

favouring the interpretation 'manor house' in this group of names.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, Simon Draper has recently identified a number of *burh* names where the reference is to non-monastic enclosed settlements, particularly late-Saxon aristocratic manor houses.<sup>16</sup>

It is true that, in the case of Bibury, Stenton's 'monastic' interpretation receives some support from the fact that Bibury possessed rights over other churches in the area as early as the 9th century.<sup>17</sup> But overall the association of *burh*, and early monasteries — and certainly the idea that the term might be used in some place names *because* a place was a monastic establishment — has not found widespread acceptance among place-name scholars. The possibility is tacitly rejected in Albert Smith's *English Place-Name Elements*, while David Parsons and Tania Styles' *Vocabulary of English Place-Names* favours the sense of 'fortified house or estate' in most of the cases discussed by Stenton.<sup>18</sup>

Nevertheless, Stenton's 'monastic' interpretation has continued to find supporters. In 1986, James Campbell suggested that *burh* could have been used to refer to monasteries with a defensive *vallum*, noting the appellation of Peterborough as *Burch* (ie *Burh*) in a 12th-century interpolation in ASC MS E following its enclosure with a wall around the year 1000 (the monastery had previously been known as *Medeshamstede*).<sup>19</sup> In 2005, John Blair went further, arguing that *burh* was *mainly* used in this way in the period before the later-8th century. Of the ten places with names incorporating *burh* which appear in English sources before 750, no fewer than seven were minsters (an impressive figure, even if monastic sites are likely to be over-represented in the relevant material).<sup>20</sup> Nor, he suggested, was this simply a consequence of the fact that such sites were sometimes placed in abandoned hillforts, defended Roman towns and forts. Rather, it reflected the fact that monasteries were invariably enclosed, if not with banks and walls, then with hedges and fences: 'enclosure was fundamental to the monastic ideal'.<sup>21</sup> More recently, Simon Draper has similarly identified a number of place names for which the primary motivation for the use of *burh* seems to be monastic enclosure.<sup>22</sup>

Blair has recently revised his interpretation of *burh* in place names, arguing that by the 8th century the term had developed a primary meaning of 'important node in the royal infrastructure'. But the examples he discusses in detail are all themselves defended or

otherwise enclosed sites,<sup>23</sup> raising the possibility that the concept of enclosure, rather than administrative importance per se, continued to be central to the use of *burh*. More importantly, Blair's revised view does not affect his earlier assessment of the term's frequent monastic associations in the period before the mid-8th century; while in the period subsequent to this monasteries may often have been seen as the main attribute of some *burhs* which possessed multiple functions — ecclesiastical, defensive, administrative and commercial. Indeed, we should note here the very real problems involved in, and arguments over, the extent to which elite sites and monastic establishments can be distinguished archaeologically, given their similarities and probable co-location.<sup>24</sup> Both are associated with high-status goods, trade, manufacture, document production and enclosure.<sup>25</sup>

It thus remains possible that in many cases *burh* was often used in places names for settlements perceived to be entirely or primarily monastic in character. In this article we explore the relationship between OE *burh* and early monastic establishments in East Anglia (defined here as the area of the pre-1974 counties of Norfolk and Suffolk), an area that has featured little in previous discussions of the term.

#### EARLY MONASTERIES IN EAST ANGLIA

Whether as a consequence of Viking raiding and settlement, or for other reasons, few charters or wills survive in East Anglia from the pre-Viking period which might indicate the sites of early monasteries. In addition, and in contrast to many other areas of England, there is little in the way of early medieval worked stone which might be used to this end, in part for geological reasons.<sup>26</sup> The more general history of the East Anglian kingdom is, moreover, poorly served by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede. These sources only refer to three ecclesiastical centres in the kingdom established during the period of the conversion: *Domnoc*,<sup>27</sup> given by King Sigeberht to the Burgundian Felix as the site for the first bishopric in the 630s; *Cnobheresburg*, given to the monk Fursa by Sigeberht in 633, and further endowed by his son Anna; and *Icanho*, where Botolph began to build a minster in 654, according to the *Chronicle*. Much academic ink has been spilled over the precise locations of all three sites.

Some historians argue that *Domnoc* was an early name for Dunwich, a city on the Suffolk coast now largely eroded by the sea.<sup>28</sup> Most now agree that it was the old Roman Saxon Shore Fort at Walton in south-eastern Suffolk, at the mouth of the river Deben and some 15 km to the south of Rendlesham, itself described as a *villa regia* of the East Anglian kings by Bede, and which has now produced archaeological evidence for a substantial and wealthy early Anglo-Saxon/middle-Anglo-Saxon settlement.<sup>29</sup> There appears to have been a church dedicated to St Felix within the walls of Walton Castle in the 12th century, when the place was granted to Rochester Priory by the Bigods. The name of the adjacent parish, of which Walton was probably once a part, is Felixstowe. This place name (*Filchestowe* 1291) has been interpreted as a compound of an unattested OE personal name \**Filica* with OE *stōw* ‘place, meeting-place, holy place’,<sup>30</sup> but the first element is now more usually interpreted as an Anglicisation of the Latin *Felix*.<sup>31</sup> Whatever the precise significance of either element, the name Felixstowe is not recorded in Domesday, when the place was instead simply named *Burg*, *Burch*.

The monastery established by Botolph at *Icanho* has also been variously identified,<sup>32</sup> but was almost certainly at Iken, 15 km east of Rendlesham. The almost isolated church here, dedicated appropriately to St Botolph, stands on a virtual island, prominently positioned overlooking the estuary of the river Alde, a classic site for an early monastery.<sup>33</sup> In 1972 the base of a late-9th-century cross was discovered built into the medieval tower, and subsequent excavations revealed evidence, admittedly limited, of middle-Anglo-Saxon activity on the site.<sup>34</sup>

The site of *Cnobheresburg* is likewise contested and Bede describes how the monastery:

Was pleasantly situated close to woods and the sea, in a Roman camp which is called in English *Cnobheresburg* [OE *Cnoferesburg*], that is, the city of Cnobhere (*in castro quodam quod lingua Anglorum Cnobheresburg, id est Vrbs Cnobheri, uocatur*). The king of that realm, Anna, and his nobles afterwards endowed it with still finer buildings and gifts.<sup>35</sup>

The place — ‘\*Cnobhere’s *burh*’ — has usually been identified with the Saxon Shore Fort at Burgh Castle near Yarmouth, but other sites have been proposed.<sup>36</sup> Its destruction in the mid-7th century, recorded in an account of Foillan, half-brother of Fursa and Abbot of *Cnobheresburg*, means it must in any case have been a short-lived foundation.<sup>37</sup>

The next explicit mention of a major ecclesiastical site in the written sources comes in 673, when Bede records that the East Anglian see was divided; he does not name the second see (the first being *Domnoc*) but later episcopal lists indicate that it was at Elmham, probably North Elmham in Norfolk.<sup>38</sup> In addition, the 14th-century antiquary Henry de Kirkestede, whose antiquarian notes are preserved in the so-called *Liber Albus* of Bury St Edmunds, records how an inscription on the wall of the church at Loddon in southern Norfolk stated that Felix had founded ‘the kirke at Lodne [Loddon] and the kirke at Redeham [Reedham] and the halige kirke at Babingley’.<sup>39</sup> Historians are understandably cautious in using such late evidence, although the establishment of a church at Babingley (western Norfolk) by Felix is also recorded in the *Liber Eliensis*.<sup>40</sup> Other possible early monastic sites in East Anglia have, however, been proposed on the basis of archaeological evidence, mainly in the form of excavations, although (as already noted) debate continues over the extent to which such places can be distinguished from high-status secular complexes — or whether the two were, in reality, always entirely distinct. They include the sites at Brandon in north-western Suffolk; Burrow Hill in Butley on the Suffolk coast; Caister-on-Sea in eastern Norfolk; and Wormegay and Bawsey in western Norfolk.<sup>41</sup>

#### MONASTIC *BURH* NAMES IN EAST ANGLIA

In addition to these places, several other possible examples of early ecclesiastical sites have been suggested more cautiously by a range of scholars, on the basis of more limited archaeological or documentary evidence. Such suggestions can receive additional support, however — and a number of new examples can be proposed — using place names, for they lie in parishes with names incorporating the element *burh* (Fig 1).

PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED EXAMPLES OF MONASTIC SITES WITH *BURH* NAMES

### *Bawburgh, Norfolk*

The village of Bawburgh lies some 7 km west of the city of Norwich, in the valley of the river Yare. It is traditionally associated with St Walstan, and a well dedicated to the saint survives some 90 m to the north-east of the church. The legend of Walstan, although relating to events in the 10th or 11th century, was first recorded by John Capgrove in the 15th century, and the church displays no certain pre-Conquest fabric.<sup>42</sup> However, in 2002, a lead plate was recovered from near the church of the type associated with 10th- and 11th-century burials, bearing an inscription interpreted as meaning ‘of St John, abbot \*H[ear]dwerh, in the ground.’<sup>43</sup> As Tim Pestell has noted:

It would be dangerous to use the plate, or its uncertain reading, as evidence for an Anglo-Saxon religious community being based at Bawburgh in the 11th century. Nevertheless, the rarity of such inscribed lead plates, and their characteristic appearance on monastic sites, does raise the possibility that devotion to Walstan had already taken hold at Bawburgh by the time of the Norman Conquest.<sup>44</sup>

### *Blythburgh, Suffolk*

Blythburgh church occupies a dramatic location on a promontory overlooking the estuary of the river Blyth, 4 km from the present coastline. While the ‘*burgh* on the river Blyth’ might refer to a lost fortification, there was almost certainly an early monastery here. The *Liber Eliensis* records that the East Anglian king Anna was buried at Blythburgh, following his death in battle with Penda of Mercia in AD 654, and was still being venerated at the church there in the 12th century.<sup>45</sup> Blythburgh was also the supposed burial place of Anna’s son Hiurmine (as recorded in the interpolations made to a Bury St Edmunds copy of John of Worcester’s *Chronicle*).<sup>46</sup> Hinton (*Hinetuna* 1086) ‘the settlement of the (monastic) community’ (OE *hīwan* ‘members of a (monastic) household’ + *tūn*), originally a separate vill in the south of the parish, is noteworthy in this context.<sup>47</sup> Quantities of Ipswich ware have been found on the site of the medieval priory, which lies immediately to the north-east of the church, and a whalebone tablet was found close by in 1902, which is now in the British Museum.<sup>48</sup> The hundred of Blything, Peter Warner has argued, fossilised the ancient territory of a tribal group called the *Blythingas*, based on the catchment of the river Blythe (the hundred boundary mainly follows the watershed of the Blyth drainage system).<sup>49</sup>

Blythburgh is located fairly centrally within this territory. Domesday describes how the church was endowed with two hides of land, but it was extensively rebuilt in the 15th century and has no obviously early fabric.

#### *Burgh at Felixstowe, Suffolk*

As already noted, Felixstowe in south-eastern Suffolk is only so named in documents from the 12th century: in Domesday the vill is simply named *Burg, Burch*.<sup>50</sup> The presence of a Roman Saxon Shore fort of Walton Castle (now destroyed by the sea but originally part of Felixstowe) could explain the use of *burh* but, if this does represent the site of the see established by Felix, the place clearly also had important early ecclesiastical associations.<sup>51</sup>

#### *Burgh by Woodbridge and Grundisburgh, Suffolk*

These two parishes lie adjacent, some 4 km to the west of Woodbridge in south-eastern Suffolk. The church at Burgh — the smaller of the two parishes — has no obviously early fabric, but lies within a substantial rectangular earthwork enclosure with evidence of Iron-Age and Roman-period occupation. It is dedicated to St Botolph. Marginal notes in an expanded version of Florence of Worcester's *Chronicle of England to 1131*, probably compiled at Bury St Edmunds, record that Cnut authorised the removal of St Botolph's bones from Grundisburgh to Bury St Edmunds after the latter was founded in the early 11th century, and Norman Scarfe suggested that they had previously been removed to Grundisburgh when Iken was threatened by Viking attack in the 970s.<sup>52</sup> While Stevenson and others have argued that the church at Burgh was founded to mark the place where the saint's bones had rested, Richard Hoggett has plausibly suggested it is more likely that there was already a monastic community here, although limited excavation within the enclosure has revealed only limited evidence for middle-Anglo-Saxon occupation.<sup>53</sup>

#### *Burgh Castle, Norfolk*

The parish of Burgh Castle derives its name from the well-preserved Saxon Shore Fort lying a few kilometres to the south-east of Great Yarmouth, on the southern edge of the Broadland marshes, an estuary in Roman and early post-Roman times: the 'Castle' was added to the original name following the erection of a motte, since destroyed, within its walls. The identification of the place as *Cnobheresburg* is no longer generally accepted, but

excavation recovered over 300 sherds of middle-Anglo-Saxon Ipswich ware from the far north-eastern interior of the fort, while in the SW corner, protected from ploughing by the former existence of the Anglo-Norman motte, part of an extensive cemetery comprising 163 inhumations was discovered. Radiocarbon dating suggested that this had come into use in the early 7th century, continuing into the later-Saxon period.<sup>54</sup> Both the character of the excavated evidence and its location within an abandoned Roman fort suggest that it was a place of 'a significant amount of early Christian missionary activity'.<sup>55</sup>

#### *Bury St Edmunds, or St Edmundsbury, Suffolk*

The earliest reference to a monastery at Bury St Edmunds are in bequests made in the wills of Bishop Theodred (AD 942x951; S 1526) and Ælfgar (AD 946x951; S 1483).<sup>56</sup> However, there was evidently a tradition that Bury was an earlier foundation. The *Liber Eliensis* claims that the first community here was established by Sigebert of East Anglia (d 640s).<sup>57</sup> The monastery here may have been founded soon after the martyrdom of Edmund in 869. While it may have been established a little later, under Cnut, it is possible that it could pre-date the Viking incursions.

#### *Dickleburgh, Norfolk*

At some time between 1044 and 1052, Oswulf and Leofrun left land at Dickleburgh and Semer (presumably near Semere Green in that parish)<sup>58</sup> to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds on condition that:

Four priests should sing, two after Oswulf's day and two after Leofrun's day, and each week [they are] to sing 12 masses. And we desire that whosoever is abbot of St Edmunds Bury should be the guardian of the minsters (*bis ministres mund*), and their priests must never transfer or surrender them to themselves or their kin.<sup>59</sup>

At the time of Domesday, the manor of Dickleburgh was still held by two priests, and the 18th-century historian Francis Blomefield described how the church was divided into four separate sections: the Portion in the Marsh, the Portion in the Field, Long Moor Portion, and Sea Mere Portion, divisions that can be traced back to at least the 12th century.<sup>60</sup> Evidently, by late-Saxon times the church was some kind of minster, although the present parish church, All Saints, has no obviously early fabric. The first element of the name

has a number of possible interpretations (see Appendix) but one is an Irish personal name, *Dícuill*. If so, it may be significant that, according to Bede, *Dícuill* was the name of one of Fursa's companions at *Cnobheresburg*. There is a possible parallel in the name of Malmesbury (Wiltshire), the first element of which is generally accepted as the Irish personal name *Máeldub*, and there is good evidence for Irish involvement in the monastery here before its refoundation by Aldhelm in the late-7th century.<sup>61</sup>

### *Rumburgh, Suffolk*

Rumburgh Priory in north-eastern Suffolk is a late foundation, apparently established by Bishop Æthelmær between 1047 and 1064.<sup>62</sup> Twelve monks are recorded, with a church, in the neighbouring vill of Wisset in Domesday.

### *Sudbury, Suffolk*

Sudbury — the 'south *burh*' — is located beside the river Stour, the present-day boundary between Suffolk and Essex. The name is first recorded in an 11th-century copy of a 10th-century will, but an entry of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, dated 1100–7, records the death of Ælfhun, Bishop of East Anglia, there in 799.<sup>63</sup> If drawing on genuine material, Sudbury might thus already have been a place of some importance in the 8th century. The earliest of the town's three churches is dedicated to St Gregory, and stands towards the northern end of a promontory overlooking the marshes on the floodplain of the Stour to the west. It was comprehensively rebuilt in the 14th century and has no obviously early fabric, but it is recorded in the will of Ælfflæd (AD 1000x02).<sup>64</sup> The street pattern suggests that the church may have stood within an ovoid enclosure covering perhaps 15 ha, one side of which was defined by the edge of the marshy ground beside the river (Fig 2). This has been interpreted as an urban defence — coins were being struck here by the time of Æthelred 'the Unready', and at the time of Domesday was home to no fewer than 118 burgesses.<sup>65</sup> However, it may mark a large monastic enclosure, although possibly, to judge from evidence of Iron-Age occupation in the area, one with earlier origins.<sup>66</sup> Within this, and some 80 m to the south-west of the church, excavations in 1990 on land fronting Walnut Tree Lane located two large pits, one containing sherds of Ipswich ware.<sup>67</sup> The church is mentioned in Domesday, by which time it was already dedicated to St Gregory and had a reasonably large endowment of 50 acres.

There are 24 major place names in Norfolk and Suffolk — parishes or vills recorded before 1086 — which have names featuring the element *burh*.<sup>68</sup> Of these, ten (42%) have been identified by previous scholars, on quite different evidence, as being associated with possible monastic sites, mainly of middle-Anglo-Saxon date.<sup>69</sup> In addition, although not an example of a major place name, attention should be drawn to Burrow Hill in the parish of Butley in south-eastern Suffolk, which is referred to as *Insula de Burgh* in early documents. Excavations carried out on the summit of the hill — which rises dramatically from what are now drained marshes — in the late 1970s and early 1980s produced extensive evidence for middle-Anglo-Saxon settlement, including a number of post-built buildings and a metalworking kiln, together with significant quantities of Ipswich ware, metalwork and coins from the 7th and 8th centuries.<sup>70</sup> In addition, a cemetery containing more than 200 inhumations was excavated which, because these were mainly male and adult, suggested that the settlement was monastic in character. The excavations have only been published as an interim report, but the island location of the site would support such an interpretation, as would the discovery of a writing implement similar to one recorded from Whitby Abbey. By the 9th century the site was completely abandoned, with not even the church surviving.

#### OTHER *BURH*-NAMES ASSOCIATED WITH POSSIBLE MONASTIC SITES

The following places with *burh*-names have not previously been proposed as monastic sites, but have some supporting evidence, archaeological or documentary in nature, for such an identification.

##### *Burgh by Aylsham, Norfolk*

Burgh in north-eastern Norfolk has a parish church, dedicated to St Mary, which occupies an unusual position, on a former promontory in marshes beside, and only slightly elevated above, the river Bure. It stands on the opposite bank of the river to the Roman ‘small town’ of Brampton. This was the second largest urban centre in East Anglia and the only one, other than the civitas capital *Venta Icenorum*, to possess defences. Although the church was extensively rebuilt in the 13th century, the N wall of the chancel incorporates a set of massive quoins of iron-bound conglomerate, apparently from a substantial pre-

Conquest building.<sup>71</sup> The field to the north-west contains ploughed-out settlement earthworks, the surface finds from which include quantities of Ipswich ware.

#### *Burgh St Peter, Norfolk*

St Mary's church, largely rebuilt in eccentric form in the 18th century, occupies an isolated and striking situation on a low promontory projecting out into the marshes beside the river Waveney (Fig 3). An undated inhumation has been recovered c 85 m to the south-west of the current churchyard, while a medieval chapel dedicated to St Peter stood a similar distance west-north-west of the church. Aerial photographs suggest possible grubenhäuser lying in the area between the two buildings.<sup>72</sup> The neck of the promontory is cut off by a slightly sunken lane which is continued southwards in the line of the present boat dyke, already in existence by 1840,<sup>73</sup> just possibly representing the remains of an outer vallum. The area so defined extends over c 8 ha.

#### *Great Ryburgh, Norfolk.*

In 2016, 81 burials in hollowed-out trunks, and a further six in timber-lined graves, were recovered from waterlogged ground beside the river Wensum in Great Ryburgh during excavations by Museum of London Archaeology Service (MOLAS). The burials, of middle-Anglo-Saxon date, lie c 100 m from the parish church. The initial discoverers interpreted the site as a monastic cemetery, but no detailed analysis has yet appeared in print and it remains under investigation.<sup>74</sup>

#### *Happisburgh, Norfolk.*

Happisburgh — the *burh* of *Hæpp* — is located on the NE coast of Norfolk. The same personal name appears to occur in the name of Happing Hundred, within which the parish lies. Like Blything Hundred, this presumably developed from the territory of an earlier folk group, in this case the *Hæppingas*. Evaluation trenches dug in anticipation of housing development in the field lying some 150 m to the south-west of the church in 2012 recovered large quantities of Ipswich ware, animal bone and a middle-Anglo-Saxon copper-alloy strap end, as well as a high density of pits and ditches, many of which were of 8th- or 9th-century date.<sup>75</sup> The excavator concluded that 'the evidence of middle-Anglo-Saxon activity represented at the site is considered to be at least of regional importance'.<sup>76</sup>

Happisburgh church, now a little over 200 m from the cliff edge, is positioned on a low hill and is widely visible. Although largely rebuilt in the 14th century, the tower may incorporate 11th-century fabric. Adjacent Walcott (*Walecota*, *Walchota* 1086 < OE *wealh* ‘Briton’ and later ‘slave, servant’) parallels other *wealh* names around minster sites, whilst the parish of Eccles (*Eccles*, *Heccles* 1086) immediately to the south may indicate an earlier British church.<sup>77</sup>

#### *Tasburgh, Norfolk*

Tasburgh parish church lies within a large undated earthwork enclosure and appears to be partly of pre-Conquest construction.<sup>78</sup> In addition, excavations in the immediate vicinity of the church produced, among other things, 135 sherds of Ipswich ware — a remarkably large quantity.<sup>79</sup> The enclosure has been interpreted as prehistoric but a section of bank excavated on the south-eastern side was dated to the late-9th century or later by the presence of Thetford ware immediately below it, although there is uncertainty over whether this was actually part of the original circuit.<sup>80</sup> Timber buildings of late-Saxon date were also uncovered, attesting to the continuing importance of the site, although there is nothing in Domesday to suggest the presence of a major church here.

### DISCUSSION

There are 24 examples in Norfolk and Suffolk of identifiable parishes, or vills recorded before 1086, which have names featuring the element *burh*, either alone, or in combination with another element. Ten are plausibly identified as pre-Conquest monastic sites and a further five have some indications of such a status. A total of 71% of these place names thus have some indication (admittedly meagre in several cases) that they were the sites of early monasteries. If *Cnobheresburg* is not to be identified with Burgh Castle or Burgh by Woodbridge, then we have another short-lived *burh*-named monastic establishment; while Burrow Hill in Butley might also be added to the list.

What constituted a ‘monastery’ changed over time and varied from place to place. While some of the monasteries with *burh* names discussed here may be relatively late Benedictine foundations, most are sites from the 7th-century ‘missionary’ phase of Christianity in East Anglia. The main use of *burh* to denote a monastic site may thus (as

Stenton and Blair originally suggested) be early, although it would seem that the term continued to be used in this way, if only on a sporadic basis, to the end of the Anglo-Saxon period. In this context it is noteworthy that a high proportion of these sites are associated with confluences, promontories, islands and major estuaries: Burgh Castle, Blythburgh, Sudbury, Burgh St Peter, Burgh next Aylsham, Tasburgh, as well as Burrow Hill in Butley; Happisburgh is also located on the coast, on a prominent hill. In some of the cases discussed above — including Burgh by Woodbridge/Grundisburgh, Burgh Castle, *Burgh* at Felixstowe and Tasburgh — it is possible that the term refers to a Roman or prehistoric enclosure, reused as the site for a monastery, in the manner well documented from elsewhere in England.<sup>81</sup> But even with these examples this may not have been the only or even the main sense in which it was employed, and in other cases *burh* more probably refers specifically to an enclosed monastic site.

Pestell, Foot, Cambridge and Rollason, and Blair have all discussed the tangled terminology of Old English monasteries and churches, but there is a suggested distinction in the evidence discussed here between missionary establishments of the 7th and early 8th centuries — many described using OE *burh*, many in coastal/island/peninsula locations; and the ‘minsters’ or mother-churches, with extensive *parochiae* served by teams of clerks, of the 9th and 10th centuries. While some probable East Anglian examples of the former clearly evolved into the latter (Blythburgh, Sudbury), most did not. Conversely, there are hints that many late-Saxon minsters — such as Wymondham in Norfolk — occupied rather different sites, more closely associated with royal estate centres.<sup>82</sup>

It might be objected that *burh* never appears to have been used to mean ‘monastery’ in Old English *texts*. But such a difference between lexical and toponymic usages can be paralleled in other items of vocabulary.<sup>83</sup> Indeed, while *burh* itself is used in the sense of ‘town’ in OE texts, the element’s use with this meaning in pre-Conquest place names is uncertain, and possible examples are rare. The use of *burh* in the names of Peterborough and Bury St Edmunds could feasibly indicate urban functions, but these usages cannot be dated earlier than c 1000, and in the case of Peterborough renaming followed enclosure by the monastery.<sup>84</sup> Newbury (*Neuberie* c 1080 [in an undated later

copy] ‘new town/borough’) (Berkshire) is a better example, but the ‘new town’ was a post-Conquest development at the manor still known as *Ulvritone* in 1086.<sup>85</sup>

We do not, of course, mean to suggest that *all* East Anglian place names incorporating the element *burh* imply the presence of an early monastery. There are no obvious ‘monastic’ associations, early or late, for Ickburgh, Attleborough or Oxborough in Norfolk, for example. Several such names probably refer to abandoned prehistoric earthworks, as is certainly the case with Narborough in Norfolk, where a substantial Iron-Age hillfort still survives beside the river Nar; or simply to enclosed thegny residences or other secular, defensive or quasi-defensive enclosures as discussed in particular by Draper and Blair.<sup>86</sup> But more important than any particular meanings of *burh* — as ‘fortress’, ‘defended residence’ or ‘monastery’ — may, perhaps, be the simple underlying concept of ‘enclosure’, as the discussions by Draper, and by Parsons and Styles, imply.<sup>87</sup> Enclosure was a key physical characteristic of early ecclesiastical sites and the use of OE *burh* in this way is widely paralleled in Brittonic-speaking areas of Britain in the use of Welsh *llan* and related terms. The overlap between *burh* names and probable early monastic sites which we have described in East Anglia is certainly suggestive, and place-name scholars, archaeologists and historians might usefully pay more attention to this particular significance of the term.<sup>88</sup>

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, D 2013, Archaeological Evaluation at North Walsham Road, Happisburgh, Norfolk, (unpubl rep, NPS Archaeology, Norwich).

*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, MS E*, ed S Irvine, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, vol **7**, 2002.

*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, MS F*, ed P S Baker, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, vol **8**, 2000.

- Baker, J 2012, 'What makes a stronghold? References to construction materials in place-names in OE *fæsten*, *burh* and *(ge)weorc*', in Jones and Semple, 316–33.
- Baker, J T and Brookes, S 2013, *Beyond the Burghal Hidage: Anglo-Saxon Civil Defence in the Viking Age*, Leiden: Brill.
- Barrow, G W S 1973, *The Kingdom of the Scots*, London: Arnold.
- [BCS] Birch, W de Gray (ed) 1885–1899, *Cartularium Saxonicum, a collection of charters relating to Anglo-Saxon history*, 3 vols, London: Whiting.
- Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed and trans B Colgrave and R A B Mynors, Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- Blair, J 1988, 'Introduction: from minster to parish church', in J Blair (ed), *Minsters and Parish Churches. The Local Church in Transition 950–1200*, Oxford Univ Comm Archaeol Monogr **17**, 1–19.
- Blair, J 1992, 'Anglo-Saxon minsters: a topographical review', in J Blair and R Sharpe (eds), *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 226–66.
- Blair, J 2002, 'A handlist of Anglo-Saxon saints', in A Thacker and R Sharpe (eds), *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 495–565.
- Blair, J 2005, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blair, J 2011, 'Flixborough Revisited', *Anglo-Saxon Stud Archaeol Hist* **17**, 101-7.
- Blair, J 2018, *Building Anglo-Saxon England*, Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Blomefield, F 1805, *An Essay Towards a Topographic History of the County of Norfolk*, Vol 1, London: Miller.
- Bourne, M 2012, '*W(e)alh tūn*: balancing the probabilities', in Jones and Semple, 284–300.
- Briggs, K (unpublished), Suffolk place-names.
- Briggs, K and Kilpatrick, K 2016, *A Dictionary of Suffolk Place-Names*, Nottingham: English Place-Name Society.
- Cameron, A, Crandell Amos, A, diPaolo Healey, A et al 1986–, *Dictionary of Old English* [DOE], Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, 2018, <[www.doe.utoronto.ca](http://www.doe.utoronto.ca)> [last accessed 16 August 2018].

- Cameron, K 2007, 'Place-names and field-names as indicators of settlement and environmental history', in Loveluck, 83.
- Campbell, J 1986, 'Bede's words for places', in J Campbell, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History*, London: Hambledon, 99-119.
- Carr, R, Riddler, I, Tester, A et al 2014, *Staunch Meadow, Brandon, Suffolk: a High Status Middle Saxon Settlement on the Fen Edge*, East Anglian Archaeol **151**.
- Carroll, J and Parsons, D N 2007, *Anglo-Saxon Mint-Names. I. Axbridge–Hythe*, Nottingham: English Place-Name Society.
- Coates, R 2000, 'Domnoc/Dommoc, Dunwich and Felixstowe', in A Breeze and R Coates (with D Horovitz), *Celtic Voices English Places: Studies on the Celtic Impact on Place-Names in England*, Stamford: Tyas, 234–40.
- Cox, B H 1975–76, 'The place-names of the earliest English records', *J English Place-Name Soc* **8**, 12–66.
- Cramp, R 1984, 'The Iken cross-shaft', *Proc Suffolk Inst Archaeol History* **35:4**, 291–2.
- Domesday Book: Norfolk*, ed P Brown, draft trans M Hepplestone, J Mothersill and M Newman, 2 vols, Chichester: Phillimore, 1984.
- Domesday Book: Suffolk*, ed A Rumble, draft trans M Hepplestone, Chichester: Phillimore, 1986.
- Draper, S 2008, 'The significance of Old English *burh* in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon Stud Archaeol Hist* **15**, 240–53.
- Draper, S 2012, '*Burh* enclosures in Anglo-Saxon settlements: case studies in Wiltshire', in Jones and Semple, 334–51.
- Dymond, D and Martin, E (eds) 1988, *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, Ipswich: Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History.
- Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language [eDIL] <<http://www.dil.ie/>> [last accessed 16 August 2018].
- Ekwall, E 1928, *English River-Names*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ekwall, E 1960, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th edn, Oxford: Clarendon.

- Fellows-Jensen, G 1999, 'Scandinavian settlement names in East Anglia: some problems', *Nomina* **22**, 45–60.
- Fenwick, V 1984, 'Insula de Burgh: excavations at Burrow Hill, Suffolk 1978–1981', *Anglo-Saxon Stud Archaeol Hist* **3**, 35–54.
- Foote, S and Roffe, D 2007, 'Historical context within Lindsey and possible estate structures', in Loveluck, 130–43.
- Gelling, M 1973–76, *The Place-Names of Berkshire*, 3 vols, English Place-Name Society **49–51**.
- Gelling, M 1984, *Place-Names in the Landscape*, London: Dent.
- Gelling, M 1990–, *The Place-Names of Shropshire*, 6 vols to date, English Place-Name Society **62–3, 70, 76, 80, 82, 89**.
- Gelling, M 1997, *Signposts to the Past: Place-Names and the History of England*, 3rd edn, Chichester: Phillimore.
- Gover, J E B, Mawer, A and Stenton, F M 1939, *The Place-Names of Wiltshire*, English Place-Name Soc **16**.
- Hart, C 1966, *The Early Charters of Eastern England*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Haslam, J 1992, 'Dommoc and Dunwich: a reappraisal', *Anglo-Saxon Stud Archaeol Hist* **5**, 41–6.
- Hogg, R M 1992, *A Grammar of Old English, Volume 1: Phonology*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hoggett, R S 2007, *Changing Beliefs: the Archaeology of the East Anglian Conversion* (unpubl PhD thesis, University of East Anglia).
- Hoggett, R 2010, *The Archaeology of the East Anglian Conversion*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Hough, C 2009, 'Eccles in English and Scottish place-names', in E Quinton (ed,) *The Church in English Place-Names*, Nottingham: English Place-Name Society, 109–24.
- Hough, C 2010, *Toponymicon and Lexicon in North-West Europe: 'Ever-Changing Connection'*, Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, University of Cambridge.
- Insley, J and Rollason D with McClure, P 2007, 'English dithematic names', in D Rollason and L Rollason (eds), *The Durham Liber Vitae*, vol **2**, London: British Library, 81–165.

- Johnson, S 1983, *Burgh Castle: Excavations by Charles Green 1958–61*, East Anglian Archaeol Rep **20**.
- Jones, A E E 1958, *Anglo-Saxon Worcester*, Worcester: Baylis.
- Jones, G 2007, *Saints in the Landscape*, Stroud: Tempus.
- Jones, R and Semple, S (eds) 2012, *Sense of Place in Anglo-Saxon England*, Donington: Tyas.
- Liber Eliensis*, ed E O Blake, London: Royal Historical Society, 1962.
- Loveluck, C (ed) (2007), *Rural Settlement, Lifestyles and Social Change in the Later First Millennium AD: Anglo-Saxon Flixborough in its wider context*, Oxford: Oxbow.
- Martin, E 1988, 'Hundreds and liberties', in Dymond and Martin, 26–7.
- Mills, A D 2011, *A Dictionary of British Place Names*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, A D 2014, *Suffolk Place-Names. Their Origins and Meanings*, Lavenham: Lavenham Press.
- Newman, J 1990, 'Sudbury, Stour House, Gregory Street', *Proc Suffolk Inst Archaeol* **37**, 162–3.
- Okasha, E 2003, 'A third supplement to hand-list of Anglo-Saxon non-runic inscriptions', *Anglo-Saxon England* **33:1**, 225–81.
- Parsons, D N and Styles, T 2000 *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names (Brace-Cæster)*, Nottingham: Centre for English Name-Studies.
- Pestell, T 2004, *Landscapes of Monastic Foundation: the Establishment of Religious Houses in East Anglia c 600–1200*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Pevsner, N and Wilson, B 1999, *The Buildings of England: Norfolk. 2, North-West and South*, London: Yale University Press.
- Rigold, S E 1961, 'The supposed see of Dunwich', *J Brit Archaeol Assoc* **24**, 55–9.
- Rigold, S E 1974, 'Further evidence about the site of 'Dommoc'', *J British Archaeol Assoc* **37**, 97–102.
- Rodwell, W 1976, 'The archaeological investigation of Hadstock church, Essex: An interim report', *Antiq J* **56**, 55–71.
- Rogerson, A 2007, 'Wymondham before 1107', in P Cattermole (ed), *Wymondham Abbey: a History of the Monastery and Parish Church*, Wymondham: Wymondham Abbey Book Committee, 3–11.

- Rogerson, A and Lawson, A 1992, 'The earthwork enclosure at Tasburgh', in J Davies, T Gregory, A Lawson et al, *The Iron Age Forts of Norfolk*, East Anglian Archaeol **54**, 31–58.
- Sandred, K I 1996, *The Place-Names of Norfolk, 2. The Hundreds of East and West Flegg, Happing and Tunstead*, English Place-Name Soc **62**.
- Sandred, K I 2002, *The Place-Names of Norfolk, 3. The Hundreds of North and South Erpingham and Holt*, English Place-Name Soc **79**.
- Scarfe, N 1972, *The Suffolk Landscape*, London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Scarfe, N 1986, *Suffolk in the Middle Ages*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Scarfe, N 1988, 'Domesday settlements and churches: the example of Colneis Hundred', in Dymond and Martin, 42–3.
- Sims-Williams, P 1990, *Religion and Literature in Western England 600–800*, Cambridge Stud Anglo-Saxon England **3**.
- Smith, A H 1956, *English Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Soc **25–6**.
- Smith, A H 1964–65, *The Place-Names of Gloucestershire*, 4 vols, English Place-Name Society **38–41**.
- Stenton, F M 1943, 'The historical bearing of place-name studies', *Trans Roy Hist Soc* **25**, 1–13.
- Stevenson, F S 1922, 'St Botolph (Botwulf) and Iken', *Proc Suffolk Inst Archaeol Hist* **18:1**, 30–52.
- Thomson, R M 1980, *The Archives of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press.
- Warner, P 1996, *The Origins of Suffolk*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Watts, Victor 2004, *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, S 1984, 'Iken, St Botolph, and the coming of East Anglian Christianity', *Proc Suffolk Inst Archaeol Hist* **35:4**, 279–301.
- Whitelock, D 1930, *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitelock, D 1972, 'The pre-Viking church in East Anglia', *Anglo-Saxon England* **1**, 1–22.

William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed N E S A Hamilton, Rolls Series  
**52**, 1870.

Yorke, B 1995, *Wessex in the Early Middle Ages*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Yorke, B 2010, 'Aldhelm's Irish and British connections', in K Barker and N Brooks (eds),  
*Aldhelm and Sherborne. Essays to Celebrate the Founding of the Bishopric*, Oxford:  
Oxbow, 164–80.

Appendix 1: Previously Suggested Examples of Monastic Sites with *Burh*-Names<sup>89</sup>

**Bawburgh** (Nf) *Bauenburc, Bauenbuc* (1086) ‘*Bēawa’s burh*’ < unattested OE personal name \**Bēawa* + *burh*.<sup>90</sup>

**Blythburgh** (Sf) *Blideburc* (1086) ‘*burh* on the River Blyth’.<sup>91</sup> The river name is not independently attested until the late-16th century but its earlier currency is indicated by its occurrence in the place name Blyford and the hundred name Blything, both also recorded in the mid-11th century.<sup>92</sup> This evidence for the river name and the occurrence of the river name at least five times elsewhere in England,<sup>93</sup> means the first element is much more likely the river name than the saint’s name *Blitha*, East Anglian princess and mother of St Walstan in late legend, suggested by Blair (which is more likely a back formation from Blythburgh).<sup>94</sup>

**Burg, Burch at Felixstowe** (Sf) *Burg, Burch* (1086). Simplex OE *burh*.<sup>95</sup>

**Burgh** (near Woodbridge) *Burg, Burc, Burh* (1086) and **Grundisburgh** (Sf) *Grundesburc* (1086). *Burgh* is simplex OE *burh*, probably referring to the Iron-Age fort in which the church is situated. *Grundisburgh* is the name of the adjacent parish, and is probably a derived name meaning ‘the part of *Burgh* at the place called *Grund* (< OE *grund* ‘ground, bottom’)’.<sup>96</sup> The place’s situation in a valley bottom and the lack of an identified *burh* at *Grundisburgh* make this interpretation more likely than the alternative suggestion, an unrecorded personal name \**Grund* + *burh*.<sup>97</sup>

**Burgh Castle** (Nf) *Burch* (1086), *Burghchastel* (1269). Simplex OE *burh* with later addition of ME *castel* ‘castle’.<sup>98</sup>

**?Burrow Hill, Butley** (Sf) [not a parish name] *Burrowhill olim vocat. insula de Burgh* and *Burrowe hill alias insula de Burgh* (1594).<sup>99</sup> Interpreted as OE *burh* by Fenwick, but given the late forms of the name, a reflex of OE *beorg* ‘rounded hill, tumulus’ or ME *burgh* ‘burrow’ (itself derived from OE *burh*) are possible if, as Briggs suggests, the so-called older forms were Agas’ interpretation.<sup>100</sup>

**Bury St Edmunds or St Edmondsbury** (Sf) *sancte Eadmundes byrig* (1045×65) ‘Saint Edmund’s *burh*’ < Lat. *sanctus* + personal name OE *Ēadmund* + *burh* ultimately replacing an earlier name *Bidricheswrthe* ‘Beadurīc’s enclosure’ and alternative names for the religious

centre at the burial-place of St Edmund, king of the East Angles martyred in 869.<sup>101</sup> The development of a major religious centre around the burial place of St Edmund accounts for the change of name and may have followed enclosure of the monastic compound, as seems also to have been the case at Peterborough (discussed above).<sup>102</sup>

**Cnobheresburg** (c 731 (mid-8th century)) *Cnoferesburg* (c 9th century) [lost] ‘\*Cnobhere’s *burh*’. The name is, as glossed by Bede, readily explicable as a compound of an unattested personal name \**Cnobhere* and *burh*.<sup>103</sup> Given the reference to a *castrum*, OE *burh* may refer to a fortified site of some kind.

**Dickleburgh** (Nf) *Dicclesburc* (1086), *Dicclesburch* (c 1182×80). The second element of this name is evidently *burh*, the first element is usually interpreted as an unattested personal name OE \**Dic(c)el* or \**Dicla*, or an existing place name OE \**Dīc-lēah* ‘ditch/dyke clearing’ (the first element of which is either OE *dīc* or the place name Diss).<sup>104</sup> However, the attested Irish personal name Dícuill, the name of one of Fursa’s companions at *Cnobheresburg*, has also been suggested as the first element.<sup>105</sup> This is recorded twice in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* as *Dicul* (and dative *Dicullo*)<sup>106</sup> and, taking this as a plausible Anglicisation, we would expect \**Dīcules-burh* to become \**Dīcles-burh* (with high-vowel syncope) giving the 1086 forms.<sup>107</sup>

**Rumburgh** (Sf) *Ro[m]burc*, *Ra[m]burc* (1086). The first element is uncertain. Ekwall considered OE *rūm* ‘roomy, spacious’ but preferred OE *rūn* ‘secret, mystery, council’ OE \**hruna* ‘tree-trunk, log’; the latter is preferred by Briggs and Kilpatrick and Watts, and the name would then be ‘the stronghold made of logs’, a name paralleled in eight other names in which *burh* is compounded with an element denoting timber.<sup>108</sup> Briggs considers Irish *rúam* (< Lat. *Roma*), a term whose meanings included both ‘monastic settlement’ and ‘cemetery’ possible in the context of Irish involvement in the establishment of Christianity in East Anglia.<sup>109</sup> This is an interesting suggestion, but OE *rūn* or \**hruna*, both attested in other place names, are more likely.<sup>110</sup>

**Sudbury** (Sf) *Suðbyrig* (c 960×95/94 (11th century)); *Sutberie* (1086) ‘southern *burh*’ < OE *sūð* ‘south, southern’ + *burh*, usually thought to be named in relation to Bury St Edmunds<sup>111</sup> Domesday hundredal arrangements lend some weight to this suggestion: in 1086, Sudbury

was a detached part of Thingoe Hundred, the hundred to which Bury St Edmunds (by then extra-hundredal) had previously belonged.<sup>112</sup>

#### Appendix 2: Other *Burh*-Names Associated with Possible Monastic Sites

**Burgh by Aylsham** (Nf) *Burc, Buc* (1086). Simplex OE *burh*.<sup>113</sup>

**Burgh St Peter** (Nf) *Wetacreburch* (1278), *Whetacre Borough als. Borough St Peter* (1632) cf *Qwetacre Sancti Petri* (1254). Place name Wheatacre (later replaced by church dedication) + *burh*.<sup>114</sup>

**Happisburgh** (Nf) *Hapesburc* (1086). Personal name \**Hæp* + *burh*, the personal name being that also found in the group name \**Hæppingas*, which underlies the hundred name Happing.<sup>115</sup> Sandred suggests that Happisburgh might have served as the stronghold for the hundred; however, Blair notes other instances in which a group name becomes the name of a minster, or is incorporated into the name of a minster settlement.<sup>116</sup>

**Ryburgh, (Great and Little)** (Nf) *Reieborh, Reienburh* (1086). 'Rye *burh*' < OE *ryge* 'rye' + *burh*; the referent of *burh* is unknown.<sup>117</sup>

**Tasburgh** *Taseburc, Taseburch* (1086). Probably OE *tæse* 'convenient, suitable' + *burh*,<sup>118</sup> although a derived but unattested personal name OE \**Tæsa* has also been suggested.<sup>119</sup> Other place-name occurrences of OE *tæse* are known only from Wiltshire.<sup>120</sup> OE *burh* is usually taken to refer to the undated earthwork enclosure here.

#### Appendix 3: Other *Burh*-Names (Parish Names and Domesday Villages only)<sup>121</sup>

**Aldbrough** (Nf) *Aldeburc, Aldeburg, Aldebur* (1086). '(The) old *burh*' < OE *eald* + *burh*; there is no trace of a fortification here, so the sense may be '(enclosed) manor'.<sup>122</sup>

**Aldeburgh** (Sf) *Aldeburc* (1086). '(The) old *burh*' (as Aldborough); the referent is unknown, but may have been lost to coastal erosion; Mills notes a Roman site now in the sea, a possible location for an early monastery.<sup>123</sup>

**?Aldeby** (Nf.) *Aldebury* (1086). ‘(At the) old *burh*’ < OE *eald* + *byrig* (dative singular of *burh*) subsequently replaced by ON *bý(r)* ‘farmstead, village’, unless the Domesday form is an error for the latter, which is rather likely since the Domesday spelling is the sole form indicating *burh*.<sup>124</sup> The referent is unknown but, if the generic is indeed OE *burh*, one wonders whether the ‘new’ *burh* might be nearby Burgh St Peter.

**Attleborough** (Nf) *Atlebur*, *Atleburc* (1086). ‘Ætla’s *burh*’ < attested OE personal name *Ætla* + *burh*; the referent is unknown.<sup>125</sup>

**Burgh Parva** (Nf) *Burg*’ (1254x75). Simplex OE *burh*.<sup>126</sup>

**Burgh St Margaret** (Nf) *Burc*, *Burh* (1086). Simplex OE *burh*; the name has been suggested to refer to a Roman coastal defensive fortification, but there is no other evidence for this.<sup>127</sup> The place is recorded at least once as *Flegburg* (1232), recalling other ‘regional’ names for early churches or communities noted by John Blair, and thus perhaps of Happisburgh and Blythburgh, with their echoes of the early folk territories of the *Blythingas* and *Happingas* respectively. However, it is more likely to be an ad hoc affix to distinguish Burgh (St Margaret) from identically named places.

**?Ickburgh** (Nf) *Keburna*, *lcheburna*, *lccheburc*, *lccheburna*, *lcheburc* (1086). Probably ‘lc(c)a’s *burh*’ < unattested OE personal name \**lc(c)a* (as perhaps in Iken, below) + *burh*, though the number of forms indicating OE *burna* rather than *burh* (in Domesday Book and later sources) is troubling; the referent is unknown.<sup>128</sup>

**Narborough** (Nf) *Nereburgh* (1086). Probably ‘*burh* at the narrow place’ < OE \**neru* (occurring also in the adjacent Narford) + *burh*; the referent of *burh* is probably the Iron-Age fort in Camphill Plantation.<sup>129</sup>

**Oxborough** (Nf) *Oxenburgh*, *Oxenburh* (1086). ‘*Burh* where oxen are kept’ < OE *oxa* (genitive plural *oxna*) + *burh*; the referent of *burh* is unknown.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Language and Linguistic Science, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, United Kingdom. [eleonor.rye@york.ac.uk](mailto:eleonor.rye@york.ac.uk).

<sup>2</sup> School of History, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ. [t.williamson@uea.ac.uk](mailto:t.williamson@uea.ac.uk).

- 
- <sup>3</sup> *DOE* s.v. burh. The headform used here is a late and predominantly non-Anglian form (cf early West Saxon and Anglian and Northumbrian *burg*) (Hogg 1992, §§7.60–66; Parsons and Styles 2000, 79).
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 74–85; Draper 2008.
- <sup>5</sup> Stenton 1943, 8–9.
- <sup>6</sup> Smith 1964–65, iii, 141; cf *BCS* 274.
- <sup>7</sup> *BCS* 313–14.
- <sup>8</sup> William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, Book 5, ch 202, 350–1, in Hamilton 1870; *BCS* 58–9; Smith 1964–65, i, 109–10).
- <sup>9</sup> Stenton 1943, 9; *BCS* 76; Sims-Williams 1990, 140–1.
- <sup>10</sup> Stenton 1943, 9.
- <sup>11</sup> Jones 1958, 64; Hooke 1985, 11, 84–5; Sims-Williams 1990, 92–3; Watts 2004, 235.
- <sup>12</sup> Baker and Brookes 2013, 97.
- <sup>13</sup> Gelling 1997, 180–6.
- <sup>14</sup> Smith 1964–5, i, 26; Gelling 1997, 184; Parsons and Styles 2000, 77–8; cf Gelling (1973–6, 825) for the reasons for taking the form quoted to be the earliest form of the place name.
- <sup>15</sup> Gelling 1973–76, 825; 1997, 184.
- <sup>16</sup> Draper 2008; 2012.
- <sup>17</sup> Blair 1988, 11–12; Sims-Williams 1990, 152.
- <sup>18</sup> Smith 1956 i, 58–62; Parsons and Styles 2000, 77–8.
- <sup>19</sup> Campbell 1986, 108; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, MS E, sub anno 963*, in Irvine 2002, 58.
- <sup>20</sup> Blair 2005, 250; cf Cox 1975–76, 12, 29–39, 62–3.
- <sup>21</sup> Blair 2005, 196.
- <sup>22</sup> Draper 2008; 2012.
- <sup>23</sup> Blair 2018, 200 and 202–19.
- <sup>24</sup> Eg, Blair 2011.
- <sup>25</sup> Pestell 2004, 59–64; Draper 2008, 242.
- <sup>26</sup> Cf Pestell 2004, 23–6.
- <sup>27</sup> On the reasons for preferring the form *Domnoc* to *Dommoc*, see Coates 2000, 234–5.
- <sup>28</sup> Whitelock 1972; Haslam 1972.
- <sup>29</sup> Rigold 1961; 1974; cf Scull et al 2016.
- <sup>30</sup> Watts 2004, 227–8.
- <sup>31</sup> Coates 2000, 238–9; Mills 2011, 187–8; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 52.
- <sup>32</sup> Rodwell 1976.
- <sup>33</sup> Pestell 2004, 24–5.
- <sup>34</sup> Cramp 1984; West 1984; Scarfe 1986, 39–51.
- <sup>35</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Book 3, ch 19, 270–1.
- <sup>36</sup> Hoggett 2007, 114–15; cf Campbell 1986, 101.
- <sup>37</sup> Whitelock 1972, 5–6.
- <sup>38</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Book 4, ch 5, 352–5; Whitelock 1972, 8, 19–22; Pestell 2004, 20.
- <sup>39</sup> *Liber Albus* of Bury, London, British Library, Harleian MS 1005, f 195; cf Thomson 1980, 144–5.
- <sup>40</sup> Blake 1962, 17.
- <sup>41</sup> Fenwick 1984; Carr et al 1988; Daring and Gurney 1993; Hoggett 2010, 6–63; Pestell 2004.
- <sup>42</sup> Pevsner and Wilson 1999, 196; Blair 2002, 558.
- <sup>43</sup> Pestell 2004, 147–8: although there are difficulties with this interpretation, for which see Okasha 2003, 228–9.
- <sup>44</sup> Pestell 2004, 149.
- <sup>45</sup> Blake 1962, 19; Scarfe 1986, 44; Warner 1996, 120.
- <sup>46</sup> Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 297.
- <sup>47</sup> Ekwall 1960, 241; Warner 1996, 120–1; cf Smith 1956 i, 247.
- <sup>48</sup> Waller 1903; Pestell 2004, 92; Suffolk Historic Environment Record BLB 004.
- <sup>49</sup> Warner 1996, 158–9.
- <sup>50</sup> Scarfe 1988.
- <sup>51</sup> On the application of *burh* to Roman fortifications, see Draper (2008, 241) and Parsons and Styles (2000, 75).
- <sup>52</sup> Stevenson 1922, 43–5; Scarfe 1986, 49–50.

- 
- <sup>53</sup> Stevenson 1922, 43–5; Hoggett 2010, 67–9.
- <sup>54</sup> Johnson 1983, 111–12 and 118–19.
- <sup>55</sup> Hoggett 2010, 60.
- <sup>56</sup> Whitelock 1930, 4–7; Hart 1966, 53–4; Pestell 2004, 115, appendix 1.
- <sup>57</sup> Blake 1962, 11 n. e.
- <sup>58</sup> Dickleburgh and Semere were separate manors held by Bury St Edmunds (and others in the case of Semere) in 1086 (Brown 1986, 7,13, 14,23 (note) and 14, 29–30).
- <sup>59</sup> Hart 1966, 86–9; S 1608. The text survives only in a fifteenth-century copy (the language of which has been updated) thought genuine.
- <sup>60</sup> Blomefield 1805, 191–3; Blair 2005, 360.
- <sup>61</sup> Watts 2004, 394; Yorke 1995, 162–3; Yorke 2010, 164–9.
- <sup>62</sup> Pestell 2004, 97, 125.
- <sup>63</sup> *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, MS F (sub anno 799)*, lxxvi and 58, in Baker 2000.
- <sup>64</sup> Whitelock 1930, 40–1; S 1486.
- <sup>65</sup> Wade and Dymond 1999.
- <sup>66</sup> Newman 1990.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>68</sup> Three further examples appear in Domesday but remain unlocated and, because their character and associations cannot be ascertained, are excluded from this analysis.
- <sup>69</sup> Counting Burgh by Woodbridge and Grundisburgh as two *burh* names.
- <sup>70</sup> Fenwick 1984.
- <sup>71</sup> Norfolk Historic Environment Record 11602.
- <sup>72</sup> Norfolk Historic Environment Record 44917.
- <sup>73</sup> Norfolk Record Office DN/TA 739.
- <sup>74</sup> The finds from the site are currently being analysed: *Current Archaeology* 322; [www.mola.org.uk/blog/discovery-rare-anglosaxon-burials-revealed](http://www.mola.org.uk/blog/discovery-rare-anglosaxon-burials-revealed); <https://historicenland.org.uk/whats-new/news/survival-of-rare-anglo-saxon-coffins>.
- <sup>75</sup> Adams 2013.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid, 42.
- <sup>77</sup> Sandred 1996, 99; Hough 2009; Bourne 2012. In Scotland and northern England, similar names often lie close to the administrative centres of administrative units, suggesting these were churches of some importance (Barrow 1973, 26–8 and 60–4). Eccles church itself is now lost to coastal erosion.
- <sup>78</sup> Pevsner and Wilson 1999, 692.
- <sup>79</sup> Rogerson and Lawson 1992, 57–8.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>81</sup> Cf Blair 1992, 234–46.
- <sup>82</sup> Rogerson 2007.
- <sup>83</sup> For instance, Gelling (1984) and Gelling and Cole (2000) give definitions of place-name elements that frequently differ from lexical usage — for instance the 25 Old English terms for different types of hills, slopes and ridges; Hough (2010) provides numerous examples of vocabulary attested only in place names.
- <sup>84</sup> Draper (2008, 249) argues for the application of *burh* to new towns at both Peterborough and Bury St Edmunds, noting the presence of a mint at Bury St Edmunds as evidence for Bury’s urban status, but evidence for the mint post-dates renaming by at least a decade (Carroll and Parsons 2007, 52–8). The distinction between a town and a monastery may in any case have been less clear-cut to pre-Conquest commentators than it is to us today (Campbell 1986, 108; Draper 2008, 249).
- <sup>85</sup> Parsons and Styles 2000, 79; Draper 2008, 247. The element’s Middle English (ME) reflex *burgh* was, of course, used to mean ‘borough’, ie a town with a particular legal status: Parsons and Styles 2000, 78–9
- <sup>86</sup> Draper 2008; 2012 and Blair 2018, especially ch 1.
- <sup>87</sup> Draper 2008, 242–3. Parsons and Styles 2000, 74.
- <sup>88</sup> It might usefully inform, for example, discussions about the character, and early territorial development, of the middle-Anglo-Saxon site at Flixborough in Lincolnshire (‘Flik’s *burh*’: the first element is Scandinavian but ~~may~~ have replaced an OE word or name: see Cameron 2007, 83). The excavated site was actually closer to the deserted medieval settlement of North Conesby, 700 m to the south of Flixborough village, but the latter is

---

more likely to perpetuate the name of the place: Foote and Roffe 2007, 139. For the debate about the character of the site, see Blair 2011.

<sup>89</sup> Early spellings from Briggs and Kilpatrick (2016) unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>90</sup> Ekwall 1960, 31; Watts 2004, 31.

<sup>91</sup> Ekwall 1960, 50; Watts 2004, 67; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 14.

<sup>92</sup> River Blyth: *Blith* (1586); Blyford: *Blitleford* (mid-11th century [13th century]), *Blideforda* (1086); Blything Hundred: *Blidinga H'*, *Blidigga H'* (1086).

<sup>93</sup> Ekwall 1928, 38–39.

<sup>94</sup> Blair 2002, 518.

<sup>95</sup> *Domesday Book*: Suffolk, 7,80 and 39,1 in Rumble 1986; Watts 2004, 228.

<sup>96</sup> Ekwall 1960, 75 and 207; Watts 2004, 100; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 25 and 62.

<sup>97</sup> Watts 2004, 265.

<sup>98</sup> Ekwall 1960, 75; Watts 2004, 100; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 25.

<sup>99</sup> London, British Library, Egerton MS 2789 A [survey of manors of Butley, Boyton, and Tangham made by Ralph Agas].

<sup>100</sup> Fenwick 1984, 35–7 and 52 fn 3; Briggs unpublished.

<sup>101</sup> The earlier name is (*on*) *Bidricheswrthe* (c 960×96) < OE personal name \**Beadurīc* + *word* 'enclosure'; the religious centre was known by various other names: (*into*) *sanctæ Eadmundes stope* (962×91) (11th century), (*to*) *seynt Eadmundes stowe* (946×c 951) (13th century) with OE *stōw* 'place, meeting-place, holy place'; *sanctæ Eadmundes kirke* (942×51) (13th) with ON *kirkja* 'church'; and *seynt Eadmundes minstre* (1051×57) (13th) with OE *mynster* 'monastery' (Ekwall 1960, 78; Watts 2004, 105; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 27).

<sup>102</sup> Carroll and Parsons 2007, 56–7.

<sup>103</sup> Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 25–6. The first element of the personal name, thought to be related to OE *cnapa*, *cnafa*, is attested in an early 9th-century name *Cnobualch* in the Durham *Liber Vitae* (Insley et al 2007, 99).

<sup>104</sup> Ekwall 1960, 144; Watts 2004, 186; Mills 2011, 154.

<sup>105</sup> Scarfe 1972, 119.

<sup>106</sup> Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Book 3, ch 19 and Book 4, ch 13, 274 and 372.

<sup>107</sup> Cf Hogg 1992, §6,18.

<sup>108</sup> Ekwall 1960, 396; Watts 2004, 512; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 116–21; cf Baker 2012, 320–2.

<sup>109</sup> Briggs unpublished; cf *eDIL* s.v. 1 *ruam*.

<sup>110</sup> Cf Smith 1956 i, 266; and 1956 ii 89.

<sup>111</sup> Ekwall 1960, 452; Watts 2004, 588; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 134.

<sup>112</sup> *Domesday Book*: Suffolk, 1,97, in Rumble 1986; Martin 1988, 26.

<sup>113</sup> Sandred 2002, 66.

<sup>114</sup> Ekwall 1960, 75; Schram/Sandred Collection; Watts 2004, 100.

<sup>115</sup> Sandred 1996, 84, 92–3.

<sup>116</sup> Blair 2005, 251.

<sup>117</sup> Ekwall 1960, 398; Watts 2004, 515.

<sup>118</sup> Watts 2004, 601.

<sup>119</sup> Ekwall 1960, 461; Mills 2011, 452.

<sup>120</sup> Gover et al 1939, 259, 318.

<sup>121</sup> The locations of the lost Suffolk Domesday villas of *Burch* (simplex *burh*; Plomesgate Hundred), *Nordberia* (OE *norð* 'north, northern' + *burh* (dative singular *byrig*); Plomesgate Hundred) and *Riseburc* (OE *hrīs* 'brushwood' + *burh*; perhaps Blything Hundred) in Suffolk are unknown (*Domesday Book*: Suffolk, 1,12, 6,145 and 8, 81 in Rumble 1986).

<sup>122</sup> Sandred 2002, 2.

<sup>123</sup> Mills 2014, 21; Briggs and Kilpatrick 2016, 1.

<sup>124</sup> Watts 2004, 6; cf Fellows-Jensen 1999, 49.

<sup>125</sup> Watts 2004, 26.

<sup>126</sup> Sandred 2002, 135.

<sup>127</sup> Sandred 1996, 47–8.

<sup>128</sup> Watts 2004, 328; Ekwall 1928, 465–67. The river name Wissey is recorded in the pre-Conquest period, meaning that the first element is unlikely to be a name for the Wissey.

---

<sup>129</sup> Ekwall 1960, 336; Watts 2004, 429.

<sup>130</sup> Ekwall 1960, 355; Watts 2004, 458.