Differing patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia: an analysis of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names in their geographical and archaeological contexts

by

David Alan Boulton

being a thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of History, University of East Anglia
April 2020

Volume One of two volumes
(redacted version)

- contains text of thesis, abstract and bibliography
(margins aligned for double-sided printing)

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the different phases and patterns of Viking settlement and assimilation in East Anglia from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, by means of a linguistic analysis of the Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names of the region, coupled with an examination of the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with them. Using an interdisciplinary approach and GIS mapping technology has enabled both the formation and naming of these settlements to be explored and correlated for the first time, and existing interpretations to be reconsidered.

The findings of this thesis are complex, and do not all conform to previously accepted, and largely monocausal, hypotheses for the origins of different types of Scandinavian place-names in England. The evidence suggests that the East Anglian place-names in **-thorp** and **-bý** compounded with Scandinavian personal names were formed in differing circumstances from the remaining **thorps** and **býs** containing non-anthroponymic elements or forming simplexes. It indicates also that the 'Grimston-hybrids' do not all represent well-established Anglo-Saxon villages taken over and renamed by new Danish landholders, as previously hypothesised, but that some constituted new, marginal settlements established in the upper river valleys of the East Anglian clay plateau as this was being brought back into agricultural use.

These contradictions within the individual linguistic categories of Scandinavian place-names suggest that a new paradigm of interpretation is required that identifies broader discernible patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia – and perhaps elsewhere. The thesis has therefore proposed an interpretation of the formation of the Scandinavian place-names in East Anglia in terms of a possible migrationary process – an approach which has been recently rehabilitated in Viking studies and corroborated increasingly by archaeological evidence. But it suggests also that the patterns of Viking settlement and place-name formation in East Anglia differed from those postulated elsewhere in the Danelaw partly because they coincided with major changes already occurring in the East Anglian rural landscape that resulted from the late Anglo-Saxon expansion of arable farming.

[Length of thesis, bibliography and abstract: 119,933 words]

LIST OF CONTENTS Volume One

LIST OF APPENDICES Volume Two

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to my primary supervisor, Tom Williamson, who guided my ponderous progress towards the completion of this thesis with enduring patience and unwavering enthusiasm, and steered me deftly around potential pitfalls. I always emerged from our supervisory sessions with restored confidence, renewed vigour, and my head full of exciting new ideas to explore. Many thanks also to my secondary supervisor, Rob Liddiard, who saved me from a cherished but fruitless line of interpretation, and to Jon Gregory, who initiated me into the arcane arts of GIS mapping at the start of my project and undertook the role of internal examiner at the end of my studies. I am very grateful both to him and to my external examiner, Richard Jones, for turning a daunting, Covid-compliant online viva into a civilised and rewarding experience, for responding so positively to my thesis, and for providing much invaluable feedback and advice.

I would also like to thank my tutors at the University of Nottingham where I completed the MA that made my PhD possible: Judith Jesch and Jayne Carroll, who introduced me to the academic study of both Vikings and place-names, and Julia Barrow, who supervised my MA dissertation. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Sam Newton, who encouraged and facilitated my return to university education during the halcyon days of extra-mural adult education courses, and first suggested the possibility of undertaking a PhD. I am very grateful also to Nick Groves, who taught me Old English and similarly endorsed my return to academic study.

Thanks are due also to several individuals who have freely offered me help and advice, comments and suggestions – in particular: David Addy (who generously let me use his excellent GIS layers of 11th-century hundred boundaries), Keith Briggs (who provided invaluable pre-publication access to his forthcoming detailed survey of Suffolk place-names), Gillian Fellows-Jensen (who offered much-appreciated help and encouragement at the start of my studies), and Edward Martin and Kenneth Penn (who both gave me access to unpublished papers). Heather Hamilton kindly located and supplied additional data from the Norfolk Historic Environmental Record. Thanks also to many other place-name scholars, fellow PhD students and medieval historians – especially those at numerous SNSBI conferences, PhD workshops and Wuffing Education study-days – with whom I have discussed many aspects of the issues explored in this thesis.

Sadly, my parents did not live to see the result of my labours but I would like to thank my sister and brother-in-law, Anne and Nigel, and my niece Clare and her husband Simon, for their encouragement and forbearance, particularly when my PhD work sometimes got in the way of fulfilling family duties. Finally, especial thanks to my partner Elisabeth, who provided much emotional support when my mind returned to the twenty-first century after long excursions into the ninth, tenth and eleventh.

Conventions and terminology

Use of italic and bold type

In the sections of this thesis dealing with the etymologies of place-names, *italic* type is used to indicate personal names (e.g. *Ulfcytel*), and **bold** type to denote appellative or non-anthroponymic elements (e.g. **bý** and **tūn**), following the practice of Watts 2004: xviii.

An asterisk* denotes an unrecorded or hypothetical name or word-element.

Dates and periods

All the dates given in this thesis are cited without an AD prefix.

In the sections dealing with the archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with specific place-names, the chronological terms 'Early Saxon' (*c.* 411-650), 'Middle Saxon' (*c.* 651-850) and 'Late Saxon' (*c.* 851-1100) are used, following the terminology used in the documentation of the Norfolk and Suffolk Historic Environment Records. No cultural connotations are implied by their use.

Use of the term 'Viking' and 'Scandinavian'

The terms 'Vikings' and 'Viking' are used broadly in this thesis to refer to people, artefacts and culture of largely Scandinavian origin, but including also those emanating from other Scandinavian-controlled territories in western Europe, who participated in activities and settlement outside the Scandinavia homelands during the period from *c.* 800 to *c.* 1100 (following Williams 2014: 17-20 and Jesch 2015: 4-8).

The term 'Scandinavian' is used more specifically to refer to the people, artefacts and culture of the territory that now forms the three present-day countries of Denmark, Norway and Sweden.

'Anglo-Scandinavian' is used to refer to the hybrid artefacts, culture and language (embodying both Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian elements) that developed in England from the ninth century onwards as Scandinavian settlers began to assimilate into English society.

Abbreviations used within the text of the thesis

ASC	Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (editions as cited in text)
c.	*circa*
CDEPN	Watts, V. (2004) *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Cambridge: CUP)
CORS	currently occupied rural settlement (ref. Lewis 2010)
DEPN	Ekwall, E. (1960) *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names,* 4th edn (Oxford: OUP)
DMV	deserted medieval village
DSPN	Briggs, K. and Kilpatrick, K. (2016) *A Dictionary of Suffolk Place-Names* (Nottingham: EPNS)
EPNE	Smith, A.H. (1956) *English Place-Name Elements*, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP)
EHER	Essex Historic Environment Record
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
LPN	Gelling, M. and Cole, A. (2003) *The Landscape of Place-Names*, repr. edn with corrections (Donington: Shaun Tyas)
NHER	Norfolk Historic Environment Record
ME	Middle English
ODan	Old Danish – only used when specified in a reference work as opposed to ON
OE	Old English
ON	Old Norse – used as a general term to indicate Scandinavian language as used during the Viking period
OED	Oxford English Dictionary online (last accessed March 2020) <www.oed.com>
PAS	Portable Antiquities Scheme
PNEss	Reaney, P.H. (1935) *The Place-Names of Essex* (Cambridge: CUP)

PNNf1 Sandred, K.I. and Lindström, B. (1989) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part One, The Place-Names of the City of Norwich*, (Nottingham: EPNS)

PNNf2 Sandred, K.I., Cornford, B., Lindström, B. and Rutledge, P. (1996) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part Two, The Hundreds of East and West Flegg, Happing and Tunstead*, (Nottingham: EPNS)

PNNf3 Sandred, K.I. (2002) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part Three, The Hundreds of North and South Erpingham and Holt*, (Nottingham: EPNS)

SHER Suffolk Historic Environment Record

SIEE Hodge, C.A.H., Burton, R.G.O., Corbett, W.M., Evans, R. and Seale, R.S. (1984) *Soils and Their Uses in Eastern England* (Harpenden: Soil Survey of England and Wales)

SPNN Insley, J. (1994) *Scandinavian Personal Names in Norfolk: A Survey Based on Medieval Records and Place-Names* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell)

SPNLY Fellows Jensen, G. (1968) *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag)

SSNEM Fellows Jensen, G. (1978) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag)

SSNNW Fellows-Jensen, G. (1985) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West* (Copenhagen: Institut for Navneforskning)

SSNY Fellows Jensen, G. (1972) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag)

TIACL Cullen, P., Jones, R. and Parsons, D.N. (2011) *Thorps in a Changing Landscape* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press)

VEPN1 Parsons, D.N. & T. Styles (1997) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 1: Á-Box (Nottingham: Centre for English Name Studies)

VEPN2 Parsons, D.N. & T. Styles (2000) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 2: Brace-Cæster (Nottingham: Centre for English Name Studies)

VEPN3 Parsons, D.N. (2004) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 3: Ceafor-Cockpit (Nottingham, 2004) (Nottingham: EPNS)

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1) The research context

The interpretation of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names has played an important role in the study of Viking settlement in several areas of England, with systematic linguistic and geographical analyses undertaken in Yorkshire, the East Midlands and the North-West (*SSNY; SSNEM; SSNNW;* [1] Cameron 1965; 1970; 1971). But none has been conducted so far in East Anglia, which has traditionally been regarded as an area of less significant and intensive Viking settlement – partly because of its relative lack of Scandinavian-influenced place-names compared with Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, especially those containing the archetypal **býr** and **thorp** elements. Intriguingly, however, East Anglia contains a comparatively higher number of the so-called 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names, containing an Old Norse (hereafter ON) personal name compounded with the Old English (hereafter OE) **tūn** generic, which have also been traditionally regarded as a significant indicator of Viking settlement (Cameron 1971).

Within East Anglia, historians have tended to focus primarily upon the apparently more intensive area of Viking settlement in eastern Norfolk, suggested by the concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names (especially the **býr**-names[2] of East and West Flegg) as well as other forms of archaeological evidence, but less attention has been paid to possible Viking settlement elsewhere in East Anglia. For example, historical evidence indicates some degree of Viking activity, control and settlement in southern Suffolk, eighty kilometres away from Flegg, centred around

[1] Abbreviations used in the text of this thesis are given on pages 17-18.
[2] The use of **bold** and *italic* type to denote place-name elements is explained in the 'Conventions and Terminology' section on page 15.

Hadleigh where the Viking leader Guthrum was traditionally reported to have been buried (Dumville and Lapidge 1984: 95) – in an area containing a considerable concentration of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names. This suggests that two or more separate processes of Viking settlement may have occurred in different areas of East Anglia, reflecting a possible dichotomy between the extensive non-written evidence for Viking activity in Norfolk (with, however, few direct historical references) and to some extent the opposite situation in Suffolk and Essex.

So there appears to be a clear need for a systematic linguistic and geographical survey of place-name evidence for Viking settlement throughout East Anglia, similar to those already undertaken for other regions of England, together with a re-evaluation of other types of historical and archaeological evidence – especially the new ideas and interpretations emerging from recent analysis of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian metalwork finds (such as those discussed in Kershaw 2013 and Pestell 2013). These have raised once more the question of possible migration from Scandinavia, an issue that has been somewhat overlooked in recent Viking studies.

Much recent academic work on Viking settlement in England has focussed upon its later stages, looking at the impact of the Vikings upon, and their assimilation into, Anglo-Saxon society – thus adopting a different emphasis to the Viking scholarship of the twentieth century, wherein questions regarding the nature and scale of Viking settlement had remained fundamental. The traditional interpretation envisaged a large-scale settlement of Danish soldiers numbering in their thousands, as indicated by the large number of Scandinavian-influenced place-names located throughout the territory of the former Danelaw (Stenton 1971: 243, 519-25). This approach, however, was criticized by revisionist scholars who argued for a smaller-scale settlement of just a few hundred veteran warriors (Sawyer 1971: 123-28, 209). Although subsequently rejected (Brooks 1979), this minimalist view led to a detailed re-appraisal of the place-name evidence and the formulation by Kenneth Cameron in the 1970s of the hypothesis of a secondary migration of Scandinavian settlers to explain how so many Scandinavian-influenced place-names could have been created by apparently so few Viking warriors (Cameron 1965, 1970, 1971). Cameron's work

was based upon an innovative analysis of the geographical and geological contexts of different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names and his interpretation was broadly endorsed by other place-names scholars such as Gillian Fellows-Jensen (1972, 1978, 1985a), but his intriguing hypothetical (but historically unattested) secondary migration of Scandinavian settlers was not explored any further.

This unwillingness to consider the possibility of a secondary Viking migration reflected a downplaying in the role of migration as an agent of social change in the processualist archaeology of the 1970s and 1980s (Trafford 2000: 24-25; Redmond 2007: 54). At the same time, new thinking on early medieval ethnicity questioned the earlier unambiguous categorisation of groups of people as 'Danish' or 'English', as ethnic identity began to be regarded less as an inherited attribute and more as a process by which individuals acquired certain desirable ethnic characteristics (Innes 2000; Hadley 2002; Downham 2009, 2012). These developments coincided with a paradigmatic shift in Viking studies at the end of the twentieth century away from the study of traditional questions, such as how many Vikings were there and where did they settle, which were regarded as 'fundamentally unanswerable' (Hadley and Richards 2000b: 4).

The use of traditional forms of evidence such as place-name studies for gauging the scale, distribution and chronology of Scandinavian settlement also came under increasing attack for being too simplistic (Hadley 1996b: 69-75; 2000a: 329-35; 2000c: 124-28); Richards 2000a: 45-47). Instead, a new generation of scholars started to examine the outcomes or results of Viking settlement in Britain, focussing upon 'the processes of accommodation, assimilation and integration' (Hadley and Richards 2000b: 4). However, an unwillingness to consider the initial migration phase has somehow removed a foundation layer from the study of the settlement process, leading to the criticism that recent scholarship has been trying 'to understand Viking settlement by projecting the perceived results backwards' (Redmond 2007: 54). Although migration as a causal factor in archaeology was rehabilitated to some extent, especially in the earlier medieval period where there has been detailed academic analysis and discussion of the Anglo-Saxon migration and settlement (Hamerow 1997), it continued to receive little attention in Viking studies. But the

tide appears to be turning, however, and migration is starting to be examined as a significant phase and component of Viking settlement in England (Redmond 2007; Kershaw 2009; 2013; McLeod 2011; 2014; Jesch 2015).

The historical value of Scandinavian-influenced place-names has also undergone a major reassessment in onomastic scholarship, and it is now accepted that they do not directly indicate individual centres of Scandinavian settlement but rather provide a broader index of the influence of ON language (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 392-93). More sophisticated models have been recently proposed for how analysis of place-names might be employed to illuminate the complexities of the Viking settlement process, involving a detailed examination of the local context of different classes of Scandinavian-influenced place-names utilising documentary, archaeological and landscape evidence (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 421-23; Hadley 2006: 104).

Renewed academic interest has also been shown in the relationships between place-names, landscape and settlement-archaeology (Higham and Ryan 2011; Jones and Semple 2012; Carroll and Parsons 2013). Since Cameron's pioneering work on the geological context of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, detailed information has become available on the different types of soil found across eastern England (Hodge *et al.* 1984), making possible a more accurate characterisation of the local landscape types (Countryside Agency 1999; Williamson 2006). Other developments in landscape history and archaeology have enabled a fuller understanding of the location of settlements and use of land in the early medieval period, revealing complex processes of territorial re-organisation and changing methods of agricultural production occurring at that time (Williamson 2003; 2013a). The increasing use of computerised mapping (Geographical Information Systems, or GIS) has made it possible to locate settlements and place-names accurately in terms of the underlying geological formations, soil-types, topography, hydrology and climate (Chapman 2006). The historical impact of such environmental factors on settlement in East Anglia has been explored both in broad regional terms (Countryside Agency 1999; Williamson 2006, 2013) and in more detailed case-studies of specific areas or localities (such as Laverton 2001; Williamson 1997; 2005a; 2008), but no systematic

analysis has yet been made of the geographical context of Viking settlement in this region.

The recent historiography of Viking settlement in East Anglia has been somewhat limited or fragmented, with only partial surveys and analyses – some as summarised accounts (Pestell 2019) or part of broader studies of Viking activity in England as a whole (Hadley 2006; Hart 1992), and others as part of examinations of more specific historical topics within East Anglia (Pestell 2004; Martin and Satchell 2008). The focus of interest has been on Norfolk, with scholars debating the nature and scale of Viking settlement there (Williamson 1993; Margeson 1996; 1997), postulating possible origins for the **bý**-names of Flegg (Campbell 2001; Abrams and Parsons 2004; Abrams 2005), and interpreting the significance of recent Scandinavian metalwork finds (Kershaw 2009; 2013; Pestell 2013). Recent onomastic scholarship has examined specific issues in East Anglia arising out of the linguistic interpretation of Scandinavian-influenced place-names (Fellows-Jensen 1999; 2007; Insley 1999; Sandred 1987; 1990; 2001) or their distribution in individual counties (Boulton and Briggs 2017), and the distribution of Scandinavian-influenced field-names (Sandred 1979; Parsons 2006) and Scandinavian-influenced personal names (Insley 1994; Parsons 2002), but once again no overall synthesis has yet been attempted.

This research project seeks to redress the omissions of scholarship outlined above by exploring systematically the differing patterns of Viking migration and settlement in East Anglia, utilising the research objectives, hypotheses and methodologies outlined below.

1.2) Research objectives, hypotheses and methodologies

This thesis aims to explore the different phases and patterns of Viking settlement and assimilation in East Anglia from the ninth to the eleventh centuries primarily through a linguistic analysis of the region's Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements

associated with them. This will be used to determine the nature and extent of Scandinavian linguistic influence across the differing geographical zones of the region, from which in turn the underlying patterns of Viking settlement may be hypothesised. The results of this analysis will be tested against, and supplemented by, the other available forms of evidence, and used to identify different groups of Viking settlers and to explore the nature of the Viking migration process.

The research project and methodology are predicated upon three working hypotheses. The first is that in the late ninth century the leaders and veterans of the Great Army took control of and occupied large areas of land located in favourable settings throughout inland East Anglia, a process which has left little evidence of Scandinavian linguistic influence apart from the numerous Anglo-Scandinavian 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names. By contrast, a more numerous and lower-status ON-speaking population formed zones of linguistic influence and settlement along the eastern coastal regions of Norfolk, Suffolk and north-east Essex, indicated by the presence of a greater number of purer ON place-names – which may possibly provide evidence of a later secondary migration of individuals from Scandinavia. It is further postulated that both these incursions occurred against a backdrop of major changes already occurring in the rural landscape of East Anglia resulting from the late Anglo-Saxon expansion of arable farming.

The second hypothesis is that the Great Army veterans (who were probably more multi-ethnic in origin than purely 'Danish') had become fairly well assimilated into Anglo-Saxon society by the time they began to form settlements in East Anglia, which may be why their historically attested presence is surprisingly hard to detect in the archaeological and onomastic record. By contrast once again, later migrants from Scandinavia would have been less well assimilated and more identifiably 'Scandinavian' in language, dress and place-naming practices – and therefore their presence, although historically unattested, may in fact be more recognizable in terms of archaeological artefacts and place-names.

Thirdly, it is hypothesised that the Great Army veterans and the subsequent immigrants from Scandinavia can be categorized in classic migration theory as

'pioneers' and 'primary' or 'secondary migrants' respectively, and the characteristics of both groups hypothesised and reconstructed accordingly.

The main methodological component of this research project is the compilation of linguistic and geographical corpora or databases of all the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in the three counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, plus some adjacent Anglo-Saxon place-names for comparison. These databases will record detailed information for each place-name, including its early name-forms and probable etymology (as a guide to possible chronology), the geographical and soil-type context of its associated settlement, together with any further known historical and archaeological information regarding its formation and development in the late Anglo-Saxon period.

The relationship between Scandinavian-influenced place-names and Viking settlement is far from a simple equation, however, and so the distribution patterns of the place-names presented in these databases will be interrogated further utilizing GIS (Geographic Information Systems) technology, which provides a sophisticated database management system designed for the acquisition, storage, analysis, manipulation and display of forms of geographically referenced information (Chapman 2006: 14-15; Conolly and Lake 2006: 1-32). GIS technology will be used to facilitate the qualitative and quantitative analysis and display of the local landscape context of the settlements associated with Scandinavian-influenced place-names (such as their underlying terrain, geology and soil-types, and proximity to water and other resources). It will also explore their wider landscape context (Chapman 2006: 89-111), including their proximity to navigable rivers and the sea, other Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon settlements and towns, military and ecclesiastical institutions, and the find-locations for other forms of archaeological evidence. This analysis will be supplemented by a comparative survey of the geographical distribution and relative proportions of other forms of onomastic evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia.

1.3) Structure of the thesis

PART I, containing Chapters 2 to 5, provides a broad context for the examination of Viking settlement in East Anglia, and assesses the differing types of evidence used in this thesis.

Chapter 2 examines the somewhat limited direct historical evidence relating to Viking settlement in East Anglia between the late ninth and the eleventh centuries, and constructs an outline historical and chronological framework, introducing themes and developments arising from the documentary sources that will be explored further in this study.

Chapter 3 examines and evaluates in turn the various forms of non-written primary sources which have been used by scholars to explore the nature of Viking settlement in East Anglia. It demonstrates that much of the traditional archaeological material apparently indicative of Viking settlement, such as that provided by 'Scandinavian-type' burials and buildings, remains sparse and inconclusive for various reasons, but it assesses also a number of new interpretations of Scandinavian influence that have emerged in response to recent discoveries in urban and rural archaeology, especially the increasingly abundant metalwork and coin finds located by metal-detectorists across the region.

Chapter 4 evaluates the use of Scandinavian-influenced place-names as linguistic evidence for Viking settlement, a subject of considerable and continuing academic debate. It then looks at the specific context and pattern of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia, compared with those found in other parts of the former Danelaw and also in comparison with the other, mainly Old English, place-names within East Anglia.

Chapter 5 provides a broad geographical background to the process of Viking settlement in East Anglia, introducing the geographical factors and parameters for evaluation that will be used to examine the specific landscape settings of the settlements associated with different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names

which are studied in Chapters 6 to 9. It also outlines the more specific developments in the patterns of settlement in East Anglia that occurred during the early medieval period contemporaneously with the process of Viking settlement.

PART II, containing Chapters 6 to 10, presents a detailed analysis of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia, which are arranged into separate chapters according to traditional onomastic categorisation by generic to facilitate comparison with existing studies of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in other regions of the Danelaw. Each chapter analyses linguistically the place-names of each category and, where possible, examines the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with them – interrogating in particular the question of whether the settlements themselves were formed before the arrival of the Scandinavian settlers responsible for naming or renaming them.

Chapter 6 examines the place-names in **-bý** of East Anglia, and concludes that there is no single set of historical circumstances that led to their formation. It also provides a possible explanatory model for the formation of the cluster of **bý**-names in East and West Flegg.

Chapter 7 analyses the place-names containing the **thorp** generic, and suggests that those compounded with ON personal names may have been formed in significantly different circumstances from the remaining **thorps**.

Chapter 8 considers the wide variety of place-names containing ON generics other than **bý** or **thorp**, and reveals an equally diverse range of settlement-formations associated with them. A few place-names, such as those containing the **thwaite** generic, were apparently given to settlements formed after the arrival of Viking settlers, whereas most of the others appear to constitute the renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements using Scandinavian or Scandinavianised elements to replace equivalent, and often cognate, OE terms.

Chapter 9 examines the hybrid place-names combining an OE generic with either a fully ON specific or one that has been altered in some way by Scandinavian linguistic influence (that is, Scandinavianised). This category includes the so-called 'Grimston-hybrids', which combine the OE **tūn** generic with an ON personal name,

and the evidence suggests that those in East Anglia were not principally formed by Great Army veterans taking over and renaming existing well-established Anglo-Saxon villages – contradicting the still largely accepted and traditional explanation for the 'Grimston-hybrids' found elsewhere in the Danelaw.

Part II concludes with **Chapter 10**, which examines the geographical context of the other forms of onomastic evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia, such as Scandinavian-influenced language and dialect, minor and field-names, hundred names, personal names and street names, and compares the findings with those of the place-name evidence.

PART III contains Chapters 11 and 12, which provide a discussion of the complex and diverse body of evidence presented by Scandinavian-influenced place-names for the possible patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia, and presents the thesis's conclusions.

Chapter 11 seeks to discern broader patterns and paradigms of place-name formation and Viking settlement in East Anglia that transcend the individual name-type categories that have been presented separately in Chapters 6 to 9. It also reconsiders the long-postulated 'secondary migration' of settlers from Scandinavia in terms of recent migration theory as it might be reflected in the formation of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and tentatively proposes a possible historical and migrationary model of Scandinavian settlement in East Anglia.

PART ONE:
CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

Chapter Two:

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

This chapter will examine the somewhat limited direct and indirect historical evidence relating to Viking settlement in East Anglia between the late ninth and the eleventh centuries, looking at the various types of historical narrative-accounts and the differing forms of evidence provided by Domesday Book and shorter medieval documents (both Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest), together with the material deriving from Scandinavian sources. It will then construct an outline historical and chronological framework, and introduce themes and developments arising from the documentary sources that will be explored further in this study.

The 'Viking period' in England has been usefully divided into two distinct phases of Viking activity: the First Viking Age from 793 (the year of the raid on Lindisfarne) until 954 (the end of Scandinavian rule in the kingdom of York), and the Second Viking Age from *c.* 980 (the renewal of Viking raids on England) until an indeterminate endpoint in the eleventh century, with suggested dates ranging from 1016 (Cnut's conquest of England) until *c.* 1100 when Scandinavian raiding on England finally ceased (Sawyer 1969; Pestell 2004: 65). This terminology will be used in the survey below.

2.1) Documentary sources

(2.1.1) The lack of documentary sources from East Anglia for the whole Anglo-Saxon period has long proved a major obstacle to the study of its pre-Conquest history (Hoggett 2010: 22-23; Yorke 1990: 58-60). The loss of what early documents there probably were, especially those from ecclesiastical institutions, has traditionally been regarded as itself evidence of the widespread destruction caused by the Vikings in

the ninth century (Whitelock 1972: 1), but a general dislocation of ecclesiastical organisation at this time may also have been a contributory factor (Pestell 2004: 72-76). For Viking activity in eastern England during the First Viking Age, therefore, the principal contemporary and near-contemporary narrative accounts are those provided by documentary sources emanating from outside the region. These include the earliest surviving recension of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (hereafter 'ASC'), now known as the 'Parker Chronicle' or Manuscript A, as well as Asser's *Life of King Alfred* and Æthelweard's *Chronicon*, both of which were also partly derived from now-lost alternative texts of the ASC (Bately 1986; Stevenson 1904; Campbell 1962; Gransden 1974: 29-53). Their accounts of Viking activity, however, were concerned primarily with military and political events, and developments that directly and immediately affected Wessex, rather than with longer-term trends or processes (Dumville 2002; 2008), and contain only brief and occasional references to Viking activity and settlement in East Anglia.[1] The historical value of the multiple texts that comprise the ASC has been much debated (Jorgensen 2010b), and it seems clear that for much of the First Viking Age the annular entries preserved in Manuscript A, itself a composite work written by a number of different scribes (Parkes 1976), were also carefully constructed and edited to fulfil their primary purpose of enhancing the reputations of the house of Wessex and the reigns of Alfred and his descendants (Abels 1998: 9-18; Stafford 1989: 5-9; Gransden 1974: 34-38).

However, the detailed and propagandist reporting of developments involving the kings of Wessex contrasts with the rather terse descriptions of Viking activity elsewhere in England; these peripheral remarks may therefore contain a less constructed and perhaps more neutral record of the particular chronicler's understanding of more distant and less significant events. Asser's *Life* and Æthelweard's *Chronicon* contain differing and in some cases more detailed accounts than those of the ASC of military and naval encounters between the forces of Wessex

[1] The references in these sources for Viking activity in the East Anglian region during the First Viking Age are:
ASC, MS A – Bately 1986: s.a. 838, 866, 867, 870, 875, 880, 885, 890, 894-97, 904-06, 913, 918-921; Asser's *Life of King Alfred* – Stevenson 1904: chs 21, 26, 32, 33, 35, 47, 49, 60, 67, 72; Ætheleweard's *Chronicon* – Campbell 1962: pp. 35-37, 41, 43-45, 47, 49, 50.

and the Vikings as the latter raided, settled and defended their settlements and camps in East Anglia and Essex (especially during the 880s and 890s). They also provide valuable alternative early name-forms of the place-names and protagonists involved (Campbell 1962: xix-xxxvii, lv-lx; Keynes and Lapidge 1983: 210-275; Gransden 1974: 42-53).

For the Second Viking Age, the ASC provides a more detailed narrative (common to Manuscripts C, D and E) of Viking activities in England from the renewal of raiding in the early 980s until Cnut's accession as king in 1016 (Irvine 2004; Stafford 1989: 15-18). But this section of the ASC is a highly subjective account written retrospectively during the early years of Cnut's reign by one individual with a hostile view of the Scandinavian invaders and a negative perception of the abilities of the English régime under Æthelred to defend the country against them (Dumville 2008; Keynes 1978). It provides detailed descriptions of the Vikings' raiding activities across East Anglia (Irvine 2004: s.a. 991, 992, 1004, 1010-1016), but makes no direct mention of any longer-term Viking settlement.

(2.1.2) More locally, the *Annals of St Neots*, an early twelfth-century chronicle compiled at Bury St Edmunds from earlier texts, includes sections from another lost version of the ASC and other local East Anglian material regarding Viking activity in the region during the late-ninth century (Dumville and Lapidge 1984: lxii-lxv; Hart 1981; 2006). However, the origins of this local material are uncertain, making it 'the most difficult evidence to handle' (Dumville and Lapidge 1984: lxii).

Another problematic source is the *Liber Eliensis*, a twelfth-century history of the abbey at Ely which also contains earlier Anglo-Saxon material, and includes accounts of how Viking raiding and settlement affected the extensive lands owned by the abbey scattered across East Anglia (Blake 1962; Fairweather 2005; Pestell 2004: 72; Ridyard 1988: 51-53).

A different kind of local narrative is provided by the Old English poem which commemorated the battle of Maldon in 991 (Scragg 1981). The historicity of the poem's account has been increasingly questioned and it is now clear that it should be regarded as a literary rather than a historical work (Macrae-Gibson 1970; Williams

1992b; 2003: 44), but it can nevertheless provide some useful insight regarding the longer-term assimilation of the original Viking settlers and their descendants into East Anglian society.

(2.1.3) Further afield, contemporary continental annals such as the *Annals of St-Bertin* (Nelson 1991) and *Annals of Fulda* (Reuter 1992) can also provide useful information for the First Viking Age regarding the origins and nature of the Viking warbands in Frankia during the mid-ninth century (McKitterick 1983), some of which were later active in the Great Army's campaigns in eastern England.

Similarly for the Second Viking Age, other near-contemporary continental historical narratives, such as the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* (Campbell 1998) and the *Chronicon* of Thietmar of Merseburg (Whitelock 1979: 347-50), have been utilized by historians to illuminate the political and military developments of the period in both England and Denmark (Stafford 1989: 16-20; Lawson 2004: 57-59) but these provide no information regarding Viking settlement in eastern England.

(2.1.4) Other narrative texts from the Anglo-Saxon period created in a religious context, such as hagiographies, may also indirectly provide some insight into the nature of the Viking settlement. The intrinsic historical value of Abbo of Fleury's tenth-century narrative of Edmund's life and martyrdom at the hands of the Danish invaders (Winterbottom 1972: 67-87) has long been debated (Bale 2009b), with some historians discerning 'authentic' Scandinavian elements embedded within the otherwise orthodox hagiographical formula (Whitelock 1969; Smyth 1977: 201-13).[2] Other hagiographies, such as Byrhtferth's *Life of St Oswald* (Lapidge 2009), have provided some incidental details about how descendants of Danish Great Army veterans who settled in East Anglia in the 870s quickly became assimilated into Anglo-

[2] Much more significant in terms of Viking settlement and assimilation, however, is the rapid adoption of the cult of St Edmund by the new Viking rulers of East Anglia, its subsequent migration to Scandinavia and Iceland, and its revival during the reign of Cnut in the eleventh century (Ridyard 1988: 211-33; Finlay 2009).

Saxon society and acquired senior ecclesiastical positions (Wareham 1996; Barrow 2000).

(2.1.5) A final category of narrative accounts are those provided by the twelfth-century historians such as John (or 'Florence') of Worcester, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon (Gransden 1974). Their potential value lies in the additional narrative information they contain which may be derived from earlier contemporary sources and oral traditions which are now lost, but it is difficult to determine the historicity of such unprovenanced material (Gransden 1974; Stafford 1989: 20-23; Williams 2003: ix-xiii).

(2.1.6) As well as the historical narratives discussed above, a number of shorter Anglo-Saxon documents can also provide information relating to Viking settlement in East Anglia – these include charters and writs, and wills (Whitelock 1979: 369-89). Some survive in their original form, but many are preserved only in later medieval copies of uncertain authenticity. Charters and writs recorded grants or gifts of land or privileges by the king to particular individuals or religious institutions, and wills similarly recorded bequests of land and property to the church, family or friends (Keynes 1999; Lowe 1999; Sawyer 1968 and online; Harmer 1952; Hart 1966, 1971; Whitelock 1930). A few of these documents contain information regarding changes of land ownership that may allude to earlier Viking landholdings in East Anglia, as well as rare early forms of place-names from the pre-Conquest period.

Anglo-Saxon charters also include lists recording the names of prominent individuals who served as witnesses, and the fluctuating presence or absence of those with ON names may provide an indication of the changing status and influence of individuals of Scandinavian descent – especially in the aftermath of the conquest of Viking East Anglia by Edward the Elder and subsequent reign of Æthelstan (Marten 2006; Hadley 2006: 60-61; Hart 1992: 577), as well as during Cnut's reign when a new influx of earls from Scandinavia acquired positions of authority in his régime, some with associated landholdings in East Anglia (Keynes 1994; Lawson 2004: 66-70). However, the question of how far ON personal names recorded at this time may be

directly linked with individuals of 'Scandinavian' ethnicity (rather than just being given to English people for reasons of fashion or political expediency) has become a matter of some debate (Hadley 2006: 118-20), and will be explored further below.

(2.1.7) Several Anglo-Saxon law-codes issued in the names of successive kings from Alfred to Cnut (Attenborough 1922; Robertson 1925) reflect the changing perceptions of 'Danish' identity as the Viking settlers and their descendants became more integrated into Anglo-Saxon society (Kershaw 2000; Innes 2000). They contain clauses[3] that defined the geographical boundaries and legal distinctiveness of the areas settled by the Scandinavians, or land of the *Dene lage* or 'Danelaw' as it became known (Holman 2001: 2-3) – although the continuing acknowledgement into the eleventh century of legal differences between 'Danish' and 'English' people[4] may reflect a political need by West Saxon kings to cultivate local support in their newly conquered territories (including East Anglia) rather than any longer-term or deep-rooted ethnic or social divisions (Innes 2000; Hadley 2000c).

(2.1.8) Arguably, the most important single documentary source for any analysis of Viking settlement in East Anglia is Domesday Book. The information presented in Little Domesday Book for the three counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex (Brown 1984; Rumble 1983; 1986), which is collated in a more detailed format than that for the remaining English counties covered by the Great Domesday Book (Roffe 2007: 62-108), often provides the earliest surviving written records of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia. It is far from being a complete and systematic survey, and contains many inaccurate renderings of place-names due to the Norman scribes' difficulties with the English language (Cameron 1996b: 16; Gelling 1997: 26-28). But the Little Domesday Book's detailed entries for individual vills and manors provide a wealth of statistical information regarding the settlements associated with each recorded place-name, including the size and value of individual landholdings,

[3] 'Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum', 1; 'Laws of Edward and Guthrum', 7.2 (Attenborough 1922: 98-99, 106-07); VI Æthelred 37 (Robertson 1925: 102-03).
[4] E.g. IV Edgar, 2a, 12; Cnut's Proclamation of 1020, 9 (Robertson 1925: 32-33, 142-43).

the nature and potential of their agricultural exploitation, and the status of landlords and tenants (Darby 1971; Hesse 2003; Barlow 2011; 2013) – as well as many of their personal names, some of which were also ON in origin (von Feilitzen 1937; Parsons 2002).

More broadly, Domesday Book also records a number of social and economic features that are more prominent in particular counties of East Anglia or the former Danelaw than other counties of southern England, such as the relative distributions of freemen and sokemen (Darby 1977: 57-94; Barlow 2013) – but how far these differences can be attributed to, or be regarded as evidence of, the influence of Scandinavian settlers has long been a subject of academic debate (Stenton 1971: 514-20; Loyn 1994: 94-97; Hadley 2006: 88-89; Williamson 2013a: 107-24). Finally, the format of Domesday Book itself may also reflect elements of Scandinavian administration in, for example, the use of 'carucates' or 'ploughlands' rather than 'hides' in the former Danelaw counties for measuring areas of land (Hart 1992: 289-335).

(2.1.9) A number of later medieval documents of local and national government contain crucial information for this study in the early forms of place-names and personal names. These include Pipe Rolls, Charter Rolls, Close Rolls, Patent Rolls, Assize and Court Rolls, Fine Rolls and Feet of Fines, Coroner's Rolls and *Inqusitiones post mortem* (Cameron 1996b: 16-17; Watts 2004: x-xi) – sources which have been utilized by generations of place-name scholars to provide a representative collection of spellings for each individual place-name to supplement those found in Domesday Book.

In addition to medieval governmental documents are those produced in ecclesiastical institutions during the post-Conquest period, and some of these have not yet been utilized to their full onomastic potential. Published editions of later medieval charters and cartularies from abbeys and monasteries throughout East Anglia provide details of the lands owned by each institution, including large numbers of local minor and field-names, as well as the personal names of individuals

associated in some way with the abbey or monastery in question, which can also be quantified in terms of linguistic origin.

(2.1.10) A final category of sources are those that originated within a Scandinavian context, including the extensive corpora of sagas, skaldic verse and runic inscriptions. The surviving texts of Icelandic sagas contain a few oblique references to East Anglia and East Anglian people during the Viking period, including possible references in the Icelandic *Landnámabók* to Edmund's daughter and grand-daughter after his death, which may throw light on the relationship between the Viking conquerors of East Anglia and its defeated royal family (Pálsson and Edwards 1968: 22, 119; Abrams 2005: 312-13; Finlay 2009: 60-62). But the origins of sagas as historical and/or fictional texts are unclear, and their historical accuracy and value have been much debated (O'Donoghue 2004: 130-34; Holman 2007: 12; Lönnroth 2008).

Many sagas contain short sections of contemporary skaldic verse written by historically-known poets working in the service of Viking kings, princes and earls (Holman 2007: 12-14; Jesch 2008: 295-96). Some verses recorded eleventh-century Viking military campaigns in eastern England in short poems that can be compared with equivalent narrative passages of the ASC (Campbell 1971; Poole 1987). They also provide many incidental details, such as the ON form of East Anglian place-names and individuals which can be compared with their OE equivalents (Townend 1998).

During the Viking period, Scandinavians carved runic inscriptions in short memorial texts commemorating the dead (Holman 2007: 146-49; H. Williams 2008). A few refer specifically to Cnut's campaigns in England (Keynes 1994: 44-45), but there are no runic inscriptions in East Anglia relating to Viking settlement (Page 1999a: 200-11) and none of those located elsewhere are known to provide any specific information about settlement in this region.

2.2) Outline historical narrative from documentary sources

(2.2.1a) The ASC briefly mentions occasional Viking raids in southern England during the first two-thirds of the ninth century, including an attack on East Anglia in 841, and records the 'Great Army' (*micel here*) arriving in East Anglia in 865 (Bately 1986: 43 – s.a 838 [*recte* 841], 47 – s.a. 866 [*recte* 865]). Its size has been much debated (as outlined in section 1.1) but an approximate figure of 'several thousand warriors, though probably not more than […] about ten thousand' (Heather 2009: 481-84) is now generally accepted.

Æthelweard's and Asser's observations that the Vikings came 'from the north' or 'from the Danube' (presumably meaning Denmark) suggest that some elements did come directly from Scandinavia, but earlier ASC entries and those of continental annals indicate that other contingents may well have been previously active in Kent, Frankia and Ireland (Campbell 1962: 35; Stevenson 1904: 19; Keynes and Lapidge 1983: 74, 238; Abels 1998: 113-14).

(2.2.1b) The ASC often adopts the ethnically neutral Old English term *se here* ('the army/raiding-army') to denote Viking armies in the years from 860 to 892, and the term *wicenga* itself ('[of] vikings/pirates') is also used occasionally.[5] But from 870 onwards, the specific adjective *Deniscan* is used frequently to describe the Viking armies in eastern England, a term which was taken at face value by twentieth-century historians in labelling them as 'Danish' (such as Stenton 1971: 239-44). The 'Danish' Vikings thus came to be regarded as primarily responsible for the settlement of eastern England and formation of the eponymous Danelaw, whereas 'Norwegian', 'Norse' or 'Hiberno-Norse' Vikings were seen as the predominant groups involved in the raiding and settlement of northwest England, Scotland and Ireland (Downham 2009: 152-57).

[5] MS A – Bately 1986: 51, 52, 67; s.a. 879, 885, 917; MS E – Irvine 2004: 108, s.a. 1098.

It is significant that the onomastic evidence for Viking settlement in England has similarly been predicated upon clear and binary distinctions between people of 'Danish' and 'English', and 'Danish' and 'Norwegian', origin (*SSNEM*: 261-67, *SSNNW*: 307-21). But the assumption of such a clear ethnic distinction in the interpretation of place-name evidence has been criticised in recent years (Hadley 2006: 101-02; Downham 2009: 157-61), and the question of whether the ASC's use of the term *Deniscan* was intended to indicate ethnic groups specifically from the region that became Denmark or more generally from Scandinavia has now become a matter of some academic debate (Downham 2009: 141-49).

Recent analysis suggests that by the time the 'Danish' Great Army reached eastern England, it comprised men of diverse origins from different parts of Europe and Britain as well as Scandinavia. It has been suggested, for example, that there may have been 'a significant Frisian element in the make-up of the Great Army' which invaded East Anglia in 865 (Smyth 1998: 25), and Ubba, one of the Great Army leaders, has been described in documentary sources from northern England as being a 'duke' of the Frisians.[6] Further indications of the multi-cultural nature of the Great Army are apparent from archaeological evidence, which will be examined in Chapter 3. Such a heterogenous collection of individuals may have been held together by a group identity created by common experience on the war-trail and possibly also by adopting some of the ethnic attributes of an élite leadership which perhaps could reasonably accurately be described as Danish in origin (Innes 2000; Redmond 2007: 18-19, 60-66). This may have facilitated the use of the Old Norse language as a *lingua franca*, contributing to the Scandinavian influence upon the language, place-names and personal names of England – but it is unclear how much can be attributed directly to the impact of the Viking Great Army.

(2.2.1c) If the ethnic identity of the male warriors of the Great Army is difficult to determine, then that of the women who may have accompanied them is even more uncertain. It is known from historical sources that some women were present when

[6] *'dux Fresciorum'*, *'dux Fresonum'* (Johnson South 2002: 51, 53).

the Viking armies crossed to England from the continent in the 890s (see below, 2.2.5), but it is uncertain how many women accompanied the original Great Army warriors of the 860s or where they might have originated (McLeod 2014: 89, 100-01).

However, the *Annals of St-Bertin* records how the Danish leader Weland was baptised 'with his wife and children' in 862 after being defeated by Charles the Bald, suggesting that she too had come from Denmark (a local woman would presumably already have been a Christian), so it seems apparent that some Scandinavian women did participate in Viking expeditions to western Europe (Nelson 1991: 99; Jesch 1991: 104). Other women may have been 'recruited' en route (on the continent or in other parts of Britain or Ireland), making the question of their origins and ethnicity, and that of their children, more uncertain (Jesch 1991: 84-123).

(2.2.1d) When the Great Army first arrived in eastern England, many of its warriors were probably young, single men who would have had the opportunity to form liaisons with local women as the Army over-wintered in East Anglia and subsequently embarked upon its long campaign of conquest around the country. For while the pillage and destruction of traditional accounts no doubt did occur widely, Viking armies would also have been involved in more peaceful contact with local populations and camp followers as they obtained the food, equipment and services required by their troops (Redmond 2007: 18-19; McLeod 2006). To that extent, the process of assimilation could be said to have begun with the arrival of the Great Army in 865 rather than during the more formal process of settlement which commenced in the late 870s according to the ASC. Therefore the young adult males who remained in England for the duration of the Great Army's recorded campaigns would have spent almost fifteen years in Anglo-Saxon England before the settlement period (for at least half their lifetime or most of their adulthood), and so their formative adult years would have been experienced within an Anglo-Saxon cultural milieu rather than that of their homelands, Scandinavian or otherwise (Redmond 2007: 64). This process may be reflected in the changing terminology of the ASC (Downham 2009: 150) which, from 893 until 919, often adopts the regional appellations *Eastengle* and *Norþhymbre* ('East Angles' and 'Northumbrians') without any ethnic qualifier to refer

to Viking armies from those areas,[7] thus (possibly unintentionally) implying that a generation after the arrival of the Great Army in East Anglia the offspring of the original warriors had to some extent become assimilated into their respective local populations. The use of this regional terminology in a Wessex-centred document may also reflect a continuing sense of the clear political and cultural divisions between the separate kingdoms of England that existed prior to the First Viking Age.

Some recent scholarship thus regards the Great Army veterans who settled in East Anglia as the 'pioneers' of a larger-scale migration process between Scandinavia and England that started in the late ninth century and continued into the tenth (Redmond 2007; McLeod 2014). There is no documentary evidence to support the idea of such continuing immigration, but that may merely reflect the pre-occupation of the narrative sources with the aristocratic and royal levels of society rather than Anglo-Saxon or Scandinavian society as a whole (Hadley 2000a: 20) – for whom non-written sources are more informative (as will be examined in the next chapter). The viability and specific implications of such a migration model for the formation of different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in England have not yet been considered in Viking studies, but they will be explored further in Chapter 11.

(2.2.1e) The Great Army that invaded East Anglia in 865 apparently remained there until they had been provided with sufficient horses to launch a cross-country expedition to attack York, but in 870 they returned and 'took winter-quarters at Thetford'. They defeated the East Anglian king Edmund and 'conquered' the kingdom, presumably displacing the existing régime and establishing themselves in direct control (Bately 1986: 47; Keynes 1997: 54). In the following year the Great Army left East Anglia to attack Wessex, although no doubt some forces remained to control their newly won kingdom.

In 871, a 'Great Summer Army' (*micel sumorlida*) arrived from overseas to join forces with the original Great Army and the military campaign continued (Bately 1986: 48; Stevenson 1904: 31; Abels 1998: 134; Smyth 1977: 240-42). But in 874 the

[7] Bately 1986: 55-58, 60, 62, 67 (s.a. 893, 896, 904, 917).

two forces split, with Halfdan leading what were probably the war-weary veterans of the Great Army of 865 into Northumbria where in the following year they 'shared out the lands... and proceeded to plough and support themselves' (Bately 1986: 49; trans. Whitelock 1979: 194-95). The other contingent, which probably constituted the bulk of the Summer Army under the command of Guthrum, Oscetel and Anwend, departed for Cambridge where they settled for a year and presumably consolidated their control of East Anglia (Keynes 1997: 55-56; Smyth 1977: 242-44). This army then attacked Wessex again, but was ultimately defeated by Alfred's forces in 878.

(2.2.2a) In 880, after his submission to Alfred, Guthrum (newly baptised with the traditional English name of Æthelstan) and the remains of his army 'went from Cirencester into East Anglia, and settled there and shared out the land', in the frustratingly concise words of the ASC.[8] Asser merely paraphrases the ASC's words in Latin, but Æthelweard adds a further phrase: '[they] laid out a camp there, and brought all the inhabitants of that land under the yoke of their overlordship'.[9] Although it seems evident that some kind of organised distribution of land between Guthrum and his Army veterans was imposed upon the indigenous population, the details of the operation are far from clear. But the same phraseology, translated as 'sharing out', is used also of the parallel processes of Viking land distribution in Northumbria and Mercia in the ASC's entries for 876 and 877 (Bately 1986: 50), from the Old English verb *gedǽlan*, 'to divide, part, impart, separate, distribute, share, partake' (Bosworth and Toller 1898: 383). The overall impression is one of an orderly process organised by the army leaders rather than a violent 'free-for-all' land-seizure, perhaps made possible in East Anglia because it had probably remained under some form of Scandinavian control during Guthrum's campaign in Wessex (Morris 1977: 96; Hadley 2006: 30, 84-85).

[8] '*Her for se here of Cirenceastre on Eastengle ⁊ gesæt þæt lond ⁊ gedęlde*' (Bately 1986: 51; trans. Whitelock 1979: 197).

[9] '*Elevatus est prædictus exercitus relicto Cyrenceaster ad Orientalium Anglorum partes, castra metatique sunt ibi, omnesque habitatores illius terræ sub iugo imperii sui duxere*' (Campbell 1962: 43).

An indication of how Viking armies may have 'shared out the land' at this time is provided by the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, a twelfth-century history (based on older traditions) of the episcopal community of St Cuthbert in Northumbria. It describes how Rægnald (identified as Ragnall, the leader of a Hiberno-Norse army which invaded Northumbria *c.* 918) took control of the community's pre-existing estates and granted two large tracts of this land to his senior warriors Scula and Onlafbald – who may in turn have then further subdivided their portions amongst their own followers (Johnson South 2002: 60-63, 104-06; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 407-8; Morris 1977: 96-101; 1981: 223-27). It has been suggested that as these large landholdings in Northumbria were subdivided and occupied by the lower ranks of the Viking armies (and possible Scandinavian immigrants), some of the settlements associated with these smaller land-units began to acquire the Scandinavian-influenced names by which they are still known today (Morris 1977: 97-101, 1981: 227-28, 1984: 7-9). A similar process may have occurred in East Anglia, as will be explored below.

(2.2.2b) It may have been soon after the Great Army's settlement of East Anglia that the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum was drawn up to delineate the boundary between the territories ruled by each and the rights of their respective subjects (Attenborough 1922: 98-101). The treaty's preamble states that it was ratified on Alfred's side by 'the councillors of all the English nation' *('ealles Angelcynnes witan')*, which is quite specific and may indicate early notions of English identity, but Guthrum's subjects are categorized merely as 'all the people who live in East Anglia' *('eal seo ðeod ðe on Eastænglum')* (Attenborough 1922: 98-9) – which may once again reflect a recognition of East Anglia's separate political and cultural identity prior to the Viking takeover of the kingdom. Significantly, no reference is made to the equivalent ethnicity of the new rulers of East Anglia (although the rights of individual Danes are mentioned in later clauses), and the more general term *ðeod* is used instead presumably to encompass a mixed population of new settlers and pre-existing inhabitants (Kershaw 2000: 57).

(2.2.3a) Although the term 'East Anglia' is now defined rather loosely, it seems clear that *East Engle* in the ninth and tenth centuries referred specifically to the territory of the old Anglo-Saxon kingdom of East Anglia which survived as a single province until the formation of the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk probably in the early eleventh century (Marten 2006: 13-18). It therefore excluded Essex which had been an old East Saxon kingdom in its own right from the late sixth century (Yorke 1990: 45-50), but formally became part of the Wessex kingdom from 860 onwards with an ealdorman appointed to rule the province (Williams 1996: 92). An ancient boundary between the East Angles and the East Saxons was provided by the river Stour (Scarfe 1987: 39-40; Dumville 1992: 8). This clear demarcation between the territories of East Anglia and Essex becomes apparent in the first direct historical reference to Viking activity in Essex. Æthelweard's *Chronicle* records that in 885 Vikings conducted raids in southern Essex and 'the foul people who then held East Anglia gave support, and suddenly made an expedition outside their own boundaries to Benfleet' (Campbell 1962: 44). It is also significant that Essex was still apparently ruled by an English ealdorman in 896,[10] suggesting that it had remained under the nominal administrative control of Wessex throughout this early Viking period – albeit as a somewhat peripheral outpost of the kingdom, vulnerable to continuing attack by Vikings from East Anglia and abroad (Hart 1992: 116-125; Williams 1996: 97).

However, this interpretation of the administrative status of Essex is at odds with traditional views of the territorial boundary between the lands of Alfred and Guthrum delineated in the treaty drawn up between them at some time from 878 to 890 (Attenborough 1922: 98-101). This places Essex to the north-east of the line – that is, in the lands controlled by the Vikings that would eventually become known as the Danelaw. Successive historians have used the traditionally accepted boundary line of the Alfred-Guthrum treaty as marking the long-term southern limit of the Danelaw and indeed of Scandinavian settlement in England. The map prepared by A.H. Smith in 1956[11] provided an exemplar for such an interpretation which was

[10] Brihtwulf or Beorhtwulf, whose death was recorded in that year by the ASC (Bately 1986: 59-60).
[11] Reproduced in Appendix 2.2.3a.

followed by several subsequent historians (including Jones 1984: 222; Loyn 1994: 83; and Keynes 1997: 65). In the light of the anomalies outlined above, however, Dumville (1992: 20-23) proposed a revised interpretation of the border line for Alfred and Guthrum's treaty that places Essex within the control of Wessex, suggesting that the easternmost section of the Wessex/Danelaw border may have been provided instead by the traditional boundary between Essex and Suffolk along the river Stour.

However, the treaty of Alfred and Guthrum was short-lived and represents the boundary line only at a particular moment and 'it does not follow that this was for all time the boundary between "English" England and the Danelaw' (Keynes 1998: 33) – or, indeed, for determining the precise geographical areas of Scandinavian settlement and influence from the late ninth century until 1066 and beyond. The continuing Viking raids and apparent lack of Scandinavian settlement in most of Essex do indeed become more comprehensible if it is regarded as an outer region of Wessex, and this may also explain the pattern of what little Scandinavian settlement there apparently is – in the far north-east of the county, close to the more established Viking power-base in East Anglia and away from the heartlands of the Wessex kingdom to the south-west.

(2.2.3b) If the treaty was drawn up in a period of truce between Alfred and Guthrum during the early 880s, it was indeed short-lived. In 885, possibly in response to a perceived threat to Wessex's interests in Essex, Alfred despatched a naval force to East Anglia which confronted and seized sixteen Viking ships in the mouth of the river Stour (Bately 1996: 52), only to be subsequently defeated by a larger force from (as Asser records) 'the Vikings who lived in East Anglia [who] assembled ships from everywhere and met it in the mouth of the same river' (Stevenson 1904: 50-51; trans. Keynes and Lapidge 1983: 87).[12]

It seems, therefore, that this area of southern Suffolk north of the river Stour was of some importance to the Vikings' régime at this time – as apparently it had

[12] The site of the battle is said to have given its name to 'Bloody Point', a sand spit off Shotley (OS grid reference 256341; Arnott 1954: 19), but the origins and etymology of this name are uncertain.

already been in the decades before the Viking occupation, with evidence of some degree of prosperity and militarised activity earlier in the ninth century (Plunkett 2005: 198-200). The *Annals of St Neots* reports that Guthrum died in 890 and 'was interred in East Anglia in the royal vill called Hadleigh',[13] in south Suffolk on the river Brett, a tributary of the Stour and one of the main valley routes up onto the central claylands (Warner 1996: 23-27). Guthrum's *villa regia* at Hadleigh may have been only one of several used by the Viking leaders, possibly inherited from Edmund when they 'conquered' the kingdom, but its location may reflect the need to retain control of a traditional border area adjacent to Essex on the other side of the Stour – which, it has been suggested above, was at this time not part of the Danelaw but a peripheral, frontier zone of the Wessex kingdom instead.

(2.2.4) The existence of Guthrum's royal estate around Hadleigh may also be hinted at in the tenth-century wills of Ælfgar (ealdorman of Essex from 946 to 951) and his daughters Æthelflæd and Ælfflæd, which reveal the family's ownership of a quite surprising concentration of properties in south-central Suffolk, including Hadleigh, which presumably had been under Danish rule before 917 (Whitelock 1930: 6-9, 34-43; Martin & Satchell 2008: 221). It has been suggested that these lands were given to Ælfgar (or his parents) by Edward the Elder or one of his successors following Wessex's conquest of East Anglia and sequestration of property held by Guthrum's successors (Martin 2003; Hart 1992: 126-35). A further clue to possible earlier Viking ownership in Ælfgar's will, which has been overlooked in recent discussion of this document, is the passing reference to two individuals with personal names of probable ON origin, *Aylkil* and *Aeulf*, as previous holders of small areas of land that became part of Ælfgar's estate. *Aylkil* (or *Eakild*) may be a contracted form of *Alfketill*, a relatively rare Danish personal name, and *Aeulf* may similarly represent *Eyjulfr*, a name which appears quite frequently in Icelandic sources from the tenth century (Whitelock 1930: 8-9, 107-08; Fellows-Jensen 1968: 8, 77). When or how these

[13] *'Mortuus est itaque anno .xiiii. postquam baptismum suscepit mausoleatusque in uilla regia quę uocatur Headleaga apud Orientales Anglos'* (Dumville and Lapidge 1984: 95; trans. Hart 2006: 141).

individuals obtained their lands is unknown, but projecting backwards from the date of Ælfgar's will (946 x 951), it is possible that they acquired them during the period of Danish rule (possibly from the hypothesized royal estate) and managed to retain them for a while after 917 until they came into the possession of Ælfgar's family.

It seems clear, therefore, that land in southern East Anglia was being held quite widely in the early tenth century by individuals with ON names,[14] with similar references in other sources. The *Liber Eliensis* records details of land owned subsequently by the abbey at Livermere, Brandon and Sudbourne that had initially been held by 'a certain earl called Scule', who also attested several charters during Athelstan's reign – *Scule* was an anglicized version of the ON personal name *Skúli* (Blake 1962: xiv, 111; Insley 1994: 337-39). These indications of land ownership in Suffolk by people of probable Scandinavian origin in the early tenth century may have resulted from a process similar to the historically recorded seizure and distribution of land in Northumbria (see above, 2.2.2a). By contrast, there appears to be no corresponding evidence for acquisition or ownership of land by Scandinavian-named individuals across the Stour in Essex – and indeed some surviving charters of diocesan estates that owned land in Essex, such as St Pauls in London, suggest some degree of continuity throughout the early Viking period (Williams 1996: 93; Dumville 1992: 13, n. 63; Hart 1992: 205-220).

(2.2.5) Both East Anglia and Essex became very much involved in the next major phase of historically-recorded Viking activity and settlement, which began in 892 when a large Viking force left Boulogne on 250 ships provided by the Franks so it could cross the Channel 'in one journey, horses and all'.[15] This phrase implies that Viking armies often required two or more sea-journeys when transferring themselves from one region of activity to another in order to transport all their possessions, and

[14] At this early stage in the process of Viking settlement, individuals with Scandinavian names (and of sufficient age to own property) were presumably also of Scandinavian (or non-indigenous) descent, as the use of Scandinavian names by English people for reasons of fashion or expediency would have occurred over a longer period of time.

[15] '*⁊ þær wurdon gescipode swa þæt hie asettan him on anne siþ ofer mid horsum mid ealle*' (Bately 1986: 55).

quite possibly women and children as well – whose presence in this case is specifically mentioned in the ASC's entries for the following few years.

After landing in Kent, the Viking warbands fought against Alfred's forces before withdrawing to a defensive site at Benfleet in Essex, where they were attacked by the English in 893 who captured the wife and two sons of one of the Viking leaders, Hæsten – a family which presumably had made the crossing to England in 892 (Bately 1986: 55-58; Jesch 1991: 96-98). The survivors built further camps at Shoebury, a few miles along the Thames, and subsequently on Mersea Island (Williams 1996: 94-95) – which are all in the south or middle of Essex, away from the cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in the north-east, and with no sign of any longer-term settlement (Pewsey and Brooks 1993). With reinforcements from the 'East Angles' and 'Northumbrians', the Viking warriors based in the Essex camps launched further military campaigns across England – but only after they had 'placed their women and ships and property in safety in East Anglia',[16] which by this time had apparently become an established and secure haven of Viking settlement whilst Essex remained a disputed border-region of conflict. Eventually in the summer of 896, the Viking army dispersed, with 'some going to East Anglia, some to Northumbria, and those without money (or property) got themselves ships and sailed south across the sea to the Seine'.[17] The implication that those without funds were unable to settle in the Danelaw suggests that by this time land was being acquired once again by purchase rather than seizure.

(2.2.6) The ASC then records in detail the years of military campaigning by Edward the Elder's Wessex against Viking-controlled Mercia and East Anglia, which began with Edward confronting the challenge posed in eastern England by Æthelwold's forces (Bately 1986: 61-63; Campbell 2001: 20-22; Williams 1996: 96) and ended with the submission during the years from 914 to 918 of successive batches of

[16] *'⁊ befæston hira wif ⁊ hira scipu ⁊ hira feoh on Eastenglum'* (Bately 1986: 58; trans. Whitelock 1979: 204).
[17] *'Ða þæs on sumera on ðysum gere tofor se here, sum on Eastengle, sum on Norðhymbre, ⁊ þa þe feohlease wæron him þær scipu begeton ⁊ suð ofer sæ foron to Sigene'* (Bately 1986: 59).

Scandinavian earls and landholders in districts around the borders of East Anglia, including Bedford, Northampton, Cambridge and Stamford (Bately 1986: 65-68). On each occasion, the ASC's language is similar, indicating a clear submission before Edward and acceptance of him as lord and protector. The word *hlaforde*, 'lord', is repeated every time, sometimes followed by *mundboran*, 'protector' (Bately 1986: 66-68, s.a. 914, 917, 918). But the wording of the entry for 917 recording the East Anglian Vikings' acknowledgement of Edward's overlordship is different: 'and all the army in East Anglia swore agreement with him, that they would (agree to) all that he would, and would keep peace with all with whom the king wished to keep peace, both at sea and on land' – the words *hlaforde* and *mundboran* are not used.[18]

As Lucy Marten (2006: 5) has suggested, this phraseology indicates a more favourable political arrangement for East Anglia that marked not its complete submission to Wessex, but rather a negotiated 'union' that initiated the long process of administrative integration. A continuation of some degree of Viking autonomy in East Anglia after its integration with Wessex (which is suggested also by numismatic evidence discussed in the next chapter) may well have provided a context that enabled some Scandinavian-named individuals to retain their lands as discussed above (2.2.4), and perhaps also allowed an unrecorded process of immigration from Scandinavia – and further Viking settlement extending into the tenth century – to continue. This idea will be explored further below.

(2.2.7) After a period of relative peace in East Anglia during the middle decades of the tenth century, the Second Viking Age commenced in 980 when well-organised Viking armies launched a fresh wave of attacks upon England in search of silver, moveable wealth and political power (Keynes 1997: 73-82). The ASC (Irvine 2004: 61-74) and several skaldic verses (Poole 1987) record a succession of raids and battles throughout East Anglia between 991 and 1016, culminating in Cnut's victory at Assingdon in 1016 (Howard 2003; Lavelle 2002: 65-77; Williams 2003), but no

[18] '*⁊ eal se here on Eastenglum him swor annesse þæt hie eal þæt woldon þæt he wolde, ⁊ eall þæt friþian woldon þæt se cyng friþian wolde, ægþer ge on sæ ge on lande'* (Bately 1986: 68; trans. Whitelock 1979: 216).

mention is made of further Viking settlement in the region. Cnut's victory resulted in a period of Danish rule in England from 1017 until 1042, during which the country became part of a North Sea empire that encompassed much of Scandinavia. Cnut consolidated his rule by appointing a number of his Scandinavian followers as earls in England, and assigned the control of East Anglia to Thorkell the Tall who had led the 'immense raiding army' that attacked southern England and East Anglia during the campaign of 1009-1011 (Keynes 1994: 43-57). Other Scandinavian-named individuals were appointed to senior positions in the 'English' parts of England as well as the area of the former Danelaw. Their status and influence, plus that of an unknown number of their immediate followers, may well have facilitated the spread of Scandinavian naming practices throughout the country during the eleventh century beyond the confines of the traditional areas of Scandinavian settlement (that is, those with Scandinavian-influenced place-names) – a development that becomes apparent in the widespread distribution of Scandinavian-named individuals recorded in Domesday Book (Williams 1986; von Feilitzen 1937).

It has been argued that the military campaigns of the Second Viking Age may also have resulted in some degree of further Viking settlements (Logan 2005: 159). The ASC's entry for 994 records that the Viking army was granted winter quarters near Southampton if it ceased raiding (Irvine 2004: 62), and the surviving treaty between Æthelred and the Viking leaders[19] suggests that in return for their keep (plus payment of the Danegeld) the Viking forces agreed to assist the English against other marauders, which seems to imply that some of the Viking war bands were allowed to remain in England, presumably in the king's employ (Williams 2003: 47). But the numbers of possible new Viking settlers during the Second Viking Age are unclear, and a broad consensus of scholarship retains the view that they are unlikely to have been on the scale of the Great Army veterans and Scandinavian immigrants believed to have settled in eastern England during the late ninth and early tenth centuries (Williams 1986: 15-16) – and their impact on place-names is correspondingly less significant, too.

[19] II Æthelred (Robertson 1925: 56-63).

(2.2.8) One development that is clear from documentary evidence for the Second Viking Age is the degree to which the Scandinavian-named descendants of the original Viking settlers of the First Viking Age had become assimilated into English society by the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. The poem of the battle of Maldon (Scragg 1981) carefully records the names of the English warriors who remained loyal to their lord until death – including several bearing names of ON origin, such as Wistan, son of Thurston[20], and 'Gadd's son'[21] (Clark 1983: 31-32; Insley 1994: 128, 425-29). Similarly, the name of Ulfcytel, the commander of the East Anglian armies who fought courageously but unsuccessfully against the Viking forces in 1004 and 1010, is an Anglo-Scandinavian form of the ON personal name *Ulfketill* that became particularly widely used in East Anglia (Fellows-Jensen 1968: 325-27; Insley 1994: 433-37). This suggests that Ulfcytel may have been an assimilated descendant of the original Danish settlers of the late ninth or early tenth centuries, whose name had become anglicised by the early eleventh.

More detailed historical information is available for Anglo-Scandinavian individuals from East Anglia who entered the church, especially from hagiographical sources. Byrhtferth of Ramsey's life of Oswald (archbishop of York, 971-92) records that his uncle was Oda, archbishop of Canterbury from 941 to 958, of whom 'certain people say that his father was one of those Danes who came with the ship-army of Ubbe and Ivarr'[22] – that is, the Great Army that over-wintered in East Anglia in 865-66. Two possible kinsmen of Oda, Oscytel (archbishop of York from 958/59 to 971) and Thurcytel (abbot of Bedford), had anglicised Scandinavian names and are recorded as important landholders in East Anglia (Wareham 1996: 48). The rapid advancement of members of this family in the church, plus the retention of its lands in East Anglia, clearly demonstrates how influential and well-integrated into Anglo-Saxon society some descendants of the original ninth-century Danish settlers had

[20] *'Wistan, þurstanes suna'* (Scragg 1981: 66, lines 297-98).
[21] *Gaddes mæg* (line 287).
[22] *'Dicunt quidam quod ex ipsis Danis pater eius esset qui cum classica cohorte cum Huba et Hinuuar ueniebunt'* (Lapidge 2009: 17).

become in the years following the conquest by Wessex of the previously Danish-controlled East Anglia.

2.3) Conclusion

Evidently much information can be derived from the various types of documentary sources regarding Viking settlement in East Anglia. But it is fragmentary and diverse, favouring the recording of events and developments in southern and western parts of East Anglia that were in closer proximity to the chroniclers and administrators of Wessex, and relating only to the activities and practices of élites (Hadley 2000a: 340-41). This leaves much that remains unknown in what James Campbell has described as 'the lost internal history of the Danelaw and especially of East Anglia' (Campbell 2001: 21). Clearly all the available forms of non-written evidence need to be considered as well in order to construct a fuller picture.

Chapter Three:

NON-WRITTEN PRIMARY SOURCES AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

3.1) Introduction

This chapter will examine and evaluate the various forms of non-written primary sources which have been used by scholars to explore the nature of Viking settlement in East Anglia. It will demonstrate that much of the traditional archaeological material apparently indicative of Viking settlement, such as that provided by 'Scandinavian-type' burials and buildings, remains sparse and inconclusive for various reasons. However, it will assess also a number of new interpretations of Scandinavian influence that have emerged in response to recent discoveries in urban and rural archaeology, especially the increasingly abundant metalwork and coin finds located by metal-detectorists across the region.

The use of archaeological evidence for the study of Viking migration and settlement in eastern England has been hindered over the past few decades both by its subjection to periodic and major shifts of theoretical interpretation and by the overall lack of discernible Scandinavian artefacts until very recently. For much of the twentieth century, archaeologists worked within a 'culture-history' theoretical framework, in which certain types of remains (such as artefacts, burial rites and building forms) repeatedly found together were viewed as expressions of a common set of beliefs or 'cultural norms' that represented a shared culture which in turn could be equated with a specific ethnic group, people or race (Jones 1997: 15-39; Johnson 2010: 15-21). This 'normative' approach viewed cultures as intrinsically conservative, with internal development and innovation usually occurring very slowly or gradually. Therefore, sudden and large-scale changes could only be explained in terms of

external influences, such as diffusion (the spread of ideas through cultural contact) or the succession of one cultural group by another as a result of migration and conquest (Jones 1997: 24-25). In such a way, archaeologists usually assumed a direct, causal connection between ethnic/cultural groups of the early medieval period and the surviving artefacts of their material culture, and hypothesised large-scale movements of the former by plotting the find-locations of the latter – often in attempts to 'confirm' the invasions and conquests referred to in the historical sources that tended to set the research agenda for early twentieth-century archaeology (Johnson 2010: 15-21; Hadley & Richards 2000b: 9). Until the end of the twentieth century, however, there was an apparent lack of archaeological evidence relating to Viking settlement, in contrast to that abundantly available for the earlier Anglo-Saxon migrations. This resulted in archaeology being marginalised or simply ignored by a generation of historians who postulated a large-scale Viking settlement by Danish soldiers numbering in their thousands, basing their interpretation largely on contemporary written sources, the abundance of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in parts of eastern England, and other forms of linguistic and onomastic evidence (Stenton 1971: 243, 519-25; Loyn 1962: 49-62).[1]

But this traditional view was criticised by revisionist historians who began to consider the implications of the limited archaeological evidence and proposed a much smaller-scale settlement of just a few hundred warriors (Sawyer 1971: 123-28, 209). This minimalist approach coincided with the development of the 'New Archaeology' or processualist movement in the 1960s, whose proponents sought to understand and explain the process of culture change rather than merely describe its details as they believed earlier archaeologists had done. They analysed past cultures as systems interacting with their natural environment, viewed material culture as the means by which human societies made the necessary adaptations, and rejected explanatory schemes that involved unpredictable phenomena such as population movements (Johnson 2010: 23-31, 74-88; Hadley and Richards 2000b: 10; Trafford 2000: 25). Consequently, the significance of migration and invasions was minimalised

[1] Neither scholar makes any mention of archaeology in relation to Viking settlement in the cited books.

by archaeologists for several decades, and academic consideration of any form of large-scale Viking migration to eastern England became an unfashionable and theoretically untenable area of study (Chapman and Hamerow 1997b: 1-4; Trafford 2000: 20-21, 24-25). Indeed, the comparative scarcity of finds indicative of Viking settlement or burials in eastern England itself became a factor that apparently supported the new orthodox and minimalist view of Viking settlement (Hadley 2006: 5).

In the 1990s, however, the processual approach was itself superseded by the era of post-processualism which encompassed a wide diversity of new concerns and approaches (Johnson 2010: 102-21). Anthropological migration theory was utilised in order to explore the social processes of population movement, and migration as a causal factor in archaeological explanation became rehabilitated to some extent (Trafford 2000: 25; Chapman and Hamerow 1997a; Hamerow 1994; 1997). This was apparent especially in the earlier medieval period where there has been detailed academic analysis and discussion of the Anglo-Saxon migration and settlement (Hamerow 1997) – although initially migration continued to receive little attention in Viking studies (Trafford 2000: 22-25, 30). But as metal-detectorists began to reveal surprisingly large amounts of Scandinavian-style metalwork in eastern England from the 1990s onwards, the possibility of a larger-scale Viking settlement began to regain a degree of archaeological legitimacy (Hadley 2006: 5). Some scholars have recently gone further in suggesting that this evidence may be indicative also of a large-scale migration of individuals from Scandinavia and Scandinavian-controlled territories in the decades following the Great Army's original colonisation of East Anglia in the ninth century (Redmond 2007; Kershaw 2009, 2013; McLeod 2014). This is indeed a hypothetical and historically unattested process (Trafford 2000: 20-21), but one that is now starting to be examined as a significant phase and component of Viking settlement in England, and which will be explored in detail below.

But the question of how far the discovery of Scandinavian-style artefacts dating from the late Anglo-Saxon period may actually demonstrate the presence or immigration of people of Scandinavian origin has itself become a matter of theoretical debate. As ethnic identity came to be regarded as a more diffuse and

subjective attribute (as discussed in section 2.2.1b above), so it has become more difficult to assign definitive ethnic identities and origins to the presumed users and owners of items of material culture (Thomas 2000: 238-40, 252; Jones 1997: 106-27). On a more pragmatic level, the debate regarding the interpretation of Scandinavian-style personal artefacts has coalesced around issues of whether they may variously have arrived in England with immigrants from Scandinavia or other Viking-controlled territories, obtained through trade or as gifts, indicate the cultural preferences and influence of a small Viking élite, or suggest patterns and processes of cultural assimilation (Margeson 1996, 1997; Williamson 1993: 107; Thomas 2000; Hadley 2006: 120-27) – or as a combination of some or all of these factors.

As mentioned at the end of the previous chapter, early medieval documentary evidence tends to be limited to the activities of élites, and so archaeology may offer a broader insight into the practices and developments concerning the broad mass of the Anglo-Saxon population, in terms both of indigenous society and Viking settlers (Hadley 2000a: 340-41). However, a perennial problem in evaluating the nature and impact of Viking settlement during the ninth to eleventh centuries arises from the significant social and economic changes occurring in eastern England at this time. Determining whether these changes are due to local and indigenous developments or the result of some degree of intrusive influence from Viking immigrants remains a crucial issue of interpretation. Dawn Hadley has concluded that while 'much that was once directly ascribed to the Scandinavian settlement can now be seen either to have had earlier origins or to have been the result of later developments, [... playing down] the Scandinavian influence ... fails to do justice to the Scandinavian impact' (Hadley 2000a: 298, *passim*).

In a broader European context, the traditional and still widely accepted view of the far-reaching effects of the Vikings has also been questioned, with a suggestion that new methods of archaeological analysis show 'beyond doubt' that the Vikings were not so much agents of change but rather participants in a complex realignment of western Europe in the aftermath of the decline of the Carolingian empire (Hodges 2006: 162). These theoretical and interpretative complexities surrounding the question of Viking settlement in eastern England provide a multifaceted backdrop

against which each form of archaeological evidence can now be outlined and evaluated in turn.

3.2) Burials

(3.2.1) The archaeological evidence for Scandinavian burials in England is surprisingly sparse, with less than twenty-five known burial sites in England dating from 800 to 1000 described as Scandinavian (Richards 2002: 156). Identifying 'Viking' burials is made difficult by the diversity of late Anglo-Saxon burial practice, with some furnished pagan burials still being conducted outside Christian churchyards as late as the ninth century which could be (and have been) mistakenly construed as those of Scandinavian immigrants (Halsall 2000). It is furthermore hindered by the lack of a clear diagnostic type in Scandinavia, where the wide range of ninth and tenth century burial practices include both cremation and inhumation burials, and burials with and without grave goods (Richards 2011: 55-56; Hadley 2006: 253-54; Roesdahl 1982: 164-71). This may reflect the more informal and unstructured nature of Viking 'religion' (for which there is no specific ON word) as a loosely held and largely unformulated set of beliefs and customs (Price 2014: 164-65).

The nature, extent and speed of the Vikings' conversion to Christianity after they had settled in England is uncertain and the subject of some academic debate, with very little definitive historical or archaeological evidence to suggest when or how the process occurred (Abrams 2001: 31-32). But a distinction has been drawn between 'conversion' as the immediate official and outward acceptance of Christianity denoted by baptism, and 'Christianisation' as a longer-term process in which the beliefs and practices of the adopted religion were fully absorbed by a society's individuals (Abrams 2000: 136). It has been suggested that the early decades of Viking settlement in eastern England saw a 'top-down' process of mass-conversion in which Viking leaders such as Guthrum were publicly baptised,

sometimes as part of a process of political submission, with lower ranks of the Great Army and lower-status settlers subsequently following suit (Abrams 2000: 137-38).

Conversion to Christianity in this context may therefore have been more a matter of outward group identity and conformity than inner spiritual conviction – although in archaeological terms, it is only the former that can be discerned (McLeod 2014: 245). So it is possible that many Scandinavian immigrants came to England as pagans but went to their graves as Christians – outwardly at least. The relative scarcity of burials of apparent Scandinavian character in lowland and eastern England may consequently reflect a process in which even first-generation Viking settlers were encouraged or coerced into abandoning their own pagan burial practices and adopting Anglo-Saxon churchyard burials as the norm (Redmond 2007: 145) – which no doubt also helped accelerate their integration into local Anglo-Saxon society (Richards 2002; 2008: 369-70; 2011: 56).

As has been discussed above (2.2.1b), however, it is quite likely that some members of the original Great Army and other Viking settlers of the late ninth and early tenth centuries did not emigrate directly from Scandinavia but came instead from other Scandinavian-controlled territories such as Ireland and Frankia that were already Christian – where they would have become familiar with Christianity and in some cases have been converted and baptised themselves before arriving in England (McLeod 2014: 255-69). This may well have helped reduce the apparent levels of overt paganism and facilitate the process of conversion in England, and perhaps also create a social milieu in which nominally 'pagan' immigrants who did arrive directly from Scandinavia felt obliged to follow suit and convert also.

(3.2.2) There are, however, a small number of burials discovered in the area of the former Danelaw that clearly do express elements of Scandinavian identity, especially Heath Wood near Ingleby in Derbyshire. Associated with the mid-870s Mercian campaign of the Great Army (elements of which had previously subjugated East Anglia and would subsequently settle there), it is the only known Scandinavian-type cremation cemetery in England and displays a defiant use of traditional pagan cremation rites, animal sacrifice and mound burial that represents a deliberate

allusion to the funerary practices of pre-Christian Scandinavia, in direct and knowing contrast to the inhumation cemetery located just four kilometres away at Repton (Richards *et al.* 2004). Here, another group of Vikings (some of whom had been converted to Christianity) were buried around a churchyard, adjacent to the Mercian royal shrine (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 2001). These connected but contrasting burial sites have been interpreted as representing differing reactions by two opposing factions of the Viking Great Army, with one group already starting to indicate their assimilation into a Christian society and the other defiantly maintaining their traditional pagan values (Richards *et al.* 2004: 99-107). It may indeed be possible that some members of the Christian faction had already been converted and baptised in Frankia or elsewhere before their arrival in England.

(3.2.3) Within East Anglia, the burials identified as 'Viking' comprise a small number of isolated inhumations which have been singled out as probably 'Scandinavian' in view of their accompanying grave goods (Richards 2002: 158). These have been located in or adjacent to church graveyards (such as at Santon Downham, Middle Harling and Sedgeford), amongst a row of late Anglo-Saxon graves (at Saffron Walden), or further away from any known church sites (at Thetford and Leigh-on-Sea).[2] The noticeable lack of pagan Viking burials in locations away from churchyards in East Anglia and other parts of the Danelaw contrasts markedly with the abundance of early Anglo-Saxon non-Christian cemeteries containing thousands of burials which have provided a significant form of evidence for the period of Anglo-Saxon migration (Hills 2003: 95-99; Lucy 2000). So it may well be significant that the majority of 'Viking' burials identified so far in East Anglia have been found in or just outside Anglo-Saxon churchyards – possibly reflecting patterns of early conversion and assimilation discussed above and perhaps echoing also the early example of Guthrum's reputed burial in the church or churchyard at Hadleigh [see 2.2.3 above].

[2] Details of these burials and their associated grave goods are provided by: Richards 2002: 158; Graham-Campbell 2001: 111-114; 2004: 38; Margeson 1996: 50; 1997: 15; Rogerson *et al.* 1995b: 24-25, 79-89; Cox *et al.* 1998: 75; Rogerson and Dallas 1984: 53, 105-06, 198; Evison 1969: 336-41; Bassett 1982: 10-14.

However, quantifying the overall numbers of 'Viking' burials located in or near churchyards is difficult in view of the continual grave-digging conducted in such locations, which has often caused considerable disturbance to the underlying archaeological deposits of churchyards datable to the Anglo-Saxon period, as large numbers of burials were accommodated in successive layers over the centuries (Rodwell 2005: 166-67; Hoggett 2007: 162-63). Possible 'Viking' burials would have been in the lowest of such graveyard layers and potentially subject to the most disruption. In such circumstances, and considering the absence so far of any identifiable pagan Scandinavian graves in Suffolk (Graham-Campbell 2001: 112), it does not seem possible at present to extrapolate realistic numbers or proportions of Viking burials from an overall corpus of just a few isolated examples scattered around East Anglia or to use the data from them to obtain any meaningful insights into the nature and distribution of Viking settlement in the region.

(3.2.4) Nevertheless, attempts have recently been made to utilise new biological techniques in order to obtain more detailed information about the age, gender and ethnic profiles of individual settlers whose bodies were buried. A small-scale survey of fourteen 'Viking' burials at different cemeteries in England (including Heath Wood and Repton discussed above) has indicated that the Viking settlement process may have involved a greater proportion of Scandinavian female immigrants than previously thought, and 'strongly suggest[s]' that the Great Army which arrived in East Anglia in the 860s was accompanied by Scandinavian women (McLeod 2011; 2014: 82-101) – just as documentary evidence suggests that the later Viking army of the 890s had been (discussed in 2.2.5 above).

A similar analysis of a small number of ninth-century Scandinavian-type burials concluded that 91% of those sampled were young adults (i.e. aged between fifteen and forty-five), which conforms to the typical age profiles of migrating population groups (McLeod 2014: 79-86). There is certainly a problem with extrapolating likely age profiles, gender proportions and geographical origins of the broad mass of Viking settlers from such small samples (McLeod 2014: 100), but the data does support recent suggestions for a substantial female Scandinavian presence

in England in the late ninth and tenth centuries based on the evidence from jewellery and metalwork finds that will be discussed below.

(3.2.5) Within East Anglia, a similar analysis has been conducted of skeletal evidence from an eleventh- to fourteenth-century cemetery at Ormesby St Margaret in the hundred of East Flegg (an area of Norfolk traditionally associated with Viking settlement in view of the concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names ending in **-by** that will be discussed below). This has been compared with skeletal evidence from two nearby Anglo-Saxon cemeteries – one with burials dating from the eighth to the eleventh centuries at Caister-on-Sea (just 3 km away, also in East Flegg hundred), and the other with slightly earlier burials from the seventh to the tenth centuries at Burgh Castle, around 10 km away in the hundred of Lothingland on the other of the Yare estuary (Wallis and Anderson 2009).

The comparative analysis indicates similarities between the Ormesby and Caister-on-Sea skeletons reflecting a similar genetic base for the early medieval population in the Flegg area, while the difference between these two populations and that at Burgh Castle indicates a dissimilarity in populations between those two areas – with the burials in Flegg perhaps representing a population heavily influenced by a Scandinavian presence, while those in Lothingland may represent the 'native' population largely unaffected by later immigrants (Wallis and Anderson 2009: 31). These conclusions are certainly of interest, but it should be borne in mind that the place-names of Lothingland also indicate a considerable Scandinavian influence (albeit different to those of East and West Flegg), demonstrating that the complex patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia cannot be immediately identified through simple, but only partial geographical correlations of differing forms of evidence.

3.3) Genetic evidence

(3.3.1) Recent efforts have also been made to derive more 'objective' evidence regarding the Scandinavian settlement of England from various forms of genetic analysis, including ancient DNA extracted from buried skeletons and the living DNA of present-day populations (Hedges 2011). Modern DNA is relatively easy to collect and identify from large samples of living people, making it possible to extrapolate from modern genetic patterns the possible earlier relationships between different 'ethnic' groups – and the likelihood of any possible large-scale migrations. Attention has focussed primarily on genetic analysis based on DNA from the Y chromosomes of living men inherited exclusively through the male line and the mitochondrial DNA of women transmitted by every mother to her children, and the two techniques offer different evidence corresponding to characteristic male and female migratory patterns. However, surveys of Y-chromosomal DNA from present-day men across Britain have found it difficult to distinguish genetically between earlier Anglo-Saxon and later Danish immigrants as both originated from adjacent regions of northern Europe (Capelli *et al.* 2003: 979), and difficult to differentiate between possible Anglo-Saxon or Danish immigration in the medieval period and much earlier prehistoric migrations (McEvoy *et al.* 2004; Oppenheimer 2007).

Nevertheless, a phylogeographical survey has analysed the geographical distribution of Y-chromosomal gene types (or haplotypes) in order to reconstruct their points of origin and routes of movement to target regions, and provide a likely timeframe for these also (Oppenheimer 2007: 428-29, 523). This has detected a cluster of males living in Norfolk today (centred around Fakenham) who all bear a founding gene line (a haplotype known as I1a-3) that would appear to have originated in Denmark around 1,200 years ago (Oppenheimer 2007: 450-55). This seems to support the evidence from other sources regarding Viking settlement in East Anglia and its apparently greater concentration in Norfolk, but Oppenheimer's methodology has been criticised by other geneticists (Richards, Capelli and Wilson

2008: 465) and the accuracy of phylogeographical analysis has also been questioned (Manco 2013: 23-30).

(3.3.2) Present-day genetic analysis using mitochondrial DNA has not been used so widely to gain information about migration in the Anglo-Saxon and Viking periods because it shows less differentiation between the relevant populations than does the Y chromosome (Forster *et al.* 2004: 100). The geographical proximity between Denmark and northern Germany once again makes it difficult to distinguish genetically between the earlier Anglo-Saxon and later Danish immigrants into eastern England (Hills 2003: 68).

(3.3.3) Extracting ancient DNA from the buried skeletons of possible early medieval immigrants has also proved very problematic for technical reasons (Pääbo *et al.* 2004), but recent advances have made the process more viable (Töpf *et al.* 2006). A recent analysis of the mitochondrial DNA taken from seventeen skeletons buried near the castle in Norwich between the eighth and eleventh centuries has concluded that some of the burials 'may have been those of Vikings themselves, or of people of Viking descent' (Popescu 2009: 257). Intriguingly, this DNA evidence points to possible genetic origins in Norway and the Western isles rather than Denmark. Another individual was identified as being of possible Romani origin, suggesting that non-Scandinavian women may have been enslaved by the Vikings, or formed liaisons with them, during Viking activities in other parts of Europe or Britain (Töpf 2009: 253-54).

(3.3.4) Overall, the differing forms of genetic analysis that have been conducted so far can be said to be broadly consistent with the historical evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia, with some degree of multi-ethnic origins, but (like the more traditional burial evidence considered above) it provides little specific information about its nature and distribution. More fundamentally, geneticists are rarely trained in disciplines such as history and archaeology (McLeod 2014: 17), and often tend to assume a traditional and somewhat simplistic equation of biological genotype with

cultural ethnicity (Evison 2000), ignoring the implications and complexities of identifying ethnic origins as discussed above.

Conversely, scholars with no biological training can struggle to utilize genetic data effectively, especially when geneticists disagree between themselves about how it should be interpreted (Oppenheimer 2007: 420-23). While genetic analyses can undoubtedly offer important new methods for exploring early medieval migration, the evidence produced so far is fragmentary and inconclusive, and academic work in this area has not yet established any agreed parameters and common methodologies necessary to compare one study with another (Higham and Ryan 2013: 91, 294) – or for non-geneticists to derive any significant conclusions from them about possible patterns of Viking migration and settlement.

3.4) Buildings

(3.4.1) As will be examined below, the evidence of Scandinavian-influenced place-names that are the focus of this study demonstrates a clear linguistic influence upon the naming practices of Anglo-Saxon England that indicates the presence of settlers of Scandinavian origin in considerable numbers. This would suggest in turn that there were a number of rural settlements[3] in eastern England that were partially or completely occupied by Scandinavian settlers during the Viking period, but identifying their locations archaeologically has remained a particular problem (Wilson 1976b: 400-01; Hadley 2006: 104). Whereas the introduction of novel and characteristic timber-building techniques has long been used to chart patterns of Anglo-Saxon migration and settlement (Hamerow 2011b), differentiating between indigenous later Anglo-Saxon timber buildings and possible Scandinavian-influenced variations is more difficult. Moreover, it is uncertain to what extent by this period crafts such as house-building were being undertaken by professional specialists

[3] The question of Viking settlement in an urban context will be considered in the next section below (3.5).

(Ljungkvist 2008: 187), and if so whether such craftsmen came to England from Scandinavia or were indigenous builders trying to implement the requirements of their new Scandinavian masters (Wilson 1976c: 112). Nevertheless, scholars have recently categorised specific aspects of late Anglo-Saxon settlement sites that may display distinctive Scandinavian traits, such as characteristic building forms, innovations in construction techniques, dislocation or relocation (or re-organisation) of settlement-sites, and the presence of distinctive artefacts (Richards 2000b: 296-300; Hadley 2006: 106).

(3.4.2) Bow-sided buildings or halls are a characteristic feature of tenth-century Danish settlements, which culminated in their most developed form in the Trelleborg-type fortresses established by Harald Bluetooth in the 980s (Richards 2011: 51; Roesdahl 1982: 147-55). It has been suggested that the presence of bow-sided or curved-wall buildings in England is indicative of Scandinavian settlement (Rahtz 1976: 88), and two examples with distinctly curved walls and dated to between the ninth and eleventh centuries have been identified in East Anglia at North Elmham and Thetford (Richards 2000b: 301; Wade-Martins 1980a: 137-39; Davison 1967). Two more possible examples have been identified in Essex at Chigborough Farm near Maldon (Waughman 1998: 98-99, 106-08) and at Waltham Abbey, although the identification of the latter by its excavator as a 'Viking hall' of Cnut's era (Huggins 1976) has been disputed (Graham-Campbell 1977: 427; Richards 2000b: 300-01). Once again, no building with possible Scandinavian features has yet been found or excavated in Suffolk, and the identification of a few widely scattered Viking settlements by the possible use of Scandinavian building forms and construction techniques seems to remain a rather haphazard and inconclusive exercise.

(3.4.3) However, the combined presence at settlement-sites of assemblages of Scandinavian-style artefacts and evidence of settlement disruption or relocation has recently been utilised to gauge the degree of Scandinavian involvement in, and influence upon, the broader processes of social and economic change in the rural landscape of later Anglo-Saxon England. Excavations at Cottam in Yorkshire revealed

the site of a typical eighth-century Anglo-Saxon farmstead, indicated by a cluster of eighth-century metal artefacts and pottery, with no apparent Scandinavian influence. But another cluster of artefacts of late ninth- and tenth-century date, including several examples of Scandinavian-style metalwork, was discovered just 100 metres to the north, which revealed another farm complex comprising several small timber-framed halls similar to those found at the first site, but the new settlement included also a monumental timber gateway designed more for symbolic than defensive purposes (Richards 2000b: 303-06, 2001: 271-74; Williams 1992a). It has been suggested that the second, grander tenth-century farm complex at Cottam may possibly indicate the seizure and re-organisation of the site by a new Scandinavian lord, but (as there is no evidence of a violent takeover) it is more likely to represent a localised settlement-shift at a time when Anglo-Scandinavian identity was being vigorously displayed and closely associated with new patterns and expressions of lordship and land reorganisation that were developing at that time also (Richards 2001: 272-74; Thomas 2012: 59).

A similar restructuring and re-organisation of settlement patterns under the apparent auspices of new Anglo-Scandinavian influence and ownership has been detected at Raunds in Northamptonshire, a county containing a light scattering of Scandinavian-influenced place-names similar to those found in Suffolk. Recent archaeological excavations have shown that a dispersed pattern of small, short-lived settlements in the early to middle Anglo-Saxon period was followed in the late ninth and early tenth centuries by the creation of a larger single farm complex comprising several substantial timber halls associated with a ditched enclosure (Audouy and Chapman 2009: 25-32). The farm appears to have had a more formal, seigneurial structure than the earlier and simpler Anglo-Saxon farmsteads, and has indeed been called a 'proto-manor', one which apparently originated under Danish control and ownership, and survived Edward's conquest of the region (*ibid*., 14-15, 31-32, 52, 62-74). Its creation in the late ninth or early tenth centuries coincided with a broader re-organisation of the local landscape that saw the nucleation of settlements and the laying-out of an open-field system (*ibid.*, 28-32, 51-53) – raising the question of how far the processes of nucleation and creation of open fields can be attributed or

connected in any way to the influence of high-status Scandinavian landowners in this area and elsewhere (*ibid.*, 29).[4]

There has until recently been a lack of such evidence in East Anglia, where excavated sites such as Sedgeford in Norfolk have shown continuous occupation sequences throughout the Viking period but without revealing any readily discernible change in the character of settlements or apparent disruption of occupation (Cabot, Davies and Hoggett 2004: 322-23). But a recent comprehensive archaeological survey at Wormegay in west Norfolk has indicated a clear and sudden transformation of settlement-use from an Anglo-Saxon monastic site in the early ninth century to a short-lived and possibly Scandinavian-controlled manorial centre in the late ninth century (Davies 2010: 109-11, 117). The assemblage of Scandinavian-type artefacts in the later manorial enclosure, such as a Borre-style brooch, two oval-brooch fragments 'within an area of human bone indicative of a Scandinavian-style burial', and an undated gold ingot may represent a change of land ownership that can be associated in some way with the settlement of the Great Army in East Anglia (discussed above in Chapter 2.2.2a).

A similar process is believed to have occurred at Burnham on the north Norfolk coast, where a Middle Anglo-Saxon trading and settlement site by the waterfront was transformed in the tenth century into a trading area under Scandinavian control or influence (indicated by a number of metal finds of Scandinavian style or origin and an Arab dirham that may have arrived via a Scandinavian trading network). This transformation has suggested a scenario in which 'an insecure Anglo-Saxon figurehead granted a waterfront to a new Anglo-Scandinavian elite' (Davies 2010: 112-13). However, such an interpretation of recently-discovered changes in settlement-use in terms of direct Scandinavian or Anglo-Scandinavian involvement related to known historical developments may possibly be trying too hard to fulfil entrenched and outmoded expectations of a 'Viking heritage', and certainly contradicts the more cautious and pragmatic

[4] Similar processes of settlement-restructuring have been detected at Wharram Percy in Yorkshire and Goltho in Lincolnshire (Richards 2001: 274-75, 2011: 51-52).

approach of recent Viking scholarship (Hadley and Richards 2000). This evidence may therefore need further consideration and revision as more archaeological material becomes available.

3.5) Towns

(3.5.1) The extent of Scandinavian involvement in the urban development of East Anglia has become a matter of some debate, revolving around the question of whether the settlers were a catalyst to the emergence of towns or merely added a new dimension to processes of urbanisation which were already occurring (Hadley and ten Harkel 2013b: vii). There has once again been a surprising paucity of diagnostically 'Scandinavian' material culture discovered in towns traditionally associated with Viking settlement (*ibid.*: viii; Richards 2011: 52). This may be partly due to inherent problems in urban archaeology, such as the difficulties of identifying specifically 'Scandinavian' buildings and artefacts (Hadley 2006: 154, 180), the reduction of large-scale archaeological excavations being conducted in town or city centres (Hadley and Harkel 2013b: ix), and major delays in analysing and publishing material excavated in the extensive urban archaeological projects completed in earlier decades (Griffiths 2013: 6-7). This has resulted in a fairly piecemeal exposition of possible Scandinavian influences on urban development, producing a fragmentary and incomplete picture that is compounded today by the occasional and small-scale, 'keyhole' nature of investigations that now tend to be conducted in selected urban locations – leaving much potential 'Scandinavian' material still unreported or undiscovered.

So the effects of Scandinavian influence now appear more complex or partial than originally believed, which reflects also the lack of a clear archetype of 'Viking' urbanisation in Scandinavia where a predominantly rural society and economy were maintained throughout the Viking Age (Griffiths 2013: 9-10; Skre 2008). Nevertheless, the emergence or re-emergence and growth of towns throughout

England between the late ninth and eleventh centuries that formed the urban framework of the post-Conquest era did coincide with the phase of Viking control and settlement (Hadley and ten Harkel 2013b: viii), and it appears that the Vikings provided more of an indirect stimulus to urban growth, both in the defensive *burhs* built against them in Wessex and as a result of their own defensive and economic activities within the Danelaw (Richards 2000a: 77-78).

Recent research has suggested that as contingents of the Viking Great Army colonised and settled the regions they had previously raided in northern and eastern England, some new towns may have evolved from the trading and manufacturing sites that developed out of the winter camps previously established by the Viking armies to provide security and control over local resources. Excavated camps such as Torksey in Lincolnshire were clearly large enough in terms of ground area to compare with the emerging towns of the ninth and tenth centuries, and the extensive finds uncovered indicate a range of urban activities in the camps (Williams 2013: 17-19). The winter camps may also have helped accustom members of the Great Army to life within an urban environment by providing an element of shared identity for what was probably a heterogeneous group of people with diverse origins. The Great Army would have needed to control the countryside beyond the security of the main camp, and so the relationship between town and hinterland became more significant when the Vikings turned to permanent settlement, as the towns presumably provided a focus and garrison for defending an Anglo-Scandinavian population dispersed across rural areas (Williams 2013: 17-20). The relationship between late Anglo-Saxon towns and their rural hinterlands has been somewhat neglected in recent academic analysis with a divergence of approach between urban and rural archaeology leading to debates, about urban origins on one hand and the formation of nucleated villages and field systems on the other, taking place in virtual isolation from each other (Griffiths 2013: 4).

(3.5.2) In East Anglia, the classic example of a possible former Viking camp that may have developed into a significant Anglo-Saxon town is at Thetford, an idea inspired by the tantalising entry in Æthelweard's *Chronicon* for 869 relating how the Vikings

'laid out a camp in the winter season at Thetford' (Campbell 1962: 36; discussed in sections 2.1.1a and 2.2.1e above). But the archaeological evidence is inconclusive, with some degree of uncertainty about what kind of pre-Viking settlement existed at Thetford (Hadley 2006: 175; Dallas 1993: 220; Andrews and Penn 1999: 89-91).

Two defensive circuits dating from the late ninth or early tenth centuries have been excavated on either side of the Little Ouse and Thet rivers, which may have enclosed a fortified military camp (Rogerson and Dallas 1984: 55-63 re. Site 1092, 197; Andrews and Penn 1999: 91), similar in size to the Viking winter camp recently excavated at Torksey in Lincolnshire (Williams 2013: 17; Hadley and Richards 2016). It is therefore possible that either or both defensive circuits may be associated with the Great Army's campaign of 869-70, and perhaps also or alternatively with subsequent defensive measures against later Viking threats and attacks. However, recent chronological analysis has indicated that the defensive circuit dated from *c.* 917, suggesting the defences were constructed after the annexation of East Anglia by Edward the Elder (Hutcheson 2009: 292-94).

The question of why the Viking Great Army chose Thetford as a base from which to exert its control of East Anglia rather than the larger and economically more significant *wic* of Ipswich has never been made clear. But it has been suggested that Ipswich was declining by the mid-ninth century, possibly as a result of earlier Viking raids (see sections 3.5.4 and 3.6.2 below), and that the royal administration therefore relocated inland to an apparently safer location at Thetford – where it became a strategic target for a later and more-organised generation of Viking invaders in the 860s (Hutcheson 2006: 93, 2009: 320-21). By the tenth century, Thetford had become established as a significant urban and trading centre of Anglo-Scandinavian East Anglia (Crosby 1986: 20-24), with some evidence of continuing Scandinavian influence suggested by isolated metalwork finds (Wallis 2004: 38-40). It then became the target of renewed Viking attacks and raids in the early eleventh century – by which time it had apparently become the stronghold of the defence forces of East Anglia who were commanded by Ulfcytel, presumably the assimilated descendant of earlier Danish immigrants (see 2.2.8 above). Thetford's prominence in resisting the establishment of Cnut's régime may have been a factor in its ultimate decline, as its

status was reduced when its urban territory was arbitrarily divided between the newly formed counties of Norfolk and Suffolk – whose county towns of Norwich and Ipswich subsequently became more prominent and prosperous (Marten 2006: 17-18).

(3.5.3) Norwich is another East Anglian urban centre whose rapid growth and development in the late Anglo-Saxon period has been attributed in part to the impetus provided by the presence and influence of Scandinavian settlers. However, identifying the nature and extent of a Scandinavian involvement in the city's development has been hampered by the general problems of early medieval urban archaeology outlined above (3.5.1) and also by the apparent classification of some possible Scandinavian material in earlier archaeological investigations in Norwich as 'Saxon' – using the term as a chronological rather than cultural indicator, where perhaps 'Anglo-Scandinavian' might have been more appropriate (Atkin and Evans 2002: 237).

Several proto-urban settlements started to appear in the Wensum valley during the eighth century which probably formed the earliest nuclei of the medieval city, but it appears that the first truly urban centre began to develop in the ninth century from modest mercantile settlements on both banks of the river – with evidence of early Viking involvement (Ayers 2009: 27-30, 2011: 70-76). An urban area north of the river was apparently occupied by both Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon townspeople and enclosed in the late ninth or early tenth century by a defensive D-shaped earthwork bank and ditch (Popescu 2009: 52; Ayers 2009: 32-33; 2011: 76-78; Ayers *et al.* 1991: 7-11; Atkin *et al.* 1985), during the time when East Anglia was under Viking control.

There is little further tangible evidence of *early* Scandinavian activity in this fortified urban area, due partly to the limited archaeological opportunities (Ayers 2009: 37-38), but some degree of later Scandinavian influence is indicated by place- and street-name evidence (which will be examined below) and the location of churches dedicated to St Clement and St Olaf, who both became particularly venerated in Scandinavia during the eleventh century and whose cults were

patronised by Cnut's régime in England for political purposes (Ayers 2011: 78; Crawford 2008: 13-28, 100-01; Groves 2010: 145-57).

In terms of archaeological evidence, the bulk of the diagnostically 'Viking' artefacts in Norwich has been found south of the river Wensum where excavations have suggested urban occupation began in the early tenth century (Ayers 2004: 9; Popescu 2009: 52-53). These cover a wide chronological range of Viking art styles, including late ninth- or early tenth-century Borre-style brooches, a later tenth-century Mammen-style cross shaft, an early eleventh-century Ringerike harness-mount and an early twelfth-century Urnes-style capital which formed part of the Romanesque cathedral, once again implying a continuing Scandinavian influence upon the developing city (Penn 2000: 7-8; Ayers 2004: 5; Margeson 1997: 23-25/33-39). Three Borre-style brooches were all found within fifty metres of each other near Rose Avenue, suggesting the presence of a workshop for their manufacture in the locality (Ayers 2004: 5, 2009: 51, 1985: 29 & fig. 24). Excavations beneath the site of a later Franciscan friary have revealed a half-*eyrir* lead weight, dated to the 880s and identified as a Viking die copied from a coin produced by one of Alfred's moneyers, indicating the possibility of a Viking mint operating in Norwich as early as the late ninth century (Archibald 2007; Hutcheson 2009: 234). Excavations to the west of the early south-bank urban district have discovered a Viking gold ingot, a ceramic crucible containing traces of gold, and fragments of litharge – an assemblage which suggests Anglo-Scandinavian gold-working may have been taking place in a location outside the built-up area (Ayers 2004: 8-9, 2009: 36; Hutcheson 2009: 241-42).

In summary, the archaeological evidence from Norwich suggests some degree of Viking political and military influence upon the urban area during the late ninth century and early tenth century when East Anglia was under Viking control, with items displaying diagnostically 'Scandinavian'-type art-styles becoming apparent from this period and lasting into the eleventh century – due possibly to increasingly specific and enduring Scandinavian influence resulting from continuing migration from Scandinavia, a theme that reflects the onomastic evidence of this study and one which will be explored further below.

(3.5.4) In contrast to the abundance of archaeological reports recording the nature of Viking influence and activity in Thetford and Norwich, there is unfortunately a dearth of such documented material available for Ipswich (Hutcheson 2009: 272), where excavations and reports of early medieval sites have tended to concentrate on its urban development during the sixth to eighth centuries. It has been suggested from the evidence of coin loss datable to specific periods (i.e. the number of coins that have been subsequently recovered by archaeology and metal-detecting) that Ipswich was most 'numismatically active' during the first half of the eighth century and was in apparent decline by the mid-ninth century, possibly as a result of earlier Viking raids such as that recorded in the ASC for the year 841 (Hutcheson 2006: 93, 2009: 274-78, 320-21; see section 2.2.1a above). It is around this time also that Ipswich ware pottery apparently ceased production.

Nevertheless, there is some evidence that the town was enclosed in the early tenth century by a circular or D-shaped defensive circuit, consisting of an earthen rampart and ditch (Wade 1993: 148), which may have been constructed during the Viking administration of the town in response to the threat from Wessex (Wade 1993: 148; 1999: 158; Dunmore *et al.* 1976: 135-39; Young *et al.* 1984: 241; 1986: 162). Excavations within the town centre have apparently also revealed 'distinctively "Viking" objects' (Wade 1999: 158) and evidence of 'great cultural change […] which must reflect Scandinavian rule and settlement' (Wade 2014). However, although a comprehensive archaeological database for Ipswich is now available online,[5] there has so far been no systematic exploration of the extent of Viking involvement in the urban development of the town, and so 'a Scandinavian imprint on Ipswich is [still] difficult to identify' (Hadley 2006: 178).

(3.5.5) In Essex, only Colchester and Maldon could qualify as towns with burgesses recorded in Domesday Book (Darby 1971: 251-55). Colchester was besieged by Edward's forces in 917, and the violent nature of their attack suggests a concerted operation to dislodge a contingent of Viking warriors who had occupied the town on

[5] https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/ipswich_parent_2015/index.cfm; Cutler 2018.

a tactical basis rather than the removal of any longer-term Scandinavian settlers (Crummy 1997: 137). For there is no record of established Scandinavian settlers being expelled violently from other East Anglian towns during Edward's campaign and no archaeological evidence of Viking activity or settlement in Colchester, apart from some isolated finds of Scandinavian-style weapons dredged up from the river Colne and a late eleventh-century Urnes-style bronze mount found in the bailey of Colchester Castle (Crummy 1981: 19-20, 78 / 1997: 137). It may be significant that a substantial Danish military force had apparently tried to resist Edward's advance by stationing itself in the old fortified Roman town of Colchester, an ideal location from which to defend Tendring hundred immediately to the east - the one small area of Essex that contains a number of Scandinavian-influenced place-names indicating some degree of Scandinavian settlement (which will be examined below).

An island in the Blackwater estuary just outside Maldon was the site of another well-known encounter between Danish and English forces in 991, but there is no apparent archaeological evidence of Scandinavian settlement within the town itself. Similarly, other locations such as Benfleet, Shoebury and Mersea Island are all recorded as the sites of temporary Viking camps (see 2.2.5 above), but there is no evidence of any of these developing into longer-term settlements (Pewsey and Brooks 1993: 32-33, 72-75) or of any long-term Viking presence in the other smaller urban centres of Essex.

(3.5.6) It is difficult to summarise the current state of urban evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia as it is so diverse, inconclusive because of the difficulties of urban archaeology, and often inter-connected with other forms of archaeological evidence. It is clear that the process of Viking settlement in eastern England coincided with a period of urban growth throughout the country, but disentangling more precisely the relationship between the two remains an elusive exercise.

3.6) Pottery

(3.6.1) The growth of pottery production in late Anglo-Saxon England has long been regarded as an integral part of urban development during this period, but the extent of Scandinavian involvement in this process remains uncertain, and academic interpretation of it is unresolved – just as it is more broadly for urban development as a whole in late Anglo-Saxon England (Hadley 2006: 178-79; Blinkhorn 2013: 160-66; ten Harkel 2013b: 183-84).

(3.6.2) But pottery evidence of a very different kind for the study of Viking settlement has been provided by the geographical distribution of Ipswich and Thetford ware. The former was a squat grey type of domestic pottery made on a slow wheel or tournet (revolved by hand), produced in Ipswich during the Middle Saxon period from *c.* 720 to *c.* 850 and used widely throughout East Anglia during this period. As its manufacture declined around the 850s, it was replaced by Thetford ware, a similar type of grey pottery but with taller and thinner walls that was produced following the introduction of new ceramic techniques (possibly associated with Scandinavian influence), including the use of a proper potter's wheel. Thetford ware was also first made in Ipswich, but its manufacture subsequently shifted to Thetford and other East Anglian towns where production continued into the twelfth century, and scatters of its remains have also been found widely throughout Norfolk and Suffolk (Hurst 1976: 299-303, 314-23; Blinkhorn 2012: 1-8; 2013: 160-66).

More pragmatically and in view of their prevalence throughout East Anglia, the geographical distribution of Ipswich and Thetford ware makes it possible to estimate the approximate dates of origins for many of the region's Anglo-Saxon settlements. In simplified terms, the presence of Ipswich ware indicates a Middle Saxon settlement that was in existence before *c.* 850 and the arrival of any Scandinavian settlers, and the presence of Thetford ware as well suggests a settlement that continued in existence into the Viking Age. But a site that produces

only Thetford ware without Ipswich ware may indicate a Late Saxon settlement that originated after *c.* 850 – that is, within the period of possible Viking settlement. Conversely, a site producing Ipswich ware but not Thetford ware suggests a Middle Saxon settlement that did not survive into the Late Saxon or Viking period, and a site without either type of pottery may be of post-Conquest formation.

Fieldwalking surveys have been conducted widely in the areas of existing or deserted villages surrounding Anglo-Saxon churches and churchyards, providing a systematically recovered and recorded data-set of archaeological material in which the presence of either or both pottery types can provide crucial chronological evidence. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between the finds of Ipswich and Thetford ware revealed by systematic fieldwalking and the isolated stray finds discovered more by chance (often in churchyards) that are also listed in archaeological records but are not necessarily representative of a wider pattern or chronology of occupation (Hoggett 2010: 146-47). Nevertheless, this simple, but effective dating mechanism has been used widely by archaeologists in surveys of several East Anglian parishes with Anglo-Saxon origins (summarised in Hoggett 2010: 147-59). Pottery finds have similarly played a crucial dating role in the University of Cambridge's extensive survey of currently occupied rural settlements (CORS) across eastern England, in which large numbers of small-scale test-pit excavations were dug to explore each settlement's early medieval development (Lewis 2010). The chronological evidence provided by these surveys will be utilised in the analysis of Scandinavian-named settlements below.

3.7) Coins

(3.7.1) The interpretation of numismatic evidence regarding Viking activity and settlement in East Anglia has been transformed over the last few years by the discovery of coins in increasing numbers through the activities of metal-detectorists. So information traditionally obtained from the discovery of coin hoards (deposited

intentionally, but not necessarily near the source or sources of the coins they contain) is now being supplemented by the geographical analysis of single coin-finds (lost accidentally, but usually within the area of a coin's circulation).

Numismatic evidence from the Viking period is diverse, as the abundant finds of coins can be interpreted both as historical texts and archaeological objects. The inscriptions and iconography of individual coins can reveal useful historical evidence about the issuing authorities, from simple factual information about who was reigning when and where to more nuanced indications of the political, religious and cultural attitudes and identities prevalent in the time and place where the coins were issued. As individual archaeological artefacts, coins have long been used as dating evidence but more recently the collective distributional analysis of their find-locations has been used to provide an index of the movement of wealth (through both trading and raiding) as well as the operation of government and effectiveness of royal authority, and the state of the economy and nature of monetary circulation – both inside and outside the territory of Viking-controlled East Anglia (Blackburn 2011a: xi, 2011b; Williams 2014: 26; Hutcheson 2009: 74-250; Mirrington 2013: 70-75, 165-232).

A further and unusual characteristic of some coins dating to the early Viking period is the presence of 'peck' marks, small incisions made to gauge the purity of its silver. Pecking and other testing methods are typical features of a bullion economy, in which the weight and quality of the metal used in coinage are of prime importance, unlike a monetary economy in which coins are valued according to the face-value of each individual coin that needs no further validation regarding its intrinsic metallic value (Moesgaard 2011: 297). Until their engagement with the monetary economies of other regions, it is believed that the Scandinavian societies utilised bullion as a means of exchange (Pestell 2013: 244). So, as will be examined below, bullion economies were prevalent in some Viking-controlled territories in England in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, often operating alongside the monetary use of coins.

Ultimately, the various forms of evidence provided by numismatics as outlined above can provide an indication of the political and social circumstances pertaining throughout East Anglia during the Viking period, which may in different

ways have facilitated or hindered the processes of Scandinavian immigration and settlement.

(3.7.2) There are no written sources available regarding the political control of East Anglia during the decade between the death of King Edmund in 869 and the formal commencement of Viking settlement in 879 recorded in the ASC. However, a few East Anglian coins have been found from this period which were struck in the names of two apparent successors to Edmund, a King Æthelred and a King Oswald. These coins bear clear stylistic similarities to the preceding coinage of Edmund, with at least two of his moneyers apparently still in place, indicating a degree of continuity in both minting and government during the 870s following Edmund's death (Blackburn 2005: 22-30, 34-35, 2009: 51-52). But the coins also incorporate a specific Frankish design feature that is found only on the coinage of particular regions such as Frisia – where elements of the Viking Great Army had established bases prior to their arrival on the shores of East Anglia in 865. This numismatic evidence suggests the Great Army maintained a Frankish connection after its arrival in England (McLeod 2014: 146-53).

The transformation from the coinage of the shadowy figures of Æthelred and Oswald to that of the known historical figure of Guthrum upon his army's return to East Anglia in 879 may again provide some significant political insights. Guthrum introduced a new coinage which imitated that of the Wessex coinage of Alfred, with some bearing his Anglo-Saxon baptismal name 'Æthelstan' instead of his own ON name and others copying even the inscription of Alfred's name. This suggests a display of respect for Guthrum's former enemy Alfred, who had sponsored his Christian baptism, and an aspiration to be regarded as a legitimate Christian ruler, but more pragmatically it may indicate a need to emulate a successful neighbouring coinage to ensure a sound currency in the newly established Viking-controlled East Anglian kingdom – a practice common among states issuing coinage for the first time (Blackburn 1989: 20, 2005b: 30-36, 2009: 52).

No successor to Guthrum after his death in 890 can be identified from either written or numismatic sources, but a distinctive anonymous coinage was introduced for East Anglia around 895 bearing an inscription commemorating King Edmund who

had been killed by the Viking leaders a generation earlier, perhaps to reflect and acknowledge the rapid rise in the cult of St Edmund amongst the indigenous East Anglian population. This coin became the sole type struck on a large scale in East Anglia and probably parts of the East Midlands as well for at least twenty years (Blackburn and Pagan 2002; Blackburn 2009: 52). It is uncertain who was responsible for the St Edmund memorial coinage (Pestell 2004: 78-79), but it seems clear that such a fulsome veneration of the martyred saint was sanctioned by the new Danish rulers of his former kingdom and perhaps reflects a negotiated concession to help consolidate their political authority (Ridyard 1988: 211-18). More broadly, this development might once again reflect a fairly rapid process of pragmatic assimilation into the forms and values of the Anglo-Saxon society of East Anglia on the part of the Great Army leaders and veterans – which could partially account for their virtual disappearance from the historical and archaeological record.

(3.7.3) Significant information can be derived from the names of moneyers which appear on most coins from this period – that is, either the craftsmen who actually struck the coins or the men held responsible for their quality (Smart 1986: 171). In the eighth and first half of the ninth centuries, the moneyers' names on coins from the English kingdoms were nearly all of Old English derivation (*ibid*., 174-75). From the late ninth century onwards, ON names began to appear amongst Anglo-Saxon moneyers, with 'large concentrations of Scandinavian moneyers' names [being] found in just those areas where other sources indicate a heavy Scandinavian settlement' (*ibid*., 175). But more surprisingly, 83% of the moneyers' names for the coinage produced in those areas of England under Scandinavian control were Frankish, a trend which increased with the St Edmund memorial coinage produced in East Anglia from *c.* 890 to *c.* 905 (McLeod 2014: 147; Smart 1985). The sudden preponderance of Frankish names on coinage produced in areas of Scandinavian settlement is significant, and may indeed represent 'a large influx of first-generation immigrants from the Continent' (Smart 1986: 176). It has been suggested that some men with Frankish names were either part of the Great Army, brought to England as captives, or had already been active in East Anglia as traders. Alternatively, some

Frankish moneyers could have been invited to England by Vikings in the early settlement period, to become 'career migrants' in terms of migration theory (McLeod 2014: 148-49).

(3.7.4) In a broader numismatic context, analysis of the contents and geographical distribution of coin-hoards deposited in different parts of East Anglia during this period can provide evidence regarding the nature and extent of Viking control, authority and influence before and after the region's annexation by Edward the Elder in 917 – which in turn may have indirectly affected the extent and duration of possible Scandinavian settlement. For it has traditionally been assumed that Scandinavian settlement and the formation of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia were less intensive than in other parts of the Danelaw, largely because Viking control of the region lasted for a shorter period of time and ended abruptly with the 'conquest' of East Anglia by Edward the Elder's Wessex in 917. Underlying this interpretation is the assumption that Wessex's annexation of Viking-controlled East Anglia and imposition of its political authority was swiftly and effectively achieved, resulting in a rapid termination of opportunities for further Scandinavian settlement and immigration from Scandinavia. As discussed above (2.2.6), however, recent historical analysis has suggested that Edward the Elder's overlordship of the Anglo-Scandinavian leaders in East Anglia established in 917 was not as complete and effective as the submission to him by those in neighbouring areas of the former Danelaw (Marten 2006: 5) – an interpretation that is increasingly supported by numismatic evidence, some of it only recently discovered.

Analysis of coin-hoards from different parts of East Anglia and different dates in the Viking period can be used to chart the changing nature and extent of political control of the region in the early tenth century. Two coin-hoards from the territory of Viking-controlled East Anglia have been dated to *c.* 915, one from Manningtree in the north-east corner of Essex and the other (the so-called 'Baldwin parcel') of unknown find-location, and they both consist almost entirely of the widely used St Edmund memorial coins discussed above. This suggests a degree of homogeneity in the currency of Viking-controlled East Anglia in the mid-910s, from which 'foreign'

coins (including those from other parts of the Danelaw) had been largely excluded (Blackburn 2006: 206-07), and may therefore indicate a political authority firmly in Viking control. It is significant that the Manningtree hoard was located in the Tendring hundred of north-east Essex, just over the border from the kingdom of East Anglia, which was apparently the location of a small pocket of Viking settlement indicated by a scatter of Scandinavian-influenced place-names – the only such area in Essex, which is discussed in detail below.

Three more coin-hoards datable just a few years later to the mid-920s contain mainly coins of Edward, as would be expected following his annexation of the region in 917, but these display variations of quality that hint at discrepancies in the effectiveness of his control of southern and northern parts of East Anglia. A hoard discovered in 2003 at Brantham in south Suffolk, just over the border from Manningtree in Essex, and dated to *c.* 923 consists entirely of ninety coins of Edward the Elder which were produced to the same higher weight standard of around 1.60 gm then being used by Mercian and West Saxon coinage. Although the hoard contained no Anglo-Scandinavian coins remaining from the earlier Viking régime of East Anglia, three of the moneyers on the Edward coins have names found also on the St Edmund memorial coins, indicating that previously Viking-controlled mints were by this time required to produce instead the new standard coins of Edward. This suggests that the local Scandinavian currency in this part of southern East Anglia was removed from circulation and replaced with the regular coins of Edward the Elder, thus fully integrating the region into the monetary system of Wessex and Mercia (Blackburn 2006: 207) and the administrative polity of the newly emerging English state.

However, the numismatic evidence of this period from northern East Anglia presents a very different political picture. Two hoards in Norfolk (one at Morley St Peter discovered in 1958 and dated to *c.* 925, the other at Framingham Earl discovered in 1994-97 and dated to *c.* 923) also contained a large number of coins of Edward the Elder but these were struck to the lower East Anglian/Scandinavian weight standard of 1.35 gm and bear derivative or blundered legends unlike the higher-quality Mercian/Wessex standard coin-issues of Edward. The Morley St Peter

hoard also contained a number of pre-conquest Anglo-Scandinavian coins from East Anglia, including some St Edmund memorial coins and earlier Danelaw issues. This evidence suggests that Edward had sufficient authority in this part of East Anglia after 917 to order a replacement of the Anglo-Scandinavian currency with one in his own name, but perhaps not to fully control its minting or coin-circulation as closely as elsewhere in his kingdom, with the previous Anglo-Scandinavian mint administration apparently able to continue producing poorer-quality coins and permitting earlier Viking coin issues to remain in circulation (Blackburn 2006: 207-08).

The possible geographical extent of Viking influence in Essex, which (as discussed above) was a border region of disputed territory between the Danelaw and Wessex, has been suggested by two coin-hoards dating from the late ninth century and discovered at opposite ends of the county. The Ashdon hoard in north-west Essex (just 150 metres from the Essex-Cambridgeshire border) was discovered in 1984 and contains twelve intact silver coins and the broken fragments of sixty-five or seventy more that were probably deposited between *c.* 890 and *c.* 895. Nearly all the identifiable coins were clearly Viking issues, with five bearing Guthrum's name and one that of Guthrith (probably the ruler of York from 883 to 895), while twenty-eight coins were various types of Viking imitations of Wessex coins issued by Alfred. One was a genuine coin-issue of Alfred and, intriguingly, four were Frankish coins datable to between 864 and 898, but it is unclear whether these arrived with one of the Viking armies of 892 (discussed in 2.2.5 above) or perhaps by trade in earlier years. A number of the intact coins were 'pecked', indicating that they had been used in a bullion economy as well as for their monetary value. It has been suggested that such a hoard of predominantly Viking coins indicates the far north-west of Essex was by the early 890s within the economic and trading system of the neighbouring Viking-controlled East Anglia (Blackburn 1989: 26-27, 2009: 50-51).

By contrast, an isolated 'Viking' burial at Leigh-on-Sea in southern Essex contained a hoard of coins deposited between 895 and 900 which were all regular issues of Alfred's Wessex coinage and apparently lacking peckmarks (Blunt and Dolley 1958-59: 235-39). If these coins were typical of those in local circulation, that would imply a monetary system without any bullion trading in southern Essex firmly within

the orbit of Alfred's Wessex, quite different from an apparent zone of Viking influence in the north of Essex (Blackburn 1989: 26-27; Rippon 1996: 123; Williams 1996: 94). The inclusion of northern Essex in the Viking-controlled East Anglian region of influence in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, with southern Essex remaining more within the milieu of the Wessex trading and cultural network, is reflected also in the evidence of Scandinavian metalwork and dress-fittings, which will be examined further in section 3.8 below.

So although it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions from the evidence of a small number of hoards, the distribution of coin-finds does suggest differing patterns of Viking influence in Essex in the late ninth century and differing patterns also in the effectiveness of Edward's control over different parts of the former Viking-controlled kingdom of East Anglia in the early tenth (Blackburn 2006: 208, 221). Developing further an idea that has been outlined above in terms of the historical evidence (in section 2.2.6), this might reflect a political and administrative situation in which the southern part of East Anglia (which subsequently formed the county of Suffolk) and northern Essex were quickly and fully integrated into the Wessex régime in the period after 917, whereas the Anglo-Scandinavian leaders in the northern part of East Anglia that became Norfolk continued to retain for a while at least some degree of autonomy. Ultimately, such a political situation could perhaps have created the circumstances in which for some time after 917 widespread Scandinavian migration and settlement were able to continue into what is now Norfolk and north Suffolk but not south Suffolk or Essex – in a pattern that is still reflected today in the distribution of Scandinavian artefacts and place-names that will be examined further below.

(3.7.5) As well as the abundant finds of Viking-Age coins, metal-detectorists in East Anglia have also recently uncovered a considerable number of metal ingots identified as Viking in origin, which may provide further evidence of a bullion economy operating in Viking-controlled East Anglia alongside the monetary use of coins (Pestell 2013: 244-53). Bullion economies developed in many of the areas in Britain settled by Scandinavians, including parts of northern England, Scotland and the Irish

Sea region, leaving evidence in the form of foreign coins, silver and gold ingots, hacksilver, and 'pecks' or other marks on metal objects for testing their purity (Blackburn 2001: 134). In East Anglia, an increasing number of silver ingots, as well as a few gold ingots, have been discovered, mainly in Norfolk (Pestell 2013: 246-50), together with foreign coins dating from this period or earlier, especially in the form of Arabic dirhams – some of which were found as cut fragments, a further sign of their use as bullion (Pestell 2013: 252-53). In Essex, the isolated finds of Kashmiri, Arabic and Byzantine coins may testify to bullion trading there also (Mirrington 2013: 222).

Overall, the evidence of ingots, foreign coins and the 'pecking' of coins (such as that observed in the Ashdon hoard discussed above) all point towards the operation of a 'dual economy' in East Anglia in the late ninth and early tenth centuries, after bullion had been introduced as a means of exchange by Viking traders and then used widely throughout the region alongside the continuing production and use of Anglo-Saxon coins or Viking imitations of them (Blackburn 2009: 48-51). But as the introduction of Anglo-Scandinavian coinage in East Anglia was clearly sanctioned if not commissioned by its new Viking leaders, it is intriguing that apparently 'there lingered in some parts of the community a distrust of the coinage' (Blackburn 2001: 135). The question then arises of which part of the Anglo-Scandinavian community may have distrusted coins and preferred to use them only as part of a bullion economy. Could it have been an incursion of lower-status immigrants from Scandinavia who, unlike their more-assimilated Great Army forebears, had no previous experience of using coins monetarily?

3.8) Metalwork

(3.8.1) The nature and scale of the evidence provided by other forms of Scandinavian metalwork, such as female dress fittings and jewellery, Thor hammers and religious items, and equestrian equipment, have been transformed over the past few decades

by the advent of metal-detecting. The resulting abundant finds have been recorded and catalogued through such schemes as the Portable Antiquities Scheme (hereafter 'PAS'), and utilised for the academic study of Viking activity and settlement (Richards and Naylor 2010: 338-41).

However, the evidence provided by the geographical distribution of metal-detected artefacts is limited by a number of constraints and biases, such as the tendency of metal-detecting activity to favour accessible flat, low-lying agricultural land within the limits of plough-zone farming, resulting in a greater concentration of finds from all periods recorded under the PAS in the south and east of England, particularly in East Anglia (Richards *et al*. 2009: 2.4.1, figs. 5 & 7; Pett 2010: 8, fig. 7). Conversely, few finds have been discovered within urban zones, where little metal-detecting activity is possible, or in other locations where access may be physically difficult or legally restricted (Richards and Naylor 2010: 342; Kershaw 2013: 13-14). In East Anglia, such specific areas of constraint include the urbanised areas along the Essex coast, Thetford Forest Park and its adjacent military training zone, as well as the wetlands and lakes of the Norfolk Broads and west Norfolk (Kershaw 2013: 187 and Map 6.3; Richards *et al.* 2009: 2.4.2.4 and Figs. 23, 25).

The pattern of finds-discovery can be affected also by the personal interests of detectorists, with repeated visits to so-called 'productive sites', and varying abilities to recognize the relevant early medieval artefacts, especially when these are heavily worn or corroded items with little decoration (Kershaw 2013: 14). Nevertheless, the recording and analysis of Scandinavian-style metalwork and the geographical location of their find-spots have provided useful information regarding the distribution of possible Viking settlement and trading patterns (Richards and Naylor 2010), especially when compared with similar work undertaken in the 'Danish' Viking homelands of Denmark and northern Germany (Pedersen 2005).

(3.8.2) The significance of Scandinavian-style metalwork finds, especially those relating to female dress items, has been much debated over the past two decades or so, reflecting the underlying theoretical concerns outlined above (in section 3.1) surrounding the use of archaeological artefacts as evidence of immigration in the late

Anglo-Saxon period. Some scholars have interpreted the widespread distribution across East Anglia of a large number of poor-quality artefacts associated with women as confirming a large-scale immigration of low-status settlers from Scandinavia, whereas others questioned the validity of assigning ethnic origins to inhabitants of a region on the basis of material culture alone, as the items in question could have arrived by trade instead (Margeson 1996: 55-56; Williamson 1993: 107; Thomas 2000: 240).

There are indeed challenges in using the distribution of small Scandinavian-style artefacts as a guide to possible Scandinavian influence and settlement in England, as such highly portable items may have been carried over some distances by their wearers or transported by trade networks. But as most of the dress items were found as single finds in scattered rural locations (with only a few derived from burials or urban contexts), it has been argued that most of these artefacts represent accidental losses associated with everyday activity and local movement around the countryside – in which case their find-locations today are likely to have been influenced both by the underlying settlement patterns of the late Anglo-Saxon period and the varying regional tastes and fashions for metalwork consumption at that time (Kershaw 2013: 181). Moreover, it has recently become possible to correlate the distribution of Scandinavian-style artefacts with that both of other 'multi-period' finds and with other contemporary Anglo-Saxon material recorded by the PAS which can provide controls against which the find-locations of the Scandinavian material can be compared (Kershaw 2013: 181; Richards *et al.* 2009: 2.4.1, 2.4.2.4, 2.5.1, 3.2.1, 3.3.4 and Fig. 24).

(3.8.3) The abundance of new information and comparative data has been utilised in a recent comprehensive analysis of Scandinavian metalwork in eastern England conducted by Jane Kershaw (2009, 2013), which has identified a corpus of over five hundred items of generally poor-quality Scandinavian-style female jewellery and dress-fittings, especially brooches and pendants. Around half of these have been defined as 'Scandinavian', as they are identical in appearance to corresponding artefacts found in the Scandinavian homelands, displaying pre-Christian Scandinavian

motifs decorated in the Borre and Jellinge artistic styles datable from the mid-ninth to the late tenth centuries (Kershaw 2009: 298-99; 2013: 5, 20-128; Graham-Campbell 2013: 9, 63-95). Analysis of the materials and probable techniques of manufacture suggests that these artefacts were produced in Scandinavia and transported by some means to England. The presence in eastern England of such a wide range of Scandinavian brooch types, encompassing almost the full repertoire of styles then found in Scandinavia, is commensurate with the items having reached England on the clothing of female settlers from Scandinavia rather than being imported as trade goods. For if they had been introduced by trade or manufactured locally, then it might be expected that a more restricted number of mainstream brooch types would have prevailed, as well as a more clustered geographical pattern of their find-spots around trading centres and routes – which has not been the case (Kershaw 2009: 299; 2013: 129-34, 244-245).

But in addition to these explicitly 'Scandinavian' items, a large number of brooches have also been discovered in eastern England which have been characterised as 'Anglo-Scandinavian'. These display a blend of Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon forms and styles, and are revealed by analysis of their constituent materials and probable manufacturing processes to have been produced within the Danelaw (Kershaw 2013: 5, 38-40, 159-70). Their use may attest to the desire of local inhabitants (who perhaps included second-generation settlers of Scandinavian origin) to form Scandinavian associations in opposition to Anglo-Saxon values (Kershaw 2009: 301, 2013: 235) – perhaps to articulate a distinct and continuing 'East-Anglo-Scandinavian' identity in defiance of Wessex after its annexation of Viking East Anglia in 917 (Kershaw 2013: 248; Pestell 2013: 238).

The differences between Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian brooches suggest that there were two distinct traditions of female costume within the Danelaw and at least two different groups of wearers (Kershaw 2013: 178). Kershaw concludes that as the explicitly Scandinavian brooches were likely to have been brought to England by Scandinavian settlers, the distribution of their find-spots may be directly indicative of possible areas of Scandinavian settlement, whereas the distribution of

Anglo-Scandinavian brooches probably highlights broader regions of Scandinavian cultural influence rather than settlement per se (Kershaw 2013: 212).

(3.8.4) In terms of geographical distribution across England, the find-spots of ninth- and tenth-century jewellery and dress-fittings in both Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian styles are nearly all located within the documented areas of Scandinavian settlement that have traditionally constituted the 'Danelaw'. There is accordingly a clear concentration in Norfolk and to a lesser extent in Suffolk and Lincolnshire, but a surprisingly sparse distribution in Yorkshire and only a scattering in Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire (Kershaw 2013: 184-85 and Map 6.2). Within East Anglia, the constraints on metal-detecting are fewer and so a fairly dense and widespread distribution of multi-period finds has been recorded across the region (Richards *et al.* 2009: 2.4.2.4), which provides a full background against which the distribution of Scandinavian-style brooches can be compared and assessed (Richards *et al.* 2009: 2.4.2.4; Richards and Naylor 2010: 248; Kershaw 2013: 187-89 and Maps 6.3, 6.5). Conversely, the low numbers in the East Midlands and Yorkshire may partly reflect the constraints on metal-detecting activity, but sufficient quantities of finds from other periods indicate that the absence of Scandinavian brooches is genuine (Kershaw 2013: 194-99; Richards *et al.* 2009: Fig. 42). It has been suggested that this discrepancy may reflect a pattern of Scandinavian settlement in East Anglia which was fundamentally different in some way from that manifested elsewhere in the Danelaw, where there was possibly a more military orientation with fewer women and families of Scandinavian origin (Kershaw 2013: 202-06; Townend 2014: 93, 138-40).

(3.8.5) Within East Anglia, the find-spots of Scandinavian-style jewellery are widespread and numerous compared with other parts of the Danelaw, but they are clearly concentrated in Norfolk, where 60% of the 497 recorded brooches can be classified as Scandinavian-style, 34% as Anglo-Saxon and just 6% as Continental. These figures are almost identical to those in Lincolnshire, where 60% of a smaller total of 122 brooches were identified as Scandinavian-style, 35% as Anglo-Saxon and

5% Continental. The picture in Suffolk is very different, where a total find of 113 brooches revealed only 36% that could be classified as Scandinavian-style, with 48% as Anglo-Saxon and 16% as Continental – most of the Scandinavian-style brooches were located in north Suffolk adjacent to the border with Norfolk, with only a scattering found in south Suffolk, where Anglo-Saxon and Continental styles are more common. Despite a fairly widespread pattern of multi-period finds recorded in Essex, only a few isolated finds of Scandinavian-style objects have been located, mainly in the north of the county (Kershaw 2013: 189-92, 237-41, Maps 6.6, 7.11; Mirrington 2013: 157).

(3.8.6) The contrast between the abundance of Scandinavian-style brooches in Norfolk and north Suffolk on one hand and their relative scarcity in south Suffolk and Essex on the other is striking, and clearly suggests that the southern half of East Anglia was less Scandinavian and more 'English' in character than the northern half. Kershaw has linked this difference in the relative density of finds to the characterisation of two distinct cultural zones in East Anglia separated by the so-called 'Lark-Gipping divide' that has been proposed by other scholars (Kershaw 2013: 192, Map 6.6; Martin and Satchell 2008: 217-221) – an idea that will be explored further below, in conjunction with the relevant evidence from Scandinavian-influenced place-names and areas of linguistic influence.

Within Norfolk, a majority of the Scandinavian-style brooches have been categorised as Anglo-Scandinavian rather than Scandinavian (47% as opposed to 8%), suggesting that most were made locally within the region. A marked cluster of Anglo-Scandinavian brooches has been discovered around the south of Norwich, which appears to have been a centre of manufacture for locally made Scandinavian-style brooches – a possibility supported by archaeological evidence within the city (discussed in section 3.5.3; Kershaw 2013: 193, 241 and Map 6.7). This cluster of finds coincides with a particular concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names also located to the south of the city. A smaller cluster of late ninth- and early tenth-century brooches is found also on the southern fringes of Flegg, an area that contains a marked concentration of Scandinavian **-by** place-names (Kershaw 2013:

211). Conversely, the numbers of Scandinavian brooches in south Suffolk and Essex are fewer, and are similarly matched by a lower concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, suggesting that Scandinavian influence was significantly less marked in this region than in northern East Anglia. The inter-relationship between the two forms of evidence for Scandinavian settlement will be explored further below.

(3.8.7) As well as the abundant finds of Scandinavian female dress items, a smaller number of religious items of Viking Age metalwork have also been discovered in East Anglia, particularly in the form of Thor's hammers which appear to have been worn both as a symbolic representation of the Scandinavian pagan god Thor and as an amulet invoking his protection (Pestell 2013: 238-44). They are assumed to indicate an outward display of non-Christian belief, suggesting their wearers may have been ethnically Scandinavian (*ibid*., 242); but during what appears to have been a fairly rapid process of conversion to Christianity throughout the Danelaw (discussed above in 3.2.1), their use may perhaps also be regarded as a lingering symbol of defiant pagan reaction against Christianity (Staeker 2003: 468). Like the brooches, Thor's hammers can be dated to the main period of Scandinavian settlement in the late ninth and tenth centuries, and the distribution of those discovered so far falls similarly within the areas of the former Danelaw – suggesting that they were not just dropped randomly by Vikings on military campaigns but used by Scandinavian settlers (Pestell 2013: 242). There is once again a significant concentration of Thor's hammers discovered in Norfolk, with ten recorded in the county so far compared with just one in Suffolk and a smaller number elsewhere in the Danelaw (Pestell 2019: 38-40, Fig. 26). So they may indeed provide some degree of archaeological corroboration for the circulation of pre-Christian Scandinavian beliefs in East Anglia that in turn may indicate the presence of non-Christian immigrants from Scandinavia during the First Viking Age, reinforcing the evidence from the more abundant female dress items.

(3.8.8) The pattern of Scandinavian metalwork datable to the Second Viking Age is markedly different from that produced during the First, and consists mainly of pieces

of equestrian equipment (such as bridle and harness fittings, stirrup terminals and stirrup-strap mounts) which are decorated in the later Ringerike and Urnes styles of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and more identifiable with use by males. They may have been associated initially with an élite cavalry group operating under Cnut, but large numbers of low-quality, mass-produced copies have been found, which suggests they were widely imitated in England and perhaps signalled a desire to be associated with the emerging political and military establishment of Cnut's régime (Graham-Campbell 1992: 88; Sheeran 2009; D. Williams 1997; Kershaw 2013: 177).

The find-spots of eleventh-century equestrian equipment are once again concentrated mainly in Norfolk and Suffolk, but they extend also into Essex, southern England and the West Midlands and Warwickshire – well beyond the bounds of the former Danelaw (Richards and Naylor 2010: 350 and Map 32.4; Mirrington 2013: 160-62). However, the widespread use of such male-orientated artefacts is not regarded as evidence for a significant Scandinavian population or immigration movement in the eleventh century, as it is not matched by any other forms of evidence for Scandinavian settlement, and the distribution of the few corresponding female dress accessories datable to the same period is restricted to the former Danelaw (Sheeran 2009; Hinton 2005: 157). Examples of Scandinavian-style female jewellery decorated in the later Mammen, Ringerike and Urnes styles (Graham-Campbell 2013: 9, 100-57), from the late tenth to the early twelfth centuries, have been found in England in far fewer numbers than the female dress items decorated in the earlier Borre and Jellinge artistic styles. Their distribution is once again restricted to the counties of the former Danelaw, but there is no longer any particular concentration in Norfolk (Kershaw 2013: 116-25, 207-08, Maps 3.22, 6.16). In the immediate political context of the early eleventh century, the male-orientated items can be seen as indicative of a southern-based equestrian class associated with the reign of Cnut which maintained a strong Scandinavian identity that was emulated also by the wider indigenous population (Sheeran 2009; Richards and Naylor 2010: 349-50).

(3.8.9) The evidence from Scandinavian metalwork in the Ringerike and Urnes styles datable to the Second Viking Age tends to reflect once more the nature of Cnut's

conquest as a small-scale élite takeover of the entire English kingdom rather than a large-scale settlement of part of it – in contrast to the distribution of the earlier Borre- and Jellinge-style female dress fittings of the First Viking Age which as discussed above corresponds more closely and significantly with probable areas of Scandinavian settlement within the Danelaw (Richards and Naylor 2010: 350, Fig. 32.5).

In summary, the discovery of such a wide range of female brooch styles that originated in Scandinavia indicates a substantial involvement by Scandinavian women in the Viking settlement of eastern England, challenging previously held views that it was largely a male-dominated process. It provides tangible archaeological evidence for a significant female Scandinavian population in Viking-Age England, perhaps numbering in thousands rather than hundreds, which may have involved women from the recorded onset of settlement in the 880s and possibly even earlier during the Viking military campaigns of the 860s and 870s. Significantly, the evidence of Scandinavian brooches dating from throughout the tenth century suggests that the Scandinavian female population was not confined to the short period of formal Viking rule in East Anglia but may well have been continually refreshed by the arrival of new settlers into the later tenth century. Similarly, the widespread and prolonged use of locally-made Anglo-Scandinavian brooches indicates the enduring popularity of Danish-inspired fashions amongst the settled Danelaw population, including indigenous women as well as second-generation settlers or those of mixed descent – especially in Norfolk, where a sustained Scandinavian influence is apparent even after the 'conquest' by Wessex of East Anglia (Kershaw 2013: 244-47). Ultimately, the evidence of Scandinavian-style brooches may indeed provide some tangible support for the theory of secondary migration hypothesised by Kenneth Cameron in the 1960s in the light of the place-name evidence; the geographical correlation between the two forms of evidence in East Anglia will be examined in more detail below.

3.9) Conclusion

Much of the traditional archaeological evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia, such as the evidence from burials and rural buildings, has proved somewhat inconclusive – as has the more recent biological evidence from ancient and present-day DNA analysis. But the intensive urban archaeology of the 1980s and 1990s has demonstrated some degree of Viking involvement in the late Anglo-Saxon development of East Anglian towns, especially Norwich. Recent numismatic evidence has also helped support possible clues from historical sources which indicates that Wessex's administrative control of East Anglia after Edward the Elder's 'conquest' was patchy and incomplete – perhaps permitting a greater degree of Viking autonomy in northern East Anglia. In turn, the recent abundant finds in this area of Scandinavian-style female brooches dating from the First Viking Age are indicative of the immigration and settlement of a substantial number of Scandinavian women into the rural hinterland of Norwich that apparently persisted after Wessex's takeover of the former Viking-controlled kingdom – suggesting a continuing process of migration that was perhaps made possible by a lack of effective control by the Wessex régime.

The non-written primary sources discussed in this chapter have thus been able to build upon the limited historical evidence in suggesting a possible underlying pattern of Viking settlement in East Anglia. However, much of the archaeology remains uncertain and incomplete, and requires further corroborative evidence to construct a fuller picture. This provides the context for an examination of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia which are the focus of the remainder of this thesis.

Chapter Four: LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF PLACE-NAMES

4.1) Introduction

This chapter will review some of the criteria for the linguistic analysis of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names, and evaluate their use as evidence for Viking settlement. It will then examine the specific linguistic context and pattern of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia, introducing the parameters for their detailed examination in Chapters 6 to 9. Chapter 5 will then correspondingly introduce the geographical contexts of these place-names.

The question of which place-names to include in any onomastic study or survey always involves an element of subjectivity, and usually requires a fairly arbitrary distinction (based on often conflicting administrative and linguistic criteria) to be drawn between major names, minor names and field-names (*CDEPN*: vii; Rumble 2011: 34--40). This thesis takes as its criteria for inclusion all the relevant place-names which are mentioned in Domesday Book, which became the names of parishes, or form the names of sizable settlements still in existence today. It also includes some 'minor' names recorded in documentary sources dating from the thirteenth century or before which can be assumed to have been the names of former settlements (but now lost, or surviving only as farmsteads, cottages or other individual buildings). The names of hundreds plus those of major topographical features are referred to where they may further illustrate the degree or nature of Scandinavian linguistic influence, but these are not interpreted statistically or included in any quantitative or comparative survey of settlement-names. Other minor and field-names that cannot be regarded as former settlement-names are excluded from this chapter (although the numbers and distribution of their generic

elements may be briefly referred to in the relevant sections), but some examples are considered in more detail in Chapter 10.

4.2) The use of Scandinavian-influenced place-names as evidence for Viking settlement

(4.2.1) Toponomastics, the academic study of place-names, began in England during the early twentieth century, utilising rigorous philological methodologies to determine the etymologies of individual English place-names and thereby propose meanings for those names and their possible origins. This involved collecting, from the earliest available written records down to those of the present day, a list or corpus of the forms or spellings of place-names to show how they have changed and developed linguistically during their recorded history – and how they may have originated orally before their first documentary appearance (Cameron 1996: 12-14). The philological study of place-names is therefore akin to history, being similarly based mainly on – and subject to the limitations of – the available written evidence. Increasingly detailed corpora and surveys of place-names throughout the counties of England have been collated and published by the English Place-Name Society after its formation in 1923 (Carroll 2013; Gelling 1997: 9-20), and deployed to support the ever-changing interpretations of Viking settlement.

In the absence of detailed historical sources and before the effective utilisation of the various types of archaeological material discussed in the previous chapter, the abundant Scandinavian-influenced place-names scattered throughout the territory of the former Danelaw were regarded for much of the twentieth century as the most significant single source of evidence for its history (Stenton 1971: 520-21). Scandinavian place-names were plotted on distribution maps to indicate their geographical locations and relative densities, often presupposing a simple and direct correlation between place-names and settlement. In 1956, A.H. Smith displayed all the English parishes with names of Scandinavian origin as little black dots on a classic

and much-copied map, which was indeed entitled 'THE SCANDINAVIAN SETTLEMENT'.[1] The large number of Scandinavian place-names located throughout the territory of the former Danelaw were frequently cited in support of the traditional interpretation of a large-scale settlement of Danish soldiers, numbering in their thousands (Stenton 1971: 243, 519-25; Loyn 1962: 49-62). As outlined in section 1.1, this approach was criticised by revisionist scholars, starting a debate which provided the impetus for Kenneth Cameron's postulation of a secondary migration of Scandinavian settlers (Cameron 1965; 1970; 1971), based on an analysis of the geographical contexts of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. This hypothesised a three-stage process: the so-called 'Grimston hybrids' marking the initial takeover by the ninth-century military veterans of English settlements in the most favourable locations; the **bý**-names suggesting a secondary phase of colonizers forming new settlements on less attractive sites; and the **thorp**-names a third stage of settlement activity in even more marginal land. Gillian Fellows-Jensen (*SSNY*, *SSNEM* and *SSNNW*) utilised a similar methodology in the preparation of three comprehensive regional surveys of Scandinavian settlement names in Yorkshire, the East Midlands and the North-West. These systematically applied linguistic techniques for gauging the likely dates and possible national or ethnic origins of the Scandinavian-influenced settlement-names, and examined their geographical locations in terms of surrounding topography and geology, resulting in analyses which broadly endorsed Cameron's approach and conclusions.

However, by the late 1990s and early 2000s the formulation of such specific chronologies and patterns of Viking settlement from place-name evidence became increasingly criticized by revisionist scholars. Dawn Hadley emphasised the dangers of using place-name evidence on its own for exploring Viking settlement, and cautioned against trying to 'read too much between the dots' of place-name distribution maps for various reasons. (Hadley 2002: 57 [quoting from Keynes 1997:64]; 1996b; 2000a: 17-22, 323-335; 2000c; 2006: 99-104). Similarly, Julian Richards concluded that 'there is no need to postulate a mass folk migration in order

[1] Discussed above in Chapter 2.2.3a, and reproduced as Appendix 4.2a.

to explain the distribution of Scandinavian place-names' (Richards 2000a: 47). By the early 2000s, therefore, a number of traditional assumptions about the use of place-names as evidence for substantial Viking settlement had been queried and somewhat undermined. Nevertheless, the radical reappraisal and downgrading of the historical value of place-name evidence as proposed by Hadley and other revisionists was rejected by place-name scholars such as Gillian Fellows-Jensen (2007: 94-95) as the stuff of 'nightmares', and somehow a number of fundamental questions about the origins of the large numbers of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in eastern England and the significant linguistic influence that they represent remained unresolved.

(4.2.2) It has been in such a milieu of scholarly confusion and fractious debate that the historical value of Scandinavian-influenced place-names has recently undergone a major reassessment in onomastic scholarship. It is now accepted that place-name evidence is essentially linguistic, so that distribution maps of Scandinavian place-names do not directly indicate individual centres of Scandinavian settlement but rather provide a broader index of the influence of Scandinavian language upon the wider region in which the place-names are situated (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 392-93). More sophisticated models have been proposed for how toponomastic analysis might be employed to illuminate the complexities of Viking settlement in eastern England, such as the comprehensive survey undertaken by the historian Lesley Abrams and place-names scholar David Parsons (Abrams and Parsons 2004). They argue that careful interpretation of the broader and regional context of Scandinavian-influenced place-names is now required as much as detailed etymologies of individual place-names (*ibid.*, 392-94); that the circumstances of Scandinavian settlement and land-taking varied significantly from area to area of the Danelaw (*ibid*., 404-07); and that, in order to fully understand the historical significance of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, it is necessary to 'examine the documentary, archaeological and landscape evidence at a very local level' (*ibid.*, 421). This is a view not dissimilar to Hadley's conclusion that 'it is difficult to generalise about the significance of Scandinvian place-names, and it is only really on a localised basis that

we can begin to understand their historical context' (Hadley 2006: 104). So there would seem to be a consensus amongst scholars on both sides of the place-names debate that much further work is required on the local circumstances of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in different areas of eastern England, which provides an agenda and framework for the analysis below.

(4.2.3) Recent academic debate in toponomastics has also begun to address some broader and fundamental complexities in the interpretation of how place-names were formed and used, including questions such as who gives a place its name – the people living in it or those nearby, the landlord, or the authority which first recorded it in writing? Or what circumstances might lead to a place being renamed, and how did new names become established and accepted in the longer term? (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 381). A distinction has been drawn by European onomastic scholars between two aspects of interpretation that has hitherto been somewhat overlooked in British scholarship. The first is that of traditional etymology which seeks to discover the linguistic origins of words and recognize the linguistic elements present in a name at the time of its formation. The second concerns motivation, which tries to establish the reasons for the use of those linguistic elements in a particular name on a particular occasion (Coates 2013: 150-52). This distinction has often been overlooked in the formal interpretation of English place-names, but it is one that can provide a broader understanding of the historical and social context in which place-names were formed.

It is also becoming evident that there are some underlying limitations and uncertainties in how place-names have been recorded and studied for the past one hundred years or so, being based almost exclusively upon the philological analysis of place-name forms and spellings recorded in written sources – even though what changes they have undergone must have manifested themselves mainly through spoken language (Rumble 2011: 34-40; Cameron 1996: 19). So the formal names attested in the historical record may be no more reliable than those informal names (often quite different in form) that circulated within oral tradition (Gardiner 2012). Some Anglo-Saxon minor names have persisted only in spoken language for over a

thousand years before being first written down in tithe apportionment records of the nineteenth century (Gardiner 2012: 20). The oral traditions of early Anglo-Saxon England are clearly unavailable to modern scholars, but perhaps there is a need to move beyond what has been characterised as the 'dead specimen' or taxonomic approach to place-name records and begin to examine more critically the character and purpose of the documents which bear the place-names (*ibid.*, 28) – just as historians are increasingly scrutinising the original context and function of contemporary written sources for the early medieval period and evaluating their use by a society in which oral procedures and discourse were dominant (Halsall 2005: 56-78; McKitterick 1995: 5-8).

It is clear that some documents in which place-names appear were produced by and for a centralised bureaucracy using normalised spellings which may indicate a pronunciation or form of a particular name that differs from that current in the district in which the place-name occurs. It is quite possible therefore that the frequency of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in an East Anglian context may be under-reported in the surviving textual sources (Cameron 1996: 22; Townend 2002: 51-52). It is also significant that literacy in late Anglo-Saxon England was practised only by the English-speaking community, as the Scandinavians who participated in colonisation and settlement were illiterate. So although many new Scandinavian place-names and Scandinavianised forms of existing East Anglian place-names may have been coined and used orally by influential Viking settlers (especially during their period of political control in the late ninth and early tenth centuries), these would not have been used by the indigenous administrators and scribes in their own written records (Townend 2002: 188-90).

So behind the apparent certainties of twentieth-century toponomastic scholarship that has adhered scrupulously to evidence provided by carefully catalogued lists of written place-name forms, is there perhaps a more shadowy and uncertain world of frequently changing names being used for settlements in the pre-Conquest era during which most of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names of East Anglia were formed? These considerations will be borne in mind in the analysis below.

4.3) Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia

(4.3.1) The Scandinavian-influenced place-names located throughout England can be grouped into three principal geographical areas of concentration separated from each other by natural barriers which may also have been reflected in the political boundaries of the late Anglo-Saxon period.[2] The largest and densest cluster covers the pre-1974 coastal counties of Yorkshire and Lincolnshire, stretches into the inland counties of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, and includes sparser numbers also in Derbyshire, Rutland and Northamptonshire. A second and less dense area of Scandinavian-influenced place-names is found in north-west England, divided from the first by the physical barrier of the Pennines. A third and similarly less intensive cluster is located in East Anglia, separated from the first by the Fenlands and marshlands of Huntingdonshire and Cambridgeshire.[3] This clear division between the two clusters in eastern England facilitates the analysis of those in the geographical region of East Anglia that is the focus of this study.

The English Place-Name Society lists 130 current place-names in Norfolk with possible ON elements, fifty-five in Suffolk, and just six in Essex – figures which are considerably less than the 320 recorded for Lincolnshire and 572 for Yorkshire.[4] The proportional quantities of specific types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names found in East Anglia differ also from the other counties of the former Danelaw. There are far fewer place-names ending in -**býr**, with only twenty-two in Norfolk, three in Suffolk, and one in Essex – compared with 184 in Lincolnshire and 162 in Yorkshire. The **thorps** are relatively more numerous (sixty-eight in Norfolk, twenty-seven in Suffolk, and eight in Essex), but still considerably fewer than the 112 in Lincolnshire and 336 in Yorkshire.[5] This comparative pattern of distribution helped to formulate

[2] See maps in Appendices 4.2a and 4.3b.
[3] See map in Appendix 4.3c.
[4] See table in Appendix 4.3a.
[5] The figures for **thorp** totals in each county are for both current and lost place-names, and derived from *TIACL*: 20 (see table in Appendix 4.3a). The remaining EPNS figures cited here for comparative

the traditional view of Viking settlement in eastern England, with the main concentrated cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire being regarded as the principal region of Scandinavian settlement.

However, this traditional pattern is contradicted by a third category of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, the so-called 'Grimston-hybrids', which are found in relatively higher numbers in East Anglia than elsewhere in the Danelaw, and are scattered widely across both Suffolk and Norfolk (but not in Essex) – unlike the overall pattern of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia which tends to be more concentrated in east Norfolk and coastal Suffolk.[6] The significance of the distribution of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in Norfolk and Suffolk will be explored in detail below.

(4.3.2) The Scandinavian-influenced place-names of East Anglia constitute only a very small proportion of the region's overall corpus of place-names, and need to be considered within a broader toponomastic context which this section will briefly survey. The vast majority of East Anglian place-names were coined during the Anglo-Saxon period, and comprise a broad range of OE toponymic formations created from a number of habitative and topographical generics that can constitute place-names on their own in simplex form, but which are usually compounded with a wide variety of qualifying specifics. Habitative generics are elements that originally denoted some structure or structures used for habitation, shelter or other purposes by man or animal; topographical generics are those that denoted some topographical feature of natural or artificial origin which usually became associated in some way with the settlement referred to by the place-name in question (*SSNEM*: 8, 136, 174, 199).

The specific elements of place-names can be derived from nouns or adjectives that usually describe the geographical or topographical context of the settlement being named, its function, or the status or occupation of its inhabitants or owners.

county-by-county analysis are for current place-names only. The more detailed analysis of individual ON place-name forms below will consider also the many place-names of each category that are now lost, but their relative proportions do not alter the overall comparative picture presented here.

[6] See map in Appendix 4.3c.

Alternatively, a specific can be an anthroponymic element derived from the personal name of an individual who may have owned or occupied the settlement. Such a name usually appears in a place-name's earliest recorded spellings in a genitive singular form to denote possession, in the form "X's farm or settlement". The personal names of Anglo-Saxon England and Viking Age Scandinavia can be divided into two broad morphological categories: dithematic or compounded names which consist of two word-elements in conjunction (such as *Æþelred* and *Þorketill*), and monothematic or uncompounded names consisting of a single element (such as *Beorn* or *Leof*). The monothematic names can be divided into further sub-categories, including bynames (a form of characterising nickname given to an individual in addition to his or her personal name) and secondary formations (in which a short, hypocoristic form of a dithematic name is created by the addition of the suffixes *-i* or *-a* to one or other of the original two elements). During the later Anglo-Saxon period in England and the Viking period in Scandinavia, personal names tended to be dithematic, especially for people of higher social rank. Uncompounded or monothematic names were less common by this time, and it is believed that they were generally borne by individuals of lower rank (*SPNLY*: XXIX-XXXI; Sandred 1987: 311; Insley 2003: 375-87; 2013: 218-31; Clark 1992: 456-71).

By far the two commonest types of place-names in East Anglia are those with -**hām** and -**tūn** habitative generics, which display quite contrasting characteristics and distributions.[7] It appears that **hām**, meaning 'village, estate or settlement', was the most favoured habitative term in the early years of Anglo-Saxon place-name formation before the mid-eighth century,[8] but ceased to be used widely in the formation of new place-names from then onwards (Gelling 1992: 55-56; Cox 1972-73: 37-47; 1975-76), which may help to explain its complete absence from Anglo-Scandinavian place-names in East Anglia – in noticeable contrast to **tūn**.

The OE **tūn** generic, meaning 'farmstead, settlement or village', is found abundantly in Norfolk and Suffolk (where the **tūns** outnumber the **hāms**), but less so

[7] See map in Appendix 4.3d
[8] See table in Appendix 4.3.2a.

in Essex (*PNEss*: 569; Baker 2004: 12-15).[9] The comparative paucity of **tūn**-names in Essex appears to be part of a broader pattern of fewer **tūns** in a distinctive Home Counties belt around London, encompassing Essex, Hertfordshire, south Buckinghamshire, east Berkshire, Surrey and north Sussex (Baker 2004; 2006b: 223-36). Like the **hāms**, the **tūns** in East Anglia are compounded with a wide variety of specifics – including a number of Scandinavian origin.

In contrast to the earlier **hāms**, the **tūn** generic does not feature very widely in place-names recorded in early documentary sources before the mid-eighth century, but then appears more frequently from the later eighth-century onwards (Baker 2006a: 50, 58-59) – including many compounded with ON specific elements. Increasingly, **tūn** became compounded with personal names rather than topographical elements to form place-names, as will be discussed below.

The other OE generics of East Anglian place-names are more diverse in form and difficult to broadly categorise in terms of relative chronology or settlement-type. Place-names ending with, or incorporating, the **-ing**, **-ingas** or **-ingahām** elements are regarded as early in formation, but their origins are uncertain and have been much debated (Gelling 1992: 54-55). The other common OE habitative generics, such as **wīc**, **worð**, **burh**, **stōw**, **stoc** and **stede**, are all found in several place-names in each of the three counties, although in far fewer numbers than the **tūns** and **hāms**. It is significant that, unlike the **tūns**, these elements are only very rarely compounded with ON specifics to form Anglo-Scandinavian place-names, a pattern which will be explored further below.

OE topographical generics are similarly found in place-names in varying numbers and distributions both within East Anglia and across the whole of England, with elements such as **lēah**, **ford**, **feld**, **ēg**, **dūn**, **halh**, **beorg**, **hōh** and **denu** being the most prevalent.[10] Some of these topographical generics (such as **halh** and **ēġ**) are compounded frequently with OE personal names in East Anglian place-names and

[9] See maps in Appendix 4.3d, 4.3e and 4.3f.
[10] See maps in Appendices 4.3d, 4.3g, 4.3h and 4.3i.

others less so, for reasons that are not readily apparent,[11] but they are only very rarely compounded with ON personal names or other ON specifics.

Several of the above-mentioned OE topographical elements found in East Anglian place-names are associated in some way with the presence or absence of trees and woodland. Those place-names containing elements such as **lēah** and **feld** usually denote areas of cleared open land, often implying a contrast with adjacent areas of woodland. However, the term **lēah** had a range of meanings from 'forest' to 'clearing in woodland' and 'pasture', and the meaning of **feld** appears similarly to have shifted from 'pasture' or 'grazing land' to 'arable land' (Gelling 1984: 198-207, 235-39, 1992: 60-62; *EPNE*: 1.166-68, 2.18-22), which may reflect progressive processes of woodland clearance and the development of open-field farming during the Anglo-Saxon period. Other OE terms for different types and sizes of woodland, such as **wudu**, **wald**, **grāf**, **holt**, **sceaga** and **hangra**, are also found but in fewer numbers than the **lēahs** and **felds** (Schram 1961: 146-47; Gelling 1992: 60-62). OE names for species of trees, such as **āc**, **æsc**, **box**, **elm** and **wilig**, are also occasionally found in East Anglian place-names. These arboreal names are mirrored by equivalent ON topographical terms found in East Anglian place-names as both generics and specifics that also denote woodland (such as **lundr** or **skógr**), cleared woodland (**þveit**), or individual species of tree (**eik**). Significantly, these constitute a considerably higher proportion of the total number of ON topographical generics than the equivalent OE woodland terms, which may suggest a broader geographical context for the formation of Scandinavian-influenced place-names following their Anglo-Saxon predecessors that will be discussed further in Chapter 8.

In spite of the far-reaching effects of the Norman Conquest on the English language, the Norman-French influence on the place-names of Norfolk and Suffolk is minimal. It seems that by the time of Domesday Book, most major settlements had established names and the new Norman owners only occasionally added their family names or official titles to the names of their estates. The led to the occasional French-derived affix or prefix being added to existing place-names – including a few of

[11] See table in Appendix 4.3.2a; Gelling 1997: 187-88.

Scandinavian origin, such as Kirby Cane, Kirby Bedon and Baconsthorpe in Norfolk, and Carlton Colville and Thorpe Morieux in Suffolk, (Mills 2014: 18; Schram 1961:149). The Norman-French influence on the place-names of Essex is more prominent with a greater number of French-derived affixes and suffixes added to existing place-names (including the use of the French definite article in Thorp-le-Soken) as well as evidence of earlier Anglo-Saxon names being replaced completely by those of French origin (*PNEss*: xxx-xxxiii; Kemble 2007: 15-17, 143-44). In Tendring hundred, the one area of Essex in which a number of Scandinavian-derived place-names are located, the OE-named *Fulepet* ('foul pit or hollow') recorded in Domesday Book had been rather optimistically replaced by the late twelfth century by the French name *Beaumont* ('fair hill') (*PNEss*: 327-28). It is possible that other established but unrecorded or more transitory place-names (of ON origin as well as OE) in the same locality or elsewhere in East Anglia may have been similarly replaced by French or later English names.

4.4) Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated the continuing role of place-name evidence in furthering our understanding of Viking settlement, established the parameters of linguistically analysing and categorising Scandinavian-influenced place-names – and reviewed some of its inherent difficulties. It has also looked at how the Scandinavian-influenced place-names of East Anglia relate to the broader toponomastic context of the predominantly OE place-names throughout the region. It is necessary also to examine their geographical context.

Chapter Five: GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT OF PLACE-NAMES

5.1) Introduction

The geographical context of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in England has long been recognized as fundamental to understanding the nature of early Viking settlement, and was explored systematically during the 1970s and 1980s by Kenneth Cameron (1965, 1970, 1971) and Gillian Fellows-Jensen (*SSNY*, *SSNEM*, *SSNNW*) in the East Midlands and northern England. However, little further work along the lines of their geographically-based regional analyses has since been conducted with regard to Viking settlement in England. Other related work has explored the landscape context of place-names with topographical generics and specifics (Gelling 1984; *LPN*), the historical context of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in England (Abrams and Parsons 2004), and the impact of geology and topography on human settlement in East Anglia (Williamson 2006; 2013a), but there has been no systematic examination of the geographical context of Scandinavian-influenced place-names and Viking settlement in this region.

The significance of the underlying geological context of Scandinavian-influenced place-names examined in Cameron's and Fellows-Jensen's studies was limited to some extent by their inability to fully take account of the effects of overlying soil layers which could greatly alter the suitability of any site for settlement or agriculture (*SSNEM*: 300-01). Since the 1970s, however, more detailed information has become available on the diverse range of soils found in different areas across the country, making possible a more accurate characterisation of local landscape-types. The Soil Survey of England and Wales has classified soils into individual types or 'series', and grouped these into 296 geographic 'soil associations' of which 141 occur in eastern England (Avery 1980; *SIEE*: xix, 52-78; Williamson

2013a: 46-53). Other developments in landscape history and archaeology have enabled a fuller understanding of the location of settlements and use of land in the early medieval period (Williamson 2003, 2013a).

The introduction of computerised mapping (Geographical Information Systems, or GIS) has transformed the potential for studying the historical and geographical context of settlements (Chapman 2006; Conolly and Lake 2006), making it possible to clearly locate and contextualise settlements and place-names accurately in terms of the underlying geological formations, soil-types and topography. However, GIS technology has so far been surprisingly under-exploited in onomastic studies for analysing the geographical context of place-names. In this study, GIS technology will be fully utilised to facilitate the qualitative and quantitative analysis and display of the local landscape contexts of the settlements associated with Scandinavian-influenced place-names.

This chapter will introduce the geographical factors and parameters for evaluation that will be used to examine the specific landscape settings of the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names which will be studied in turn in Chapters 6 to 9. Section 5.2 will provide a broad geographical background to the process of Viking settlement in East Anglia, looking at the local landscape characteristics affecting the individual settlements associated with Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and exploring also their wider regional context (Chapman 2006: 89-111). Section 5.3 will outline the more specific developments in the patterns of settlement that occurred during the early medieval period which provide a backdrop to the process of Viking settlement. Ultimately, the aim will be to evaluate the significance of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in helping to understand the possible patterns of land occupation and ownership by Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian settlers in the different geographical zones of East Anglia.

5.2) Geographical background

(5.2.1) The underlying solid geology of the region is determined primarily by layers of chalk deposits that have tilted downwards towards the south and east. [1] In west Norfolk, north-west Suffolk and north-west Essex, the raised chalk is exposed as an escarpment (the so-called 'East Anglian Heights'), but as it slopes down towards the south-east it has become submerged below layers of sand and clay in the south of the region (especially London Clay) and later deposits of gravel, clay and sand in the east known as the Crags. These in turn have been largely covered with the most recent surface (or 'drift') geology formations of glacial deposits, of which the largest single type is the extensive plateau of boulder-clay that stretches across a wide area of south Norfolk, central Suffolk and north-east Essex (*SIEE*: 2-25; Williamson 2006: 12-20;).

(5.2.2) The characteristic soil-types of East Anglia have greatly affected patterns of settlement, and the development of field-systems and agriculture, during successive eras of human history. The distribution of soil-types across East Anglia[2] is highly complex and can exhibit considerable variation within small areas, often showing a jigsaw-like interdigitation when mapped, which has resulted in very local fluctuations in fertility, workability and lengths of growing season (Williamson 2013a: 45-46).

Nevertheless, the soil-types can be broadly grouped into three main categories. Firstly, there are the light, freely-draining sandy soils formed over deposits of chalk, limestone, sands and gravels that were generally easy to cultivate with simple ploughs or ards. These apparently formed the core areas of settlement in East Anglia during the early Anglo-Saxon period, and are found in three main areas: a broad band extending along the northern and western coasts of Norfolk down through west Suffolk and south-eastern Cambridgeshire; a second area of more

[1] See map in Appendix 5.2a.
[2] See map in Appendix 5.2b.

uniformly sandy and acidic soils (principally of the Newport Associations) extending in a patchy band from Norwich northwards to the coast; and a third (also consisting largely of infertile Newport soils) extending along the Suffolk coast in the area traditionally known as the Sandlings and intermittently into north-east Essex (Williamson 2006: 20-22, 173-92; 2013: 46-49; Countryside Agency 1999; *SIEE*).

Adjacent to, and sometimes interspersed with, these areas of light soils are smaller deposits of fine, silty wind-blown (or 'aeolian') *loess* that have formed localised pockets of soil-types, such as those of the Wick Associations, which are comparatively more fertile than the sandy soils surrounding them. These have created very productive areas in east Norfolk, and in the Suffolk hundreds of Lothingland and Colneis, that supported unusually dense populations in the early medieval period (Williamson 2006: 23; 2013a: 51; Countryside Association 1999: 40-44; *SIEE*).

The second broad category of soils in East Anglia are those formed in clays which are all moderately fertile but poorly draining – making them liable to becoming heavy, saturated and waterlogged in winter, especially in areas of level ground with little potential for natural drainage, and thus more difficult to cultivate with primitive technology. It appears therefore that theses soils were not much utilised in the early Anglo-Saxon period after the economic and technological recession of the immediate post-Roman era, and were only cultivated again when larger and more sophisticated ploughs came into widespread use from the ninth century onwards (Williamson 2013a: 16-20, 49-52).

The clay soils are found primarily in the central parts of East Anglia across the underlying plateau of boulder-clay, a large tract of land which can be broadly characterised as forming two distinct types of clay landscape separated along a line formed by the rivers Lark and Gipping. The clayland areas to the north and east of this line are flatter, with wide and level plateaux between the principal valleys, and occupied by the clayey loam soils of the Beccles Associations which are fertile, but slow to drain when wet and heavy to plough. The sides of the few but large river valleys in this area are characterised in Norfolk by the Burlingham Associations' soils which are sandier and more freely draining, and in Suffolk by the chalky but fertile

clay soils of the Hanslope Association (Williamson 2003: 94-102, 142-47; 2006: 22-23, 153-54; Countryside Agency 1999: 63-68; *SIEE*).

The Hanslope Association soils are more extensive south and west of the Lark-Gipping divide, forming a clay plateau dissected by more numerous and closely-spaced rivers and streams (often less than five kilometres apart) that have cut pronounced valleys into the clay, exposing the underlying sands and gravels. These river valleys have largely determined the pattern of settlement on the south-western claylands, as the valley slopes are easier to drain and cultivate than the impermeable clays of the flatter upland interfluves. The more permeable sands and gravels (with soils of the Melford and Ludford Associations) exposed along the bases of larger valleys also provide better-drained land for settlements (Countryside Agency 1999: 75-80; *SIEE*). So when the improved ploughs introduced during the middle Anglo-Saxon period enabled the difficult, but fertile soils to be brought back into cultivation, settlements with primarily OE names became established in the most advantageous valley locations across the claylands of south-west Suffolk and north-west Essex.

The boulder-clay plateau continues into central and parts of north-east Essex, where it has produced the fertile soils of the Hornbeam, Tendring and Wix Associations. It has also been dissected by river valleys, exposing the underlying sands and gravels which have formed the soils of the Ludford Associations. The plateau is bounded to the east by lower-lying land along the coast where the underlying London Clay has also been exposed, forming the heavy and impervious soils of the Windsor Association (Countryside Agency 1999; Sturdy and Allen 1981: 1-14; *SIEE*; Hunter 1999: 12-42) – creating a coastal fringe of marginal and less productive land, where the one small cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in Essex is located.

The third category of soils in East Anglia are those formed in wet, low-lying districts from both alluvial and peaty deposits. The silty, alluvial deposits of rivers created pockets of salt marsh along the coast in the lower reaches of estuaries, the flood plains of many river valleys (especially along the coasts of Suffolk and Essex), and behind spits (such as the Halvergate Marshes adjacent to the shingle spit on which Great Yarmouth was built). There is also a larger area of marshland in the

north-eastern section of the Fens that partially lies within Norfolk. Many areas of marsh, characterised by soils of the Wallasea and related Associations,[3] were reclaimed and often settled from the middle Anglo-Saxon period onwards as the salt marshes (including Halvergate) were progressively embanked, drained and converted to grazing or arable land – a process that coincided with the period of Viking settlement.

The areas of low-lying peat deposits are normally found in former basins and estuaries lying inland and upstream from the silt land, forming waterlogged 'fens' that were usually suitable only for grazing or providing thatching materials in the Middle Ages, and only reclaimed in the post-medieval period. Peat soils (including those of the Altcar, Mendham, Isleham and Hanworth Associations) are located mainly in the upper reaches of most river valleys in eastern Norfolk, but also in larger areas across the southern and western parts of the Fens, although these have been largely eroded now (Williamson 2006: 20-21, 193-209; Countryside Agency 1999: 13-19, 45-50; *SIEE*).

(5.2.3) The differing geological formations and soil-types have also helped determine a range of more localised geographical factors that affected the choice of individual sites for early medieval settlements, of which the most significant (but often overlooked) is the supply of water. Before the advent of large-scale reservoirs, most water in south-eastern Britain was traditionally obtained on a local basis from springs or wells, and therefore derived from aquifers (permeable geological formations in which water accumulates and can be stored). These are widespread in East Anglia, but the abundant and impermeable clay formations act as aquitards which hold water in the permeable strata above them (or in layers of sand and gravel within the clay itself), and often force it to flow sideways, emerging from the side or base of a valley slope as a spring (Williamson 2013a: 184-87). This reinforced the hydrological suitability of river valleys in clay landscapes as settlement-sites, where spring waters

[3]The soils of the Wallasea 1 Association [813f] were previously classified as Newchurch 2 [814c] (Soil Survey of England and Wales 1983).

were supplemented by the sands and gravels of the valley floors which provide good sites for wells – and, of course, the running water of the rivers themselves. The valley slopes of clay plateaux are also much easier to drain than the flat claylands of the upland interfluves which tend to become waterlogged in winter (*SIEE*: 51-52, 237-41, 245-47), and this provided another suitable factor for settlement. Conversely, it is difficult to obtain water on the surface of thick layers of permeable rock such as the chalk deposits of western East Anglia, where the water table lies deep below the range of wells, and so settlements on the chalk landscapes of East Anglia have tended to be sparser than those elsewhere (Williamson 2013a: 48, 187).

The proximity of surface watercourses that provided navigable inland waterways was also another crucial factor in the location of early medieval settlements, especially those of high-status communities. Until the nineteenth century, rivers and canals provided the cheapest and quickest means of transporting heavy cargoes from the coast or across the sea to inland locations, and also facilitated shorter movements of goods and materials within the East Anglian region. In the early medieval period, proximity to navigable water (and land routes such as those provided by Roman roads) also enabled the rulers of society to maintain administrative and military control of their territories as well as gain access to prestige goods from overseas (Williamson 2006: 25-26; 1993: 15).

The major rivers of East Anglia and their tributaries can be broadly grouped into a number of self-contained systems, with different characteristics regarding ease of seaward access and inland navigation.[4] East Norfolk and north-east Suffolk were served by the Broadland complex of interconnected waterways that included the Yare, Bure, Waveney, Chet, Ant and Thurne rivers, which enjoyed generally easy approaches from the sea and connected major inland towns such as Norwich and Beccles, situated at the upper limits of navigation along their respective rivers. Similarly, the closely located outfalls of the Deben, Orwell (the estuary of the Gipping) and Stour rivers facilitated maritime access to south-east Suffolk and north-east Essex.

[4] See map in Appendix 5.2c.

But in contrast to the welcoming estuarine systems of east Norfolk and Suffolk, access to the Essex coastline south of Harwich was obstructed by a series of extensive offshore shoals and mudflats which made seaward approach more hazardous. Safe passage was possible through to the three main estuaries of the Colne, Blackwater and Crouch, but it is significant that there were no early ports established along this section of the Essex coast. The western regions of East Anglia were served by the Fenland rivers that flowed into the Wash, including the Nene and Great Ouse, with an extensive network of tributaries such as the Little Ouse and Lark providing navigable access into south Norfolk and central Suffolk for towns such as Thetford and, arguably, Bury St Edmunds (Admiralty 2011; 2014; Priestley 1831; London Canal Museum [undated]; Williamson 2006: 25-27). These navigable rivers thus provided a network of communication across much of the inland territories of East Anglia that to some extent influenced the patterns of settlement – and conversely, the absence of navigable rivers across some of the clay plateaux of East Anglia hindered the development of settlement in those areas (Warner 1996: 21-27).

Beyond their navigable limits, the upper reaches of rivers fulfilled another important function in providing a supply of running water, which became of particular economic significance from the ninth century onwards as watermills began to be used increasingly in England and had become widespread by the time of Domesday Book (Watts 2006: 5-7; Darby 1977: 270-75). They tended to be located along the faster-flowing, higher sections of rivers and their tributaries with sufficient gradient of flow to supply the head of water required, and were noticeably absent in some estuarine coastal areas such as the Broadlands (Darby 1971: 136-38, 188-90, 248-50; Williamson 1997: 148-50). It is possible, therefore, that the development of watermills may have provided an economic impetus to the apparent increasing formation of settlements (often named using the later OE **tūn** generic) along the higher reaches of river valleys in the ninth and tenth centuries, further up from the earlier **hāms** that had tended to be located in the lower, often navigable sections of river valleys.

Overall, it is striking how the geographical distribution of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia is clearly influenced by the pattern of river

systems described above[5] – in contrast to the broader distribution of all Anglo-Saxon settlements as recorded in Domesday Book (Darby 1971: 353). There is a marked concentration around the Broadlands complex of estuaries, extending along their navigable inland rivers into the non-navigable upper reaches and tributaries. A smaller and more diffuse cluster is located around the estuaries of the Deben, Orwell and Stour, and scattered along the inland sections of their rivers also.

Conversely, virtually no Scandinavian-influenced place-names are found in the less accessible hinterland of Essex beyond the north-east hundred of Tendring adjacent to the Stour/Orwell river system. Similarly, only a few isolated Scandinavian-influenced place-names are found on the tributaries of rivers in western East Anglia that flow north-west into the Wash, which reflects the almost total absence of evidence for Viking settlement in the Fens. The concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names around river systems flowing east into the North Sea may reflect a continuing ability of immigrant Scandinavian communities to retain a more direct maritime contact with the North Sea and beyond than the wider, indigenous Anglo-Saxon population living in settlements scattered across the remainder of East Anglia. Within this broad paradigm, however, the distribution of individual types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names varies considerably, as will be examined below.

(5.2.4) The proximity of settlements to both the navigable lower sections of rivers and their non-navigable upper reaches was thus clearly a significant factor in their siting and development during the early medieval period, but it is difficult to define, quantify and compare (or display on distribution maps) the nature of this attribute for each of the several hundred Scandinavian-influenced place-names discussed in the chapters below. A new exploratory scheme has been devised, therefore, for the symbology of the maps accompanying the textual analysis to broadly categorise the types of local landscape settings in which the Scandinavian-influenced place-names are individually located, together with those for a representative sample of

[5] See map in Appendix 4.3c.

equivalent OE place-names for comparison. This has been formulated through an examination of the relevant contours and watercourses of the present-day Ordnance Survey 1:25,000-scale Explorer Map series, and the pre-modern settlement patterns depicted on the earliest editions of the nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey One-Inch 'Old Series'. The map symbols[6] used are intended to indicate whether the place-name in question was, in the early medieval period, situated adjacent to (that is, within approximately three hundred metres of) an estuary or a large river that was navigable, or a small river that was not – or alternatively located on land with no nearby river, on a flood plain, or beside the coast. Such an analysis can, of course, only provide a present-day or nineteenth-century perspective of the place-names' landscape contexts, although due account has been taken of the known manmade alterations and natural changes to the coastline, some estuaries and the lower courses of some rivers.[7] Ultimately, it is a qualitative and, to some extent, subjective exercise, but it is hoped that it can provide a simple but effective means of evaluating and comparing the topographical contexts of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names and their OE equivalents.

(5.2.5) The relative status and chronology of the settlements and estates formed in the late Anglo-Saxon period can also, albeit to a limited extent, be gauged by the territorial sizes and shapes preserved in the parish boundaries of villages which were created between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, and often survived unaltered into the nineteenth century (Hadley 2000a: 88-90, 95-96, 131-38, 149-52; *SSNEM*: 328-32). The earlier Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical organisation based on large, regional parishes or *parochiae* served by teams of priests operating from important central churches (the 'old minsters') was gradually being replaced by a more locally-based parochial system with smaller, individual churches each being served by a village priest supported by the payments of tithes and other dues from the local community or township. The territorial extent of each township was carefully delineated to form

[6] As depicted on the map in Appendix 6.4b, and the equivalent maps for subsequent chapters.
[7] For example, it is usually apparent from the configuration of contour lines where rivers have significantly altered their course.

a local parish (which determined the area from which a priest could claim tithes), and in southern England it often closely coincided with the boundaries of a local estate. For many of the new local churches established between 950 and 1150 appear to have originated as seigneurial foundations, created by lay landowners on their estates which provided tithes to support the priests, with the boundaries of each parish often closely following those of its founder's property or vill (Winchester 2000: 5-14; Blair 1988: 1-9).[8] So once again, the parish boundaries often reflected ancient divisions of the countryside between rural communities, providing each with an equal share of the natural resources it needed. Direct evidence of the link between landownership and the territory of parishes is often found in medieval documents, with records of land disputes confirming that estate and township boundaries were frequently identical. Charters granting estates to new owners during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries sometimes included clauses which identified bounds that are found to coincide with the parish boundaries shown on nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey maps (Winchester 2000: 21-28; Hadley 2000a: 95-96).

It appears that the broad framework of parish boundaries in southern England and the Midlands was established in the late Anglo-Saxon period, and that the main changes to this pattern resulted from the subsequent subdivision of existing parishes (Hadley 2000a: 131). A distinction has thus been drawn in East Anglia between 'primary' and 'secondary' parishes (Warner 1986: 13-18). As outlined above, primary parishes were formed from the tenth century onwards, often reflecting ancient divisions of the countryside, whereas secondary parishes were later creations, sometimes formed from sub-divisions of more ancient mother-church territories or as parts of more than one pre-existing parish, in order to rationalise an original parish pattern which had been overtaken by subsequent settlement development – such as the formation of **thorp**-named settlements discussed in Chapter 7, or later settlements created on the edges of greens and commons.

[8] However, some lack of coincidence between the boundaries of manor and parish is apparent in parts of East Anglia, especially in east Norfolk. A number of East Anglian parish churches were founded and owned by groups of freemen in the eleventh century, according to the evidence of Domesday book, which led to a more piecemeal and diffluent process of parish formation in those areas (Campbell 1981: 13-14; Warner 1986).

It is often possible to differentiate between primary and secondary parish formations in the boundary shapes of individual parishes, which may reveal whether any examples break an otherwise clear pattern of size and shape discernible from the earliest Ordnance Survey maps (showing the medieval parish boundaries that existed before the boundary changes of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries). For example, a particular parish shape that is smaller and more irregular than those surrounding it, and perhaps displaying also a degree of interdigitation with a larger adjoining parish, may be indicative of a secondary or subsidiary formation created at a later date (*SSNEM*: 328-32). A 'panhandle' shape, in which the boundaries of a parish diverge markedly to incorporate a tongue of land projecting into a neighbouring parish may similarly indicate a separate estate which was subsequently absorbed into the parish from which it now protrudes (Winchester 2000: 64-66; Cameron 1985: 151-53). This type of analysis provides a somewhat subjective evaluation, but it may be used to supplement – and provide a geographical context for – the written evidence of Domesday Book, which can provide more specific information regarding the size and value of individual landholdings, the nature and extent of their agricultural exploitation, and the identity and status of their owners or tenants.[9]

(5.2.6) The pattern of early medieval settlement in East Anglia has also been affected by wider geographical factors, including an unstable coastline that has resulted in the loss of considerable swathes of land since the early medieval period and of a number of settlements that were recorded in Domesday Book[10] (Williamson 2006: 16-20; Cracknell 2005: 60-72, 80-87). A few of these bear names indicating some degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence, such as Minsmere in Suffolk and Keswick in Norfolk.[11] It is possible that some marginal and perhaps short-lived coastal settlements also bore Scandinavian-influenced names that were only ever

[9] See section 2.1.8 above.
[10] As shown on the map in Appendix 5.2d.
[11] These place-names are discussed in Chapter 9.

transmitted orally and never entered any English written records before the settlements were destroyed by the sea.[12]

At this time also, the course of some rivers in east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk was very different from the routes they take today, which meant that some areas of the present-day mainland, such as those enclosed by the hundreds of East and West Flegg and Lothingland, were effectively islands at the start of the Anglo-Saxon period, surrounded by open water or marsh (Williamson 1997: 10-15, 40-48; 2006: 17-21; Cracknell 2005: 55-72).

(5.2.7) The inland topography and hydrology of East Anglia, especially the configuration of river drainage basins and the watersheds between them, have also helped determine its cultural boundaries and patterns of settlement. The early Anglo-Saxon settlements of southern and eastern England tended to be located within major river valleys, whereas the upland wolds between the valleys were only used initially for grazing and woodland. These upland territories were therefore only sparsely settled and thus tended to constitute cut-off points in patterns of human communication and form the margins of social territories. Similarly, the estuaries of rivers also created significant territorial boundaries adjacent to the coast. In such a way, extensive drainage basins, surrounded and defined by major inland watersheds and coastal estuaries, appear to have constituted cultural provinces, within which communities shared particular beliefs and elements of social, cultural and linguistic identity (Williamson 2013a: 55-57; 2013b: 45-47; Rippon 2007).

Within East Anglia, a diffuse network of minor watersheds stretches diagonally across the boulder-clay uplands of central Suffolk from north-west to south-east, placing the southern part of greater East Anglia – the south and south-west of Suffolk and the whole of Essex – into a different drainage province from the remaining East Anglian territory of Norfolk and north-east Suffolk. This watershed boundary coincides approximately with the line of the rivers Lark and Gipping (lying slightly to the north of them), and has been interpreted as a major cultural division

[12] See section 4.2.3.

in existence since the Iron Age when it served as a border between the Iceni and Trinovantes tribes. Subsequently, it has marked a line of transition between a number of medieval and early modern cultural distribution patterns for various agricultural and building practices – and, arguably, a southern demarcation line of Viking influence (Martin 2007: 128-30; Martin and Satchell 2008: 198-206, 214-28). Other evidence, however, suggests that the river Stour between Suffolk and Essex also served as a political (and, to some extent, cultural) frontier between the East Angles and East Saxons, and may indeed have formed the eastern end of the southern Danelaw border (Phythian-Adams 2000; Williamson 2010b: 53-55). [13]

5.3) Developments in the settlement-patterns of East Anglia during the early medieval period

(5.3.1) The majority of both OE and Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia, as well as for much of England, are recorded for the first time in Domesday Book, in forms that have usually changed little over the following nine hundred years. But these place-names only came to be thus recorded in the late eleventh century after a prolonged process of change in the development of rural settlement during the preceding two or three centuries that encompassed the period of Viking settlement.

(5.3.2) Underlying these changes were fluctuations in the size and density of the population of England in general and East Anglia in particular. Recent estimates of the early medieval population of England suggest it reached a late Roman peak of around two million in the fourth century, declined to some extent in the fifth and sixth centuries AD with the fall of Roman Britain and the onset of Anglo-Saxon migration and settlement (Higham and Ryan 2013: 30; Härke 2002: 146-50, 167-69), and then reached between 1.5 and 2.25 million by the late eleventh century at the

[13] The 'Lark-Gipping divide' is discussed further in section 11.4 below.

time of Domesday Book (Roberts and Wrathmell 2002: 40-43). In East Anglia, it appears that the population began to slowly increase during the middle Anglo-Saxon period, and then underwent a major expansion during the tenth and eleventh centuries – the period of Viking settlement – that continued into the post-Conquest period (Williamson 2013b: 11-16).

Calculating the total numbers of settlers from Scandinavia and other regions of Europe during the period of Viking settlement has proved a far more uncertain exercise. A broad consensus has emerged estimating the original Viking Great Army of the 860s and 870s as numbering a few thousand men,[14] but it is impossible to quantify the number of immigrants from Scandinavia who it is presumed subsequently settled in parts of eastern England.

(5.3.3) The increase in population, together with a growing need to supply the emerging towns and monasteries, may have been factors leading an intensification of agricultural production in parts of rural England during the period from seventh to the eleventh centuries. The middle Anglo-Saxon period saw an increase in the overall volume of arable crops grown after the decline of the post-Roman era, with wheat becoming predominant (Härke 2002: 152-55; Banham and Faith 2014: 19-40, 73-74; Rippon 2008: 191-92). This increase in production required more effective utilisation of larger areas of arable land, which resulted in the extension of cultivation into the fertile but heavy clay soils of East Anglia which had not been used since Roman times.[15] Heavier, mouldboard ploughs were required to till such soil, which in turn required larger teams of oxen to pull them, and larger fields in which to turn the oxen. Greater co-operation was needed between farmers to co-ordinate the use of large plough-teams as well as the practice of crop-rotation (Banham and Faith 2014: 42-74; Williamson 2013a: 16-20, 196-206; Fleming 2010: 279-84).

These may have been factors that contributed to the creation of the open-field system, which originated in the Midlands and spread from there to East Anglia

[14]See section 2.2.1a above.
[15] See section 5.2.2 above.

and the western regions of England (Oosthuizen 2010; Rippon 2008: 189-94). Within East Anglia, it was the chalkland regions of western Norfolk that saw the greatest number of open fields created, in a landscape which apparently did not differ much from that seen in the East Midlands (Rippon 2008: 189-194, 198; Martin 2012: 234-35). However, the open fields took different forms in other parts of East Anglia, such as east Norfolk where the division of fields was more irregular than the commonfield systems of the Midlands (Campbell 1981: 12-14).

The open-field system appears to have facilitated new agricultural innovations such as the use of heavy ploughs by dividing common fields into narrow strips that could be worked more easily by large plough teams operated collaboratively, and consequently required the clearance of land on which earlier dispersed and isolated settlements may have been scattered. It has been argued that the open-field system necessitated a communal re-organisation of settlements around the newly laid-out arable fields, in which new small, outlying hamlet-clusters were formed to house the temporary or seasonal ploughmen required to work the more distant crops (*TIACL*: 138-56). These settlements became referred to by the OE term **þrop** – or its ON cognate **þorp** in Scandinavian-speaking areas – and will be examined in detail in Chapter 7.

(5.3.4) The underlying trend in the development of settlements during the Anglo-Saxon period was a process of stabilisation. There was a tendency for many early Anglo-Saxon settlements during the fifth to seventh centuries to constantly shift and relocate across the land (Hamerow 1991; 2012: 67-72; Rippon 2008: 171-73). It is unknown how such shortlived settlements were named or identified, or whether any such names were changed after a major relocation to better signify an altered topographical context or landmark. But the constant shifting of settlements may perhaps have contributed to the lingering sense of fluidity and impermanence that seems to have characterised place-names into the later Anglo-Saxon period.[16]

[16] See section 4.2.3 above.

By the middle Anglo-Saxon period, it appears that settlements were stabilising. They then expanded, often around the focal point of a parish church. The main evidence in East Anglia for the existence of middle Anglo-Saxon settlements is provided by scatters of Ipswich ware pottery (datable from the late seventh century to the mid-ninth),[17] revealed in many parts of the region by the fact that the *foci* of settlements often shifted in the post-Conquest period, leading to some dispersal. Across parts of Suffolk and Essex, however, a significant proportion of dispersed later medieval settlements may have earlier origins, representing sites which had stabilised in the middle Anglo-Saxon period (Williamson 2013a: 13-18; Martin 2012: 229-30).

Many of the middle Anglo-Saxon settlements associated with Ipswich ware that have been characterised as 'nucleated' bear place-names in **-hām**, whereas a smaller number have **tūn**-names, a pattern which reflects the relative chronologies of both generics outlined in section 4.3.2 above. In a survey of the Launditch hundred in central Norfolk, six out of eleven settlements that produced Ipswich ware bear **hām**-names, and all but one of the village sites with **hām**-names that were surveyed produced Ipswich ware. The sites of some of the hundred's six **tūn**-names also produced Ipswich ware but in smaller quantities, and these settlements have been interpreted as being generally later formations, even though their origins stretch over several centuries (Wade-Martins 1980b: 84-85; Rippon 2008: 187-88). Fieldwalking surveys have also been conducted in other parts of East Anglia, such as the Deben valley in Suffolk, central Norfolk and the Norfolk Fenlands, and in scattered single parishes or groups of parishes in southern and eastern Norfolk (summarised in Hoggett 2010: 142-62). These surveys differ in their approach and methodology, but overall the evidence produced from them appears to support the hypothesis that **tūn**-named settlements tended to be formed later in the Anglo-Saxon period whereas **hām**-named settlements were generally earlier in origin.

Nevertheless, the settlements associated with some **tūn**-names examined in these surveys have produced sherds of Ipswich ware (such as Mannington in north

[17] Discussed in section 3.6.2 above.

Norfolk, Illington in south Norfolk, and Clopton in south-east Suffolk), indicating probable origins in the Middle Saxon period (Davison 1995: 166-67, 181-83; Davison *et al.* 1993: 2-10; Newman 1992: 34-35). A comprehensive survey at Witton in north-east Norfolk produced finds of Early Saxon pottery as well as later Ipswich and Thetford ware, which has been interpreted as indicating a dispersed Early Saxon settlement, consisting of one or more farmsteads, which was replaced in the seventh century by a nucleated and larger, single settlement in a slightly different location that lasted until the end of the Anglo-Saxon period and beyond (Lawson *et al.* 1983: 50-77). This may have been the point at which the name of **widu-tūn** ('wood settlement'), or Witton, (Watts 2004: 691) was first applied, perhaps using the **tūn** generic to reflect the term's early sense of an enclosed area of settlement.

In East Anglia, it is particularly significant that the increasing use of the **tūn** generic coincided with the later Anglo-Saxon recolonization of the higher claylands, which had been largely abandoned in the post-Roman era (discussed in section 5.2.2 above). There is fieldwalking evidence from both the Deben valley in Suffolk and the Launditch hundred in Norfolk for a recognisable phase of settlement-expansion from the eighth to the tenth centuries into areas with fertile but difficult soils for farming, due to a rising population and increasing pressure on available resources (Newman 1992: 34-36; 2005: 480-83; Wade-Martins 1980b). In this process, individuals and kinship groups apparently moved beyond the social and territorial confines of the established earlier Anglo-Saxon settlements (often with **hām**-names) of the principal river valleys into more marginal and peripheral locations higher on the clay plateaux (Warner 1987: 25-28). Here, they established secondary settlements which owed some allegiance to the lords and landowners of the ancient estates, but in time acquired new names (often incorporating a personal name compounded with **tūn**) as they became separate estates, severed from the larger and older territorial units (Williamson 1993: 85-88).

It has been suggested from the evidence of pottery finds that the process of colonising the claylands occurred in two main phases (Newman 1992: 34-36). Firstly, the more attractive and workable areas of boulder clay were resettled from the early eighth century until the mid-ninth, as indicated by scatters of Ipswich ware found

around the parish churches of the more established villages in these localities. A second phase of expansion then took place in the later ninth and tenth centuries, in which less attractive areas of heavier boulder clay were settled, producing smaller and secondary settlements that generated scatters of Thetford ware pottery. These late Anglo-Saxon settlements were generally less successful than their middle Anglo-Saxon predecessors, and were often the first to be deserted in the later medieval period (Newman 2005: 481-83). It may be possible to associate the different phases of the claylands' colonisation with the use of particular types of place-name generic and specific as these developed during the Anglo-Saxon period, an idea that will be explored further below.

(5.3.5) The colonisation of the East Anglian claylands often involved the development of new settlements around the edges of common land, especially in Norfolk and north Suffolk, a process that appeared to commence before the Conquest but occurred mainly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Wegman 2016; Williamson 1993: 167-70; 2003: 91-101; Warner 1987: 1-3, 13-18, 44-47). It is clear that some settlements bearing Scandinavian-influenced names subsequently relocated to common-edge sites in the later medieval period, but the evidence from this thesis suggests that the process was not a significant factor in their original pre-Conquest formation.

During the later medieval period and into the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, many villages in East Anglia declined and dwindled in size, and some were abandoned completely. This process was especially prevalent with settlements that had been formed relatively late in the more marginal areas of central and western Norfolk, and may reflect the 'last-in, first-out' pattern of the late formation and early desertion observed for villages on the Midland Wolds (Fox 1989). There were several causes of village-desertion in East Anglia, including the widespread enclosure of land by landlords for use as sheep pasture, engrossment (the piecemeal acquisition of village land by a lord to enlarge his demesne) and emparking (the creation of landscape parks around country mansions), as well as the effects of climatic and environmental change, depopulation following epidemics such

as the Black Death, and the abandonment of poor land in a declining agricultural market (Davison 1996: 22-34; *SSNEM*: 357-63; Dyer and Jones 2010: 20-22, 29).

(5.3.6) The processes of stabilisation and nucleation, colonisation of new territory, and ultimate desertion culminated in the formation of a diverse range of late Anglo-Saxon settlement-forms that are often still discernible in present-day village morphology. Fieldwalking surveys have shown that in many cases the outlines of hollow ways and tracks, tofts and crofts on the sites of deserted medieval villages, and sometimes the street-plans of villages shown on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century maps, follow the basic layouts of settlements in their earliest phases of occupation, dating back to the Middle or Late Saxon periods. In other cases, of course, it is clear that settlements underwent a process of fundamental reconfiguration or even relocation on different sites during the medieval period (*TIACL*: 97-103). Nevertheless, it has been suggested that the original forms of settlement can be broadly categorised as either linear in configuration, forming a row or single main street, or non-linear, forming an agglomeration (Roberts 1977: 122-28; 1987: 20-86, 127-50, 158-59). Further variations in this basic pattern can occur with both linear and agglomerate settlements that contain, or are formed around, open spaces within their plans that are too large to be streets and constitute greens or commons. Other villages may have developed from more than one central core, and coalesced to form polyfocal settlements (Taylor 1977).

These overall patterns can vary enormously in terms of how regular or irregular the resultant geometric shapes appear, and it is also possible that village plans are composite in nature, comprising combinations of two or more basic plan-types. This method of categorisation involves some degree of subjectivity in characterising settlement-forms, and the 'agglomerate' category encompasses a diverse range of non-linear village layouts (Williamson 2013a: 129, 165-77), but it provides a basis for distinguishing between the settlement-forms associated with the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names discussed below.

(5.3.7) A further development in territorial administration that apparently affected both the formation and naming of settlements in the late Anglo-Saxon period was the fragmentation of large multi-vill territories (or 'multiple estates') into the smaller manorial units that are recorded in Domesday Book. The origins and precise nature of these large estates have been much debated ever since the 'multiple estate' model was first theorised by G.R.J. Jones (1965; Hadley 2000a: 84-88; Williamson 2013a: 25-30). Much remains unresolved, but it is generally accepted that the early medieval farming landscape was organised into large territories, each containing a number of widely dispersed holdings which performed a variety of specialised economic functions. These holdings constituted subsidiary settlements which provided particular goods and services to the estate centre, and often acquired place-names that identified their function or geographical location, such as Barton ('barley-growing farm'), Chiswick ('cheese-producing farm'), Norton and Sutton (Coates 2012; Smith 1956).

The large estates are believed to have originated as monolithic royal holdings dating from the early Anglo-Saxon period of tribal kingship. Portions of them began to be granted to members of a king's retinue for the duration of an individual life, and then from the seventh century onwards noble families and monastic institutions were sometimes granted full rights of ownership over areas of land in perpetuity. By the late eighth century, many of the newly formed secular estates were continuing to fragment, as portions were sold, granted away, or divided by partible inheritance (Rippon 2010: 61-63; Williamson 2010a: 25-26).

As a large, older estate was split by this process into smaller, discrete units, it appears that particular care was often taken to ensure a systematic and equitable division of land, so that the resulting new estates were of a similar size with access to an equal share of the older territory's resources (such as arable and grazing land, woodland, a stretch of riverbank, and access to tracks or roads) – enabling each to become a viable, self-sustaining agricultural entity in its own right (Fleming 2003: 109-11, 2010: 277-78, 2011: 22-23; Hadley 2000a: 96-101).

The new smaller units formed by this fragmentation were frequently given names that incorporated the personal names of individuals – often the thegns to whom the divided parcels of land had been originally granted, who developed a

closer association with the land they owned and managed than the more distant tenure of the previous estate owners (Fleming 2011: 22-23; G.R.J. Jones 1965: 83). This reflected a fundamental shift in the concept of land ownership during the eighth and ninth centuries, away from the earlier Anglo-Saxon notion of land being held in trust by individuals for the duration of their lives on behalf of their families or lords. Instead, land was increasingly being held directly by individuals who thought of themselves as the owners in perpetuity of estates which they regarded as their homes – and to which they could grant place-names derived from their own personal names to signify their full rights of ownership (Sawyer 1998: 155-56; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 389-91). As discussed in section 4.3.2, settlements were therefore increasingly being named after their owners rather than the non-anthroponymic elements such as topographical terms that were generally used in the earlier Anglo-Saxon period, and the **tūn** generic was becoming much more widely used by this time also. Consequently, many of the newly created smaller landholdings were given place-names containing the **tūn** element compounded with the name of a new owner, which could be an OE personal name – or, indeed, a Scandinavian one.

The late Anglo-Saxon fragmentation of large estates into smaller units coincided with the period of Viking invasion and subsequent control of territories in the former Danelaw, and there is some evidence to suggest that the Scandinavian settlement was to a large extent effected through the occupation and exploitation of pre-existing estate structures (Hadley 2006: 84; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 404-11). The break-up of large estates may in some cases have been immediately and directly caused by the Viking take-over of territory, corresponding with the traditional interpretation of the 'sharing out of the land' alluded to in the ASC, with Viking leaders seizing the large estates in question and granting smaller portions of them to their followers.[18] In such a situation, it has been suggested that the Viking leaders generally retained the existing and established names of the large estates with which they had little direct personal contact, whereas their followers formed an closer association with the subsidiary hamlets, villages or units of land that they had been

[18] This process is discussed in section 2.2.2a.

granted, and renamed them accordingly using their own personal names (Hadley 2000a: 25; G.R.J. Jones 1965: 83; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 387, 390). Although there is no direct evidence of an estate in East Anglia being taken over in this way, it may provide a possible model for the formation of ON anthroponymic place-names, as will be explored below.

Other mechanisms for land-taking may have included the purchase of land by the settlers from local lords (Hadley 2006: 85-88). The comment in the ASC's entry for 896 (Bately 1986: 59) regarding elements of the Viking army 'without money or property' having to return to France rather than settle in the Danelaw implies that by this time land was being obtained more by purchase than seizure.[19] This process may have helped to stimulate a growing commercial market for the sale and purchase of land, and the break-up of other large estates may similarly be viewed as a more indirect and longer-term consequence of the Viking disruptions, setting in motion a major reorganisation in patterns of landholding that continued for several decades into the tenth century (Fellows-Jensen 1982: 31; 2012). In the Anglo-Scandinavian society of the Danelaw that had developed by this time, therefore, it is quite probable that many of the individuals with the authority or financial resources to be granted or purchase the small units of land that were becoming available were of Scandinavian descent and bore an ON name.

(5.3.8) The relatively high numbers of peasants in Lincolnshire, Norfolk and Suffolk categorised in Domesday Book as freemen (*liberi homini*) or sokemen (*sochemanni*) were traditionally assumed to be a direct consequence of the Viking invasions (Stenton 1971: 515-19; Hadley 2006: 88-89). However, evidence for such a direct causal connection is lacking, and the apparently higher number of free peasants in areas of the Danelaw have more recently been attributed instead to a combination of other factors (Williamson 2013a: 107-10, 121-24; Hadley 2000a 22-24, 180-96).

Nevertheless, it is apparent that the differing status of freemen and sokemen may have been of significance in terms of Viking settlement. Although the use of the

[19] Discussed in section 2.2.5.

two terms in Domesday Book varied from county to county and often appeared to be interchangeable, (Roffe 2007: 219-29; Hadley 2000a: 176-89), the two groups were more carefully distinguished in Norfolk. In general terms, freemen tended to be small or medium-sized proprietors who effectively owned their own land, whereas sokemen also possessed land but owed certain obligations and services to particular lords (Williamson 2013a: 107-09). According to Domesday Book, sokemen were widely scattered through Norfolk and tended to be associated with the centres of ancient estates. In contrast, freemen were concentrated in particular areas, such as the heavy clay plateaux in the south-east of the county, the edges of fens in the west, and the edges of marshes in the east – such as those surrounding the former island of Flegg, as will be discussed below (Williamson 1993: 94-102, 117-22; 2003: 49-50). In each case, it seems that freemen were associated with the colonisation of remote and previously unoccupied or under-utilised areas of islands, marshes and moors away from the main arable lands – and obligations – of the ancient large estates (*ibid.*: 125).

5.4) Conclusion

This chapter has shown how patterns of settlement and agriculture in East Anglia during the early medieval period were determined to a large extent by a number of underlying geographical factors, such as the characteristic soil-types of the region, its network of major rivers and tributaries, and its ever-changing coastline. It has demonstrated how the Viking settlement of East Anglia coincided with some fundamental changes occurring in rural society, such as the intensification of agricultural production and the associated recolonisation of the claylands, the stabilisation and nucleation of settlements, and the fragmentation of earlier large Anglo-Saxon estates. These interconnected developments therefore provide a complex backdrop against which the formation of the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names can be evaluated in the next four chapters.

PART TWO:
ANALYSIS OF PLACE-NAMES

Chapter Six: PLACE-NAMES IN *BÝ*

6.1) Introduction

The distribution of place-names containing the **býˊ** element has often been regarded as primary evidence for the extent of Viking settlement in the Danelaw during the late ninth century, probably more so than any other type of Scandinavian-influenced place-name. This interpretation is based largely on indications that they may be relatively early in formation (*VEPN2*: 104), an assumption which will be explored in detail below. The **býˊ**-names in East Anglia are less numerous than the **thorps**, but have been subject to more academic scrutiny and discussion than the other Scandinavian-influenced place-name types in the region. This is partly due to the puzzling presence of a concentrated cluster of **býˊ**-names in the hundreds of East and West Flegg in east Norfolk.

The **býˊ** generic has been identified as ODan in origin. It is similar to the Old West Norse equivalent form **býˊ*r***, but traditionally it has been believed on largely historical grounds that it is the ODan form of the generic that was used widely in England by settlers emanating primarily from the area of Scandinavia that later formed Denmark (*VEPN2*: 105). The original **býˊ** word-element seemed to embody the two different senses of 'to dwell' or 'dwelling', and 'to make ready, cultivate' or 'land prepared for cultivation' (or more specifically, 'new land prepared for cultivation'), reflecting the similar meanings of cognate words in other early Germanic and Indo-European languages. It appears that the original Scandinavian sense of the word may have embodied the idea of an 'isolated and secondary settlement or farmstead' that involved some element of newly cultivated land. This more specific meaning may reflect the traditional interpretation of **býˊ**-names in the Danelaw as representing new settlements located in previously unoccupied land

(Cameron 1965), and may be particularly relevant to the formation of some of the **býr**-names on Flegg, as will be discussed below.

During the period of Viking settlement in England, however, the **býr** generic became used increasingly to signify a broader range of new settlements, from farmsteads to villages and towns, and also for the renaming of established Anglo-Saxon settlements, such as *Norðworðig* which became known as *Deoraby* or Derby in the ninth or tenth centuries (*CDEPN*: xliii; *EPNE*: 1.66-72; *SSNEM*: 10-12). But unlike other regions of the Danelaw, the **býr**-names of East Anglia remained as small villages and did not develop into significant settlements, with none becoming towns, hundredal manors or archdeaconries. This may reflect a different pattern of usage, in which the **býr** generic was used mainly in East Anglia for the naming of new settlements and not so much for the renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon villages and towns that was apparent elsewhere in the Danelaw.

Unlike the **thorp** element which often appears in simplex form, the **býr** generic is always compounded in a place-name with another (usually preceding) word-element or specific. Around half of these are derived from nouns or adjectives of either ON or OE origin referring to a place's location, age, size or status, its local topography, fauna or flora, or the status, occupation or possible ethnic identity of its owners or inhabitants. The other half are anthroponymic specifics, derived from personal names which can be ON, OE, Gaelic, or post-Conquest 'Norman' in origin (*VEPN2*: 106-08; *SSNEM*: 15-27; *EPNE*: 1.70-72). This is in marked contrast to Denmark, where most **býr**-names were formed with nouns as specifics and only about 10% contain personal names (Fellows-Jensen 1981: 138-39), which may indicate a different pattern of usage for the **býr** generic. It has been suggested that the English **býr**-names formed with non-anthroponymic specifics may therefore predate those formed with personal names (Fellows-Jensen 2013: 85-87) – but the question of why and how personal names came to be used so widely in conjunction with the **býr** generic in England has hitherto proved a conundrum that will be explored further below.

6.2) *Býr*-names in East Anglia

There are comparatively few recorded place-names in -**býr** in East Anglia, with twenty-two in Norfolk, three in Suffolk and just one in Essex – far fewer than the sixty recorded for Leicestershire, 225 for Lincolnshire and 210 for Yorkshire, but broadly similar to the corresponding figures for other southern Danelaw counties such as Derbyshire (eight), Northamptonshire (sixteen) and Nottinghamshire (twenty-two).[1] Within East Anglia, there is a prominent main cluster in the hundreds of East and West Flegg, and the remaining **býr**-names are also concentrated more in east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk than the other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, with only an outlying pair lying further to the south-west in Norfolk and the isolated examples of Risby in west Suffolk and Kirby-le-Soken in north-east Essex.[2] There is a similar scarcity of **býr**-names in the neighbouring counties immediately to the west of East Anglia, with none recorded in Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire or Hertfordshire.[3]

6.3) *Býr*-names of Flegg – linguistic analysis

The hundreds of East and West Flegg today constitute a plateau of slightly raised land or 'upland' to the north of Great Yarmouth, which in Roman times formed an island. The area's distinctive topography will be examined below, but is reflected onomastically in the place-names of the settlements that were formed on the former island.

The thirteen **býr**-names of Flegg[4] have been the subject of conflicting onomastic interpretations by different place-name scholars over the last few

[1] See map in Appendix 6.2a, and tables in Appendices 4.3a and 6.6a.
[2] See map in Appendix 6.2b.
[3] See map in Appendix 6.2a.
[4] See map in Appendix 6.3a.

decades, resulting in some still unresolved etymologies. However, five of the Flegg **býr**-names can be categorised confidently as being formed with specifics derived from the genitival forms of personal names of Scandinavian origin. Rollesby[5] is derived from the ODan personal name *Rolf* or Old West Scandinavian *Hrólfr,* a contraction of the archaic Danish dithematic name **Hróðúlfr* (which appears in *Beowulf* as the name of a sixth-century king). It is thus the only East Anglian **býr**-name to be formed with a dithematic Scandinavian personal name, unlike the identifiable personal names of the remaining **býr**-names of Flegg which are all monothematic[6] in form (Sandred 1987: 316; *PNNf2*: 73-74; *CDEPN*: 506; *SPNN*: 209-13; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 420-421; Klaeber 1950: line 1017). Ormesby is derived from the common ODan by-name *Orm* (which has given rise to several other English place-names), Clippesby from the ON by-name *Klyppr* or **Klippr*, Hemsby from the rare ON personal name *Heimir* or ODan **Hēmir*, and Scratby from the rare ON by-name *Skrauti* (Sandred 1987: 313-17; *PNNf2*; *CDEPN*; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 51; 2007: 98; *SPNN*; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 420-421).

Herringby has hitherto usually been interpreted also as deriving from the ODan personal name *Hæring* or Old West Scandinavian *Hæringr*, but there is a growing consensus that it contains instead an ON word for the fish derived from the OE **hæring** ('herring'), reflecting the importance of the North Sea fishing industry in pre-Conquest East Anglia (*PNNf2*: 23; *SPNN*: 215; Campbell 2002; Parsons 2003-04; Fellows-Jensen 2014a: 145).

Similarly, four more **býr**-names have generally been regarded as deriving from ON personal names, but their etymologies appear somewhat problematic and unsatisfactory. Gillian Fellows-Jensen has therefore proposed alternative non-anthroponymic forms for each of them instead, which do seem to be descriptive of their particular topographical settings. So Thrigby may possibly derive from an ON

[5] Each of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names discussed in the text of this thesis is listed in a corpus/database of place-names (one each for Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex) in Appendices 1, 2 and 3, which provide further linguistic and geographical information for individual place-names plus references.

[6] The characteristics and significance of dithematic and monothematic personal names are explained in section 4.3.2 above.

personal name **Þrykki*, a hypocoristic form of the Old West Scandinavian name *Þrýðríkr* – but not one that is recorded in Danish sources. Alternatively it may contain an ON form of the OE verb **þryccan** ('to press, crush'), possibly referring to a narrow passage in the local undergrowth, or a word related to ON **þrekkr**, meaning 'dirt, filth' or 'mud', which may have described the local terrain adjacent to the similarly-named Muck Fleet river before the Filby Broad was formed (*PNNf2*: 26-27; *SPNN*: 431; *CDEPN*: 613; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 51; 2007: 99; 2014a: 143-45; *DEPN*: 470, s.n. Threckingham). Oby may likewise contain a rare Old Danish personal name *Øthi* or the Old West Scandinavian *Auði* which was extremely uncommon in England, or alternatively the ON noun **auðr** ('empty, desolate'), perhaps referring to its isolated location on the far western edge of Flegg (*PNNf2*: 42; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 50-51; 2007: 98; *SPNN*: 81-82). An even more uncertain name is Billockby, which may contain a hypothesised ON by-name **Biðil(l)-Áki* or dithematic ON personal name **Bið-lákr*, or instead a hypothesised lost place-name containing OE ***bita** ('small piece of land') and OE **lacu** ('slow-moving stream') that also seems applicable to the settlement's small size and location (*PNNf2*: 46-47; *CDEPN*: 57; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 51-52; 2007: 99; *EPNE*: 1.37, 2.8; *SPNN*: 2-8, 94-95). Mautby may contain an ODan personal name *Malti* (which was not recorded, however, until the thirteenth century), or alternatively the ON noun **malt** or OE **m(e)alt** ('malt'), which was a common agricultural export from England to Scandinavia later in the medieval period (*PNNf2*: 10; *CDEPN*: 404; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 50; 2007: 98; *SPNN*: 296-98).

Two more **býr**-names in Flegg are considered more likely to be compounded with nouns. Ashby is believed to contain ON **askr** or OE **æsc** ('ash-tree'), although the rare ON personal name *Aski* has been suggested also. Filby is generally considered to be derived from the ODan collective noun ***fili** ('planks'), possibly referring to a plank bridge or causeway across the nearby Muck Fleet; an alternative derivation from the rare ODan personal name *Fili* or OE *Fila* has gained little support (Sandred 1987: 312, 314; *PNNf2*: 7-8, 41; *CDEPN*: 20, 230; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 49-50; 2007: 98; *SPNN*: 60-61, 121-22).

Finally, the name of Stokesby is generally accepted as containing an earlier OE place-name derived from the OE noun **stoc**, referring to a secondary settlement or

an outlying pasture for cattle (Sandred 1987: 317; *PNNf2*: 22; *CDEPN*: 580; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 51; 2007: 98; *EPNE*: 2.153-56), a possible role also reflected in the implied pastoral functions of other settlements on or near Flegg with similarly indicative OE place-names. The names of Somerton and Winterton, 'farms or dwellings used in summer or winter', suggest the seasonal movement of grazing cattle from one location to the other, while Horsey immediately to their north means 'horse island'[7] (*PNNf2*: 76-79, 107).

These names may thus provide some lexical insights into the places' original functions, but in order to assess the full significance of the **býʼ**-names of Flegg in terms of Viking settlement, it is necessary to examine their geographical context also.

6.4) *Býʼ*-names of Flegg – geographical and archaeological analysis

Previous scholarship regarding the **býʼ**-names of Flegg has tended to focus on the onomastic implications of their individual etymologies and the possible historical circumstances of their formation, and so the more tangible geographical context of the settlements associated with these place-names has hitherto been little explored.

Generally, **býʼ**-named settlements throughout the Danelaw appear to have been usually located on less favourable sites than those settlements with OE place-names, which were presumably formed earlier in more attractive locations. The **býʼ**-names have thus been regarded as evidence of a secondary phase of colonizers (possibly including immigrants from Scandinavia) forming settlements in more marginal areas of land (Cameron 1965; 1976: 17-22; 1985: 133-39). A recent comparison of agricultural land-use by **býʼ**- and **thorp**-named settlements in the Midland counties has indicated that the **býʼ**-names did tend to congregate in areas of poorer soils that could be utilised only for pastoral farming – unlike the soils adjacent to the **thorps** which were more suitable for arable farming. This evidence has been taken to suggest that the term **býʼ** became associated throughout the Danelaw with

[7] The location of the parishes bearing these names is shown on the map in Appendix 6.4c.

settlements whose primary function was the pursuit of dairy and livestock farming. However, this study acknowledged in passing that the **býr**-names of East Anglia did not conform to this pattern, with some sited on more favourable arable soils (*TIACL*: 124-32). The geographical context of the **býr**-names on Flegg and throughout the remainder of East Anglia will be examined in more detail below.

(6.4.1) The former island of Flegg is today bounded in the east by the North Sea and on the other three sides by the rivers Thurne and Bure,[8] which have changed courses dramatically during prehistoric and historic times as climatic conditions and sea levels fluctuated. In the Roman period, they both flowed directly into the sea to the north and south of Flegg respectively, which was effectively isolated as an island. But the open outfalls to the sea of these two rivers were gradually blocked during the Anglo-Saxon period by further changes in land and sea levels, together with coastal accumulations of sand and gravel. The former estuaries of the Thurne and Bure gradually formed open marshland containing the fertile alluvial soils of the Wallasea Associations (*SIEE*: 336-41).[9] By the ninth or tenth centuries, these had apparently become sufficiently dry to be exploited as grazing land and ultimately territory for settlement (Williamson 1997: 10-15, 40-48, 74-77; Cornford 2002: 14-20). Fieldwalking on the Halvergate Marshes has been unable to recover any Middle Saxon Ipswich ware but did reveal fragments of Late Saxon Thetford ware (Williamson 1997: 47-48),[10] which may indicate the commencement of human occupation and exploitation of the former estuary around Flegg in the late Anglo-Saxon period. As names were given to discrete areas of the marshes which had begun to be utilised, many of these were formed from ON elements,[11] suggesting that Scandinavian-speaking communities were involved in this process (Williamson 1997: 42-44).

[8] See map in Appendix 6.3a.
[9] See map in Appendix 6.4a.
[10] See section 3.6.2 above. NHER webpage TNF 346 (http://www.heritage.norfolk.gov.uk/record-details?TNF346 – accessed 23.10.2017); NHER 35369, 21645 (see note 25 on page 146).
[11] Indeed, the name of Flegg itself is derived from a Danish word **flæg**, meaning 'marsh plants', that presumably referred to the original landscape of the district (Sandred 1986-87: 310-11; *PNNf2*: 1-2).

(6.4.2) The settlements associated with the thirteen **býr**-names of Flegg are all located on, or on the edges of, fertile deposits of the Wick Association soils, but their topographical contexts are much more varied. If they are categorised according to the scheme outlined in section 5.2.4 above for identifying and symbolising different types of local landscape settings, it can be seen that five of the **býr**-names (Oby, Clippesby, Billockby, Stokesby and Herringby) are located together in a contiguous block around the south-west corner of Flegg adjoining the former wide estuary which had previously surrounded the former island.[12] In contrast, six more **býr**-names (Ashby, Rollesby, Hemsby, Scratby, Ormesby and Mautby) are located on the undulating interior landscape of 'upland' Flegg, away from the surrounding former estuary and any other significant surface watercourses, so water was obtained from springs or wells fed by the underlying aquiferous Norwich Crag.[13] The remaining two **býr**-names on Flegg, Filby and Thrigby, are located on the southern slopes of the valley of the Muck Fleet river.

If these **býr**-names are then categorised also according to the types of specific element with which each has been compounded (that is, derived from a personal name, or a topographical or geographical noun),[14] it becomes apparent that there is a high degree of correlation between these two name-types and their landscape settings. Four of the five **býr**-names that are clearly compounded with ON personal names (Rollesby, Hemsby, Ormesby and Scratby) are located together in the same types of landscape setting, on the undulating interior terrain of Flegg and away from any rivers. By contrast, those with specifics probably derived from topographical or geographical nouns (Ashby, Oby, Stokesby, Herringby and Filby) are located on the western and southern edges of Flegg adjacent to the surrounding former estuary, or along the valley slopes of the Muck Fleet river that intersects the upland.

[12] See map in Appendix 6.4b.
[13] Hemsby and Scratby are today located very close to the coast after a continuing process of severe coastal erosion, but in the early medieval period both would have been situated two or more kilometres inland.
[14] As outlined in section 6.3 above and shown on the map in Appendix 6.3a.

(6.4.3) There thus appears to be a clear geographical distinction between the two types of **býr**-name, which becomes even more pronounced if the locations of the settlements associated with these place-names are examined in the context of the parish boundaries that have been created around them and the other settlements located on Flegg.[15] The parishes with **býr**-names are bordered on the northern edge of Flegg by four parishes with OE names (Winterton, East and West Somerton, and Martham), and two that may contain other Scandiavianised elements (Repps with Bastwick, and Thurne).[16] On the southern edge are two more parishes with OE names, Runham and Caister-next-Yarmouth, and towards the centre is the parish of Burgh St Margaret, surrounded by parishes with **býr**-names. Two of these parishes, Caister and Martham, are larger than the remaining parishes of Flegg, which may be indicative of early origins, and either one or both may represent the centres of old pre-Viking estates based on Flegg (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 48-49), as discussed below. There are also several other settlement-names in East and West Flegg which have been identified as Scandinavian in origin, including Thurne, Repps, Althorpe and Poketorp,[17] but none of these formed parishes of their own. The **býr**-names of Flegg, however, all formed more significant settlements that did become parishes,[18] and their individual boundary shapes display no obvious signs of interdigitation with adjoining parishes – unlike many of the **thorps** in East Anglia. This may suggest that they were all created at a relatively early date with no subsequent formation of smaller, subsidiary parochial units by the division of the original larger parishes, as apparently occurred with some **thorp** parishes.

The parishes with **býr**-names are grouped together in a large central swathe across the middle of Flegg, and it is striking how the parishes derived from the two different types of **býr**-names divide broadly into two separate but contiguous blocks. Four of the **býr**-names with specifics clearly derived from ON personal names

[15] See map in Appendix 6.4c.
[16] Discussed in Chapter 8.
[17] Discussed in Chapters 7 and 8.
[18] Although two pairs of neighbouring **býr**-names subsequently amalgamated into single parishes, as discussed below.

(Rollesby, Ormesby,[19] Hemsby and Scratby) have formed quite large parishes that are fully located on the upland of Flegg away from the surrounding estuary.[20] But in contrast, the parishes with probable non-anthroponymic specifics (Ashby, Oby, Stokesby, Herringby and Filby) have formed parishes around the western and southern edges of Flegg that are generally smaller, narrower and more elongated than those of the 'inland' **býr**-names, as each has enclosed a portion of Flegg's upland territory together with a segment of the low-lying former estuary. Geographically, the three remaining **býr**-names with more uncertain specifics (Thrigby, Mautby and Billockby) are located between, and adjacent to, the two blocks of parishes with more readily differentiated specifics, and can therefore be allocated to either group without disrupting the suggested overall pattern. The one outlier or exception is Clippesby, which bears a personal-name specific but has formed a narrow parish on the western edge of Flegg, but remains attached contiguously to the block of other **býr**-names with personal-name specifics.

(6.4.4) This apparent division into two broad categories of **býr**-names is reflected also in the relative fiscal values of the corresponding vills in Domesday Book.[21] Once again, four of the **býr**-names compounded with personal names (Rollesby, Hemsby, Ormesby and Scratby) are recorded with considerably higher fiscal values than those of the probable non-anthroponymic **býr**-names situated around the western and southern edges of Flegg (Ashby, Billockby, Herringby) and two with more uncertain specifics (Thrigby and Mautby). The exceptions to this pattern are Stokesby, which bears a name suggesting a settlement with earlier origins than those of the other **býr**-names (as will be discussed below), and Filby, with a more uncertain specific. This pattern of relative fiscal values in Domesday Book is reflected also in the number of households and ploughs recorded or estimated for each vill, with Ormesby, Hemsby,

[19] Since the time of Domesday Book, Ormesby has been divided into two parishes, with the eastern portion enclosing also the settlement of Scratby, while Ashby and Oby (discussed below) have combined to form a single parish, as have Stokesby and Herringby.
[20] The block comprising the parishes of Rollesby, Hemsby, Ormesby, Scratby straddles the boundary between East and West Flegg, but this may be a later division due to the exceptionally high value of Flegg compared with the other hundreds of Norfolk, as recorded in Domesday Book.
[21] See map in Appendix 6.4d.

Mautby, Rollesby, Filby and Stokesby all containing more of both than Ashby, Oby, Billockby, Herringby and Thrigby.

The varying status of the tenants in the vills of Flegg as recorded by Domesday Book may provide another indication of the possible divergent origins for the two groups of **býr**-names. It is apparent that by the late eleventh century there were, compared with other areas of Norfolk,[22] relatively high numbers of freemen attached to the vills associated with the probable non-anthroponymic **býr**-names situated around the western and southern edges of Flegg. Thirty-four are recorded in Mautby, twenty-four in Stokesby, twenty-two in Filby, twenty in Oby, eighteen-and-a-half [23] in Thrigby, seventeen in Clippesby, sixteen in Billockby, nine in Herringby, and five-and-a-half in Ashby). In contrast, three of the four anthroponymic **býr**-names situated on inland Flegg away from the surrounding estuary and former marshes are recorded with comparatively fewer freemen (none in Hemsby, four in Ormesby, and eleven in Scratby). Conversely, the pattern for the relative numbers of sokemen, who owed some services to their lord, is reversed. None are recorded for Clippesby, Thrigby, Mautby, Billockby, Stokesby, Herringby, and Oby, with just three for Filby and thirteen for Ashby; whereas eighty are recorded for Ormesby, seven for Scratby and four for Hemsby.[24] However, it has to be acknowledged that the anthroponymic Rollesby constitutes an outlier in this analysis, with thirty-six-and-a-half freemen recorded, and no sokemen.

Although Domesday Book records the status of tenants some time after the putative period of formation for the **býr**-named settlements, the continuing greater number of freemen in the vills on the edges of Flegg may indeed hold some significance for their origins, as will be considered below. The question of the likely chronology of settlement-formation is thus clearly crucial, and can be gauged to some extent using the evidence of archaeology.

[22] See section 5.3.6 above.
[23] The counting of a 'half freeman' in a vill refers to the land of a freeman who may have held more land of the same lord elsewhere (Cornford 2002: 32).
[24] Domesday Book figures obtained from Cornford 2002: 32, Table 2.3.

(6.4.5) The pattern of settlement on Flegg suggested by the geographical and parochial analysis above appears to be broadly supported by the archaeological evidence discovered so far, as recorded in the Norfolk Historic Environment Record (NHER). However, much of this material consists of isolated artefacts scattered across the landscape, which are often difficult to associate directly with processes of Viking immigration and settlement, bearing in mind the theoretical concerns and practical constraints outlined in Chapter 3. More specifically, unless these artefacts have been found on, or close to, the presumed initial site of an incipient village or settlement (which may often only occupy a very small proportion of the comparatively large parish to which it subsequently gave its name, and to which the archaeological finds are now allocated), it is difficult to regard such material as evidence of the settlement's chronology or possible pre-Viking existence before it acquired a Scandinavian-influenced name (*SSNEM*: 367).

Nevertheless, some broad archaeological patterns can be discerned from the NHER for Flegg.[25] There is widespread evidence of Neolithic and Bronze Age activity, farming and settlement across the district, but settlement datable to the Iron Age and Roman period appears more sporadic, with evidence of scattered Roman farmsteads and field systems in some parts of what was then the island of Flegg. These may have been associated with the Roman 'Saxon Shore' fort established at Caister in the early third century, which appears to have become disused by the late fourth century (NHER 8675; Pearson 2002: 15-16, 54, 65-66, 167-68; Darling & Gurney 1993: xvii, 6, 240-55).[26] There is little evidence of any Early Saxon (411-650 AD) re-occupation, and few Early Saxon finds have been recovered either from the **býr**-named parishes.[27] However, metal-detecting and fieldwalking surveys have recently revealed finds of both Early and Middle (651-850) Saxon brooches and

[25] The archaeological information in this section (and the corresponding sections of subsequent chapters dealing with archaeological sites in Norfolk) is derived from the online Parish Summaries and Record Details for the individually numbered NHER finds at http://www.heritage.norfolk.gov.uk/home (accessed 19.10.2017 – 29.11.2019), and further data supplied by NHER.
[26] See map in Appendix 6.4c.
[27] Archaeological evidence for Early Saxon buildings and artefacts is recorded in the parishes of Filby and Hemsby, but the relevant find-spots are over one kilometre from the churches at the centre of each village, which may suggest they represent earlier and unassociated wandering Early Saxon settlements (NHER 27619/42090/27340/34025).

pottery within 500 metres of the presumed original centre of Martham (around St Mary's church) and around Runham also, indicating that these were probably early Anglo-Saxon settlement formations (NHER 15388/24405/31209; Cornford 2002: 21-22). Archaeological evidence suggests that settlement re-commenced during the Middle Saxon period within and just outside the Roman fort at Caister, with some indications from the finds there of high-status occupation (Darling and Gurney 1993: xvii, 44-45, 68-71, 255; Abrams 2005: 316-17) – which might have provided a context for the establishment of a large estate administration over much of Flegg. Stray finds of Ipswich ware have also been found in the parish of Somerton, which may be consistent with the idea that Somerton and Winterton were formed as later, but still pre-Viking, daughter settlements to the neighbouring Martham (NHER 16781; Cornford 2002: 21-22), thus conforming with the relative place-name chronology for **hām**- and **tūn**-named settlements discussed in section 4.3.2. Sherds of Middle Saxon pottery have also been found on the site of a small Roman settlement around 400 metres from St Andrew's church at Stokesby (NHER 41010), which may similarly support the interpretation of the place-name Stokesby as a Scandinavianisation of an earlier OE name for an existing pre-Viking settlement.

In contrast, the absence of Middle Saxon finds close to the original settlement-sites of Ashby, Billockby, Clippesby, Hemsby, Mautby, Ormesby, Rollesby and Thrigby tends to confirm the apparent lack of pre-Viking settlement in these **býr**-named parishes indicated by the similar dearth of Early Saxon finds, suggesting that these Scandinavian **býr**-names were applied to new settlements rather than used to rename pre-existing old ones. Most of these **býr**-names have indeed produced finds and some pottery from the Late Saxon era, defined as 851-1065 (NHER 31479/16336/34671/34686/18914/37383), which is consistent with their formation in the same period that their Scandinavian-influenced place-names were also presumably coined. This evidence supports the interpretation that these areas of Flegg may previously have been exploited only for grazing livestock (as implied by the earlier OE place-names of neighbouring settlements), without being actually inhabited before the period of Viking settlement, thus conforming to the traditional interpretation of **býr**-names as representing new settlements in previously

unoccupied territory (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 418; Sandred 1987: 311, 320-21; Cameron 1965).

Further archaeological evidence for the possible Viking occupation of Flegg is provided by the analysis of skeletal evidence from burials in medieval cemeteries at Ormesby St Margaret, Caister and Burgh Castle (Wallis and Anderson 2009). As discussed in section 3.2.5, this suggests that the burials in both Ormesby and Caister may represent a population heavily influenced by a Scandinavian presence, while those at Burgh Castle may represent the 'native' population largely unaffected by later immigrants (*ibid.*: 31). But the evidence may also indicate that settlement on Flegg by people of Scandinavian origin extended into villages and estates bearing earlier OE names as much as those with later Scandinavian-influenced names, and perhaps also supports the hypothesised model of an earlier estate on Flegg based on Caister being taken over by Viking settlers and subsequently divided between them.

(6.4.6) Overall, it appears that the **býˊ**-names of Flegg can thus be divided into two broad categories according to their name-types, with correspondingly different patterns of location and landscape settings across the former island, different shapes of parish-boundaries, and differing status of tenants and fiscal values in Domesday – as if, indeed, they had been formed under varying circumstances and at different times. Gillian Fellows-Jensen (2013: 85-87) has argued that the **býˊ**-names with nominal, adjectival or adverbial specifics were the first to be formed in England, by the earliest Danish settlers establishing new settlements or taking over pre-existing English ones in the late ninth or early tenth centuries – and creating names for them that used specifics similar to those of the **býˊ**-names with which they would have been familiar in their homelands, where very few were formed with personal names. Is it possible, therefore, that the **býˊ**-names on Flegg containing topographical and geographical specifics may represent the relatively early establishment by entrepreneurial Great Army veterans or Scandinavian immigrants of settlements on more marginal land around the edge of Flegg, perhaps in order to exploit the newly formed grazing land created on the former marshes of the drying-out estuary? The use of the **býˊ** generic in such a context would seem to embody the early, more specific

meaning of the term as discussed above (6.1), denoting isolated settlements involved in some way with the utilisation of new agricultural land – a usage which may also possibly suggest a relatively early date of formation before the **býr** element came to signify a broader range of settlement-types.

Such a colonisation may have occurred at a time when most of the fertile upland territory of Flegg was already under cultivation as part of one or more established estates based on Caister or Martham, or both. But these estates may themselves have been taken over in the late ninth century by higher-status Viking leaders, perhaps as part of the 'sharing out of the land' of East Anglia under Guthrum.[28] These may then have been subsequently broken up into smaller independent units, and allocated to a number of individuals of Scandinavian origin who named or renamed them using their own ON personal names, perhaps reflecting the growing tendency in late Anglo-Saxon England for using personal names to name settlements. But instead of the usual OE **tūn** generic, they compounded their names with the familiar ON **býr** generic that had already been used on Flegg for naming the earlier batch of settlements.[29] It has hitherto been unclear why a new and unfamiliar practice of combining Scandinavian personal names with the **býr** generic began to be used throughout the Danelaw, but perhaps the example of Flegg as suggested here shows how the **býr**-generic may have been used on analogy with several other **býr**-names already in existence nearby,[30] and thus created an onomastic pattern or fashion for the wider use of the generic compounded with personal names that was emulated elsewhere.

[28] See section 2.2.2a above.

[29] This hypothesised process reflects Gillian Fellows-Jensen's postulated second stratum of **býr**-names (after those formed with non-anthroponymic specifics) that were formed when Danish settlers in eastern England began to split off independent units of land from the old Anglo-Saxon estates and gave their own Danish personal names to these new settlements (Fellows-Jensen 1983: 54-55; 1984: 35-36; 2007a: 93-95; 2013: 86-87).

[30] It has been suggested that the predominance of **býr**-names in the North Riding of Lincolnshire may similarly reflect an onomastic fashion which caused younger secondary settlements to be called **býs** on analogy with their neighbours (*SSNEM*: 371, 256). However, no rationale has previously been offered to explain how **býr**-names began to be formed in the Danelaw in conjunction with ON personal names.

The break-up of one or more ancient estates on Flegg that has been hypothesised here may to some extent account for the relatively high numbers of sokemen recorded by Domesday Book in the vills bearing anthroponymic **býr**-names that may have been formed by estate-fragmentation, just as sokemen recorded elsewhere in Norfolk by Domesday Book have been associated with the heartlands of former old estates (Williamson 1993: 94-102, 114-20). Conversely, the greater number of freemen recorded in the vills bearing probable non-anthroponymic **býr**-names situated around the western and southern edges of Flegg may be a residual reflection of their suggested origins as areas of marginal and previously unexploited marshland that were colonised and brought into agricultural use by entrepreneurial settlers operating outside the more traditional manorial structures of the ancient estates on Flegg located further inland.

The unusual clustering of **býr**-names on Flegg has prompted speculation that they may have resulted from the hypothesised use of the former island by the Vikings as a military base in the earlier ninth century before the main period of Viking activity in England began in the 860s – possibly with the sanction of the East Anglian rulers, in the same way that the Frisian island of Walcheren was ceded by the Frankish king Lothar to the Viking leader Harald in 841 (Campbell 2001: 19-21; Abrams 2005: 316-18). It has been suggested that the abundant resources of Flegg were exploited to support a Viking fleet stationed in East Anglia, while some archaeological evidence at Caister-on-Sea is consistent with the possibility of high-status Viking occupation of the former Roman fort, including an early ninth-century Wessex coin found under the head of a body in the extra-mural cemetery in a manner reminiscent of pagan Scandinavian burials (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 417-19; Darling and Gurney 1993: xvii, 37-45, 69-71, 255). However, it is unlikely that a relatively short-lived Viking military base on Flegg would have given rise to so many long-lasting place-names (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 418; Hadley 2006: 37). Nevertheless, a Walcheren-type establishment may have facilitated the longer-term occupation and settlement of the existing estates of Flegg by high-status Viking leaders and their followers, thus possibly creating the circumstances in which the formation of the different types of **býr**-named settlements as outlined above may have been feasible.

6.5) Remaining *býr*-names in East Anglia outside Flegg

Outside Flegg, there are a number of **býr**-names scattered across east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk, and a few outliers beyond.[31] These are more varied than the **býr**-names of Flegg in terms both of the types of specific they are compounded with and the geographical contexts of their associated settlements, with no discernible common overall pattern of formation and development.[32] In this section, these diverse **býr**-names will be categorised and examined in turn according to the nature of their specifics.

(6.5.1) There are only three **býr**-names outside Flegg that are compounded with ON personal names, all situated in north-east Norfolk: Alby, Colby and Tyby, derived from the ON personal names *Áli* (or ODan *Āli*), *Koli*, and **Tyði* (or *Tīdhe*), respectively (Sandred 1987: 318, *PNNf3*: 48; *CDEPN*; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 51, 2007: 99-100; *SPNN*). Alby and Colby are located together in the hundred of South Erpingham and, like the anthroponymic **býr**-names of Flegg, situated on the same fertile *loess* soils of the Wick 2 Association, away from any significant surface watercourses. In Domesday Book, their quite substantial vills were assessed at one carucate for Alby and 2.01 for Colby. They formed two large and adjoining parishes which have highly irregular boundary shapes with some degree of interdigitation with adjoining parishes,[33] suggesting they may have been formed from the break-up of an earlier larger parish or estate – a possibility that is discussed further in section 11.3. Archaeologically, the few Anglo-Saxon artefacts discovered within the parishes of Alby and Colby are inconclusive.

The third anthroponymic **býr**-name of Tyby is around fifteen kilometres to the south-west of Alby and Colby,[34] too far away to have any direct manorial association, but once again it is situated on fertile Wick 2 Association soils and away from any

[31] See map in Appendix 6.2b.
[32] See maps in Appendices 6.2b and 6.5a.
[33] See map in Appendix 6.5b.
[34] See map in Appendix 6.5b.

rivers. The value of its vill in Domesday Book was a tiny 0.13 carucates and it has survived today only as a small hamlet within the parish boundaries of Wood Dalling.

It is intriguing that all three **býr**-names outside Flegg compounded with personal-name specifics are situated in similar landscape settings to those of the anthroponymic **býr**-names located on Flegg and within the same Broadland river system,[35] which may indicate some commonality of origin that is possibly connected with the break-up of former large estates, as has been suggested.

(6.5.2) The remaining East Anglian **býr**-names beyond Flegg contain specifics which are all considered to be nouns or adjectives, with four of ON and five of OE origin. Kirby Cane and Kirby Bedon in Norfolk, and Kirby-le-Soken in Essex, all contain the Middle English element **kirk** which is assumed to be derived from the ON **kirkja** ('church'). The term was widely used in post-Conquest eastern England, commonly replacing 'church' (derived from the corresponding OE **cirice**) in local dialects as far south as the Norfolk-Suffolk border (Fellows-Jensen 1987b: 295-96; Jones 1972: 192-93, Map 1; Benskin *et al.* 2013;[36] *OED*: s.v. kirk) It is often difficult to determine whether a place-name with 'Kirk-' or '-kirk' in its modern form originally contained the OE **cirice** that was changed to **kirk** by the indirect Scandinavian linguistic influence upon the local dialect of English, or whether it represented a more direct use of the ON **kirkja** by Scandinavian-speaking settlers (*VEPN3*: 63; Gelling 2009: 12-13). But it has generally been assumed that the use of the term to form a place-name in conjunction with another Scandinavian element (as with Kirby) indicates a fully ON formation by Scandinavian speakers (Gelling 2009: 12-13), possibly representing a renaming of old-established English settlements in which incoming Scandinavian settlers found a church which might have been a notable feature in the Anglo-Saxon landscape (Sandred 1987: 311, 319-20; *SSNEM*: 355; Fellows-Jensen 1987b: 298-99; 1999: 49; 2005: 101).

[35] See map in Appendix 6.5a.
[36] http://archive.ling.ed.ac.uk/ihd/elalme_scripts/lib/create_feature_map.php?showother=ShowOthers&mapid=1080008 – accessed 27.12.2016.

Kirby Bedon and Kirby Cane are both located on the upper slopes of large river valleys (the Yare and Waveney, respectively), bearing the light and freely draining soils of the Burlingham Associations as well as the heavier Beccles clay soils. They constituted substantial vills in Domesday Book (Kirby Bedon: 2.05 carucates; Kirby Cane: 3.72) and formed quite large parishes which appear not to display any sign of formation by division from neighbouring parochial territories.[37] Archaeologically, little Anglo-Saxon material has been recovered from Kirby Bedon, and the evidence at Kirby Cane regarding the possible existence of a pre-Viking settlement is inconclusive.

Kirby-le-Soken in north-east Essex is an outlier located over sixty kilometres from any of the other East Anglian **býr**-names, but amidst the small cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in Tendring hundred. Kirby-le-Soken is today situated close to the edges of the Hamford Water estuary, but this section of the Essex coastline has been severely eroded and so in the early medieval period the settlement was probably located further inland away from any river, on the heavy and poorly draining clay soils of the Windsor Association. However, Kirby-le-Soken formed a large parish that enclosed much of the former marshland area to the north of the settlement that provided valuable grazing land (Faith 1996: 203).[38] But it is not recorded in Domesday Book, as at that time it formed part of the larger estate of *Ældulvesnasa* or 'Adulfesness' (*ibid.*: 202), and there is little archaeological evidence to provide any chronology of early medieval settlement.

The large parishes associated with the Kirby place-names in East Anglia may support the possibility of earlier origins as old and established Anglo-Saxon sites that were renamed by Scandinavian settlers, but the archaeological evidence for possible pre-Viking settlement on any of the Kirby-named sites is lacking and consequently no firm conclusions can be drawn regarding the dates of their formation.

[37] See map in Appendix 6.5c.
[38] See map in Appendix 6.5d.

(6.5.3) Three other **býˊ**-names outside Flegg are assumed to contain non-anthroponymic specifics of ON origin. Barnby, in north-east Suffolk, probably contains the ON noun **barn** ('children's'), perhaps referring to an estate held jointly by a number of heirs or children of the original owner, or a secondary settlement established at the edge of their parents' estates (*DSPN*: 7; *CDEPN*: 37; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 52; Mills 2014: 25; Parker 1985; *VEPN1*: 50-51; von Feilitzen 1937: 192, 202). Risby in Suffolk, which is located well away from the other **býˊ**-names and place-names of Scandinavian origin, may be derived from the ON **hrís** or its OE cognate **hrīs** ('brushwood'), or alternatively from the Old East Scandinavian **ryð**, ('a clearing'). Like the Ashby in Flegg, the Ashby in north-east Suffolk has been derived from ON **askr** ('ash-tree'), although the rare ON personal name *Aski* remains a possibility also (*DSPN*: 3, 116; *CDEPN*: 502; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 52; *EPNE*: 1.13, 265, 2:91).

The geographical diversity of these three settlements' locations probably precludes any commonality of origins, and the archaeological evidence is inconclusive. The common use of the **býˊ** generic in Barnby and Ashby may therefore simply reflect the Scandinavian linguistic influence upon the place-naming process in north-east Suffolk manifested in the many other Scandinavian-influenced place-names formed in the same area. But the question of how and why the **býˊ** generic came to be used for the isolated Risby remains more of a conundrum.

(6.5.4) All the remaining **býˊ**-names outside Flegg are believed to contain non-anthroponymic specifics of OE origin. The early spellings of Ashby St Mary and Ashby Mere in Norfolk indicate a derivation from the cognate OE **æsc** ('ash-tree') rather than ON **askr** or *Aski*. Both OE and ON forms of **æsc/askr** are commonly compounded also with **býˊ** generics in the East Midlands counties (with fifteen examples recorded), but not at all in Yorkshire and only four examples in north-west England. Such a selective distribution is puzzling, but may indicate a sacred reverence for the ash-tree reflected in its roles in Scandinavian mythology as both the ancestral first man *Askr* and the *Yggdrasill* tree that held up the world. In Scandinavia, tree-names are combined more with **býˊ** than any other habitative element. 'Oak' tree-names are the most prevalent in Danish **býˊ**-names, so its total absence from English **býˊ**-names is

similarly striking and puzzling (*SSNEM*: 22-23; *SSNNW*: 18; Gelling 1984: 219; Hooke 2010: 7-8, 201). Just three kilometres away from Ashby Mere is Wilby, which contains the Old English tree-name ***wiliġ** ('willow').[39]

The geographical settings of these three **býr**-names compounded with OE tree-names are broadly similar, all being located on undulating landscapes away from any rivers and on reasonable farming soils. Ashby St Mary and Wilby have formed quite small parishes, while Ashby Mere survived only as a hamlet into the nineteenth century within the parish of Snetterton. Little archaeological evidence of Anglo-Saxon occupation has been recovered from the two Ashbys, but the discovery of Ipswich ware at Wilby suggests that the village 'may have been an existing settlement which underwent a change of name at some point after an influx of Scandianvian settlers' (Davison 1999: 271).

Finally, Aldeby in Norfolk contains the OE adjective **ald** ('old'), but it has been suggested that the ON **býr** generic was a later replacement for the dative singular form **byriġ** of the OE **burh** ('fortified town'), in view of its early name-form of *Aldebury* in Domesday Book – which may once again be evidence of Scandinavian linguistic influence lingering into the post-Conquest period (Sandred 1987: 318-19; Fellows-Jensen 1984: 33; 1999: 49, 52; *CDEPN*; *DSPN*: 3, 154; *EPNE*: 1.4, 2.266-67; Gelling 1984: 221; *SPNN*: 60-61). Aldeby is situated on the fertile upper slopes of the Waveney valley, and has formed a large irregularly-shaped parish which may reflect possible early pre-Viking origins.

(6.5.5) The East Anglian **býr**-names outside Flegg display as much geographical diversity as they do linguistically in terms of their varying specifics, with no apparent correlation between the types of specific and the landscape context of their associated settlements. Some **býr**-names are located on poorer soils unsuitable for arable farming and may therefore have been used initially for livestock farming,

[39] The Wilby in Suffolk is also derived from OE ***wiliġ**, but its second element is OE **bēag** ('ring') rather than the Scandinavian generic **býr**. This original name-form and etymology usually causes the Suffolk Wilby to be discounted as a 'Scandinavian' place-name (*DSPN*: xx, 154), but it may be linguistically significant that the **býr**-form was familiar enough in the local dialect at a later date for it to replace the original **bēag** element.

conforming to the geographical distribution pattern that has been discerned regarding the majority of **býr**-names elsewhere in the Danelaw (*TIACL*: 124-32). Others are found in areas of East Anglia with better soils, where arable farming would have been possible. However, it may be significant that, unlike the **thorps** and 'Grimston-hybrids', very few of the **býr**-names are located on the inland clay plateaux of central Norfolk and Suffolk, suggesting that the **býr** generic was not used to name settlements involved in the process of recolonising the claylands for the extension of arable farming. This may indicate an underlying geographical or functional distinction in the choice of the two generics for some (but not all) contexts of their use in East Anglian place-names.

Overall, it appears that the **býr**-names in East Anglia outside Flegg were formed in a variety of circumstances. In some cases, the **býr** generic denoted settlements that may have been associated with pastoral or non-arable farming (as apparently it did for many settlements elsewhere in the Danelaw), but in others it appears that the generic was merely being used to name a settlement in less specific terms – perhaps reflecting a Scandinavian linguistic influence that was most prevalent in east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk.

But the **býr**-names of East Anglia do have one characteristic in common. Once again unlike many of the **thorps**, all but two of these **býr**s formed settlements of sufficient significance to become parishes, and the parish boundaries of most of these display little sign of interdigitation with adjoining parishes, suggesting that they were not formed at a later stage of development by the division of earlier larger territories. However, the parish boundaries of two of the three anthroponymic **býr**-names outside Flegg (Alby and Colby) do display some degree of interdigitation, which may indicate that their origins are connected with the formation of other nearby Scandinavian-influenced place-names, possibly resulting from the fragmentation of a larger estate, as will be explored below.

6.6) Discussion

(6.6.1) The overall significance of the evidence provided by the **býr**-names in East Anglia for the chronology, nature and extent of Viking settlement is somewhat limited by the relatively small number of examples located in the region compared with the abundance of those in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, and also by the uncertain place-name etymologies for several of the **býr**-names as outlined above. This section will focus primarily on those **býr**-names containing readily-identifiable specifics to review the available onomastic evidence, looking at issues of possible dating, linguistic patterns and ethnic identity, and compare the East Anglian examples with the **býr**-names found in other parts of the Danelaw. It will also consider broader geographical patterns of distribution for the different types of **býr**-names within East Anglia.

(6.6.2) There is little firm linguistic or written evidence for the absolute dating of the formation of the **býr**-names of East Anglia but the few available documentary clues seem to indicate a relatively early period of formation compared with that of some of the other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names found in the region. It is significant that twenty-four of the twenty-six **býr**-names in East Anglia (around 92%) are recorded in Domesday Book, with the two exceptions being Ashby in Suffolk and Kirby-le-Soken in Essex. All the **býr**-names in Norfolk are recorded in Domesday Book, and four of those in Flegg appear also in documents that can be dated to the earlier eleventh century. Ormesby and Scratby are mentioned in a will dated to *c.* 1020 (but surviving in a thirteenth- or fourteenth-century copy) of a Scandinavian-named landowner called Thurketel Heyng, while Ashby and Rollesby are listed in a charter dated 1044-47 (surviving in a thirteenth-century copy) of Edward the Confessor that referred also to another landowner known as Grimolf the Dane.[40] A number of **býr**-names in the Danelaw outside East Anglia are similarly mentioned in pre-Domesday

[40] Sawyer 1968 and online, S1528 & S1055 http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/1528.html, http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/1055.html – accessed 29.3.2016; Whitelock 1930: 70-71 (no. 25), 180-81; *SPNN*: 414; Hart 1966: 81, 92-94 (nos. 124, 134).

documents, including six recorded in probable tenth-century sources (one of which is Derby, as discussed above). Many of these early references are preserved only in later copies, but cumulatively they do tend to confirm that **býr**-names as a class were being formed in the tenth century and possibly as early as the late ninth (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 404, n. 116; *SSNY*: 237, *SSNEM*: 293). Conversely, the comparatively few post-Domesday dates of first record of **býr**-names in East Anglia, Yorkshire and the East Midlands appear to indicate that the -**býr** element dropped out of general use in the Danelaw fairly soon after the Conquest (*SSNY*: 6-8; *SSNEM*: 28-29), in contrast to some other types of ON place-name elements such as **thorp** which continued to be used long into the later medieval period.

(6.6.3) As indicated above, the fundamental distinction between the anthroponymic and non-anthroponymic **býr**-names appears to underlie their formation and distribution in East Anglia. Eight of the total of twenty-six ***býr***-names recorded in East Anglia are interpreted as being compounded with personal names, another ten are regarded as formed with non-anthroponymic specifics, and the remaining eight are uncertain.[41] Almost half (47%) of the seventeen East Anglian **býr**-names can therefore be categorised with reasonable certainty as anthroponymic, compared with corresponding estimates of between 40% and 68% for the East Midlands, and 57% for Yorkshire, [42] but in contrast to Denmark where only about 10% of the **býr***s* contain personal names (Fellows-Jensen 1981: 138-39; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 395-403). Geographically, the East Anglian **býr**-names that are, or may be, anthroponymic are only found in two clusters located in north and north-east Norfolk, all within the Broadlands river system[43] – unlike those formed with non-anthroponymic specifics which are located more widely across East Anglia. The anthroponymic **býr**-names also differ from the majority of **býr**-names found elsewhere in the Danelaw in that they are located in more favourable landscape settings and on fertile soils that are well-suited for arable farming.

[41] See table in Appendix 6.6c.
[42] See section B of table in Appendix 6.6b.
[43] Discussed in sections 6.4 and 6.5.1 above.

The personal names forming the specifics of **býr**-names can be further categorised according to their probable ethnic affiliations, and it is significant that all those in East Anglia which can be identified are of Scandinavian origin.[44] This once again reflects a broader pattern apparent elsewhere in the Danelaw, with equivalent proportions of over 90% for personal names of Scandinavian origin in the **býr**-names of the East Midlands counties and Yorkshire.[45] These ratios are much higher than the equivalent proportions of ON to OE personal names found amongst the pre-Conquest landholders recorded for the same counties in Domesday Book, which has provided localised evidence for the name-stock of landholders datable precisely to the mid-1060s. The equivalent ratios of ON to OE personal names in Domesday Book are 45:55 for Norfolk, 62:38 for Lincolnshire and 70:30 for Yorkshire (Parsons 2002: 39-46). In each county, and especially Norfolk, the proportion of landholders in Domesday Book with ON names is significantly lower than that of the personal names incorporated into the county's **býr**-names. It seems unlikely that, for reasons just of 'fashion' as suggested by revisionist scholars (Hadley 2002: 59-60), the native Anglo-Saxon name-stock of landholders would fall to below 10% in the areas where, and at a time when, the **býr**-names were being formed, and then rise again to between 30% and 50% by the mid-eleventh century. It therefore seems more probable that the **býr**-names do not contain a random selection of names from a mixed Anglo-Scandinavian population during the late Anglo-Saxon period, but rather belong to a more specific and distinctive Scandinavian linguistic context, and probably also to an earlier date (Parsons 2002: 44-46; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 398). The number of identifiable personal names in the **býr**-names of Norfolk is admittedly small, but once again the pattern does seem to follow that of the East Midlands and Yorkshire where larger and more statistically valid samples are found.

The difficulties of attributing more specific ethnic and linguistic identities to the Viking settlers in eastern England beyond the ethnonym 'Scandinavian' have been outlined in section 2.2.1b above, but it is possible to detect in the personal names

[44] See table in Appendix 6.6c. The one possible exception to this pattern is Filby, as discussed in section 4.4.3.
[45] See section B of table in Appendix 6.6b.

compounded in the **býr** place-names of East Anglia discussed above a greater affinity with the naming-practices of the East Scandinavian areas (including the regions that became Denmark and Sweden) than that of other Scandinavian territories. The few identifiable personal names compounded with East Anglian **býr**-names commonly appear also in similar forms in early medieval Danish and Swedish documentary sources and runic inscriptions. Some, such as *Orm* and *Hēmir* (from which Ormesby and Hemsby are derived) form the first elements of Danish place-names also.[46] But several of the other personal names involved are very rare in Scandinavia and appear infrequently in Danish sources (*SPNN*). Overall, the evidence for East Anglia is based on too small a sample of names to provide a statistically valid indication of linguistic or ethnic identity, but it reflects a wider pattern discernible elsewhere in the Danelaw, with 57% of the Scandinavian personal names compounded in the **býr**-names of Yorkshire, and 65% of those in the East Midlands appearing also in Danish place-names (*SSNY*: 10-12; *SSNEM*: 15-17).

The linguistic evidence presented so far has indicated that the relatively few **býr**-names of East Anglia containing personal names appear to display patterns and levels of Scandinavian influence broadly similar to those found in other areas of the Danelaw such as the East Midlands and Yorkshire, albeit to a slightly lesser degree. In other aspects of Scandinavian linguistic influence, however, the East Anglian anthroponymic **býs** differ more significantly from those elsewhere. Several of the personal names compounded with **býr**-names in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire appear in early spellings with typically Scandinavian inflexional endings, such as the genitival forms *-ar* and *-s* rather than the OE *-es*. (*SSNY*: 192-93, 240, *SSNEM*: 271-74) The use of such inflexional endings provide further support for the idea that the **býr**-names in these areas were being coined at a time and in a context when Viking settlers were still speaking their own language (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 398; Fellows-Jensen 1994: 134). However, no such inflexional endings are apparent in the **býr**-names of East Anglia, which may indicate a lesser degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence or one that did not last so long as elsewhere in the Danelaw.

[46] See table in Appendix 6.6d.

Another significant onomastic difference is that a much lower proportion of the Scandinavian personal names used as first elements of East Anglian **býr**-names are dithematic compared with those in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.[47] Whereas around 36% of the Scandinavian personal names used to form the anthroponymic **býr**-names of Yorkshire and 32% of those in the East Midlands are dithematic (*SSNY*: 9; *SSNEM*: 15-16), the corresponding figure for the identifiable Scandinavian personal names used to form the **býr**-names of north and east Norfolk (the only area of East Anglia with anthroponymic **býr**-names) is much lower, between 6% and 12% (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 420-21).[48]

It has been suggested that a clear trend towards monothematic personal names in the **býr**-names of Flegg may indicate that the settlers or landholders who bore those names came from a class of ordinary Scandinavian peasants. Monothematic names in Scandinavia were characteristic of farmers and most common among the lower classes, whereas dithematic personal names were considered to signify a higher social rank and used especially in aristocratic families (Sandred 1987: 321; Insley 1998: 115). This in turn raises the possibility of quite a separate process of Scandinavian settlement in Flegg, involving different social groups from that experienced further north in the Danelaw where more **býr**-names incorporating dithematic names were created by presumably higher-status settlers (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 420-21).

However, the use of a wide range of unfamiliar but distinctive and monothematic personal names may alternatively reflect an earlier date of formation than most **býr**-names elsewhere in the Danelaw as much as a difference in the character of settlement (Abrams 2005: 309; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 419-21). The indication of lower social status for the individuals whose names are compounded in the **býr**-names of Flegg, together with the possibility of an earlier date of formation,

[47] See section 4.3.2 above, and table in Appendix 6.6d.
[48] The percentage figure depends on how many **býr**-names are regarded as being compounded with Scandinavian personal names. See maps in Appendices 6.2b and 6.3a, and section B of table in Appendix 6.6b.

are both factors that may support the hypothesis for the creation of the place-names suggested in section 6.4.6 above.

(6.6.4) In contrast to the **býr**-names in East Anglia compounded with Scandinavian personal names which are clustered in north and east Norfolk, the remaining **býr**-names are scattered more widely across the region, although still displaying a greater concentration around the Broadland estuarine system. They are formed with nouns or adjectives which can be divided fairly equally between those of ON or OE origin, with four clearly identifiable as the former and five as the latter (but neither displaying any meaningful pattern in their respective distributions).[49] This is in contrast to other regions of the Danelaw, with corresponding ratios of ON to OE non-anthroponymic elements of 7:1 in Yorkshire, and between 3:1 and 1½:1 in the East Midlands.[50] The number of non-anthroponymic East Anglian **býr**-names is comparatively small, but in this context it may once again indicate a somewhat reduced level of Scandinavian linguistic influence from that apparent in the northern Danelaw.

6.7) Conclusion

It appears that the **býr**-names of East Anglia were formed relatively early compared with other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names such as **thorps**, some possibly in the late ninth or early tenth centuries, but did not continue to be coined for long in the post-Conquest period. A relatively early chronology of formation for **býr**-names may have influenced their overall pattern of distribution,[51] with a greater concentration in the estuarine and coastal areas of north-east Norfolk and north Suffolk – in contrast to the wider distribution of the other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names across most of Norfolk and Suffolk. The places named or

[49] See table in Appendix 6.6c.
[50] See section C of table in Appendix 6.6b.
[51] See map in Appendix 6.2b.

renamed using Scandinavian-influenced vocabulary in the early years of Viking settlement may have been sited to facilitate a continuing maritime connection via the North Sea with the Scandinavian homeland and other regions of Viking settlement elsewhere – a geographical imperative which would not have been such a significant factor in the siting of later settlements created or renamed using longer-lasting ON generics such as **thorp**, which entered the English language and were used also by the indigenous population.

There appears to be a clear distinction between the two different types of **býr**-names in East Anglia. Those incorporating Scandinavian personal names are found only in two clusters located in a small area of north-east Norfolk. To some extent, they correspond to those found in larger numbers in Yorkshire and the East Midlands. But linguistically, they lack the Scandinavian inflexional endings of some of the latter and, geographically, they are located in more favourable landscape settings than is usually the pattern for **býr**-names throughout the Danelaw.[52] A hypothesis has been offered for the formation of the anthroponymic **býr**-names on Flegg, suggesting they resulted from the fragmentation there of an earlier estate. Ultimately, it is unclear why a new and unfamiliar practice of incorporating Scandinavian personal names was initiated with the **býr**-names. But it may reflect the fact that the arrival of the Viking settlers in the late ninth century coincided with a wider transition in the place-naming processes of late Anglo-Saxon England, in which a greater importance was being attached to the ownership of settlements that was reflected in the increasing use of personal names in the new place-names that were being coined for them.

In contrast, the remaining, non-anthroponymic **býr**-names of East Anglia are scattered more widely across the region, although they are still concentrated mainly around the Broadland river system of east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk, with isolated outliers that can probably only be understood in terms of their particular local circumstances. Some of these **býr**-names may represent settlements embodying

[52] However, it is difficult to make direct comparisons between the geographical contexts of the anthroponymic **býr**-names in East Anglia and those elsewhere in the Danelaw, as previous regional analyses did not differentiate between the landscape settings of **býr**-names formed with personal names and those containing non-anthroponymic elements (*SSNEM*: 248-52, 298-372; Cameron 1965).

the **býr**-generic's early meaning of isolated farmsteads involved with newly cultivated land (as has been suggested for those on the estuarine edge of Flegg), or may reflect the association between **býr**-names and pastoral farming seen elsewhere in the Danelaw. But the use of the **býr**-generic in other East Anglian place-names seems simply to have served to denote a small settlement or village, and these **býr**-names may be indicative of a more general and diffuse Scandinavian linguistic influence throughout the region that is manifested also in other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names and field-names (as will be explored below).

It appears, therefore, that the **býr**-names of East Anglia were not formed from any single set of historical circumstances, as they display a number of different forms of specific as well as a variety of geographical settings. They may, therefore, bear witness to the different processes and circumstances of Viking settlement both throughout the Danelaw and within East Anglia itself that gave rise to a complex and multifarious process of place-name formation – one that resulted in an even wider range of specifics compounded with the **thorp** generic.

Chapter Seven: PLACE-NAMES IN *-THORP*

7.1) Introduction

Although traditionally regarded as unambiguous indicators of the presence of Scandinavian-speaking communities (Reaney 1960: 172-74), the academic interpretation of **thorp** place-names as evidence of Viking settlement has in recent years become more complex and nuanced (*TIACL*; Fellows-Jensen 1991-92; 2009). The word **thorp**, from the ON **þorp**, is of East and West Germanic origin with cognates in Gothic (**þaurp**, 'a field'), Old High German (**dorf**, 'a village', or 'a gathering of people') and Old Frisian (**torp**, 'village, village-mound'). From its apparent origins in what is now Germany during the fifth and sixth centuries AD, the **torp** element spread into Denmark where it became very widely used during the Viking period of settlement expansion and landscape colonisation, with over 3,000 of an estimated 7,000 **torp** place-names still surviving. It then spread to Sweden and Norway, where it was also used with some frequency, as well as to territories in western Europe subsequently colonised by Vikings and settled by Scandinavian-speaking communities. The **thorp**-names found across Europe today all tend to be associated with small settlements that are often outlying, low-status and dependent in some way upon other nearby communities (*TIACL*: 11-14; *EPNE*: 2.205-08).

In England, the term **thorp** appears to have been used consistently throughout the Danelaw for denoting a particular form of settlement which has been defined as 'a secondary settlement, an outlying farmstead or a small hamlet dependent on a larger place' (*EPNE*: 2.208). In territories of southern England outside the Danelaw, such as Wessex, the Old English cognate **throp** was used instead of **thorp** as a generic for the same type of settlement. This sense that **thorp** and **throp** place-names constitute a particular type of settlement dependent upon, or

subservient to, a more significant place nearby is supported by early documentary evidence. An early twelfth-century document (retrospectively inserted into the ASC) refers to a grant of freedom by King Edgar to St Peter's monastery at Peterborough 'and to all the **thorps** pertaining to it'.[1] Another twelfth-century document recorded a *Thorp* in Suffolk (now lost) as a pertinence of Pakenham.[2] Perhaps because of their insignificant and dependent origins, **thorp**-named places often only survive as single farms, small settlements or villages but rarely as towns. A high proportion (approaching 50%) are now lost or represented by only a single farm, in contrast to places named with other elements such as **hām**, **tūn** and **býr** which have survived in proportionally greater numbers (*TIACL*: 41-43).

The relationship between the ON **thorp** and OE **throp** forms is marked by a clear geographical division between the distribution patterns of the two, with **thorps** being located to the north and east of the traditional Danelaw boundary, and **throps** to the south and west.[3] This was traditionally interpreted as evidence of an earlier formation of place-names in **throp** by Anglo-Saxon settlers of the migration period, followed by a later process of **thorp**-name forming or renaming by Scandinavian immigrants in the areas that they settled (*EPNE*: 2.205-07, 214-16). However, the various cognates in other Germanic languages indicate that **thorp** is the ancestral form and the OE **throp** is a metathesised variant, both in existence before the Anglo-Saxon migration. But there is little documentary evidence regarding the early English, pre-Viking usage of the two forms, although some early Anglo-Saxon glosses of Latin manuscripts indicate that the term **þrop** was in occasional use in England by the late seventh century as a broad equivalent to **tūn**, with the probable meaning of 'small, rural settlement'. Neither the **þrop** or **þorp** form is found in any of the earliest surviving place-names, however, and so it has been suggested that both forms were introduced to southern Britain by the early Anglo-Saxons, but were little used in

[1] *'ȝ ealle þa þorpes þe ðærto lin'* (Irvine 2004: 57, s.a. 963; *TIACL*: 39, n. 3; Fellows-Jensen 2009: 43-44).
[2] *'Torp que est pertinencia de Pakenham'* (Davis 1954: 10).
[3] See map in Appendix 7.1a. The geographical distinction between the distribution of **thorps** and **throps** across England is clear, apart from a border zone in Essex where both forms are found, and two **throp** outliers in Northumberland where Scandinavian place-names are less abundant than in other parts of the former Danelaw.

place-names initially until they came into 'fashion' from the ninth century onwards – possibly because the **þorp** term was already familiar to the Scandinavian settlers from their homelands and began to be used more widely accordingly. (*TIACL*: 12-16, 33-36, 144-45). The sharp geographical division between the distribution of the **thorp** and **throp** forms helps demonstrate how specific and localised the effects of Scandinavian linguistic influence were during and after the Viking period.

Unlike the **bý** generic which only appears in compound place-names, the **thorp** element appears in English place-names in both simplex form, in which the term appears (or was originally coined) as a place-name on its own without any distinguishing element *(Thorp[e])*, and compounded with other word-elements or specifics which may be nouns, adjectives, names or other place-names. Around a quarter of 896 **thorp** place-names identified in the Danelaw are simplexes, another 47% or so are assumed to be compounded with personal names (of OE or ON origin), and the remainder are formed with specifics derived from OE or ON nouns or adjectives, or are uncertain (*TIACL*: 44-57). These relative proportions once again differ somewhat from the use of the **þorp** generic in Denmark, where (unlike the Danish **bý**-names) 70% to 80% of the place-names in **þorp** are compounded with personal names, while the remaining 25% or so are either simplex formations or compounded with nouns and adjectives (*EPNE*: 2.207; Lund 1976: 224). Some personal names used in Danish **torps** have been dated to the Viking period (although many are Christian names, and therefore later), which indicates that the practice of combining the **þorp** generic with personal names was current in Denmark at the time of Viking settlement in England (*SSNEM*: 84, 92-93; Fellows-Jensen 1981: 139-41; 2013: 90). A prior Danish usage may, therefore, have influenced the creation of anthroponymic **thorps** in the Danelaw – but perhaps not so much the formation of non-anthroponymic **thorp**-names – as will be explored below.

Also unlike the **bý** generic, the term **thorp** continued to be used in the post-Conquest period and entered Middle English alongside **throp**, with both words denoting 'an agricultural village', and then subsequently acquiring the broader meaning of 'an hamlet, village or small town' (*OED*: s.v. thorp; *TIACL*: 156).

7.2) *Thorp*-names in East Anglia

The total numbers of **thorps** recorded in Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex (sixty-eight, twenty-seven and eight respectively) are considerably fewer than the 112 of Lincolnshire and 336 of Yorkshire. But Norfolk's figure of sixty-eight is comparable to that of other southern Danelaw counties, such as Leicestershire (sixty-seven), Nottinghamshire (forty-four), Derbyshire (forty-three), and Northamptonshire (thirty-seven).[4] Within East Anglia, there is a clear gradation of intensity with a greatest concentration in central Norfolk that falls away across central and eastern Suffolk and into eastern Essex.[5] There are fewer **thorps** in western Norfolk, none in the western quarter or so of Suffolk, and none in inland Essex beyond an eastern, coastal fringe. There is a similar scarcity of **thorps** in the neighbouring counties to the immediate west of East Anglia, with only three recorded in Huntingdonshire and one in Cambridgeshire, plus one **throp** each in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire (*TIACL*: 20, 197, 200).

7.3) Linguistic analysis of simplex *thorps*

In East Anglia, the simplexes constitute the largest single category of **thorp** name-types, with around a third of all **thorp**-names recorded before 1300 represented by twenty-eight simplexes in Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex.[6] This represents a slightly higher proportion than for **thorps** throughout the Danelaw as a whole (and for **throps** beyond), of which around a quarter are simplexes. Unlike the compound **thorps**, the simplexes are scattered fairly evenly through Norfolk and Suffolk with

[4] Figures derived from *TIACL*: 18-24; see column 5 of table in Appendix 4.3a.
[5] See map in Appendix 7.2a, which shows the **thorps** first recorded before 1300 (and so displays fewer examples than the numbers in each county mentioned above).
[6] Figures derived from *TIACL*: 163-202. See unlabelled map in Appendix 7.2a for the overall numbers and distribution of different types of **thorps** throughout East Anglia, and labelled map in Appendix 7.3a for the location of specific place-names mentioned in this chapter.

fourteen and twelve in each county respectively, but only three in Essex. Six **thorps** which were recorded in Domesday Book in simplex form remained as simplexes: two in Norfolk, and four in Suffolk; another two lost *Thorp(e)s* in Suffolk were both first recorded in the thirteenth century. No **thorps** remained as simplexes in Essex. Three more simplex **thorps** in Suffolk acquired the affix 'Hall' at later dates, and another *Torp* in Colneis subsequently became Thorpe Common. The remaining two simplex **thorps** of Suffolk acquired affixes by the fourteenth century to become Ixworth Thorpe (from the nearby Old English place-name) and Thorpe Morieux (from the Norman-French name of the family who held the manor). Thorpe Morieux is one of the earliest recorded **thorps** (with a reference to its simplex form in an eleventh-century copy of a late tenth-century charter), and was referred to also as *Guvetorp* in 1201 before the 'Morieux' affix was first recorded in 1330, reflecting the continuing volatility of the **thorp**-naming process (*TIACL*: 176-79, 183-84; *DSPN*: 79, 139-40).

By contrast, the simplex **thorps** of Norfolk survived in greater numbers than the many lost ones of Suffolk and were also more likely to acquire later compound forms. Four recorded as simplexes in Domesday Book became qualified by prefixes or affixes derived from nearby OE place-names (Ashwellthorpe, Morningthorpe, Gayton Thorpe and Honingham Thorpe), and one from a nearby Scandinavian-influenced place-name (Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe). But a characteristic instability of **thorp**-names is indicated by the fact that Ashwellthorpe was recorded in both simplex form and with an *Aescewelle* ('Ashwell') affix in the eleventh century, and Morningthorpe was similarly recorded both in simplex form and as *Maringatorp* in Domesday Book (*CDEPN*: 23, 422; *TIACL*: 45 [note 26]). Likewise, Ingoldisthorpe was recorded both in simplex form and as the possibly corrupt *In evlvestorp* in Domesday Book, before eventually being compounded with the Anglo-Scandinavian *Ingald* in the later twelfth century to become Ingoldisthorpe (Fellows-Jensen 1994: 139-40; *SPNN*: 229-34; *CDEPN*: 332).[7]

[7] Three other **thorp** place-names in Norfolk that were recorded in both simplex and compound forms in Domesday Book are discussed below (*Carboistorp*, Freethorpe and Swainsthorpe).

The alternation between simplex and compound forms for Morningthorpe and Ingoldisthorpe within the text of Domesday Book indicates a degree of contemporaneity that perhaps marks a transitional phase when simplex **thorps** were in the process of becoming known by new compound names.[8] Sometimes the introduction of a personal-name specific may have signified the arrival of a new lord or tenant, but it may also have denoted the insignificance of a place whose name had not become indelibly fixed in the minds of its neighbours and tax officials (*SSNEM*: 289-91). But it has also been suggested that the occasional addition of distinguishing prefixes or affixes to previously simplex names in the written record may sometimes have been *ad hoc* coinages by scribes attempting to identify a place more precisely (Fellows-Jensen 2014b: 138-39), perhaps establishing an authoritative written precedent which may in time have led to a wider acceptance of a new compound name-form.

Three more **thorps** in Norfolk (Gayton Thorpe, Thorpe Market and Thorpe St Andrew) were recorded as simplexes in Domesday Book, before acquiring short-lived affixes that were subsequently replaced with the affixes by which they are known today. Other Norfolk **thorps** recorded as simplexes in Domesday Book had by the thirteenth century acquired compound elements or affixes arising from their function (Cockthorpe, possibly where cocks were reared), ownership (Thorpe Abbotts) or size (Thorpe Parva) (*PNNf3*: 42; *CDEPN*: 611-12; *TIACL*; 178).

Three of the six **thorps** in Essex were originally simplexes: Littlethorpe, Thorpehall Farm, and Thorpe-le-Soken. The latter continued to be recorded in simplex form into the thirteenth century, was then described as *Thorpe by Kirkeby* in the fourteenth (referring to the nearby ON place-name of Kirby), and only acquired the 'Soken' affix in the seventeenth century (*PNEss*: 201, 352; *CDEPN*: 612; *TIACL*: 29, 165, 198).

Overall, the simplex **thorps** display a greater degree of impermanence and instability than most other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-name. A large

[8] Despite its apparent simplex status in Domesday Book, Ingoldisthorpe has generally been characterised as a **thorp** compounded with a Scandinavian personal name in view of its final name-form (*TIACL*: 177), and has been plotted accordingly on the maps appended to this chapter.

proportion became abandoned and lost settlements, and many of the remainder which did acquire compound forms were subjected to one or more changes of name. Ultimately, this pattern may reflect the comparatively lower status of most – but not all – of such places. Very few simplex **thorps** in East Anglia subsequently acquired compound elements derived from personal names, with only two possible examples: Baconsthorpe and a lost *Poketorp*[9] (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 53; *PNNf2*: 9; *PNNf3*: 54; *CDEPN*: 30). There are only two **thorps** compounded with Scandinavian personal names that were initially recorded also in simplex form: Ingoldisthorpe (discussed above) and Swainsthorpe (discussed below), which are both recorded in Domesday Book in simplex and anthroponymic forms. Otherwise, it is significant that no other simplex **thorp** in East Anglia later acquired a compound element or affix derived from a Scandinavian personal name.

7.4) Linguistic analysis of *thorps* compounded with geographical and topographical specifics

Two-thirds of the **thorps** in East Anglia recorded before 1300 are compounded with a specific (in the form of a prefix, suffix or affix), of which a majority are personal names (discussed in the next section). The remainder, located mainly in Norfolk, incorporate nouns or adjectives that formed geographical or topographical elements, with four possibly of ON origin and ten derived more clearly from OE words or place-names.[10] Several incorporate the name of a nearby settlement or parish upon which the **thorp** is dependent, or a 'directional' specific such as a compass-point or other locational term.[11] Four in Norfolk have affixes or prefixes derived from nearby older OE place-names: Burnham Thorpe, Cleythorpe, Saxlingham Thorpe and Weasenham Thorpe (*CDEPN*: 613, 143, 529; *TIACL*: 176-79). Other **thorps** are compounded with OE adjectival elements referring to their size (*Smalesthorpes*), age

[9] The etymologies of these place-names are provided in the corpus in Appendix 1.
[10] See table in Appendix 7.3b.
[11] See maps in Appendices 7.2a and 7.3a.

(*Althorpe*), the local soil (Blackthorpe), and location (Westhorpe, from OE **west** or ON **vestr,** 'west') (*PNNf3*: 85; *PNNf2*: 49; *TIACL*: 45, 176-78, 183-84; *DSPN*: 150). In Essex, the lost *Westropps* is first recorded from the late thirteenth century in both **thorp** and **throp** forms and is similarly derived from OE **west** (probably not ON **vestr** in view of its likely later date of formation) (*PNEss*: 628; *TIACL*: 198). Two Thorplands in Norfolk and a lost *Thorplond* in Suffolk incorporate the word **land** ('land'), which could equally be of OE or ON origin (Fellows-Jensen 2007: 102; *TIACL*: 178-79, 184).

Overall, the **thorp**-names in East Anglia compounded with possible ON non-anthroponymic specifics are too few numerically, too scattered geographically, and too uncertain etymologically to provide any meaningful insight on their own into possible Scandinavian linguistic influence. Six of the ten **thorp** place-names in East Anglia containing OE geographical or topographical specifics were first recorded in post-Conquest documentary sources (a higher proportion than the 20% of those compounded with ON personal names, and the 25% of simplexes), suggesting that they may represent a later stage in the use of the thorp **generic**, when it had passed into late OE as a term for a small, outlying settlement. Significantly, there is a high degree of interchangeability between the **thorps** that today are compounded with geographical or topographical specifics and the simplexes, in that many of the former were originally recorded in simplex form (and therefore discussed in the previous section dealing with simplex **thorps**).

7.5) Linguistic analysis of *thorps* compounded with personal names

The most common single type of specific for the compound **thorps** in East Anglia (and the remainder of the Danelaw) recorded before 1300 are personal names.[12] A large majority are probably or possibly of ON origin; significantly, these are all located in Norfolk or Suffolk, with none recorded in Essex. Several surviving **thorps** (all in Norfolk) contain specifics derived from personal names that are

[12] See table in Appendix 7.3b.

unambiguously ON in origin: Alethorpe (from ON *Áli* or ODan *Āli*), Algarsthorpe (ON *Ásgeirr* or ODan *Ēsgēr*), Flockthorpe (ON *Flōki*), Gasthorpe (ON *Gaddr* or ODan *Gad*), Gunthorpe (ON or ODan *Gunni*), Sculthorpe (ON *Skúli* or ODan *Skūli*), and Swainsthorpe (ON *Sveinn* or ODan *Swēn*). A number of now-lost **thorps** do likewise: *Clachestorp* in Suffolk and *Clakesthorp* in Norfolk (both from ON *Klakkr* or ODan **Klak*); *Clipesthorp* (ON *Klyppr*), *Hardgrimestorp* (**Harðgrímr*), *Appethorp* (ON or ODan *Api*), and Tokethorpe (ON *Tóki* or ODan *Tōki*) in Norfolk; and *Gotesthorpe* (*Gautr*) in Suffolk (*TIACL*: 176-79, 183; *SPNN*; *CDEPN*; *PNNf3*: 23).

A few **thorp** place-names in Norfolk are compounded with personal names that may be of ON origin but are more difficult to assign definitively to any one language. These include Bagthorpe (from ON *Bakki* or OE *Bacca*), Rainthorpe Hall (ON *Hreinn* or OE **Rægen*), Glosthorpe (ON or OE **Glóir*), and the lost *Fotestorp* (ON or OE *Fot* or *Fótr*) [13] (*SPNN*; *TIACL*: 50, 177-78; *CDEPN*: 32; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 54).

Other etymological ambiguities arise with **thorp** place-names compounded with elements deriving from either ON personal names or OE nouns that may constitute topographical specifics. Examples in Norfolk include Besthorpe, Calthorpe and Freethorpe (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 54; *SPNN*; *CDEPN*).[14] Only a small number of **thorps** in East Anglia are compounded with personal names of non-Scandinavian origin, including Broomsthorpe, the lost *Kinesthorpe*, and Edingthorpe in Norfolk, and the lost *Gooderich Thorpe* in Suffolk (*DEPN* 1960: 69; *PNNf3*: 67; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 52; *PNNf2*: 153; *TIACL*: 177, 183; *CDEPN*: 209).

As discussed above, it is significant that very few of the **thorps** incorporating ON personal names were originally recorded in simplex form – unlike the many simplexes which were subsequently compounded with geographical or topographical specifics, usually of OE origin. This fundamental distinction may indeed point to differing circumstances of formation for the two types of **thorp** place-name, as will

[13] Interestingly, *Fotestorp* was apparently renamed in the early thirteenth century as *Fotestone* (a name which survived into the modern era as *Fodderstone*), thus becoming a late 'Grimston-hybrid'. This may reflect an apparent interchangeability between the **thorp** place-names that are compounded with Scandinavian personal names and the similarly-formed 'Grimston-hybrids'.
[14] The uncertain etymologies of these place-names are provided in the corpus in Appendix 1.

be explored further below in terms of their respective geographical and archaeological contexts.

7.6) Geographical and archaeological context

(7.6.1) The geographical context of **thorp**-named settlements in other regions of the Danelaw has been explored elsewhere (Cameron 1970; *SSNY*; *SSNEM*), but little work has so far been done on their geographical distribution and landscape settings specifically in East Anglia. Kenneth Cameron's hypothesis of a 'secondary migration' of settlers from Scandinavia was based mainly around his analysis of **thorps** in the north-east Midlands which suggested that they were generally located in less favourable settings than those of the **bý**-names and Grimston-hybrids (and the earlier OE place-names), and therefore represented a later phase of settlements by immigrants colonising the only vacant land still available in the most marginal areas (Cameron 1970; 1976: 18-22; 1985: 139-43).

This interpretation corresponds to some extent with a GIS-based survey of the soil-types utilised by **torp**-named settlements in Denmark, which has indicated that the Danish **torps** (largely formed during the Viking Age) tended to be sited on more outlying and marginal lands with poorer soils than the older, more established villages with earlier, pre-Viking place-name types located on more favourable soils for arable agriculture (Hedemand *et al.* 2003), thus reinforcing the sense of **thorps** as constituting dependent, low-status and outlying places.

However, the recent analysis in *TIACL* (117-32) of **thorp**-named settlements in England has shown instead that they tended to be located on reasonable agricultural soils, which are, and probably were, not the best available but still able to support a range of arable farming régimes – unlike the **bý**-names which appear to have congregated in areas of poorer grade soils suitable only for dairy farming and rearing. *TIACL* therefore suggested that **thorps** and **býs** performed different economic functions in the early medieval English countryside, and that perhaps it was

the type of farming associated with each that determined the names of the associated settlements, with **thorp** and **bý** becoming mutually exclusive terms. It concluded that the ON **þorp** and OE **þrop** generics both referred to small, outlying settlements for housing the farmworkers required by the new and more efficient method of open-field arable farming which had spread across southern England in the ninth century – an expansion of agricultural innovation which coincided with the first period of Viking settlement in eastern England, where some Scandinavian-speakers also took up this type of farming and adopted the familiar ODan **þorp**-form for naming these settlements (*TIACL*: 135-56). However, this significant and comprehensive re-appraisal of **thorp** place-names did not consider the specific circumstances of their formation in East Anglia, and did not differentiate between the landscape settings of the various linguistic sub-groups of **thorps** formed with different types of specific. These issues will be explored below.

(7.6.2) In comparison with the **bý**-names, **thorp** place-names are widely distributed across East Anglia, although concentrated more in central and north Norfolk. If their locations are mapped according to the types of specific with which they are compounded,[15] it can be seen that the simplex **thorps** (both current and lost) are also widely distributed across Norfolk and Suffolk, but only three are found in Essex. There are fewer **thorps** containing geographical and topographical specifics (mainly of OE origin), concentrated mainly in Norfolk with isolated examples in Suffolk and Essex. More **thorps** are compounded with ON personal names, and the more certain examples of these are concentrated across the claylands of central Norfolk, with only one isolated example located in Suffolk and none in Essex. It may be significant that within central Norfolk, these **thorps** are grouped into two loose clusters, one in an area drained by the upper reaches and tributaries of the Yare and Tas, and the other further north in a broad band stretching west to east around ten to fifteen kilometres from the coast. The more uncertain examples of **thorps** compounded with ON personal names display a similar but slightly wider distribution in Norfolk, with just

[15] As shown on the map in Appendix 7.2a and table in Appendix 7.3b.

one example in north Suffolk. There are only five **thorps** compounded with OE or post-Conquest 'Norman' personal names, scattered loosely across Norfolk and north Suffolk.

(7.6.3) In terms of local topography and proximity to rivers, a clear distinction emerges between the individual locations of the settlements associated with the different linguistic categories of **thorp** if these are mapped according to the scheme outlined in section 5.2.4 for categorising various types of local landscape settings.[16]

Almost a third of the simplex **thorps** are now lost, but nine of the eighteen that can be identified are located away from any rivers or significant surface watercourses, and another nine are located in a river valley. This pattern seems to conform to a wider tendency observed for **thorps** (of all types) to be frequently located away from rivers and streams (*TIACL*: 133). This may reflect their suggested primary agricultural function of providing accommodation for farmworkers in outlying arable fields, circumstances in which proximity to a river or stream was not a prime requirement. It may also reflect the role of **thorp**-named settlements in the late Anglo-Saxon expansion of arable farming, which in East Anglia involved the re-colonisation of the clayland plateaux beyond the principal river valleys which had previously contained the majority of Anglo-Saxon settlements (discussed in sections 5.3.3 and 5.3.4). The identifiable locations of the **thorps** compounded with geographical and topographical specifics, or with OE or post-Conquest personal names, are fewer in number but also divided fairly equally between settings near and away from rivers.

In contrast, a reasonable proportion of the **thorps** that are unambiguously compounded with ON personal names can be accurately located, and it is striking that these are all situated in river valleys (six beside small rivers, and two beside large rivers), and none are found in landscape settings away from rivers or streams. This suggests that the settlements bearing these particular **thorp**-names were not formed as part of the expansion of arable farming onto the higher clayland areas beyond the

[16] See table and maps in Appendices 7.6a, 7.6b and 7.6c.

river valleys, as many of the simplex **thorps** apparently had been. The landscape settings of the **thorps** which are less certainly compounded with ON personal names appear to be more equally divided, with six beside rivers (two in small, and four in large river valleys) and five in non-river settings, and display a wider distribution than the more certain personal-named examples congregated in central Norfolk.

(7.6.4) Geologically, the majority of **thorps** in East Anglia are located across the central raised plateau of boulder clay (particularly in Norfolk),[17] which may reflect their suggested origins as settlements connected with the late Anglo-Saxon extension of arable farming. More specifically, it is possible to discern differing patterns of soil-types associated with particular categories of **thorps** according to the nature (or absence) of their specifics.[18]

The simplex **thorps** are the greatest in number and most widely distributed, and accordingly display a wider range of soil-types adjacent to their individual locations. Fourteen out of a total of twenty-nine are situated wholly or partially on the fertile but heavy and poorly draining clay soils of the Beccles and Hanslope Associations found on the inland clay plateaux of central Norfolk and Suffolk, or on the better-draining Burlingham soils on the slopes of the river valleys that intersect it. Another five are located on the lighter and very fertile soils of the Wick Association in east Norfolk. Six more are situated on the sandy and generally less fertile soils of the Newport Associations found along the Sandlings coastal fringe of Suffolk and in small areas of central Norfolk (although four of these are on the more favourable Newport 2 and 3 variants, and only two on the particularly infertile Newport 4 Association). The **thorps** compounded with geographical and topographical specifics are located on a similar range of soil-types in equivalent proportions.

The **thorps** compounded with ON personal names, however, display a different pattern of distribution in terms of soil-types, reflecting their particular pattern of local landscape settings discussed above. Only one of the thirteen which

[17] See map in Appendix 7.6d.
[18] See map in Appendix 7.6e.

can be accurately located is found on the Beccles soils of the clay plateaux, and just two each are found on the silty Wick and sandy Newport soils. Instead, most are located on the soils found in the upper reaches of river valleys in Norfolk, with six on those of the Burlingham Association and five on the peaty soils of the Isleham Association.[19] The **thorps** which are less certainly compounded with ON personal names display a very similar distribution, with seven of the fourteen identifiable examples located on Burlingham and five on Isleham soils. Once again, only one is located on the Beccles clay soils, and three on the Wick soils and two on the Newports.

Overall, the types of soil on which a majority of the **thorps** of East Anglia are situated are generally well-suited for arable farming and amongst the most favourable soil-types available in the region. For East Anglia at least, this pattern tends to contradict Cameron's (1970) interpretation of **thorps** as being sited in marginal locations by immigrants unable to obtain better land. But it does not fully support the findings of the more recent *TIACL*, either, which concludes that **thorps** were the small, outlying settlements formed specifically to house the farmworkers required by the new methods of open-field arable farming. *TIACL* demonstrates a good correlation at a regional level between the overall distribution of **thorps** (and **throps**) across England and the areas where various forms of open-field farming are known or understood to have been practised (*TIACL*: 142-43, Figure 7.1).

However, *TIACL* (142) acknowledges that there are some anomalies in detail, and it does appear that in East Anglia the distribution of **thorp**-named settlements (with a greater concentration in eastern Norfolk and Suffolk) does not correlate so well with the specific areas that have been characterised as engaged in different forms of open-field agriculture[20] – which are concentrated more in western Norfolk and Suffolk (Roberts and Wrathmell 2002: 142-46, Figure 5.10; Martin and Satchell 2008: 193-213, Figures 16-18, 21, 35). Nevertheless, the abundance of simplex and non-anthroponymic **thorps** on the clay plateaux across Norfolk and Suffolk may well

[19] Some settlements are located on or near more than one soil-type.
[20] Discussed in section 5.3.3 above.

indicate a connection with the extension of arable farming onto these claylands in the ninth and tenth centuries.[21]

The settlements associated with **thorp** place-names containing ON personal names benefitted similarly from the favourable soils of the Burlingham and Isleham Associations, but their local landscape settings in the valleys of the higher reaches of rivers in central Norfolk suggests once again that they may not have been part of the late Anglo-Saxon extension of arable farming onto the interfluvial plateaux beyond the river valleys. In fact, their siting within the river valley systems of Norfolk may indicate an earlier phase of settlement-development, an idea that will be explored below.

(7.6.5) Another clear indicator of the different circumstances of formation for the various types of **thorp** place-names in East Anglia is provided by their parochial status.[22] Of the eighty-five **thorps** recorded in East Anglia before 1300, only forty-one (or 48%) survived and prospered sufficiently to form parishes that survived into the nineteenth century, compared with 92% of the **býs**. But this proportion is higher than the equivalent figure of 28% for the **thorps** in the East Midlands recorded before 1150, and an even lower 7% for those in Yorkshire recorded by 1086 (*TIACL*: 41-43; *SSNEM*: 353-56; *SSNY*: 225-27). This discrepancy clearly indicates differing patterns and circumstances of formation for **thorp**-named settlements, and considerable variations in their long-term status and viability, in different regions of the Danelaw.

Within East Anglia, a clear divergence is noticeable in the territorial boundary shapes of the different categories of **thorps** able to form parishes in their own right, which may help differentiate between the earlier, 'primary' parishes and later, 'secondary' formations (as defined in section 5.3.3 above). This pattern can be readily seen on a map (in Appendix 7.6j) showing the pre-1851 boundaries of parishes in north-east Norfolk. The lost **thorp** place-names in this area which did not evolve into settlements substantial enough to form their own parishes are located inside the

[21] See maps in Appendices 7.6d and 7.6e.
[22] The uses and methods of parochial analysis in this thesis are explained in section 5.2.5 above.

boundaries of other parishes: *Smalesthorpes* within the parish of Hevingham, *Kinesthorpe* within Buxton, *Thorpgate* within Felmingham, *Clakesthorp* within Matlask, and *Boythorp* within Bacton. Some of the **thorps** that did survive to form parishes display particularly irregular boundary shapes, suggesting that they were secondary formations, created with land obtained from other adjoining parishes. Edingthorpe (incorporating a specific derived from an OE personal name) has an unnatural, elongated shape with a pronounced panhandle at its southern end, suggesting it may have been created along with a number of adjoining parishes by breaking away from the ancient minster land of North Walsham at their centre (Williamson 1993: 152). Similarly, the boundary shape of Baconsthorpe (a simplex **thorp** that later incorporated a Norman name) suggests that it may have been formed from land previously belonging to Hempstead to its west, and likewise Thorpe Market (originally a simplex) with land from Southrepps or Roughton. But Saxthorpe, which incorporates an ON personal name, clearly appears to be a primary parish formation that cannot easily be adjoined to another neighbouring parish without creating an unwieldy, awkward new shape; and likewise with Calthorpe, also formed from an ON personal name.

If this analysis is extrapolated across all the **thorps** in East Anglia that formed parishes,[23] the results suggest that eight (or 53%) of the fifteen **thorps** with names probably or possibly containing ON personal names appear to have constituted primary parish formations: Gunthorpe, Saxthorpe, Sculthorpe, Swainsthorpe, Besthorpe, Calthorpe, Freethorpe and Pensthorpe; only four (27%) were apparently secondary formations created with land from other pre-existing parochial territories (Alethorpe, Bagthorpe, Themelthorpe and Ingoldisthorpe); and the remaining three (20%) are uncertain. In contrast, of the twenty-five remaining **thorp**-parishes (encompassing the simplexes, and **thorps** compounded with non-anthroponymic specifics and OE or Norman names), none appear to have formed primary parishes, but twenty (80%) appear to have been created with land from adjoining parishes, and five (20%) are uncertain.

[23] See table, summary and maps in Appendices 7.6f – 7.6j.

As acknowledged in section 5.2.5 above, this type of analysis involves some degree of subjective evaluation, but the results do seem to indicate a differential pattern of possible parochial status and development across the various categories of **thorp** place-names in East Anglia. It appears that most **thorps** which formed parishes did so using land from adjoining parochial units, suggesting that they constituted outlying farms or secondary settlements of other more significant settlements already in existence. Such a model would coincide with the suggested association of most **thorps** with the extension of arable farming in the ninth and tenth centuries, as discussed above. But once again, the **thorps** compounded with ON personal names (those that survived to form parishes) contradict this paradigm with boundary shapes suggesting they were primary parishes which cannot be regarded as outlying or secondary formations to other adjoining parishes. Is it possible, therefore, that these **thorps** represent a different and possibly earlier process of name-formation – perhaps before the **thorp** generic had come to be used specifically in the Danelaw to denote a particular type of outlying settlement associated with arable agriculture? For it is apparent that the anthroponymic **thorps** in East Anglia (and perhaps throughout the Danelaw as well) reflect the much wider use of personal names in forming **torp**-names in Denmark, unlike the Danish **bý**-names, which rarely incorporate personal names.

(7.6.6) The relative economic status of **thorps** in the early medieval period may be gauged to some extent by the evidence of Domesday Book. Overall, around 65% of those in East Anglia recorded before 1300 were associated with vills of sufficient economic significance in the late eleventh century to be recorded in Domesday Book – a considerably lower percentage than the 92% of East Anglian **bý**-names, but rather higher than the corresponding 54% for the **thorps** of the East Midlands (*TIACL*: 20).

In terms of the different linguistic sub-categories of **thorp** within East Anglia, around 73% of the **thorps** probably or possibly compounded with ON personal names are recorded in Domesday Book, compared with 81% of the simplex **thorps**, and much lower figures of between 40% and 44% for the **thorps** compounded with OE or Norman personal names, and with topographical or geographical specifics. However,

these relative figures may to some extent reflect the chronological fact that some **thorps** may have been formed, named or renamed in the post-Conquest period and therefore were not in existence at the time of the Domesday survey, as will be discussed further below.

A more specific measurable indicator of the relative fiscal value of **thorp**-named settlements is provided by Domesday Book's recorded level of assessment for taxation listed for nearly every vill. [24] The overall mean average value of the forty-nine **thorps** in East Anglia whose fiscal assessments can be extrapolated from Domesday Book is 2.33 carucates (or hides in Essex), which is only slightly lower than the equivalent figure of 2.69 for the twenty-four East Anglian **býr**-names recorded in Domesday Book. This close correspondence of average values between **thorps** and **býs** in East Anglia is in contrast to the East Midlands and Yorkshire, where the **thorps** are considerably less valuable than the **býs**, **tūns** or **hāms** (*TIACL*: 41-43; *SSNEM*: 332-41; *SSNY*: 222-24).

The fact that many **thorps** in the Danelaw were abandoned in the later Middle Ages and became lost place-names (such as many of the simplexes in Suffolk) has engendered an interpretation of them as settlements that were marginal from the date of their formation and unsustainable in the long-term (Cameron 1970). But the processes that led to these **thorps** becoming unviable and deserted from the fourteenth century onwards may have been more a manifestation of the specific economic circumstances during the later Middle Ages in the aftermath of the Black Death – whereas in the pre-Conquest period these **thorps** appeared to have constituted thriving and efficient units of arable production, judging by the evidence of their fiscal values recorded in Domesday Book.

[24] The relative fiscal values of the **thorp**-named vills in Domesday Book have been derived from aggregating the sizes (in carurates) of the landholdings of the individual landowners listed for each vill, as indicated on the Domesday Prosopography of Anglo Saxon England (PASE) website – http://pase.ac.uk/domesday/search-online.html ; http://pase.ac.uk/about/methodology/domesday.html (*accessed 12-13.3.2018*).

(7.6.7) The Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence discovered so far relating to settlements associated with the **thorp** place-names of East Anglia is patchy and incomplete, because many of the **thorps** recorded in documentary sources are lost and the precise locations of their deserted village sites unknown. Moreover, the archaeological material pertaining to **thorp**-named settlement sites has been recorded by the archaeological services of three separate counties over many decades, using different and changing methods of collating and displaying data, and so it is difficult to construct a consistent region-wide analysis. Nevertheless, some broad patterns of chronology and development for **thorp**-named settlements are discernible from the available archaeological data, which will be surveyed below by looking at the evidence for each linguistic sub-category of **thorp** in turn.

(7.6.7.1) Archaeological evidence for many of the simplex **thorps** of East Anglia is difficult to obtain, as some of the settlements concerned are now lost and it is difficult to identify and locate several different 'Thorp(e)s' and 'Thorp(e) Halls', especially in Suffolk. But eleven of the thirteen originally simplex **thorps** in Norfolk later acquired compound names that facilitates their identification in the archaeological record today, and from these a discernible chronological pattern of formation and development is apparent.

There is evidence for Early Saxon inhumation cemeteries and other activity in the parishes associated with three originally simplex **thorp**-names (Ashwellthorpe, Gayton Thorpe and Morningthorpe) but, as the cemeteries are all sited some distance away from the specific settlement-sites that gave rise to the **thorp**-names, they cannot therefore be linked directly to them.[25] No finds of Middle Saxon pottery or other artefacts have been located on or near the settlements of any simplex **thorps** in Norfolk, apart from an isolated single Middle Saxon pin found close to the centre of Gayton Thorpe (NHER 29392), which suggests that there were no settlements on these sites in the Middle Saxon, or pre-Viking, period. But significantly, sherds of Late

[25] The so-called 'Morningthorpe' Early Saxon cemetery is located two kilometres from the settlement of Morningthorpe, but is actually adjacent to the deserted medieval settlement of Boyland (discussed in the next chapter).

Saxon pottery have been located near the centres, and close to the churches, of four simplex-**thorp** settlements (Cockthorpe, Gayton Thorpe, Thorpe Market and Thorpe St Andrew: NHER 31583/17749/21267/9644), which indicate origins in the Late Saxon period. More significant evidence of Late Saxon occupation and burials has also been found under and around the current eponymous church of Thorpe St Andrew (NHER 9646).

There is little Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence for the simplex **thorps** in Suffolk as several are now lost, but fieldwalking at Ixworth Thorpe has revealed quantities of Late Saxon Thetford-ware pottery around All Saints' church, but once again no finds have been made of Middle Saxon Ipswich ware. This church is now isolated and the present village of Ixworth (around five hundred metres to the north-east) has produced finds no later than the twelfth century, which suggests a post-Conquest relocation of settlement (SHER IXT009/005;[26] Medieval Settlement Research Group 1993: 50-51; *TIACL*: 94).

Overall, the available archaeological evidence regarding the possible origins of the simplex **thorps** in East Anglia is somewhat limited, but it tends to support the traditional and orthodox interpretation of **thorp** place-names as representing settlements founded during the late Anglo-Saxon period in locations that had not been previously occupied (Cameron 1970; *TIACL*: 85-97).

(7.6.7.2) There are fewer **thorps** in East Anglia compounded with geographical and topographical specifics, and the available archaeological context regarding their possible origins is patchier and more uncertain, but once again the evidence tends to suggest a pattern of settlement-formation in the Late Saxon period, or occasionally later.

Although a Middle Saxon market and settlement-site has been discovered on the present-day parish boundary between Burnham Thorpe and Burnham Market (NHER 28127), it is considerably closer to the latter than the former and so

[26] The archaeological information for this site (and corresponding sections of subsequent chapters dealing with archaeological sites in Suffolk) is derived from the online individually numbered records at https://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk/monuments/search (accessed 28.11.2017 - 1.12.2019).

presumably was unconnected with the formation of Burnham Thorpe. Find-spots of Early Saxon artefacts have been located closer to the present-day site of Burnham Thorpe, but these contain no evidence of Middle Saxon material (NHER 37234/41919), although they, and another find-spot nearby (NHER 58485), do contain sherds of Late Saxon pottery (NHER 1798). This evidence seems consistent with the presence of Early and Middle Saxon settlement and activity in parts of the early territory of Burnham, but not on the site of Burnham Thorpe itself which apparently constitutes a later Anglo-Saxon settlement.

The original settlement-site of Saxlingham Thorpe lies around five hundred metres south of Saxlingham Nethergate, around the ruined church of St Mary's which has been dated to the Late Saxon period. Fieldwalking to the north and north-east of this site has revealed several sherds of Late Saxon Thetford-ware pottery – and one of Ipswich ware – in find-spots that have been identified as the sites of three houses (NHER 10115/19309). The presence of Ipswich ware therefore raises the possibility of Middle Saxon origins for Saxlingham Thorpe (Batcock 1991: 123-27).

The precise location of the lost settlement of Weasenham Thorpe is unknown, but it may be associated with a common-edge hamlet around 200 or 300 metres from Weasenham St Peter and identified on a late sixteenth-century map as Thorpe Common. Fieldwalking evidence indicates this settlement developed in the twelfth century as an offshoot from the Late Saxon village of Weasenham St Peter (Wade-Martins 1980b: 65-70), demonstrating the continuing use of the **thorp** element for naming secondary or subsidiary settlements into the post-Conquest period.

The fairly limited archaeological evidence for settlements associated with the **thorps** compounded with geographical or topographical specifics suggests that they were, like the simplexes, generally formed from the Late Saxon period onwards, although Saxlingham Thorpe remains an exception.

(7.6.7.3) There are only five **thorps** in East Anglia with specifics derived from OE or Norman personal names, of which two have identifiable archaeological remains. The possible site of Baconsthorpe Farm in Shropham hundred has been tentatively identified with the remains of a DMV on the northern outskirts of Attleborough

(NHER 9102/58610). Although no Early and Middle Saxon artefacts were found there, sherds of Late Saxon pottery have been located within one hundred metres of the site, and another find-spot around one kilometre to the north has revealed other Late Saxon pottery and metal objects, including a Viking Thor's hammer (NHER 28618/36681). [27]

Similarly, the lost settlement of Broomsthorpe has been tentatively associated with the site of a DMV (NHER 2373; Cushion and Davison 1997). A possible Early Saxon inhumation cemetery has been identified nearby, which lacks any Middle Saxon finds (NHER 32605). However, some Thetford-ware pottery and a Late Saxon box mount have been located within the present-day village of Broomsthorpe, around three hundred metres from the DMV site (NHER 30196).

There is no archaeological evidence from Edingthorpe to indicate the location or chronology of the original settlement, and *Kinesthorpe*, and *Gooderich Thorpe* in Suffolk are both now-lost settlements. The limited evidence suggests that the **thorps** incorporating OE or Norman personal names were, like the simplex **thorps** and those with geographical or topographical specifics, not formed before the Late Saxon period – but unlike the **thorps** compounded with ON personal names.

(7.6.7.4) All but two of the sixteen **thorps** in East Anglia which are certainly or probably compounded with ON personal names are located in Norfolk. It may be significant that half of these are now-lost settlements, for which no archaeological evidence is available for dating purposes. There is evidence of Early Saxon activity scattered around the parishes of Sculthorpe and Gunthorpe, but a lack of Middle or Late Saxon finds on or near the relevant settlement-sites.

Archaeological evidence has only been found on the settlement-sites of three **thorps** unambiguously compounded with ON personal names. Late Saxon pottery has been located in the current village of Saxthorpe, containing the church of St. Andrew's which has been characterised as 'basically a Late Saxon building' (NHER 36966/6682). This reflects the pattern of settlement seen for the other **thorp**-types

[27] See section 3.8.7 above.

described above, with no Middle Saxon finds to provide evidence for formation before the Late Saxon period.

However, the apparent archaeological context for the two remaining Norfolk **thorps** clearly compounded with ON personal names is different. The location of the lost Algarsthorpe is uncertain, but three possible sites have been suggested: one around the site of the lost St Mary Magdalen chapel, another at Algarsthorpe Farm which retains the settlement-name, and a third at the nearby Church Farm (NHER 9272). There is little evidence of Early Saxon material in the vicinity, but sherds of Middle Saxon pottery have been found at two of these sites: close to Algarsthorpe Farm, and near Church Farm (NHER 9257/13846). This suggests that settlements may have been established at two of the three sites by or during the Middle Saxon period, with a strong possibility that one of these could well have constituted a pre-Viking formation which was later renamed as Algarsthorpe.

There is similar evidence for possible Middle Saxon origins of the settlement that became known as Swainsthorpe. A variety of Early, Middle and Late Saxon objects (including Middle Saxon pottery) have been found on the site of a medieval churchyard attached to the former church of St Mary's that was referred to in 1503 as 'Swainsthorpe old church' and subsequently destroyed during the Reformation. This suggests there may have been a Middle to Late Saxon settlement on or near this site (NHER 9724/9725).

(7.6.7.5) Relevant archaeological evidence is only available for three of the fourteen **thorps** in East Anglia that are less certainly compounded with ON personal names (once again, mainly located in Norfolk), which follow a similar pattern. Calthorpe developed as a linear settlement, with the church of St Margaret's at one end containing some Norman fabric which suggests the presence of an earlier church on the same site (NHER 6721). Fieldwalking two or three hundred metres further along Calthorpe's central street has revealed a sherd of Ipswich ware and several of Late Saxon pottery, which does indeed raise the 'possibility of an earlier origin for this village than superficial study of its "Scandinavian" name suggests' (Davison 1995: 166-68, 181; NHER 29463).

The lost settlement of Rainthorpe has been tentatively linked with the site of a DMV on which the sixteenth-century Rainthorpe Hall was subsequently built. Around three hundred metres away is the site of the lost Rainthorpe Church, where a sherd of Ipswich ware has been found which may once again indicate Middle Saxon origins for the settlement before it became known as Rainthorpe (NHER 10110/10088).

Ingoldsithorpe contains isolated finds of Early Saxon pottery and objects that have been found around the present-day village as well as some Late Saxon pottery, but there are no connecting finds of Middle Saxon pottery that could indicate a longer-term continuity of pre-Viking settlement at the site (NHER 1559/11829/11988).

(7.6.7.6) In summary, the available archaeological dating evidence pertaining to the simplex and non-anthroponymic sub-types of **thorps** in East Anglia indicates a conspicuous lack of Middle Saxon Ipswich-ware pottery on or near the relevant settlement-sites (with the probable exception of Saxlingham Thorpe), whereas many of these sites have produced sherds of Late Saxon Thetford-ware. This suggests a process of settlement-formation in previously unoccupied locations that commenced from the mid- to late-ninth century and continued until the eleventh century or later,[28] conforming to the traditional and orthodox interpretation of the chronology of **thorp**-formation in association with late Anglo-Saxon developments in agriculture (Cameron 1970; *TIACL*: 85-97).

However, this paradigm is not reflected in the archaeological contexts of the **thorps** in East Anglia that are probably or possibly compounded with ON personal names. Archaeological evidence is available for only a few examples of these as many are now lost settlements (which itself is significant), but four of the five which have produced Anglo-Saxon artefacts of any period have generated finds of Ipswich ware on or near their respective settlement-sites. This indicates that these particular

[28] Although the production and use of Thetford ware continued into the twelfth century (see section 3.6.2), a *terminus ante quem* and pre-Conquest origins for most **thorp**-named settlements is established by their mention in Domesday Book.

thorps represent settlements which were probably formed in the Middle-Saxon period and, as their names are fully ON in origin, can only represent the renaming of Anglo-Saxon settlements already in existence before the arrival of Scandinavian-speaking immigrants and settlers.

The fact that a higher proportion of these anthroponymic **thorps** are now lost compared with the other types of **thorp** may possibly reflect a particular use of the **þorp** generic compounded with a personal name to denote an outlying and less significant secondary settlement, as it seems to have been used in Denmark – and as Cameron had originally hypothesised with regard to all **thorps**. So could **þorp** have been used in this particular context to rename existing settlements that had previously constituted outlying and subsidiary portions of earlier larger estates? These tended to be situated along the principal river valleys of central Norfolk where many of the area's earliest and well-established Anglo-Saxon settlements were located, often bearing names incorporating early OE elements such as **hām** and **burh**. For example, three **thorps** probably or possibly compounded with ON personal names (Alethorpe, Pensthorpe and Sculthorpe) are all located around three kilometres from Fakenham, and Besthorpe and Bagthorpe are similarly situated close to Attleborough and Great Bircham, respectively. Perhaps these were outlying territories granted to the eponymous followers of higher-status Viking leaders who had taken over the larger Anglo-Saxon estates, possibly in a process similar to the estate-fragmentation model initially proposed by G.R.J. Jones (1965: 83) to explain how Scandinavian names came to be applied to the appendant hamlets of discrete estates.[29] This hypothesised process may thus have constituted a separate and possibly earlier place-naming pattern[30] from the wider and more mainstream naming of the other types of **thorps** associated more with the colonisation of the claylands.

[29] This model is discussed in section 5.3.7 above.

[30] However, although some settlements bearing **thorp**-names compounded with ON personal names clearly date from the pre-Viking, Middle Saxon period, it is not clear exactly when the process of renaming took place for each of the place-names involved – with only onomastic evidence from the names themselves and limited documentary evidence from written sources, which cannot provide a precise chronology.

(7.6.8) Archaeological evidence has also facilitated the analysis of settlement morphology exhibited by the different types of **thorp**-names in East Anglia. An analysis in *TIACL* of **thorp**-named settlements throughout much of England concluded that, in their earliest phases of development, they tended to adopt regular, linear and compact layouts with rows of similarly-sized individual tofts and crofts arranged along a single village street. This configuration, it has been suggested, reflected the requirements of the agricultural labour force that needed to be accommodated, with little social stratification and a relatively high proportion of tenants holding relatively small amounts of arable land. The linear layouts typical of **thorps** are in contrast to **býr**-named settlements which were often no larger than the **thorps**, but generally had street plans which were more complex and agglomerate in configuration (*TIACL*: 97-109; 136-37).

In East Anglia, however, the overall evidence of settlement morphology is less clear-cut, although it does seem that the simplex **thorps** once again conform to the pattern seen elsewhere in the Danelaw for the **thorps** associated with the expansion of agriculture. Of those with village plans that can be identified, four simplexes clearly have linear layouts containing a single main street (Ashwellthorpe, Cockthorpe, and Thorpe St Andrew in Norfolk, and Ixworth Thorpe in Suffolk), and three may possibly do so (Gaytonthorpe, Morningthorpe and Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe), with around half thus displaying a probable or possible linear morphology. However, it is difficult to discern any meaningful pattern from the village layouts of the remaining **thorps** with compound names. The morphology of most is unclear or unidentifiable, especially those of the now-lost **thorps** whose settlements only survive as DMVs where little investigative archaeology has so far been undertaken. Only six compound **thorps** can be identified as having probably originated with a linear layout formed along a single main street: three with a topographical or geographical specific (Thorpland in Clackclose, and Westhorpe and Easthorpe in Suffolk), two which are possibly compounded with ON personal names (Calthorpe and Bagthorpe), and one with an uncertain specific (Gestingthorpe in Essex). Six of the compound **thorps**, including four formed with ON personal names, display non-linear, agglomerated village plans (Gasthorpe, Saxthorpe, Sculthorpe,

Gunthorpe, Thorpe Abbotts and Ingoldisthorpe), and one (Burnham Thorpe) has a more complex, polyfocal configuration.

It is also apparent from eighteenth-century maps of Norfolk and Suffolk (Faden 1989; Hodskinson 2003; Macnair and Williamson 2010 100-118) that a number of **thorps** were by that time located on the edges of, or close to, the many greens and commons widely found before the enclosures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It appears that settlements had begun to relocate to the edges of greens and commons by the early eleventh century (Rogerson 1995a: 156-62), and some **thorps** mentioned in Domesday Book have been associated with common-edge settlements, such as Honingham Thorpe (Williamson 1993: 169; 2003: 98), or are displayed on Faden's or early Ordnance Survey maps as adjoining, or surrounding, a green or common, such as *Carboistorp* (Shouldham Thorpe), Thorpe Market, Freethorpe and Ixworth Thorpe. In each case, however, there is no archaeological evidence to suggest that the common-edge settlement constituted the original, pre-Conquest site of the **thorp** in question, and these examples may therefore represent post-Conquest expansions or relocations.

The shift of settlements to the edges of commons accelerated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and may lie behind the formation of some common-edge, **thorp**-named hamlets such as Weasenham Thorpe (discussed in section 7.6.7.2 above) and Themelthorpe, which are not mentioned in Domesday Book and more probably datable to the post-Conquest period. There is, therefore, little evidence of any significant chronological overlap between the formation of the majority of **thorps** between the ninth and eleventh centuries, and the process of common-edge drift occurring mainly in the post-Conquest period – when some already-established, pre-Conquest **thorps** may indeed have relocated. But it seems that one significant effect of common-edge drift (which occurred more widely in East Anglia than other regions of the Danelaw) was to radically alter the original, pre-Conquest layouts of a number of **thorp**-named settlements (or cause them to be completely relocated) in such a way that obscured their initial configuration, which may help to explain why a smaller proportion in East Anglia apparently display the typical linear street-plans identified more widely in **thorps** elsewhere.

7.7) Discussion

(7.7.1) Overall, the evidence provided by the **thorps** in East Anglia for the nature and extent of Viking settlement is diverse and complex, indicating varying chronologies and circumstances of formation for the settlements associated with the different types of specifics with which the place-names are sometimes compounded. This section will review the available onomastic evidence for each type of specific, in conjunction with the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements in question, in order to consider the possible dates of formation of the **thorp**-named settlements, as well as the linguistic and ethnic identities of the individuals and communities who named them. It will also examine the broader geographical patterns of distribution for the different types of **thorp** place-names in East Anglia, and compare them with those in other regions of the Danelaw.

(7.7.2) The documentary evidence for the possible chronology of the **thorp**-named settlements in East Anglia is once again somewhat sparse, but it suggests that the **thorp** generic was being used to create place-names by the tenth century and continued in use into the post-Conquest period. Although a smaller proportion (65%) of the **thorp** place-names in East Anglia attested by 1300 were recorded in Domesday Book (compared with 92% of **bý**-names),[31] several **thorps** were apparently mentioned earlier in pre-Conquest documents: Algarsthorpe (*c.* 1050), Ashwellthorpe (*c.* 1050), Calthorpe (1044-47), and *Poketorp* (*c.* 1020-50) in Norfolk; *Redfaresthorpe* (978-1016) and Thorpe Morieux (962-991) in Suffolk; and Gestingthorpe (975-1016) in Essex. Significantly, the three examples from Suffolk and Essex all date from late tenth-century documents (in reliable, post-Conquest copies), seeming to confirm that some **thorp**-named settlements were in existence in the Danelaw by the later tenth century (*TIACL*: 57-58). Traditional place-name analysis would suggest that for each place-name to have become sufficiently established and

[31] See table in Appendix 7.7a.

recognised to be recorded by that time, its formation and origins must lie at least a generation or two earlier, possibly therefore in the early tenth or even late ninth centuries.

The chronology provided by documentary sources reflects the archaeological evidence from pottery finds for many of the **thorp**-named settlements, also indicating that they were formed largely in the Late Saxon period. Two of the anthroponymic **thorps** mentioned in documentary sources earlier than Domesday Book, Calthorpe and Algarsthorpe, are likewise associated with settlement-sites bearing finds of Middle Saxon Ipswich-ware pottery, also indicating earlier origins.

Some of the Scandinavian personal names compounded in the East Anglian **thorps**, however, are unrecorded in Domesday Book or other English documentary sources,[32] suggesting that they were not in common use by later Anglo-Scandinavian and English communities and more likely therefore to have been borne by the original Viking settlers than by indigenous people of the tenth and eleventh centuries emulating Viking fashion (*SSNEM*: 276-86; *SPNLY*: xxix-lxvi; *SPNN*: xxxiii-xli; von Feilitzen 1937:11-33). Two of the **thorps** formed with these rare ON personal names, Rainthorpe and Calthorpe, are associated with settlement-sites that have produced sherds of Ipswich ware, another indicator of relatively early origins. However, there are proportionately fewer such unrecorded Scandinavian names compounded in **thorps** than there are in the less numerous **bý**-names (38% compared with 50% for all possible Scandinavian personal names, and 25% compared with 37% for more certain examples of ON personal names).[33]

As regards the 35% of East Anglian **thorps** attested by 1300 but not recorded in Domesday Book, it is unclear whether these represent settlements that were in existence by the late eleventh century but too insignificant to be recorded in Domesday Book or else were not formed or renamed until the post-Conquest period. Archaeological evidence indicates that the settlements associated with some place-names in **thorp** (such as Weasenham Thorpe, discussed above) did not develop until

[32] See table in Appendix 7.7a.
[33] See tables in Appendices 6.6d and 7.7a.

the twelfth century, suggesting that the **thorp** generic continued to be used long into the post-Conquest period after use of other ON terms such as **býr** had ceased.

(7.7.3) The relevance of place-name specifics in the geographical analysis of the settlement-patterns associated with **thorp** place-names has been largely disregarded by previous scholarship. But this fundamental distinction underlies the circumstances of formation and distribution of the different types of **thorp**-named settlements throughout East Anglia.

In terms of linguistic morphology, it is significant that whereas the **býr** generic is never found in simplex form and rarely displays a change of specific, the use of the **thorp** generic in place-names appears to be both more varied and more unstable. It occurs as a place-name in both simplex form and in compounds that frequently change, especially in the post-Conquest period when many originally simplex formations acquired later compound forms (as discussed in section 7.3; *TIACL*: 59-61). But such interchangeability is not displayed by the **thorp**-names in East Anglia compounded with ON personal names, which nearly all appear as such in their earliest recorded forms. There are just two exceptions in which **thorps** compounded with probable ON personal names are also referred to in Domesday Book in simplex form (Ingoldisthorpe and Swainsthorpe), but no established simplexes subsequently acquired a specific derived from an ON personal name. This difference in name-formation reflects the evidence outlined above that demonstrates how the **thorps** compounded with ON personal names appear in various ways to have been formed under different circumstances from the remaining non-anthroponymic and simplex **thorps**.

Geographically, the **thorps** in East Anglia that probably or possibly contain personal names are concentrated in Norfolk, where they constitute around 55% of all **thorps** recorded before 1086 and 74% of the compound **thorps** (that is, excluding those that were originally simplexes).[34] This reflects the high proportion of personal names in the **thorps** of Denmark (see section 7.1 above), but it is difficult to make

[34] Percentages extrapolated from data presented in Appendix 7.3b.

more specific comparisons with other regions of the Danelaw, where different scholars have used different criteria for identifying personal names compounded in early place-name forms. But it appears that for place-names recorded by 1086, personal-name specifics are commonest in the **thorps** of Yorkshire, less so in those of the East Midlands counties and Norfolk, and least in Northamptonshire.[35] Geographically, this indicates some degree of decreasing intensity of personal-name use in the Danelaw moving from north to south, with Norfolk approximately halfway on this scale, but the gradation is not clear-cut or uniform. Chronologically, the proportion of personal names compounded in **thorps** declined during the post-Conquest period so that the relative proportion in **thorps** first attested by 1300 was lower, although not markedly so (*TIACL*: 47-48).

As discussed in section 7.5 above, nearly all the anthroponymic **thorp** place-names in East Anglia appear to contain specifics derived from ON personal names. Most of these are located in Norfolk, where 86% of the twenty-three anthroponymic **thorps** first recorded by 1086 are probably or possibly derived from ON personal names; the equivalent figure for Suffolk is 100%, albeit with only three examples, and there are no anthroponymic **thorps** in Essex.[36] The equivalent proportions in other regions of the Danelaw have been calculated using different methodologies by other scholars, but once again a geographical gradation of Scandinavian influence decreasing from north to south is broadly but unevenly apparent. The highest proportions of personal-name specifics in compound **thorps** first recorded by 1086 which can be categorised as ON occur in the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire, with figures of 96% and 90% respectively, and the lowest in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire (both 33%).[37] It is surprising that Norfolk appears by this criterion to be amongst the most Scandinavian-influenced of the Danelaw counties, as its

[35] Outside the Danelaw, the percentage of personal-name specifics found in compound **throp***s* is even less (*TIACL*: 64).
[36] Percentages extrapolated from data presented in Appendices 7.3b and 7.7a.
[37] To the south of the Danelaw, the personal-name specifics combined with **throp** place-names are nearly all OE in origin, with no examples that can be definitely identified as ON or Continental (*TIACL*: 64-66).

figure of 86% is higher than Lincolnshire, which displays an equivalent percentage of 75% (*TIACL*: 49-51).

Like the **bý**-names, the personal names compounded in East Anglian **thorp** place-names display an affinity with the naming-practices of the region that became Denmark. During the Viking period, many of these personal names (around 55%) were used more widely in the East Scandinavian than in the West Scandinavian linguistic zone, and often gave rise to cognate **thorp** place-names in Denmark.[38] Examples include *Áli/Āli* (Alethorpe in Norfolk, and Allerup in Denmark), *Klakkr* (*Clachestorp/Clakesthorp*, and Klastrup), and *Tóki/Tōki* (*Toketorp*, and five Tågerups) (*SPNN*: 13, 264, 371-76; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 54; Jørgensen 2008). This evidence supports the hypothesis that the East Scandinavian dialect (or Old Danish) was used more widely than West Scandinavian ('Norwegian') amongst the settlers of Scandinavian origin in East Anglia.

Morphologically, the Scandinavian personal names used to form **thorp** place-names in East Anglia also tend to be monothematic, with only three out of twenty-nine (10%) that can be categorised as dithematic[39] – whereas 28% of the Scandinavian personal names compounded in the **thorps** of the East Midlands are dithematic, as are 26% of those in Yorkshire (*SSNEM*: 92; *SSNY*: 46). As with the anthroponymic **bý**-names of Flegg, the predominant use of monothematic personal names in forming the anthroponymic **thorp**-names of Norfolk may similarly indicate that the settlers or landholders who bore those names were members of a class of ordinary Scandinavian farmers and peasants rather than of the aristocracy. The apparent lower social status of these individuals seems to be reflected in the comparatively less significant status of the settlements to which they gave their names, as discussed above – with relatively smaller parish sizes, and a higher proportion that were subsequently deserted or abandoned, in comparison with the other types of **thorp** in East Anglia. The types of personal names compounded in the anthroponymic **thorps** may thus be consistent with the hypothesis advanced above,

[38] See table in Appendix 7.7a.
[39] See table in Appendix 7.7a.

suggesting they bore the names of lower-status individuals of Scandinavian origin who had been granted the outlying territories of larger old Anglo-Saxon estates which perhaps had been taken over and fragmented by higher-status Viking leaders.

(7.7.4) The **thorps** in East Anglia compounded with nouns and adjectives are fewer in number than the anthroponymic **thorps** and the simplexes, and are not so heavily concentrated in Norfolk as the former but not so widely scattered across East Anglia as the latter.[40] Once again, as with the **bý**-names, there appears to be a significant linguistic contrast between the non-anthroponymic **thorps** and those formed with personal names. Whereas a very high percentage of the anthroponymic **thorps** in East Anglia are probably or possibly compounded with ON personal names (and only a few with OE or Norman names), none of the non-anthroponymic **thorps** contain specifics that are definitely derived from ON nouns and adjectives rather than those of OE origin. Only four are possibly of ON origin, compared with ten which are clearly OE (although this figure includes three derived from nearby OE place-names).[41] This pattern is reflected in the other counties of the southern Danelaw (such as Derbyshire, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire), as well as beyond the Danelaw where all the identifiable nouns and adjectives compounded with **throp** place-names are OE in origin. But it is in contrast to Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, where the proportions of ON specifics in non-anthroponymic **thorps** recorded by 1300 are higher (50% and 51%, respectively). This pattern once again indicates a gradation of Scandinavian linguistic influence which is strongest in the northern Danelaw and decreases moving south, with East Anglia at the lower end of the scale – unlike its relatively higher position in terms of the proportion of ON personal names compounded with **thorp** (*TIACL*: 51-53, 66-68; Fellows-Jensen 2009: 51).

[40] See map in Appendix 7.2a.
[41] See map and table in Appendices 7.2a and 7.3b.

7.8) Conclusion

The diverse origins of the different types of **thorp** place-names in East Anglia are thus clearly reflected in their relative positions within the broader patterns of distribution and Scandinavian influence for **thorps** throughout the Danelaw. Those in East Anglia appear to constitute a geographical cross-over point in the onomastic gradations of Scandinavian linguistic influence outlined above. On the one hand, the greater proportional use of personal-name specifics (especially those of Scandinavian origin) that is apparent in the **thorps** of known areas of intensive Viking settlement such as Yorkshire is seen also in the anthroponymic **thorps** of Norfolk, where there appears to have been a comparatively high concentration of individuals bearing Scandinavian names able (or permitted) to commemorate their names in settlements using the **thorp** generic. On the other hand, the non-anthroponymic **thorps** of East Anglia contain fewer nominal and adjectival specifics of ON origin (if any) than those of the northern Danelaw, revealing another facet of Scandinavian linguistic influence that is markedly less apparent in East Anglia and more akin to that of the other southern Danelaw counties away from the main areas of Scandinavian settlement.

This dichotomy indeed suggests that the anthroponymic and non-anthroponymic **thorps** in East Anglia constitute two distinct types of place-name which were the products of differing circumstances, factors and influences – as has become evident from the comparison of their geographical and archaeological contexts explored above. On the one hand, there is a wide distribution of **thorp**-named settlements across much of the region, often in previously unoccupied locations which can be associated with the recolonisation of the claylands, as part of an expansion of arable farming that has been linked to the formation of a majority of **thorps** elsewhere in the Danelaw.

On the other hand, there is a particular concentration in Norfolk of **thorps** formed with ON personal names which appear not to have been associated with the extension of arable farming onto the claylands. However, they are also sited on

reasonably favourable agricultural land, but in valley locations closer to rivers and older, well-established Anglo-Saxon settlements or estates, suggesting that they may represent an earlier phase of agricultural exploitation and settlement-formation. Furthermore, where the **thorps** in Norfolk bearing ON personal names have formed parishes, a majority appear to have been primary formations – unlike the other types of **thorp**, of which 80% were apparently created using land from adjoining parishes to form outlying farms or secondary settlements. More specifically, the somewhat limited archaeological evidence indicates that settlements associated with the **thorp** place-names incorporating ON personal names tended to have been formed in the Middle Saxon period *before* being renamed by newly-arrived Scandinavian-speaking interlopers. In contrast, nearly all the simplex **thorps** and those incorporating non-anthroponymic specifics appear to constitute settlements formed in the Late Saxon period, *after* the commencement of Viking settlement, but perhaps connected more with an expansion of arable farming into previously unoccupied or under-utilised territories of East Anglia.

This apparent chronological difference between the formation of the **thorps** compounded with ON personal names and the remainder may provide a key to their separate paths of development. It is evident from an analysis of **thorps** throughout the Danelaw that personal-name specifics (especially those of ON origin) were used most widely in **thorps** first recorded by 1086 and then declined in the post-Conquest period (*TIACL*: 47-48). Conversely, as the relative numbers of personal-name specifics declined, the proportion of non-anthroponymic specifics (mainly of OE origin) began to increase, perhaps marking a point when the **thorp** element had passed into Middle English within the territory of the former Danelaw (as **throp** had done outside it) as a term for a minor, outlying settlement that continued to be used throughout the medieval period (Fellows-Jensen 2007: 102).

The varying chronologies for the two types of **thorp** are consistent with the differing origins for both as suggested above. It has been hypothesised that some of the **thorps** incorporating ON personal names may represent pre-Viking settlements that had originally constituted outlying and subsidiary portions of earlier large Anglo-Saxon estates, which had then been granted to lower-status individuals of

Scandinavian origin who used their own personal names to rename them. Such a use of the **þorp** generic reflected its similar use in Denmark, where it was usually compounded with a personal name and tended also to denote a settlement on more outlying or marginal land. But it also coincided with a wider transformation of place-naming practice in late Anglo-Saxon England which saw an increasing use of personal names as specifics.

There is also a notable distinction between the respective formation of the **thorps** and the **bý**-names in East Anglia that are compounded with ON personal names. The anthroponymic **bý**-names have very few counterparts in Denmark, where the **býs** are rarely compounded with personal names. In East Anglia, they are not apparently associated with settlements that were already in existence before any Viking settlers arrived to rename them. Conversely, the anthroponymic **thorps** in England have clear parallels in Denmark, where a majority of **thorps** are compounded with personal names, and the available archaeological evidence indicates that some in East Anglia at least constitute pre-existing Anglo-Saxon settlements which were renamed by Scandinavian-speaking settlers. This might suggest that it was the **thorps** in East Anglia which were first compounded with ON personal names, using a practice already established in Denmark to rename existing, but outlying settlements, and thus perhaps establishing a precedent or fashion which was subsequently emulated by neighbouring Scandinavian-speaking communities who formed the anthroponymic **bý**-names (such as those of Flegg). However, such a hypothesis has to be qualified by the caveat that there are few Danish written records to indicate how many anthroponymic **thorps** were in existence in Denmark during the Viking period which might have served as exemplars for the formation of those in the Danelaw. Some Viking-period personal names do occur in Danish **thorps**, but the majority contain Christian personal names (Fellows-Jensen 2013: 90), indicating a later formation after the conversion of Denmark to Christianity, and perhaps some degree of onomastic influence flowing from England to Denmark rather than vice versa.

As with the **bý**-names, the geographical distribution of the East Anglian **thorps** compounded with ON personal names is concentrated in Norfolk, which may once

again reflect the historical and political circumstances of the short-lived Viking hegemony over East Anglia and the nature of its demise – an idea that will be explored further in Chapter 11. By contrast, a large number of the remaining **thorps** of East Anglia (those that were originally simplexes, or compounded with geographical and topographical specifics of OE origin, or with OE and Norman personal names) appear to have been formed from the late ninth century onwards as new settlements in previously unoccupied, but agriculturally-fertile locations. Such a process could quite possibly have been associated with an extension of arable farming into outlying territories adjacent to existing and established villages, in which the term **thorp** (and **throp** outside the Danelaw) came to denote the particular new type of subsidiary settlement that was formed in this process. In this respect, these East Anglian **thorps** would certainly seem to conform to the hypothesis advanced in *TIACL* (138-48).

But during the post-Conquest period, the term **thorp** began to be used in Middle English alongside its OE cognate **throp** to initially denote 'an agricultural village' and then more widely 'a hamlet, or village'. This later use of the term, without the specific context of the **thorps'** function in arable farming, may have characterised the formation of **thorp** place-names from the twelfth century onwards, including those formed on the edges of commons such as Weasenham Thorpe discussed above.

Overall, it is clear that the **thorps** of East Anglia constitute a diverse group of place-names which share the use of a single ON generic but otherwise display a wide variety of specifics (in addition to their frequent simplex formations) and geographical settings. The **thorps** in East Anglia do indeed demonstrate that there are 'exceptions to rules' (*TIACL*: 156) in the overall hypothesis advanced by *TIACL*, with a fundamental distinction between the majority of **thorps** that were apparently formed as part of an expansion of arable farming and a sizeable minority compounded with ON personal names which, as has been demonstrated, have different origins. Nevertheless, it is clear that during the late Anglo-Saxon period both categories of **thorp** broadly retained the generic's sense of being small, outlying settlements that were dependent on larger, more significant places – although the

nature or circumstances of such dependency differed significantly between the two types.

Chapter Eight:

PLACE-NAMES CONTAINING OTHER SCANDINAVIAN AND SCANDINAVIANISED GENERICS

8.1) Introduction

This chapter will analyse linguistically the place-names in East Anglia containing Scandinavian-influenced generics other than **býr** or **þorp** and, where possible, examine the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with them. It will look first at the third ON habitative generic that is quite widely used in East Anglia, **toft**, and then examine the place-names containing generics derived from ON topographical terms – looking in turn at those associated with woods, trees and clearing, which are found widely in the region, and those associated with other landscape features, which are not.

8.2) Place-names in *-toft*

(8.2.1) After **býr** and **þorp**, the next most commonly used habitative generic of Scandinavian origin in English place-names is **toft**, which has so far received little academic attention, with just two articles in the past seventy years surveying its use and distribution in Britain (Gammeltoft 2001; 2003) and only passing references in other books and articles dealing with Scandinavian-influenced place-names in England (such as *SSNEM*: 137-39, 148-50, 257).

The **toft** element is derived from an original Proto-Norse form ***tumfti** that became **toft** in ODan, meaning 'a piece of land in a village taken out of the communal land for settlement', and **topt** in Old West Norse, 'a site, place on which a building

may be, or has been, erected'. The term is found widely in place-names throughout Scandinavia and all the former territories of Viking colonial activity, with over 1,500 recorded. Settlements in Scandinavia bearing a **toft**-name are typically of a secondary nature, often single farms or small groups of farms, and the usually insignificant status of the settlements denoted by the **toft** element was transferred with its use into Britain (Gammeltoft 2003: 17-21).

The ODan **toft**-form became established as a place-name generic in the Danelaw during the pre-Conquest period of Viking settlement. It is one of the earliest known ON words to be borrowed into the English language, as indicated by the use of the OE plural ending **-as** or ME **-es** in the plural forms of several **tofts** in Norfolk recorded in Domesday Book as originally simplex names – as opposed to the original ON **ir**-plural ending found in **toft**-named settlements in the Hebrides such as Steinatotair (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 56; Gammeltoft 2003: 47).

In time, it appears that the **toft** element had acquired two different meanings, referring both to 'a homestead, the site of a house and its outbuildings', but signifying also 'a field or piece of land larger than the site of a house' (*SSNEM*: 138; Gammeltoft 2003: 44; *EPNE*: 2.182-83; *OED*: s.v. toft). In Norfolk, the term **toft** entered the local dialect in the medieval period and acquired a technical legal meaning in the context of manorial administration that designated a portion of land assigned to a named tenant which entailed certain responsibilities (Turville-Petre 1995). This breadth of meaning for **toft** created a denotational ambiguity in the medieval use of the term, allowing it to mean either 'a settlement' or 'a field' in different contexts. This may explain the parallel use of **toft** in place-names in Domesday Book for settlements or vills that were presumably of some economic significance, and also its frequent and continuing use into the later medieval period as a generic of field-names, which has often made it difficult to determine whether a name in -**toft** was originally a settlement place-name or a field-name.

(8.2.2) Around forty **toft**-names have so far been identified in East Anglia, with eleven recorded in Domesday Book, nine in the names of settlements that became parishes, and another thirty or so in minor or field-names (Gammeltoft 2003: 50-63;

Boulton and Briggs 2017: 38-39).[1] The individual figures of twenty-three recorded in Norfolk, seventeen in Suffolk and three in Essex are considerably lower than the seventy-six of Yorkshire and ninety of Lincolnshire, but comparable with the twenty of Leicestershire and thirteen of Cambridgeshire, and the remaining counties of the former Danelaw with less than ten each – a pattern which broadly reflects the distribution of **thorp**-names across the Danelaw (Gammeltoft 2003).

However, these figures encompass all names in **toft**, including a large number of field-names first recorded in the later medieval period long after the **toft** element had become established in the English language, as discussed above. Many of them are also unlocated and so cannot be examined in their geographical context alongside the other Scandinavian-influenced place-names explored in this chapter. The next section will therefore analyse linguistically only those **tofts** that can be regarded as certain or probable place-names of settlements by virtue of their inclusion in Domesday Book or other documentary source dating from the twelfth century or earlier.

(8.2.3) The thirteen East Anglian **tofts** which can be regarded as probable early place-names are mainly scattered across central Norfolk, with isolated outliers in Suffolk.[2] As with the **thorps**, they are first recorded in either simplex form or compounded with other nouns, adjectives, names or other place-names. Four **tofts** in Norfolk are recorded in Domesday Book as simplex names, and only subsequently acquired the compound forms by which they are known today: Bircham Tofts, Toft Monks, Toftrees, and West Tofts. A fifth, apparently recorded as a simplex *Tofstes* in Domesday Book, eventually became known as Rockland St Peter (*CDEPN*: 620-21; *DEPN*: 44, 476; Gammeltoft 2003: 50-52). It is significant that all these simplex **toft**-names were originally recorded in plural form (albeit often with corrupted spellings in Domesday Book), using the Middle English *-es* plural ending as discussed above. It

[1] See table in Appendix 8.2a.
[2] See table in Appendix 8.2a and map in Appendix 8.2b.

has been suggested that they each denoted a collection of building-plots which presumably constituted the new settlement (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 56).

The remaining six East Anglian **tofts** that can be regarded as place-names are in compound form, with five containing specifics generally considered to be of Scandinavian origin which are recorded early enough to be likely formations dating from the period of Viking settlement. The specific of Lowestoft is derived from the comparatively rare ON personal name *Hloðvér* (*DSPN*: 93; *CDEPN*: 384). The lost *Hundestoft* in south-east Suffolk has been derived from ON **hundr** or OE **hund** ('hound' or 'dog'), or a derivative ON by-name *Hundr* (*SPNLY*: 144; Fellows-Jensen 1999: 56; *EPNE*: 1.268; Arnott 1946: 69). Similarly, *Grisetoft*, a lost settlement near Rougham in Suffolk, has been derived from the Middle English form, **grĭs**, of the ON noun **gríss** ('young pig'), or the ODan by-name *Grīs*, (Boulton & Briggs 2017: 38; *SPNN*: 148-49). It may be significant that *Grisetoft* was referred to in the twelfth-century Kalendar of Abbot Samson of Bury St Edmunds as 'Grisetoft that is called Little Barton'.[3] This suggests a process of renaming may have been in progress, indicating an element of instability in place-names incorporating the **toft** generic similar to that displayed by many **thorp**-names, as discussed in Chapter 7. It is significant also that no OE personal names are compounded in East Anglian **toft**-names that were formed early enough or acquired sufficient importance to be included in Domesday Book, although a greater number appear in later medieval field-names in **toft**. However, Horningtoft in Norfolk is an early compounded **toft**-name apparently derived from the genitive plural form *Horninga* of an OE folk-name **Horningas* (*CDEPN*: 316).

The specifics in the two remaining probable East Anglian **toft** place-names are ON nouns. A lost *Mortoft* in Norfolk is derived from ON **mór** or OE **mōr**, probably in the sense of 'marshland' in its locational context, and a lost and unlocated *Scarftoft* in Norfolk has been derived from ON **skor**, 'opening or depression' (*PNNf3*: 86; Fellows-Jensen 1999:56; *EPNE*: 2.42; *EPNE*: 2.126). Once again, it is significant that no nouns of certain OE origin are found in the earlier-recorded **toft**-names.

[3] '*Grisetoft q[ue] dicitur parva Bertone'* (Davis 1954: 3, 18-19).

(8.2.4) The geographical and archaeological contexts of **toft**-named settlements have not been examined systematically in previous analyses of the use of the **toft** generic, which have focussed more on their linguistic interpretation (*SSNEM*: 137-39, 148-50, 257; Gammeltoft 2003).

In East Anglia, the thirteen **tofts** which can be regarded as settlement-names are considerably fewer in number than the **thorps** or **bý**-names, but a distribution pattern is nevertheless discernible. There is a concentration of **toft**-named settlements (especially those originating as simplex names) across the western side of Norfolk – but these do not coincide exactly with the largest concentration of **thorp**-names in central Norfolk, with which the **tofts** otherwise have much linguistically in common.[4] The remaining **toft** place-names are scattered more widely across the region, but there are none in Essex.

As regards local topography and proximity to rivers, there is a tendency for the **tofts** to be located away from any rivers or significant watercourses,[5] mainly on the central raised plateau of boulder clay which stretches across much of inland East Anglia.[6] Unlike the **thorps**, however, the concentration of **tofts** in western Norfolk has resulted in fewer being located on the fertile clays found further east, and more on the poorer acidic, sandy soils of the Barrow and Worlington Associations – although three (Toftrees, West Tofts and *Tofstes*) are also partially located on the more fertile valley soils of the Burlingham and Isleham Associations, and the Ollerton sandy loams.[7] In Suffolk, Lowestoft is similarly sited more favourably on the fertile soils of the Wick Association, whereas *Hundestoft* is located on the infertile, acidic soils of the Newport 4 Association. It is difficult to construct any meaningful overall pattern of settlement from such a small sample of locatable examples.

The parochial status of the **tofts** in East Anglia is similarly inconclusive. Of the thirteen attested by the twelfth century, nine either became lost settlements or were subsumed into parishes bearing different names, and only four (31%) became

[4] See maps in Appendices 8.2b and 7.2a.
[5] See map in Appendix 8.2c.
[6] See map in Appendix 8.2d.
[7] See map in Appendix 8.2e.

significant enough to have formed parishes in their own name that survived until the nineteenth century: Toft Monks, Toftrees, Horningtoft and Lowestoft.[8] These parishes were all of a comparable size to their parochial neighbours, and their territorial boundary shapes all appear to indicate that they constituted primary parish formations. Indeed, Lowestoft contains a promontorial bulge on its northern edge, perhaps enclosing the former settlement of Akethorpe which was subsumed into the township during the later medieval period. Toft Monks, located on the upland to the south of the Broadland area, possessed several detached parochial outliers on the reclaimed marshes of the Halvergate 'triangle' (Williamson 1997: 43-47).

Ten of the thirteen **toft**-names attested in East Anglia by the twelfth century that can be regarded as settlement-names were associated with vills of sufficient economic significance to be recorded in Domesday Book, constituting a percentage of 77% that lies between the equivalent 65% of **thorps** (recorded before 1300) and 92% of **bý**-names. The mean average value of the ten **toft**-names in East Anglia whose fiscal assessments can be extrapolated is 2.70 carucates, a figure close to the equivalent 2.69 for the **bý**-names in East Anglia and 2.33 for the **thorps**. The average fiscal value for **tofts**, however, is derived from a wider range of individual values, from six carucates to as little as half a carucate.

The archaeological evidence for the **toft**-named settlements, which mainly comes from Norfolk, remains incomplete and inconclusive. The settlement which became known as Horningtoft was established in the Middle Saxon period, with finds of Ipswich ware pottery close to the village church (NHER 11358). Finds of Late Saxon pottery at another site near the church indicate that the proto-Horningtoft settlement continued to develop and expand into the Late Saxon period (NHER 7177/59595; Wade-Martins 1980b: 24-28). Evidently, the pre-Viking settlement was renamed in the late Anglo-Saxon period to incorporate the ON **toft** generic, before being recorded in such form in Domesday Book.

The settlement described as *Tofstes* in Domesday Book (now Rockland St Peter) may also have Middle Saxon origins, with finds of Middle Saxon pottery around

[8] See map in Appendix 8.2f.

300 metres from the eponymous church (NHER 36655). At West Tofts, in contrast, fieldwalking surveys have revealed the presence of only Late Saxon pottery at two locations near St Mary's church, perhaps indicative of the settlement's formation in the Late Saxon period (NHER 5149/5156/36203/37248). Similarly, Late Saxon pottery, but no Ipswich ware, has been found at Toftrees close to All Saints' church (NHER 2370/2355).

As with the **thorps**, the available archaeological evidence thus indicates that some **toft**-names are associated with settlements in existence before the period of Scandinavian linguistic influence, while others may have been formed after the commencement of Viking settlement. Unlike the majority of **thorps**, however, there appears to be no common overall pattern of site-selection.

(8.2.5) Although Yorkshire and Lincolnshire contain a larger number of **tofts**, only five in each county are recorded in Domesday Book or an earlier source, compared with a much higher proportion of seven out of thirty-three **tofts** in Norfolk and four out of seventeen in Suffolk.[9] This may indicate a possible earlier and wider pre-Conquest use of **toft** as a place-name generic in East Anglia than in other counties of the former Danelaw. Their distribution tends to follow the general pattern of linguistic influence displayed in other types of Scandinavian place-names, with most in Norfolk, a few in Suffolk and none in Essex.[10] This pattern suggests that the word **toft** may have been used in East Anglia as a place-name generic in those areas subject to greater Scandinavian linguistic influence before it entered the English language and became used more widely.

More fundamentally, the use of **toft** as a place-name generic in East Anglia is strikingly similar in several ways to that of **thorp**. Both are frequently recorded initially in simplex form, and the simplex **tofts** and **thorps** of Norfolk tended to acquire later affixes and survive, whereas those of Suffolk did not and are all now lost. The earlier recorded compound **tofts** and **thorps** also tended to be formed more with

[9] See table in Appendix 8.2a.
[10] See map in Appendix 8.2b.

specifics of ON rather than OE origin. However, both terms entered the local dialect of English and continued to be used (with predominantly English specifics) into the later medieval period, a development that has masked an earlier pattern of more Scandinavian-influenced usage. Medieval **thorp** place-names tended to be unstable and were liable to renaming; the above-cited example of 'Grisetoft that is called Little Barton' suggests that this may have been a characteristic of **toft** place-names too.

Geographically, the **tofts** in East Anglia are also similar to the **thorps** in forming settlements which appear to have been usually small, secondary sites of insignificant status which often did not form parishes in their own right (Lowestoft only developed into a major town later in the medieval period), and are also located on a variety of landscape settings. But unlike the frequent siting of **thorps** in previously unoccupied locations suitable for arable farming, there appears to be no common locational factor for the **tofts**. Also unlike the anthroponymic **thorps** which were located mainly in central Norfolk, the few **tofts** compounded with ON personal names are all located in Suffolk, and so the lack of anthroponymic **tofts** (formed by the twelfth century) in Norfolk is striking. However, the total number of **toft**-named settlements in East Anglia is small (unlike the later abundance of **toft** field-names), and it is difficult to construct a meaningful pattern from so few examples.

8.3) Other ON habitative generics

Beyond the **bý**-, **thorp**- and **toft**-names discussed above, there are very few place-names in East Anglia that incorporate other habitative generics of Scandinavian origin, reflecting a similar pattern in the East Midlands. There is a much larger number of place-names in Yorkshire and north-west England containing other habitative elements, but these mainly denote temporary dwellings or shelters associated with a pastoral economy in a mountainous region (*SSNY*: 72-76, *SSNEM*: 136-39, *SSNNW*: 44-51).

There are only two isolated examples of place-names in East Anglia containing ON habitative elements other than **býr**, **thorp** or **toft**. One is Scole in south Norfolk, derived from the plural form **scales** of the ON noun **skáli**, used as a simplex name meaning 'the sheds'. The other is Forncett in Norfolk (a name now surviving in the present-day villages of Forncett St Peter, Forncett St Mary and Forncett End), which may contain the ON personal name *Forni* and the ON noun **sǣti**, meaning 'Forni's residence', but alternative etymologies have been suggested (*CDEPN*: 236, 531). It is difficult to draw any conclusions from such a small and uncertain sample, but the broader absence of ON habitative elements other than the relatively abundant **býs**, **thorps** and **tofts** does indicate a clear toponymic pattern which engendered the frequent use of some ON habitative elements and near-complete avoidance of others.

8.4) Place-names containing ON topographical generics

(8.4.1) There are around fifty-five place-names scattered across East Anglia that may be classified as containing ON topographical generics (although several have uncertain etymologies),[11] which is considerably less than the number compounded with ON habitative elements. This figure is proportionately similar to the 121 Scandinavian-influenced topographical place-names identified in the counties of the East Midlands, but comparatively fewer than the 583 found in north-west England (*SSNEM*: 136-43; *SSNNW*: 74-75). The ON topographical generics compounded in the place-names of East Anglia can be categorised into two main groups according to the landscape features with which they are associated: arboreal elements referring in some way to woods, trees, other vegetation, and clearings; and the remaining non-arboreal elements relating to hills and valleys, land and fields, water in the landscape, coastline features, and man-made features. These sub-categories are examined in turn below, but only the place-names recorded by the thirteenth century are discussed, as a large number of minor and field-names first recorded in the later

[11] See table and maps in Appendices 8.4.1a, 8.4.1b and 8.4.1c.

medieval period also contain ON topographical elements which had by then entered the English language.

(8.4.2) The most abundant category of ON generics compounded in East Anglian place-names are those associated in some way with woods, trees, and other types of vegetation. These may hold a particular significance in the pre-Christian ideology of Viking settlement, as the proportion of ON arboreal generics is higher than that of the equivalent OE topographical generics (discussed in section 4.3.2 above).

As with the equivalent OE terms, there are several ON elements denoting different types and sizes of woodland, of which the commonest in East Anglia is **lundr**. The element is usually understood to mean 'a small wood or grove', and it has been argued that in England the term was used primarily in place-names to denote a purely topographical meaning (*LPN*: 242). But the sense of a 'sacred grove, one offering sanctuary' has been discerned also in its use in early written sources (*EPNE*: 2.27-28), and this meaning appears to be reflected in the geographical and archaeological contexts of some East Anglian place-names in **lundr**, as will be explored below. Unlike many other frequently-used ON generics, **lundr** did not enter the English language but it was often represented by **-land** in later spellings of the place-names that contained the term.

Apart from the simplex Lound in north-east Suffolk, the remaining East Anglian place-names in **lundr** were all originally recorded in compound formation. Two in Norfolk are believed to be compounded with personal names: Boyland Hall, containing the Old German *Boia*, and Wayland Wood, from the ODan *Waghn*, anglicised as *Wayn*. Rather than providing a settlement-name, Wayland may have referred to the meeting-place for the hundred of the same name (*PNNf2*: 138, 178; Sandred 1994: 272-73; Anderson 1934: 77; Arngart 1980: 57). Rockland All Saints and Rockland St Mary in Norfolk both contain **lundr** compounded with ON **hrókr** ('rook') or ON **hróki** ('small hill'), with saints' names affixed later to differentiate them (*CDEPN*: 620-21). Although there are only a few East Anglian examples of early-recorded compounded place-names in **lundr**, it may be significant that, like the **toft**-names, they are nearly all formed with specifics of ON or continental origin rather

than English ones. The only **lundr**-name recorded before the thirteenth century that is compounded with a non-Scandinavian element is Shrubland Hall in Suffolk, from OE***scrubb** or **scrybb**, 'shrub' (Briggs, forthcoming).

Another commonly used ON element for woodland is **skógr**, a cognate of the OE **sceaga**, meaning 'wood'. Unlike **lundr**, its meaning lacks any discernible religious connotations and the term does not appear to have been used in the name of settlements with any special administrative status. The term briefly entered the English language as **scogh** (although it ceased to be recorded in written sources after 1420), and this may have facilitated its later-medieval use as a minor name by English speakers (*LPN*: 248-49; *OED*: s.v. scogh). The element is found frequently in northern England but hardly at all in the East Midlands (*SSNY*: 79, *SSNEM*: 141, *SSNNW*: 87), and only three East Anglian examples are recorded that may be regarded as settlement names (all in east Norfolk): *Sco*, the simplex name of a lost hamlet in West Flegg; Haddiscoe, compounded with the ON personal name *Haddr*; and Sco Ruston, in which the 'Sco' element was affixed in the thirteenth century to the *Ristuna* recorded in Domesday Book (*PNNf2*: 60, 89, 189-90; *CDEPN*: 269).

Other isolated place-names scattered across East Anglia incorporate different ON generics denoting individual trees or types of vegetation. These reflect an established Anglo-Saxon tradition of using the species of trees to name specific individual examples or groups of trees, which were often significant landscape features serving as markers for settlements, meeting-places or boundaries (Hooke 2010: 165-274). However, it should be noted that a place-name derived from a word describing an individual tree suggests a landscape sufficiently lacking in trees for the one specified to be conspicuous – in contrast to place-names containing words referring to multiple trees, woods or clearances.

Eyke in Suffolk is a simplex name derived from the singular form of the early ODan noun **eik** ('oak') and may have referred to a single oak tree that served as an identifying marker in the landscape (*DSPN*: 50; Briggs, forthcoming; Gelling 1992: 62-63; *EPNE*: 1.149). Matlask in Norfolk contains the ON **askr** ('ash-tree') in place of the cognate OE **æsc**, with an OE specific **mæðel** ('speech, or moot'), suggesting that this was probably the meeting-place of the North Erpingham hundred in which it is

located (*PNNf3*: 23; *CDEPN*: 403). The use of an ash-tree for a meeting place may possibly reflect the sacred connotations of the species (as discussed in section 6.5.4).

Other examples (all recorded in Domesday Book) are more uncertain, containing elements that could either be of ON origin or their OE cognate equivalents: Bracon Ash in Norfolk (from a hypothesised ON noun ***brakni**, an ODan form ***brækni**, or an OE cognate ***bræcen**, 'bracken'); Thurne in Norfolk (ON **þyrnir** or OE **þyrne**, 'thorn-bush'); Moze (Hall) in Essex (ON **mosi** or OE **mos**, 'moss, lichen', or 'a bog or swamp'); and Stoven in Suffolk (**stofn**, identical in both ON and OE forms, 'a shoot from a tree', or 'tree-stump') (*CDEPN*; *DSPN*: 130; *EPNE*; *VEPN2*: 4-5; Coates 2005: 42-43; *LPN*: 60-61).

Geographically, the East Anglian place-names probably or possibly compounded with ON arboreal generics are concentrated mainly in south and east Norfolk, with none in the north-west of Norfolk, and only five scattered across Suffolk and just one possible example in Essex.[12] Nine of the fourteen locatable place-names in this category are situated on river valleys or beside an estuary, whilst four are located on land away from any rivers or significant watercourses, and one is uncertain.[13] A majority are also sited on agriculturally favourable soil-types,[14] with only three (Rockland All Saints, Eyke, and Moze in Essex) located on less favourable soils. This evidence suggests that the settlements bearing these particular types of Scandinavian-influenced name tended not to be located in more marginal and previously unoccupied woodland territory with poorer soils, as has sometimes been assumed. Moreover, those with place-names referring to a single tree are in any case indicative of largely treeless landscapes, which presumably had been cleared long before the arrival of Scandinavian-speaking settlers.

The parochial status of these place-names similarly indicates a relative degree of prosperity, as ten of the fourteen attested by the thirteenth century (71%) became significant enough to form parishes in their own name that survived into the

[12] See map in Appendix 8.4.1b.
[13] See map in Appendix 8.4.2a.
[14] See map in Appendix 8.4.2c.

nineteenth century; only Boyland, Shrubland, *Sco* and Sco Ruston did not.[15] The 71% that formed parishes is less than the 92% of **bý**-names, but considerably more than the 48% of **thorps** recorded before 1300 and 31% of **tofts**. Four of these parishes (Thurne, Matlask, Bracon Ash and Stoven) were relatively small compared with their immediate neighbours, and their irregular boundary-shapes suggest they may have been formed with land taken from adjoining parishes. Lound and the two separate parishes of Rockland (which subsequently became Rockland All Saints and Rockland St Mary) were all larger, but it is difficult to determine from their boundary-shapes whether they constituted primary parish formations. Haddiscoe clearly did so, with a northern portion being subsequently detached to form the separate parish of Thorpe-next-Haddiscoe. The relatively large parish of Eyke was apparently created from part of the originally more extensive parish of Rendlesham, associated with the earlier Anglo-Saxon royal estate of the same name. It seems therefore that the ON name of Eyke ('oak') was used to rename the portion of the old Rendlesham estate that contained an earlier large minster church, on the ruins of which was built the smaller All Saints' church in the twelfth century (Warner 1996: 116-18; SHER EKE 006).

Twelve of the fourteen East Anglian place-names containing ON arboreal generics attested by the thirteenth century were associated with vills of sufficient significance to be recorded in Domesday Book, constituting a percentage (86%) very nearly as high as that of the **bý**-names (92%). The mean average fiscal values of these vills as recorded in Domesday Book is 2.77 carucates (once again, a figure very close to the averages for the other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names), but their individual fiscal values vary considerably, from 7.53 carucates to as little as 0.13.

The archaeological evidence for the settlements associated with place-names containing ON arboreal generics is variable, with more material available relating to place-names incorporating the **lundr** generic. Boyland, which survives today only as a DMV, is located 700 metres from a Roman settlement-site (NHER 10168/10178) and within 150 metres of the 'Morningthorpe' Early Saxon cemetery (NHER 1120) –

[15] See map in Appendix 8.4.2d.

so-called because of its location within the parish of Morningthorpe, although it is actually situated around two kilometres from the original site of the eponymous **thorp**-named settlement (discussed in section 7.6.7.1 above). The cemetery contains around 365 Early Saxon inhumations and cremations, but no later Anglo-Saxon material. But a find-spot (NHER 13955) around 100 metres from the cemetery and 200 from the Boyland DMV site has produced sherds of pottery from the Roman period and some which have been identified as probably Early Saxon and others as Late Saxon. This may suggest some degree of settlement-continuity from the Roman until the Late Saxon period (although the absence of Ipswich ware suggests a possible Middle Saxon lacuna), when the Boyland name was probably first used. The proximity of Boyland to the Early Saxon cemetery and presumably an adjacent wood may provide a context for the use of the **lundr** element with the sense of a 'sacred grove'.

Similarly, the name of Wayland was applied to an ancient wood in which significant archaeological evidence of prehistoric activity and a probable Iron Age settlement has been found, as well as medieval boundaries and enclosures (NHER 39524/36300). Although Domesday Book records no vill associated with Wayland, its location may have held an enduring sacred significance that was reflected in its use as a meeting place which provided a name for Wayland hundred.

The Rockland-named settlement that subsequently became Rockland All Saints is also sited in a locality that has produced an abundance of Roman artefacts and a probable Roman settlement, on which a large Early Saxon cemetery and Middle Saxon settlement were subsequently established (NHER 34984). The name Rockland may therefore have also applied to a settlement close to a wood which possibly held some sacred connotations deriving from its proximity to the cemetery.

There is little archaeological evidence for the other settlements associated with place-names containing ON generics associated with woods and trees (but excluding clearings, dealt with separately below), and so the evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia provided by this disparate group of place-names is inconclusive. But they generally appear to be associated with settlements that were established in favourable agricultural locations and often acquired a higher status than other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names such as some categories of

thorp, with more becoming parishes in their own right and more recorded as vills in Domesday Book.

Overall, it appears that the arboreal references in these place-names were used more with the sense of topographical landmarks that could help identify the settlements in question rather than functional terms describing the utilisation of the eponymous woods and trees. The arboreal generics do not, therefore, appear to be associated with the colonisation of newly exploited woodland territory, as has sometimes been suggested.

(8.4.3) But the place-names containing the **thwaite** generic present a different picture, as the term refers to the absence or removal of trees and woodland rather than their presence. The original Scandinavian word **þveit** was widely used in both East and West Scandinavian dialects of ON, apparently bearing two different meanings of 'an angular cut or slit made to fell a tree' and 'cleared land', perhaps with a sense-development from a 'felled tree' to 'a clearing'. It has been suggested that an OE counterpart of ON **þveit** was ***þwāt**, which survived into modern English as **twat** or **twot** and acquired sexual or vulgar connotations at an early date that resulted in its subsequent exclusion from literary sources (Markey 1978: 50). The cognate ON term **þveit** began to be used in England in the ninth century apparently to denote either woodland clearings or settlements established in them, or both. It entered the English language as **thwaite**, meaning 'a piece of ground cleared from forest' and has survived as a dialect word of modern English in north-west England, but not in the East Midlands or East Anglia (Sandred 1990: 1-2; Fellows-Jensen 1998; *LPN*: 249-50;. *OED*: s.v. thwaite). This reflects the term's pattern of distribution in settlement-names, with over 200 identified in north-west England and the western side of Yorkshire, but only four in the East Riding of Yorkshire, five in the East Midland counties, and eight in East Anglia (*SSNEM*: 141-43; Fellows-Jensen 1998: 103). Although the majority of place-names in **-þveit** are located in areas of northern England subject to West Scandinavian linguistic influence, it seems fairly clear that south of the Humber the **þveit**-names owe their origins to settlers who originated from the region that became Denmark (Sandred 1990: 6-7; Fellows-Jensen 1998: 101-02).

Several hundred field-names containing the **thwaite** generic have also been recorded throughout the Danelaw, including seventeen in Norfolk (Fellows-Jensen 1998: 101; Sandred 1990: 4-6). These are referred to below where relevant but otherwise excluded from this study's discussion and statistical analysis.

Throughout most of the Danelaw, very few of the settlement-names in **-þveit** are recorded in early sources, with only five out of seventy-nine in Yorkshire recorded in Domesday Book (Fellows-Jensen 1998: 102-03). This compares with a far higher proportion in East Anglia of four out of eight recorded in Domesday Book (and one in an earlier Anglo-Saxon charter) that may suggest a possible earlier use of the **þveit** element – as with place-names in **toft**. Unlike the **toft** generic, however, the Middle English word **thwaite** appears to have dropped out of use early in East Anglia, with later-medieval scribes apparently unable or unwilling to recognise the term in the place-names concerned (possibly because of the vulgar use of its OE cognate) and substituting other generics instead, such as **wīc** in Crostwick and Guestwick (Lindkvist 1912: 101).

As with the **thorp** and **toft** elements, the East Anglian place-names in **-þveit** were originally recorded in both simplex and compound forms.[16] Three were originally simplex names:[17] Thwaite and Thwaite St Mary in Norfolk, and Thwaite in north Suffolk (*CDEPN*: 616; Sandred 1990: 3-4; 2002: 48; *DSPN*: 141). It may be significant that the only three recorded simplex **thwaite**-names of settlements throughout the former Danelaw counties are those in East Anglia identified above, whereas the far more abundant **thwaite** settlements-names in northern England are all in compound form.

Two of the compounded **thwaite** place-names in East Anglia, Crostwick and Crostwight, contain the same specific derived from the ON noun **kross**, ('a cross'), which is considered to have been introduced into late OE as **cros**. The term usually referred to a carved cross, but occasionally it designated a crossroads or a cross-shaped piece of land (Sandred 1990: 3-5; *PNNf2*: 148-49; *EPNE*: 1.114-15). Guestwick

[16] See table and map in Appendices 8.4.3a and 8.4.3b.
[17] Sawyer 1968 and online, S1055 http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/1055.html – accessed 29.3.2016.

contains a specific interpreted as deriving from the place-name of Guist, a village seven kilometres to the west (*CDEPN*: 265; Sandred 1990: 5).

The two remaining compound place-names in **-þveit** are both first mentioned in thirteenth-century documents but, unusually for names initially recorded so late, both may contain specifics derived from ON words. Browick is derived from OE **brād** ('broad') which could be an anglicised form of its ON cognate **breiðr**. Lingwhite may contain the Old West Scandinavian noun **lyng,** or Old East Scandinavian **liung**, meaning 'heather'. It is unusual also that of the seventeen lost field-names containing **thwaite** identified by Karl Sandred in east and central Norfolk, five are simplexes and nine of the remaining twelve compound names appear to contain ON specifics (Sandred 1990: 3-6; Fellows-Jensen 1998: 102-03; *CDEPN*: 265). The relatively high proportion incorporating ON specifics may suggest that they were also coined at an early date (Fellows-Jensen 1998: 102-03).

Geographically, the eight **thwaite** place-names in East Anglia display a clear pattern of distribution across central Norfolk (with one located in north-central Suffolk) that coincides with the northern section of the central raised plateau of boulder clay.[18] Five of the eight **thwaites** are therefore sited away from any rivers or significant watercourses, and a similar proportion on fertile, but heavy clay soils (especially those of the Beccles Association), or on the better-draining Burlingham soils on the slopes of the valleys that intersect the clay plateau. Two are sited more specifically in the upper valleys of small rivers, partially located on the fertile soils of the Isleham and Ashley Associations.[19] The **thwaites**' pattern of distribution thus reflects that of the simplex **thorps**, and may similarly suggest a connection between their formation and the extension of arable farming onto the claylands of northern East Anglia in the late Anglo-Saxon period.

It is difficult now to establish the extent and distribution of woodlands in East Anglia at a time when the **thwaite**-names were being coined, or determine the significance of their role in the wood-clearing process. But it is possible to compare

[18] See maps in Appendices 8.4.1b and 8.4.2b.
[19] See maps in Appendices 8.4.2a and 8.4.2c.

the distribution of place-names in **-thwaite** with those containing the OE term **lēah**, which is broadly equivalent in meaning and has been used to chart the distribution of Anglo-Saxon woodlands in East Anglia (Roberts and Wrathmell 2002: 21-24; Williamson 2013a: 219-30). The **lēahs** have a wider distribution, especially along the coastal hinterlands of north-east Essex and south-east Suffolk, which may represent the areas of cleared woodland in regions that were among the first to be settled by early Anglo-Saxon immigrants.[20] There are fewer **lēahs** located on the central raised plateau of boulder clay stretching across inland East Anglia, which may have been part of the later colonisation of the higher claylands. The distribution of the **lēahs** in central Norfolk corresponds to some extent, therefore, with that of the **thwaites**, which may suggest that both were part of a later Anglo-Saxon process of clearing woodland prior to its utilisation for arable farming.

Six of the eight **thwaite** place-names are associated with settlements which became significant enough to form parishes in their own name that survived into the nineteenth century (the two exceptions being Browick and Lingwhite) – a proportion similar to the 71% of place-names containing other ON arboreal generics.[21] However, the **thwaite**-named parishes all tended to be relatively small compared with their immediate parochial neighbours, and all display boundary shapes which suggest they were secondary parish formations. The parish of Thwaite in Norfolk, for example, was clearly created (in two separated portions) with land taken from the adjoining and partially surrounding parish of Alby, indicating a close association between the two Scandinavian-named settlements (and others nearby) that will be explored further below. Only four of the eight **thwaites** are recorded as vills in Domesday Book, with a mean average fiscal value of 1.22 carucates, much lower than the equivalent 86% of place-names with other ON arboreal generics that were recorded in Domesday Book with an average value of 2.77 carucates.

The insignificant status of the **thwaites** in East Anglia is reflected in their village morphology. It is apparent from early Ordnance Survey maps and Faden's

[20] See map in Appendix 8.4.3b.
[21] See map in Appendix 8.4.3c.

map of Norfolk that the surviving eighteenth- and nineteenth-century forms of these settlements nearly all display a common pattern of small, but generally dispersed villages or hamlets, often consisting of a few isolated farmhouses. Several also show evidence of a drift of settlement to the edges of greens and commons, but there is little archaeological material available to determine the chronology of these settlement-shifts, or their preceding settlement-configurations.

The archaeological evidence for the **thwaite**-named settlements in East Anglia is indeed once again variable, with most of the relevant sites revealing little or no Anglo-Saxon material. A few Anglo-Saxon finds have been recovered from the combined parish of Alby with Thwaite, but it is unclear whether they can in any way be associated with either of the neighbouring settlements. Archaeological work in the parish of Guestwick has revealed no Early or Middle Saxon finds, but Late Saxon pottery has been found during excavations at the church and from fieldwalking conducted to the north-west of it (NHER 34913/3131), suggesting the settlement of Guestwick may have been formed in the late Anglo-Saxon period. Similar evidence comes from Crostwick (NHER 25279/8078).

In summary, the limited archaeological evidence for the **thwaites** appears to suggest possible origins in the later Anglo-Saxon period, with nothing to indicate that any **thwaite**-named settlements in East Anglia were pre-Viking formations. This chronology is consistent with a date of formation in the late ninth or early tenth centuries indicated by linguistic analysis of the **thwaite** place-names. The early spellings of several indicates a preservation of the diphthongal pronunciation of **þveit**, which suggests that the element was introduced in Norfolk before the diphthong was levelled in Danish, a process of monophthongisation that is believed to have occurred *c.* 900 (Sandred 1990: 7; *PNNf2*:148; Fellows-Jensen 1969: 68-71; 1986: 631; Lindkvist 1912: 19-20, 96-101).

It is significant that, unlike the other ON generics, none of the compound **thwaites** were formed with personal names, and the non-anthroponymic elements used instead are all of probable or possible ON origin, which may provide further evidence that they originated at a time when the Scandinavian linguistic influence was more substantial. Similarly, nine of the seventeen lost field-names in Norfolk

containing the **thwaite** element are compounded with ON non-anthroponymic specifics (Sandred 1990: 4-6), once again suggesting that some of them may have been formed particularly early, possibly in the late ninth century. The apparent lack of later field-names containing **thwaite**, and the almost complete absence of the generic in the place- or field-names of Suffolk and Essex, may be a reflection of how (as with **býr**) the term seems to have dropped out of use early in the region and did not survive in East Anglian dialects (Fellows-Jensen 1998: 102-03). The use of the **thwaite** element in East Anglian place-names is in some ways similar to that of **toft**, with an unusually high proportion being recorded in early sources compared with other regions of the Danelaw, which may similarly indicate an earlier use of the generic in East Anglia than elsewhere.

But geographically, the distribution of the East Anglian **thwaites**, which are all non-anthroponymic in form, is similar to that of the non-anthroponymic **thorps**, in that both are mainly located on the central raised plateau of boulder clay, suggesting that both were formed as part of an expansion of arable farming onto the previously under-exploited claylands. But more fundamentally, this similarity may reflect the complementary nature of the distribution pattern of the two elements that has been observed elsewhere in the Danelaw. For it has been suggested that whereas the **thorps** represented an intensified exploitation of the cultivated area by the planting of new settlements on the outfields of existing ones, the **thwaites** enabled the area of cultivated land to be increased by the clearing of woodland and scrub beyond the existing fields (Fellows-Jensen 1998: 105; *SSNNW*: 415-16). In such a way, the **thwaites** in East Anglia may provide a possible example of settlements established by Scandinavian-speaking settlers on hitherto unoccupied land, rather than the remaining settlements bearing Scandinavian-influenced place-names associated in other ways with woods and trees.

Unlike the wider distribution of the **thorps**, however, the **thwaites** are concentrated in Norfolk, with only one located on the Suffolk claylands. This pattern may reflect a short-lived duration of the use of **þveit** and its failure to enter the local dialect, which saw it restricted to the main zone of Scandinavian linguistic influence in northern East Anglia – unlike the **thorp** element which did enter the English

language and continued to be used into the post-Conquest period, allowing it to appear more widely as a place-name element across much of the region.

(8.4.4) The place-names in East Anglia that may contain ON topographical generics associated with landscape features other than woods or trees are fewer in number, with only a diverse scattering of possible examples relating to hills and valleys, lands and fields, rivers and water, coastal features, and man-made features.[22]

(8.4.4.1) Perhaps unsurprisingly in view of the region's topography, there are few place-names in East Anglia containing ON generics associated with hills and valleys, reflecting also the lower numbers of equivalent OE terms. The ON noun **haugr**, meaning 'hill' or, more specifically, 'a barrow or mound', appears in simplex form in Howe in Norfolk, and is found also in the names of several hundreds in East Anglia (as discussed in section 10.3 below). The only other possible example is Withersdale in north Suffolk, which may contain the ON noun **dalr** or ODan **dal** ('a valley') – or the OE cognate **dæl** – compounded with an equally uncertain specific (*DSPN*: 156; *CDEPN*: 690; *LPN*: 110; *EPNE*: 1.125-27).

(8.4.4.2) Similarly, there are virtually no place-names in East Anglia containing ON generics associated with land or fields, in contrast to the large number containing common OE terms such as **feld** and **land**. This may suggest that by the ninth and tenth centuries there was little scope for forming new settlements or renaming old ones by Scandinavian-speaking settlers in such favourable areas of the landscape, or else that by this time topographical terminology was being used less than other place-name elements such as personal names (as will be examined below). The only possible example is Snape in Suffolk, which may be a simplex form of the ON **snap** meaning 'poor pasture', but the etymology is once again very uncertain (*CDEPN*: 556-57; *DSPN*: 123; Briggs, forthcoming).

[22] See table and map in Appendices 8.4.1a and 8.4.1c.

(8.4.4.3) Very few East Anglian place-names contain ON topographical generics connected in some way with water in the landscape. The only one which occurs more than once is the element **holmr**, which entered the English language during the late Anglo-Saxon or early post-Conquest period and was used widely in its Middle English forms **holme** or **holm** for minor and field-names in the later medieval period. The term **holmr** denoted either 'a small island' or 'a piece of flat low-lying ground by a river or stream, submerged or surrounded in time of flood' that may have provided dry settlement-sites in wetland areas (*LPN*: 36, 55-56; *OED*: s.v. holm/holme). It was widely used in the place-names of northern England (*LPN*: 55; Fellows-Jensen 1985b), and also in East Anglian field-names, particularly in reclaimed coastal areas such as the Halvergate marshland in Norfolk, which contains some pre-Conquest **holmr**-names compounded with ON specifics to form fully Scandinavian names (Williamson 1997: 40-68).

But **holmr** only appears in three place-names in East Anglia associated with settlements, all located in west Norfolk. Two were originally in simplex form: Holme-next-the-Sea, and Holme Hale which subsequently acquired the affix Hale (from the OE dative form **hale** of **halh**, 'the nook'), referring to a nearby but separate settlement. The third is Runcton Holme, in which *Holm* is recorded in the thirteenth century as an affix to the existing place-name Runcton, recorded in Domesday Book as *Runghetuna* (*CDEPN*: 271, 311, 513).

The other East Anglian place-names incorporating ON topographical elements associated with water are more isolated examples, bearing only one form of each generic. Newbourne in Suffolk has been interpreted as containing the ODan **nīu** ('nine') and ODan **brun** or ON **brunnr** ('spring'), a name reflected in the local topography with a number of springs close to the centre of the original settlement (*DSPN*: 101; Briggs 2006: 33-34; *CDEPN*: 433). Other possible examples bear more uncertain etymologies (as can be seen from the corpora in Appendices 1 and 3): Frowick Hall and the nearby *Ciche* (now St Osyth) in Essex (Coates 2005: 38-40; *PNEss*: 347, 349),[23] and Bawsey and Syderstone in Norfolk (*DEPN*: 1960: 31; *LPN*: 42; *CDEPN*: 596).

[23] See map in Appendix 6.5d.

(8.4.4.4) It is possible also to discern the use of ON topographical elements in the naming of geographical features and place-names along the coast of East Anglia, but the evidence for this is now limited as much of the coastline has changed considerably since the early medieval period and so many of the named features have physically disappeared.[24]

Like the name of Colneis hundred in Suffolk (discussed in section 10.4), a lost settlement in East Flegg recorded as *Nessa* in Domesday Book has been interpreted as incorporating ON **nes** ('a headland or promontory'), probably referring to a spur of upland protruding into the estuary marshes of the river Bure. The ON **nes** element has been identified also in nearby Winterton Ness and the lost *Hemsby Ness*, but it is unclear whether these names referred only to geographical features or were associated with settlements as well (Cornford 1998; *PNNf2*: 12, 80). A Middle English form of ON **hóp**, meaning 'a small bay or inlet' (as opposed to the OE **hop**), has been identified in Stanford-le-Hope in south Essex (*LPN*: 133; *PNEss*: 170).

Finally, it has been suggested that the ON element **fjǫrðr** or ODan **fiorth** ('sea inlet, or firth') may be compounded in three East Anglian coastal place-names traditionally assumed to contain the OE generic **ford** ('river crossing') instead: Orford and the lost *Goseford* at the mouth of the Deben in Suffolk, and Hamford Water in north-east Essex (Round 1921-23: 169; Newton 2011: 296-98; Wain 2016).[25] The geographical basis for such an interpretation is convincing for all three place-names, but the etymological evidence is more uncertain and has been criticised accordingly from a traditional onomastic perspective (Briggs, forthcoming). But is it possible that the form and meaning of an original OE **ford** element in the three place-names were changed under local and oral Scandinavian influence to **fjǫrðr**, even though the **ford** form continued to be used (albeit with the meaning of **fjǫrðr**) when the names were recorded in formal English documents? A putative **Gosefjorð* form, along with the hypothesised **Orfjǫrðr* and **Hamfjǫrðr* names, may therefore perhaps embody the

[24] See section 5.2.6, and map in Appendix 5.2d.
[25] See map in Appendix 8.4.1c.

issues raised in section 4.2.3 above, regarding the reliability of early medieval English written sources for establishing the true form of place-names that may have been used primarily in an oral context by an illiterate Scandinavian-speaking community.

However, the significance of the use of such ON topographical elements for coastal features in terms of possible Viking settlement is more uncertain, as they may have been coined primarily for use as navigational points by Scandinavian sailors traversing the East Anglian coastline en route to destinations within or beyond the region. A clear differentiation has been drawn in south Wales between the Scandinavian-influenced names coined for the region's prominent coastal features used in navigation and those used to name settlements (Redknap 2008: 403-04; Charles 1934: 137-38, 147). It is more difficult to draw such a distinction in East Anglia as much of the early medieval coastline and its characteristic coastal features have now disappeared. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that such maritime activity alone could have resulted in ON terminology being introduced without a sufficient number of Scandinavian-speakers living in the vicinity as well to facilitate its use locally. It is possible, therefore, that there was a Scandinavian-speaking community of sea-faring immigrants living around the coastal fringe of East Anglia who participated mainly in maritime occupations such as fishing, which did not require the ownership or occupation of agricultural land with the consequent formal coining of new Scandinavian place-names. But they may have exerted some degree of more informal Scandinavian linguistic influence upon the local dialect in the naming or renaming of local geographical features that is barely discernible today in the surviving documentary record.

(8.4.4.5) A final category of ON topographical generics includes those associated with features that are in some way man-made structures. There are once again only a few isolated examples in East Anglia: Felbrigg (probably ON **bryggja**, 'a jetty or quay', or 'bridge', compounded with ON **fjǫl** or ODan **fiæl**, 'plank'), Colkirk (ON **kirkja**, 'a church', perhaps in place of the equivalent OE **cirice**, compounded with the ON personal name *Koli* or OE *Cola*), Corpusty (probably ON **stígr**, 'a path, road', compounded with the ON personal name *Korpr*) and Repps (perhaps ODan **rep** or the

Old West Scandinavian **hreppr**, 'district or community') in Norfolk (*VEPN2*; *PNNf3*: 14; *CDEPN*; *EPNE*; Fellows-Jensen 1987b: 301; *VEPN3*; *PNNf2*: 69); and the 'Skeith' element of Wickham Skeith in Suffolk (ODan ***skeith,** 'border, boundary', or ON **skeið,** 'course or track'), denoting a separate settlement within the parish of Wickham and subsequently forming an affix to its name (*DSPN*: 153-54; *CDEPN*: 677; *EPNE*: 2.124).

(8.4.5) The geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements in East Anglia associated with place-names containing ON non-arboreal generics are diverse and fragmented, which is not surprising in view of the heterogenous nature of their names, compounded by many uncertain etymologies. Nevertheless, it is apparent that nearly all the place-names in this category (that is, excluding those associated with woods and trees) are located around the coastal fringe of East Anglia and the edge of the Fenlands in the north-west.[26] To some extent, this pattern is determined by the nature of the topographical features referred to in these place-names, many of which are only found in coastal locations. But it is significant that the Scandinavian linguistic influence evident in these names extends beyond the principal area of distribution for the other types of Scandinavian place-names in east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk, as it continues further down the coastline to include several examples in north-east Essex.

At a more local level, the landscape contexts vary widely, but a majority appear to be sited in generally favourable settings. Of the twenty place-names linked to identifiable settlement-locations, nine are situated on river valleys or beside an estuary, five are on land away from any rivers or watercourses, three are on the coast, one appears to have been situated on a former island (Bawsey, as its name suggests), and two are uncertain.[27] Thirteen of the twenty (65%) are sited on agriculturally favourable soil-types of various Associations, four are on more unfavourable soils, and the remainder are in areas of mixed soils or more uncertain.[28] This pattern once

[26] See map in Appendix 8.4.1c.
[27] See map in Appendix 8.4.4a.
[28] See map in Appendix 8.4.4c.

again suggests that the settlements bearing this type of Scandinavian-influenced name are certainly not all located on marginal land.

Indeed, the relative prosperity of these place-names is reflected in the recording of sixteen of the twenty (80%) as vills in Domesday Book, with a mean average fiscal value of 2.54 carucates – a figure once again very close to the averages for the other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, except the **thwaites**. But their individual fiscal values vary widely, from 12.53 hides for *Ciche* in Essex to 0.10 carucates for Newbourne.

Similarly, sixteen of these place-names became sufficiently significant settlements to form parishes that survived into the nineteenth century: only Frowick, *Ness*, and Winterton Ness did not, and the 'Skeith'-named settlement constituted a separate hamlet within the larger parish of Wickham Skeith.[29] Most of these parishes are of a similar size to their neighbours and display little sign of interdigitation or subsequent formation with land from adjoining parochial units, suggesting that they were primary parish formations created alongside their neighbours. However, the nineteenth-century parishes of Colkirk, Withersdale and Howe were all more irregularly shaped with panhandle protuberances, and Withersdale also includes five parochial 'islands' separated from the main territory and surrounded by adjoining parishes, which may indicate a more complex or later process of parochial formation or alteration.

The archaeological evidence is once again variable, but tends to suggest that the place-names in East Anglia containing ON non-arboreal topographical generics often constituted a renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements rather than the formation and naming of new ones. It seems clear that the settlement of Bawsey in Norfolk originated in the pre-Viking period, with finds of Middle and Late Saxon pottery, metalwork and coins suggesting the presence of an important Middle Saxon settlement and 'productive site' around a church that continued to thrive into the Late Saxon period (NHER 25962/3328). Similarly, the settlement which became known as Howe in Norfolk may also have its origins in the Middle Saxon period, with

[29] See map in Appendix 8.4.4d.

finds of Middle Saxon pottery at two sites close to the hamlet and church (NHER 10132). At Newbourne in Suffolk, sherds of Early/Middle Saxon pottery, as well as Late Saxon Thetford ware, have been found close to St Mary's church in the centre of the village (SHER NBN037), suggesting the settlement originated in the pre-Viking period before being renamed using ON elements. There are similar finds of Middle Saxon pottery associated with other place-names in this category (including Snape, Holme-next-the-Sea, and Holme Hale), but it is less clear whether they can be directly associated with the settlements in question.

There is little or no Anglo-Saxon archaeological material available for the remaining place-names in this category, and it is therefore impossible to gauge the likely dates of formation for the settlements associated with them. But it is striking how, unlike other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names such as the **býs** and **thorps**, there is little or no archaeological evidence relating to any of the settlements associated with place-names containing ON non-arboreal topographical generics to indicate that they originated in the Late Saxon period after the commencement of Viking settlement. Instead, wherever there is clear evidence of Late Saxon settlement, there is often also the presence of Ipswich ware on the same site or nearby to suggest the probable or possible formation of the settlement in question during the pre-Viking Middle Saxon period or earlier. This would indicate that the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in this particular category were not being applied to new settlements created as a result of Viking colonisation of previously unoccupied territory, but often represented instead the renaming of already-existing Anglo-Saxon settlements.

8.5) Conclusion

In summary, the evidence presented by the place-names in East Anglia containing ON topographical generics (arboreal as well as non-arboreal) is diverse, with categorisations and interpretations impeded to some extent by the relatively high

proportion with uncertain etymologies. But there appears to be a fundamental division between a minority of place-names containing elements relating to the clearance of trees (mainly the **thwaites**) which apparently represent new settlement-formations, and the remainder with a diversity of generics which generally appear to constitute the renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements.

The place-names in East Anglia containing the **thwaite** generic constitute a small, but fairly homogenous category which linguistic evidence indicates may date from as early as the late ninth and early tenth centuries. The limited archaeological evidence suggests that settlements associated with these place-names date from this time as well. Geographically, they are congregated on the central raised plateau of boulder clay that spreads across inland East Anglia – but only in the northern sections which lay within the zone of more significant Scandinavian linguistic influence that also broadly coincided with the Broadland riverine system. The settlements thus formed were generally insignificant, with relatively low fiscal values in Domesday Book, and gave rise to small and secondary parish formations. In some ways therefore, the **thwaites** resemble many of the **thorps** in their common association with the late Anglo-Saxon extension of arable farming onto the claylands of East Anglia. But, unlike the **thorps**, the **thwaites** appear to represent a utilisation of newly cleared land and may thus conform more to traditional notions of a Viking colonisation of previously unoccupied territory – as Cameron had originally postulated with regard to the origins of the **thorps** (Cameron 1970, 1976: 18-22; 1985: 139-43).

In contrast, the remaining place-names in East Anglia containing ON topographical generics (those associated in different ways with woods and trees, or with other landscape features) constitute a more heterogenous linguistic category. It includes both the multiple and unambiguous use of three ON topographical generics (**lundr**, **skógr** and **holmr**), as well as place-names that perhaps contain a number of diverse ON generics which each occur only once in East Anglia and are often doubtfully identified with uncertain etymologies. Geographically, however, the settlements associated with these place-names have some features in common, with many situated in favourable locations on soils generally suitable for agriculture, and most being recorded as significant vills in Domesday Book and forming primary

parishes that survived into the nineteenth century. Archaeological evidence is lacking for many of these place-names (especially those with arboreal generics) but, where available, it tends to suggest that the settlements in question were established in the Middle Saxon period or earlier, indicating that the Scandinavian-influenced names must have constituted a renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements.

However, many of these place-names have uncertain etymologies in which the postulated 'Scandinavian influence' turns on the linguistic identification of a presumed ON topographical generic that has an identical or nearly identical OE cognate (such as ON **þyrnr** or OE **þyrne** in Thurne, ON **mosi** or OE **mos** in Moze, and **stofn** in Stoven which is identical in both ON and OE forms). It therefore seems quite possible that these place-names, and others containing more unambiguous and identifiable Scandinavian elements (such as Eyke, from ON **eik,** 'oak', as opposed to OE **āc**), originated as minor linguistic modifications or alterations of existing OE names for established Anglo-Saxon settlements, due to a prevailing Scandinavian linguistic influence in the areas concerned. Such a process might explain the haphazard and piecemeal manner in which such isolated, individual examples appear to have been formed. Superficially, their lexical meanings and distribution around the coastal fringe of East Anglia may suggest a pattern of settlement by Scandinavian-speaking communities in previously wooded, unoccupied and more marginal territory such as the generally infertile Sandlands. But a closer examination of their geographical contexts reveals that they were in fact located fairly favourably – as might be expected for established Anglo-Saxon settlements in those areas.

Another significant characteristic of the place-names in East Anglia containing ON topographical generics is that only six or seven of the total number of fifty-five can be interpreted as compounded with personal names,[30] which comprises a much lower proportion (around 12%) than those formed with ON habitative generics such as **bý**, **thorp** and **toft** (between 25% and 70%). It is also considerably lower than the equivalent figures for OE topographical generics (between 19% and 55%).[31] This may

[30] The place-names containing personal names are <u>underlined</u> in the table in Appendix 8.4.1a.
[31] See table in Appendix 4.3.2a.

seem surprising in view of the generally increasing use of personal names to form place-names in England at the time of Viking settlement, but it may once again reflect the use of many of these topographical terms as Scandinavian substitutes for existing OE names of established Anglo-Saxon settlements, perhaps using ON cognates or synonyms of earlier OE words. This practice may have been more common when there was no change of ownership that needed to be demonstrated by a more radical change of name, or introduction of a personal name, as has been hypothesised with regard to the **býr**-names and **thorps** compounded with ON personal names discussed in Chapters 6 and 7 above.

For there seems to be a fundamental distinction in East Anglian place-names between the use of the **býr** and **thorp** habitative generics on one hand, and the use of ON topographical generics (except **thwaite**) on the other. The **býr** and **thorp** generics were mainly used in conjunction with non-anthroponymic specifics for naming newly formed settlements (with the possible exception of the Kir[k]by names), and in conjunction with anthroponymic specifics to name newly created independent portions of old Anglo-Saxon estates. The **thwaite** generic has similarly been used in East Anglia to create place-names (either in simplex form or compounded with non-anthroponymic specifics) that denote newly formed settlements, similar to the non-anthroponymic **thorps** in being associated with the expansion of arable farming onto the claylands.

In contrast, the other ON topographical generics appear to have been used mainly in the renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements (or geographical features not associated with specific settlements). These place-names may therefore be evidence of a more diffuse Scandinavian linguistic influence that underlay the evolving and informal oral nomenclature of local East Anglian dialects, especially in coastal areas where there may have communities of Scandinavian-speaking individuals who did not take over land and leave their mark in the more formally naming or renaming of new settlements. But this raises the question of how and why such Scandinavian linguistic influence manifested itself in certain areas of East Anglia and not others, an issue which will be explored further in Chapter 11.

Chapter 9:

HYBRID PLACE-NAMES CONTAINING SCANDINAVIAN OR SCANDINAVIANISED SPECIFICS COMPOUNDED WITH OLD ENGLISH GENERICS

9.1) Introduction

The last category of place-names to be examined in this thesis are those combining some form of Scandinavian or Scandinavianised specific with an OE habitative or topographical generic. By far the commonest OE generic used to form such hybrid, Anglo-Scandinavian compounds in East Anglia is **tūn**, with only a few disparate and isolated examples incorporating other OE generics which are examined at the end of this chapter.

It is still not fully understood in modern scholarship why only the OE **tūn** generic was used so widely in conjunction with ON personal names to form the ubiquitous 'Grimston-hybrids', rather than any of the other OE habitative or topographical generics (Parsons 2001: 308; Townend 2013: 117-18). There are no ON elements compounded with **hām** in East Anglia, and only isolated examples formed with other OE generics.[1] As observed in section 4.3.2 above, it appears that the **hām** generic, along with several others such as such as **burh**, **ēġ**, **feld**, **dūn** and **ford**, ceased to be used widely in the seventh or eighth centuries, and would not therefore have been current as a place-name-forming element in England at the time of Viking settlement. But several other OE generics apart from **tūn** were apparently still being used to form new place-names later in the Anglo-Saxon period, such as **worð**, **halh**, **stede**, **lēah** and **denu,** (Cox 1975-76).[2] For reasons that are not yet fully

[1] See table in Appendix 9.5.1a.
[2] See table in Appendix 4.3.2a.

understood, however, there are only isolated examples in East Anglia of these generics being used to form hybrid Anglo-Scandinavian place-names, and only a small number incorporate Scandinavian or Anglo-Scandinavian personal names – often with uncertain etymologies or post-Conquest origins.

It is clear that **tūn** had become the predominant place-name generic by the time of the Viking settlers' arrival in the late ninth century, and so the consequent coining of new Scandinavian-influenced place-names may therefore have utilised the ubiquitous **tūn** element almost by default as part of a wider development in Anglo-Saxon place-name terminology. But it has been suggested also that perhaps the **tūn** generic was adopted more specifically and pro-actively by Scandinavian settlers, possibly to imbue their place-names with a notional sense of 'English village' (Parsons 2001: 308-09; Townend 2013: 117-18). These hypotheses will be considered further after a brief survey below of the **tūn** element in general and a detailed examination of its use compounded with ON specifics in East Anglian place-names.

9.2) Use of the *tūn* generic

(9.2.1) The OE **tūn** generic was used in the formation of English place-names throughout the Anglo-Saxon period and into the post-Conquest era. It stems from a Proto-Germanic word **tūn** that originally denoted 'fence', and has cognates in Old Frisian (**tūn**, 'fence'), Dutch (**tuin**, 'garden' or 'enclosure'), and ON (**tún**, 'fenced plot in which a house is built') (*EPNE*: 2.188; Coates 2012: 211-12). However, the use of the ON **tún** in Scandinavia was largely restricted to Norway and Sweden, and subsequently Iceland, during the Viking period. In Denmark, there are only a few place-names containing **tún** which seem to belong to an early pre-Viking period, and it seems certain that **tún** was no longer current as a place-name generic in Denmark at the time of Viking settlement in eastern England. Nevertheless, it is probable that settlers from what is now Denmark would have been familiar with **tūn** from the use of its cognate elsewhere in Scandinavia, which may have facilitated its adoption

without alteration into their own toponymic vocabulary (*SSNEM*: 175-76; Fellows-Jensen 2013: 96-99).

In England, the meaning of OE **tūn** developed from the original 'fence' to 'that which is fenced in, an enclosed piece of ground', 'an enclosure with a dwelling' and then 'a farmstead' (*EPNE*: 2.188-90). In some respects, it seems that the term **tūn** retained this lexical sense of 'fenced enclosure' in being applied to places with artificial or constructed boundaries that enclosed the settlement, implying a distinction from other settlements with natural or unformed boundaries such as those to which generics such as **hām** and **lēah** were applied instead (Coates 2012:211-12). It is also apparent that during the middle Anglo-Saxon period **tūns** were regarded as less significant settlements than **hāms,** and the term **tūn** began to be used in a context of secondary colonisation for naming smaller, more outlying farmsteads that belonged to larger estate centres – which themselves often bore earlier types of names containing other generics such as **hām**. In time, as settlements began to develop around the cores of such farmsteads, the term **tūn** seems also to have acquired a broader, less specific sense of 'hamlet' or 'village'. The meaning of 'estate, manor, vill' may similarly have arisen through the extension of the area of exploited land around an original **tūn**, as indicated by references in Anglo-Saxon charters (*EPNE*: 2.189-91).

The changing and evolving meanings of **tūn** is reflected in the wide range of specifics that are compounded with the generic in the abundant **tūn**-names both within East Anglia and across the whole of England. Over twenty-eight different types have been identified (*EPNE*: 2.193-98), which can be grouped into six broader categories and mapped in East Anglia accordingly.[3] Just over half (53%) of the East Anglian place-names in **tūn** are compounded with personal names, with 28% containing OE personal names and 25% probable or possible ON personal names. The remaining, non-anthroponymic specifics compounded with OE **tūn** in East Anglia are split between OE topographical terms (12%), OE geographical terms (11%), OE

[3] See map and table in Appendices 9.2a and 9.2b.

functional terms (11%), and OE folk-names (3%) – with only 4% derived from different types of ON nouns, as will be discussed below.

(9.2.2) The geographical distribution across East Anglia of place-names in **-tūn** containing different types of specific is uneven.[4] The greatest concentration of those formed with personal names (of both OE and ON origin) is in south Suffolk along the valleys of the rivers Stour, Gipping and Deben, as well as their tributaries and estuaries.[5] There is another large cluster in south-east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk, and a number of smaller clusters scattered across Norfolk. There are fewer **tūns** compounded with personal names around the edge of the Fens in west Norfolk and north-west Suffolk, and only a small number scattered around the inland boundaries and coastal margins of Essex. There are considerably more **tūns** compounded with topographical elements in Norfolk than either Suffolk or Essex, with many situated along river valleys,[6] possibly reflecting earlier origins than other types of **tūn**-names. There are similarly more **tūns** formed with geographical specifics in Norfolk than Suffolk or Essex, which tend to be located in areas of lower land around the coast. Those formed with functional specifics are scattered more evenly across Norfolk and Suffolk.

The available evidence suggests that the **tūn** place-names compounded with different types of specific were coined at different times throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. Initially, after it had begun to be used more widely from the seventh or eighth century onwards (Cox 1975-76: 63, 65), the **tūn** generic was compounded principally with topographical, geographical and functional elements, during a phase of place-name formation when the setting, location or function of a settlement was the primary factor in its identification. Later in the Anglo-Saxon period –coinciding with the commencement of Viking settlement – it appears that personal names were being used more widely to form specifics, as ownership of land became the most significant distinguishing feature of a settlement in an age of increasing bureaucracy

[4] See map in Appendix 9.2a.
[5] See maps in Appendix 9.4.4d.
[6] See map and table in Appendices 9.2a and 9.2b.

(as discussed in sections 4.3.2 and 5.3.7). It has been suggested that by the tenth and eleventh centuries the earlier, often topographical place-names of existing settlements or estates were being replaced by new ones incorporating the personal names of their new owners compounded with **tūn** (Gelling 1997: 182-86; Baker 2004: 6, 12). Evidence for such renaming has been detected in other regions of southern England with better-surviving Anglo-Saxon documentation, although it has not been directly identified in the sparse pre-Conquest written sources of East Anglia (Gelling 1992a: 56-57, 1997: 182-86; Baker 2004: 6, 21 n. 8). The growing popularity in late Anglo-Saxon England for combining personal names with the **tūn** generic, and using such compounds for the renaming of existing settlements, may thus have underlain the formation of the Anglo-Scandinavian 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names that became abundant in Norfolk and Suffolk, as will be explored below.

The generally later date of formation for several types of **tūn**-names (including those associated with Scandinavian influence) may be reflected in the characteristics of their geographical locations and contexts, in comparison with those of other OE habitative generics such as the earlier **hām**-names. The East Anglian settlements associated with place-names in **hām** are generally situated on the better-drained soils and in the main river valleys of Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, often on the lower edges of clayland areas. Conversely, there is a noticeable absence of **hāms** in other areas that presumably were colonised later, such as the former island of Lothingland which contains a particular concentration of **tūn**-names.[7]

In contrast, the settlements with **tūn**-names tend to be located in less favourable geographical locations, often along the higher valley slopes of the upper reaches of small rivers on the East Anglian claylands or on the interfluves between them. (Martin 1999; Williamson 2005b). The **tūn**-named settlements are generally also of less significant status than the **hāms**, with few becoming market towns and fewer also forming separate parishes of their own as many remained as subsidiary settlements within other parishes. In Suffolk, there are only six **hām**-named settlements which did not form parishes, but over forty non-parochial **tūns** (Martin

[7] See maps in Appendices 9.2c, 9.4.4b, 9.4.4c and 9.4.4d.

1999: 50, n. 5). It has been suggested therefore that the **hāms** represented a relatively early stratum of significant Anglo-Saxon settlements that were capable of later subdivision, whereas the **tūns** in many cases represented subsidiary or secondary settlements which only became separate and independent estates later in the Anglo-Saxon period (Martin 1999; Williamson 1993: 85-88).

However, **hām**- and **tūn**-named settlements in East Anglia are sometimes found separately in discrete clusters which tend not to overlap with each other, reflecting a certain dichotomy between the two generics.[8] In some areas, it appears that clusters of **hāms** are found where **tūns** are absent, and vice versa. This seems to complicate the accepted view that **hāms** were simply of greater status than **tūns**, and suggests that in certain circumstances the **tūn**-element in one locality came to bear a similar meaning to the **hām**-element in another (or alternatively, in chronological terms, the use of **tūn** superseded that of **hām**), and so both generics were capable of being deemed appropriate for naming settlements of similar status in different areas (Baker 2004: 15-17; 2006b: 232-36). Ultimately, this anomaly reflects the wide range of meanings denoted by the **tūn** generic discussed above, and suggests that it may have been used with different intended meanings in different areas and at different times during the Anglo-Saxon period. In such a way, a certain fluidity or flexibility in the use of particular generics to form place-names may have become the norm by the time when Scandinavian-speaking settlers were beginning to exert their linguistic influence upon the place-naming process.

9.3) Place-names containing the *tūn* generic compounded with non-anthroponymic ON specifics

(9.3.1) The East Anglian place-names containing the OE **tūn** generic compounded with Scandinavian or Scandinavianised specifics are distributed fairly widely across

[8] See map in Appendix 4.3d and 9.2c.

Norfolk and Suffolk, with just two possible and uncertain examples in Essex.[9] Most are compounded with ON personal names (with fifty-nine probably, and twenty-eight possibly so), which are examined in the next section. There are only sixteen that are, or may be, compounded with non-anthroponymic ON elements, comprising a very small percentage (4%) of the total number of specifics in the region's **tūn**-names.[10] They are thus outnumbered by the place-names in **tūn** compounded with ON personal names (the 'Grimston-hybrids') by a factor of three or four to one, in direct contrast to the East Anglian place-names in **-tūn** compounded with OE personal names (with a total of one hundred) which are outnumbered by those compounded with non-anthroponymic OE specific elements such as functional, topographical and geographical nouns and adjectives (121 in total). This may reflect the longer timeframe during the middle Anglo-Saxon period in which place-names in **tūn** were being formed with non-anthroponymic OE specifics before personal names became more popular – and before Scandinavian-influenced place-names of any kind were formed.

(9.3.2) Seven of the sixteen East Anglian place-names in **-tūn** compounded with non-anthroponymic ON specific elements bear the name of Carlton or Carleton, with four in central and east Norfolk, and two along the coastal fringe of Suffolk (plus another lost name in Carlford hundred), which places them all within the main areas of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in both counties.[11] There are no Carltons in Essex, and only an isolated outlier in south-east Cambridgeshire close to the boundary with Suffolk.

The Carlton name is usually interpreted as being formed from the OE **tūn** compounded with a specific derived from ON **karla** (the genitive plural form of **karl**), which was substituted in areas of Scandinavian linguistic influence for its cognate OE **ceorla**, the genitive plural of **ceorl**, meaning 'a peasant with some degree of freedom'

[9] See map in Appendix 9.1a.
[10] See tables in Appendices 9.1b and 9.2b. This percentage compares with the relatively small number of such compounds in the East Midland counties (6%) and a slightly higher proportion (10%) in Yorkshire (*SSNY*: 109-21, 169; *SSNEM*: 174-80, 232).
[11] See map in Appendix 9.3a.

(Sandred 1986: 23-24). Place-names incorporating the OE **ceorla** and OE **tūn** became Charlton, Charleton or occasionally Chorlton, but throughout the Danelaw they incorporated the ON **karla** instead to become Carlton, or Carleton in Norfolk.[12] The division between the two forms is delineated by the traditional Danelaw boundary marked by the Alfred-Guthrum treaty line,[13] and transgressed by just two Charltons in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, plus three more in Northumberland which was subject to less Viking political and linguistic influence. The clear demarcation between the cognate OE and ON forms of a single word is reminiscent of that between the **thorps** and **throps** discussed above.[14]

The precise meaning of the OE word **ceorla** and its ON cognate **karla**, in terms of the social status and freedom or otherwise of the peasants it denoted, has been the subject of considerable academic debate following Finberg's fundamental re-assessment (1964). A consensus now interprets the place-name Charlton or Carlton as referring to processes of manorialisation and settlement-nucleation that probably occurred in the ninth and tenth centuries. A hypothesised scenario suggests that the break-up of large Anglo-Saxon estates at this time may have led to communities of ceorls (peasant farmers with some degree of freedom) forming separate manors nearby which were still required to provide some labour services to the home-farm at busy times of the year (*VEPN3*: 21-22; Finberg 1964; Faith 1997: 127-28, 150-51).

All seven of the East Anglian Carl(e)tons appear in Domesday Book in simplex form, usually as *Carletuna*, but occasionally as *Karletun(a)* or *Kallentuna*. Between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, several of these acquired the identifying affixes by which they are known today, which are derived from the family names of their owners (Carlton Colville and Carleton Rode), the local hundred (Carleton Forehoe), a saint's dedication (Carleton St Peter), and a locational prefix (East Carleton).

[12] See map in Appendix 9.3b.
[13] Discussed in Chapter 2 (section 2.2.3a).
[14] In section 7.1 and see map 7.1a.

However, although they were all included in Domesday Book (as were a large proportion of the Carltons and Charl(e)tons located elsewhere in England),[15] the date of the place-names' original formation is unclear. There is no unambiguous written evidence for either form of the place-name being used any earlier than the mid-tenth century (*VEPN3*: 21) – which might have linked its introduction more definitively with the later Anglo-Saxon re-organisation of estates discussed above.

Geographically, the six Carl(e)tons in East Anglia with identifiable locations are concentrated within a relatively small area of south Norfolk and north-east Suffolk,[16] and are all associated with favourably-located settlements that appear to have been well-established by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period. Four are situated in the upper valleys of small rivers, and two are located on land away from any rivers or significant watercourses.[17] They are all sited on soil-types suitable for arable farming, with four located on or close to the heavy, but fertile clay soils of the Beccles and Hanslope Associations, and two on the sandier river-valley soils of the Burlingham Association.[18] This pattern might once again suggest an association with the extension of arable farming onto the East Anglian claylands in the later Anglo-Saxon period, as has been suggested with the **thwaites** and non-anthroponymic **thorps**.

All six locatable Carl(e)tons are recorded as vills in Domesday Book with a mean average fiscal value of 2.83 carucates, a figure close to the averages for the other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names and derived from a relatively narrow range of individual fiscal values, ranging from 4.86 for East Carlton to 0.52 carucates for Carlton Forehoe.

Similarly, all six Carl(e)tons became sufficiently significant settlements to form parishes in their own name that survived into the nineteenth century, although their sizes and boundary shapes are more varied.[19] Carleton Rode and Carlton Colville

[15] Finberg 1964 provides brief historical details and the first recorded forms for most of the identified examples of this name-form in England.
[16] See map in Appendix 9.3a.
[17] See map in Appendix 9.3c.
[18] See map in Appendix 9.3e.
[19] See maps in Appendices 9.3f and 9.3g.

have formed relatively large parishes of a similar size to their neighbours. The former shows some degree of interdigitation with the adjoining Bunwell from which it may have been formed, although it has been associated manorially since Domesday Book with Forncett to the east (Finberg 1964: 152). Carlton Colville shows no sign of secondary formation, and is actually larger than the adjoining Mutford, a royal manor in Domesday Book with which it was associated (*ibid.*, 154). Carleton Forehoe and Carleton St Peter are considerably smaller parishes, with the former adjoining the larger parish of Kimberley, an associated manor in Domesday Book (*ibid.*, 152), and the latter showing some signs of interdigitation with the much larger Langley to its east, from which it appears to have been created as a secondary parish. East Carleton contains a long panhandle and shows signs of interdigitation with Ketteringham to its north, from which it may similarly have been formed. Carlton in Suffolk has formed the smallest parish of the six and is highly interdigitated with the adjoining Kelsale to its north. Such a degree of interdigitation could provide evidence of a parish boundary being stretched around pre-existing rectilinear boundaries of open-field strips that may have underlain the allocation of land in the original formation of the **ceorla-tūn** (or **karla-tūn**), as has recently been hypothesised with regard to the formation of two Carl(e)tons in Yorkshire (Wrathmell 2017).

The archaeological evidence for each of the East Anglian Carlt(e)tons is individually inconclusive, but collectively seems to hint at the possibility that some of the associated settlements may have pre-Viking origins. Fragments of Middle Saxon pottery have been found by fieldwalking surveys and salvage excavations at locations within one kilometre of the original settlement-sites of Carleton Forehoe and East Carleton, and within the current parish boundary of Carleton Rode, along with other Early and Middle Saxon artefacts (NHER 17031, 22652/33083/34417, 21959). Test-pit excavations conducted in the parish of Carleton Rode as part of the University of Cambridge's CORS project (Lewis 2010: 88-89) have produced pottery finds indicating the late Anglo-Saxon development of a settlement around one kilometre from the surviving church (although two churches are recorded in Domesday Book) – in an area where another test-pit find of earlier Anglo-Saxon pottery 'hints at an earlier precursor for settlement' (Lewis 2011: 56). At Carlton Colville, an evaluation

excavation within 300 metres of St Peter's church has revealed fragments of pottery identified as probably Early Saxon, as well as sherds of Thetford ware (SER CAC030). The church is located around one kilometre from the extensive Early Saxon settlement and cemetery excavated at Bloodmoor Hill, which ceased to be used during the late seventh or early eighth centuries – after which, it has been suggested, the community then relocated to a new site in the vicinity, possibly developing around a church to form an incipient Middle Saxon settlement that later became known as Carlton Colville (SER CAC 007/079; Lucy *et al.* 2009: 429).

(9.3.3) A similar chronological uncertainty surrounds the coining of the place-names of Kirton near Felixstowe and the lost *Kirkton* in the Shotley peninsula (both in south-east Suffolk),[20] in which OE **tūn** has been compounded with the ON **kirk** element. For either or both names, this could represent a Scandinavianised version of an earlier OE **ciric-tūn** name, or be derived more directly from the use of ON **kirkja** as a hybrid name given by Scandinavian-speaking settlers. Both place-names are recorded in Domesday Book, suggesting an early, pre-Conquest naming or renaming process due to Scandinavian influence. But it is unclear whether the use of the OE **tūn** element in conjunction with ON **kirkja** or OE **cirice** was intended to simply denote a 'settlement with or by a church' (as with 'Kir(k)by'), or else imply a more specific relationship referring to an 'estate belonging to a church' or a subordinate part of a large early Anglo-Saxon multiple estate that contained a church (*VEPN3*: 63-65; Fellows-Jensen 1987b: 297).

Geographically, *Kirkton* and Kirton are favourably located on the slopes of small river valleys, and on the fertile soils of the Ludford and Tendring Associations, and Wick Association, respectively.[21] They formed relatively small vills in Domesday Book with fiscal values of 1.62 carucates (*Kirkton*) and 0.26 (Kirton), and only Kirton survived as a parish in its own name, with a boundary shape suggesting an original parish formation.[22] *Kirkton* was subsumed into a parish named after the adjoining

[20] See map in Appendix 9.3a.
[21] See maps in Appendices 9.3c and 9.3e.
[22] See map in Appendix 9.3f.

settlement and Domesday vill of Shotley, with the last vestiges of the name surviving in Kirkton Hall on Ordnance Survey maps until the late nineteenth century.

Archaeologically, little Anglo-Saxon material has been recovered from Kirton, but a number of stray finds of late Anglo-Saxon artefacts have been discovered by metal-detecting close to St Mary's church at *Kirkton* (now Shotley). These provide some evidence of local Viking influence, with a bronze plate decorated with a horse-like creature in the Ringerike style dated to *c.* 1000, an eleventh-century bronze brooch in the form of an openwork serpentine animal in the Anglo-Scandinavian Urnes style (SHER SLY047/SLY056; Laverton 2001: 58-60), and other metalwork finds of possible Middle or Late Saxon provenance (SHER SLY050/053). As at Kirton, however, there have been no finds of pottery or other chronological indicators that can categorically demonstrate pre- or post-Viking origins for the settlement around the church or its predecessor that gave rise to the *Kirkton* name.

(9.3.4) Two other place-names in -**tūn** are compounded with specifics derived from ON words that have been substituted for their OE cognates. Little Melton in Norfolk contains ON **meðal** ('middle') in place of OE **middel**, and the early recorded forms of Coney Weston in west Suffolk[23] display the use of OE **cyninges** ('the king's') influenced by its ON cognate **kuninges** compounded with OE **tūn** to denote 'the king's estate or manor' (*CDEPN*: 667).[24] There is some evidence for the site serving as a royal centre from the Middle Saxon period and constituting a royal vill at the time of the Norman Conquest, with a network of soke rights owed to it by freemen of the surrounding vills (Rogerson 1995b: 89; Scarfe 1987: 96-97). Geographically , Melton and Coney Weston are both located on the fertile, but heavy clay soils of the Beccles Association away from any rivers or significant watercourses,[25] which may suggest an association with the late Anglo-Saxon extension of arable farming onto the East Anglian clay plateaux. They are both recorded as substantial vills in Domesday Book,

[23] See map in Appendix 9.3a.
[24] The place-name's later change to Coney Weston was due to influence from the name of nearby Market Weston (*DSPN*: 36).
[25] See maps in Appendices 9.3c and 9.3e.

with fiscal values of 9.36 for Melton and 2.77 for Coney Weston, and both formed parishes that appear to have been original formations.[26] Archaeologically, little Anglo-Saxon material has been recovered from Coney Weston. Although the archaeology of the parish of Great Melton has been thoroughly investigated, and Middle Saxon pottery has been found at several sites of possible Middle Saxon settlements within the current parish boundaries (including Algarsthorpe, discussed in Chapter 7), it is difficult to categorically associate any of these sites with the original settlement of Melton (NHER 13846/17551).

A few other place-names in East Anglia in **-tūn** are compounded with specifics that may contain elements derived from, or influenced by, ON names or vocabulary, including Gayton in Norfolk, Melton and Stutton in Suffolk, and Clacton and Thorrington in Essex,[27] but their etymologies are too uncertain to provide any meaningful information for this study (*CDEPN*; *DSPN*: 95, 133; Coates 2005: 39; *PNEss*: 334, 353).[28] Nevertheless, it may be significant that these place-names containing possible ON elements tend to be located around the coastal fringe of East Anglia, and along its navigable rivers, constituting a zone that may embody the principal area of Scandinavian linguistic influence.

(9.3.5) In summary, the linguistic origins and chronology of formation for the place-names in **-tūn** incorporating non-anthroponymic ON specifics remain somewhat unresolved. But a pattern is discernible regarding the nature and status of the settlements associated with the place-names in this category. Geographically, they are generally located in favourable landscape settings, usually with soils suitable for arable farming, and most became prosperous enough to form parishes – although some of the Carl(e)tons display quite high degrees of interdigitation with their neighbours that may suggest a later date of parish formation around pre-existing field boundaries. The archaeological evidence indicates possible pre-Viking origins for several of the Carl(e)tons in East Anglia, suggesting a renaming of already-established

[26] See map in Appendix 9.3f.
[27] See map in Appendix 9.3a.
[28] The individual etymologies are provided in the corpora in Appendices 1, 2 and 3.

Anglo-Saxon settlements, although it is unclear whether their previous names similarly incorporated the OE cognate **ceorla**. Overall, therefore, it seems that the Carl(e)ton place-names resulted from a Scandinavian linguistic influence prevalent in East Anglia in the late ninth and tenth centuries that manifested itself in the renaming of Anglo-Saxon settlements.

The geographical contexts of the settlements associated with the two Kir(k)tons and the other place-names in this category tend to indicate that they were all sited in reasonably favourable locations, which may similarly suggest earlier, pre-Viking origins. However, the archaeological evidence for the chronology of these settlements' formation is as uncertain as the etymology of their names, making it more difficult to draw conclusions about their origins and possible relationship with the process of Viking settlement in East Anglia. Nevertheless, it is surely significant that nearly all the hybrid East Anglian place-names containing some form of ON specific combined with OE **tūn** are located in the main zone of Scandinavian linguistic influence, within the Broadland riverine system or along the coastal fringe of Suffolk and Essex. This pattern will be explored further in Chapter 11.

9.4) Place-names containing the *tūn* generic compounded with ON personal names (the 'Grimston-hybrids')

(9.4.1) The so-called 'Grimston-hybrids' (place-names combining the OE **tūn** generic with a specific derived from a personal name of Scandinavian origin) constitute the second most numerous type of place-name reflecting Scandinavian influence in East Anglia, after the **thorps**. But they have received much less academic attention than either the **thorps** or the **býs**, with only a few short recent articles or sections of books considering the 'Grimston-hybrids' as a whole across England (Fellows-Jensen 2008; 2012; Insley 1999; Townend 2013: 117-21; Gelling 1997: 230-36) or dealing with those of East Anglia only in passing as part of broader surveys (Fellows-Jensen 1999: 57-58; 2007: 103-05; 2014a: 145-48; Insley 1999: 53-56).

There are thirty-one probable 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names (for both existing and lost settlements) identified in Norfolk and twenty-eight in Suffolk, plus another sixteen possible 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk and eleven in Suffolk,[29] but there are none in Essex. There are proportionately more 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk and Suffolk compared with the total number of **býs** and **thorps** in those counties[30] than there are in Lincolnshire, where only ten 'Grimston-hybrids' are identified (compared with 225 **býs** and 112 **thorps**), and Yorkshire (thirty-eight, compared with 210 **býs** and 336 **thorps**).[31] Intriguingly, the relatively higher numbers of 'Grimston-hybrids' in Suffolk and Norfolk are broadly equivalent to the figures of twenty-one for Leicestershire and nineteen for Nottinghamshire – two other counties of the former Danelaw which also lack the major concentrations of **býr-** and **þorp-** names found in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.[32] As in East Anglia, however, the higher numbers of 'Grimston-hybrids' in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire reflect also to some extent the greater concentrations in those counties of place-names in **-tūn** that are compounded with OE specifics than are found in Lincolnshire or Yorkshire.[33]

The traditional interpretation for the majority of 'Grimston-hybrids' located within the Danelaw has regarded them as earlier English settlements taken over by new Danish landholders, possibly the retired veterans of the Viking Great Army in the late ninth century, who partially renamed them by compounding the presumably existing **tūn** generic with a new ON personal name. This hypothesis was initially postulated by Kenneth Cameron in the 1960s and 1970s (as outlined in section 4.2.1), based on a geographical analysis of the landscape settings of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in the East Midlands. Cameron's approach was broadly endorsed with regard to the 'Grimston-hybrids' in the East Midlands and Yorkshire by Gillian Fellows-Jensen (*SSNY*; *SSNEM*), who went on to suggest that most 'Grimston-hybrids' in the Danelaw may have been formed as a result of the Vikings' take-over and

[29] See table in Appendix 9.1b, and map in Appendix 9.1a.
[30] Twenty-two **býs** and fifty-nine **thorps** in Norfolk; three **býs** and twenty **thorps** in Suffolk.
[31] See table in Appendix 4.3a.
[32] See map in Appendix 9.4.1a. The sources of the numbers quoted are provided by the table in Appendix 4.3a.
[33] See map in Appendix 9.4.1b.

fragmentation of Anglo-Saxon estates in the ninth and tenth centuries (Fellows-Jensen 2012: 353-57; 1982: 16-18, 30-31). Other recent scholars, such as Matthew Townend (2014: 100-05), have continued to generally support the interpretation of 'Grimston-hybrids' as pre-existing and prosperous Anglo-Saxon settlements taken over and renamed by new Scandinavian landholders, possibly including some of the members of the Viking Great Army, in a process which may have been associated with the fragmentation of large estates.

However, there has been no recent detailed evaluation of the geographical and archaeological context of the settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in Yorkshire and the East Midlands, on which Cameron's original hypothesis was originally constructed, and no attempt has been made to explore its validity with regard to the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia. This study will undertake such an analysis in the sections below, and seek to determine what significance the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia may hold for the process and chronology of Viking settlement in the region.

(9.4.2) The significance of 'Grimston-hybrids' as indicators of early Viking settlement, possibly by the Great Army veterans of the ninth century, depends on the individual place-names being identified as of early origin (that is, formed during the earlier phase of Viking settlement in the late ninth and early tenth centuries), as Cameron argued (1971 [1975: 160-61]) with regard to those in the East Midlands. In East Anglia, 92% of the recorded 'Grimston-hybrids' are mentioned in Domesday Book,[34] compared with 86% of those in the East Midlands (calculated from *SSNEM*: 180-98), which clearly indicates a pattern of pre-Conquest origins in both regions. This percentage corresponds exactly with the equivalent 92% for the **býr**-names in East Anglia, but is considerably more than the 65% of the **thorp**-names recorded in Domesday Book. There are only a few written pre-Domesday references to East Anglian 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in charters dating to the mid-eleventh century, mostly surviving in later medieval copies, with four settlements thus

[34] See tables in Appendices 9.4.1e and 9.4.1f.

mentioned in Norfolk and three in Suffolk (as indicated in the tables in Appendices 9.4.1e and 9.4.1f).

However, there is also a hitherto unremarked reference in the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis*[35] to the presumed tenth-century existence of an estate called Drinkstone in Suffolk, a 'Grimston-hybrid' name that incorporates the ON personal name *Drengr*, or Old Danish *Dreng* (Insley 2002; *DSPN*: 44; *CDEPN*: 195). The relevant section of *Liber Eliensis* (copied from an earlier document)[36] records a previous owner of the Drinkstone estate as having purchased 'the whole estate at Drinkstone (*Dringestune*)',[37] presumably in the late tenth century. By this time, therefore, the Anglo-Scandinavian place-name of Drinkstone had apparently become established and accepted,[38] as it was not qualified by explanatory mention of any previous or alternative Old English name – unlike Æthelweard's inclusion of both *Norðworðig* and *Deoraby* in his reference to Derby.[39] This suggests that the name of *Dringestune* might have become established by the middle decades of the tenth century, and that it had perhaps originated with an earlier take-over of the estate in question by an individual bearing the Scandinavian name of *Drengr*.

In other parts of the Danelaw with more abundant surviving documentary sources, there are no ninth-century written references to 'Grimston-hybrids', but four are mentioned in tenth-century charters (dating from 942 to the 990s) in Yorkshire and the Midlands (Fellows-Jensen 2012: 353-55). This again suggests that these names had begun to be formed by the early tenth century or possibly earlier, in order for these place-names to have become sufficiently established and accepted to be recorded in legal documents of the mid-tenth century.

An early date of formation for some of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia has been suggested also from an onomastic analysis of the ON personal names used to create them. For unlike the relatively few Norman names which

[35] See above, section 2.1.2.
[36] Blake 1962: xxxviii, 136 (note 1), 156 (note 2); Fairweather 2005: xv, 160 (note 295).
[37] Blake 1962: 137, Book II, Chapter 65; trans. Fairweather 2005: 164.
[38] *Liber Eliensis* contains two other references to Drinkstone's existence in the pre-Conquest period (Blake 1962: 153, Book II, Chapter 84 (spelt as *Drenchestune*); 162, Book II, Chapter 92 (*Drinchestune*).
[39] See above, section 4.2.3.

became popular after the Conquest, there was a wide and diverse repertoire of personal names of Scandinavian origin that flourished alongside the equally varied corpus of Anglo-Saxon names in the pre-Conquest period, including many new names coined by Scandinavian immigrants and their descendants (Fellows-Jensen 1991b: 107; 1995b: 14-16). As these ON personal names continued to develop and evolve over the two centuries following the initial Viking settlements, their changing linguistic characteristics may be identified to provide a possible chronological benchmark for gauging when the place-names in which they appear may have been formed.

There are three categories of ON personal names from which 'Grimston-hybrids' were derived that may indicate early place-name formation, possibly in the late ninth or early tenth centuries.[40] The largest category, from which around a quarter of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia were formed, comprises those names which are not attested in Domesday Book or recorded independently in the Danelaw (Fellows-Jensen 1995b: 14; Insley 1999: 54). These may indicate a wide variety of personal names and by-names that were apparently in vogue during the early period of Viking settlement but had fallen out of fashion and use by the late eleventh century, when names were being recorded more widely in written records (Cameron 1975: 160-61; Fellows-Jensen 2008: 128-29; 2012: 353-56). There are fourteen such names in Norfolk out of a total of forty-eight (29%) and nine out of thirty-eight (24%) in Suffolk,[41] plus another seven personal names which are recorded only very occasionally in England[42] (*SPNN*; Insley 1999: 54; *SPNLY*; Fellows-Jensen 1995b: 14-16; von Feilitzen 1937).

Secondly, a smaller number of ON personal names used in the East Anglian 'Grimston-hybrids' appear in anglicized forms typical of the early period of Viking settlement in England. Before *c.* 1000, English scribes recorded Viking names in more familiar English linguistic forms and such anglicized names apparently came into general use amongst the mixed population of the Danelaw, especially in East Anglia.

[40] See map and tables in Appendices 9.4.1d, 9.4.1e and 9.4.1f.
[41] These names are indicated as 'Unrecorded' in the tables in Appendices 9.4.1e and 9.4.1f.
[42] Indicated as 'Rare' in Appendices 9.4.1e and 9.4.1f.

But during Cnut's reign in the early eleventh century, Danish culture became more prestigious in England and so ON personal names began to be recorded in English sources using more authentic Scandinavian forms. It is argued, therefore, that 'Grimston-hybrids' containing the earlier anglicized forms were coined before the year 1000 (*SPNN*: xxxvii; Fellows-Jensen 1995b: 15-16). In such a way, Aslacton in Norfolk appears in Domesday Book as both *Aslactuna* and *Oslactuna*, indicating some degree of anglicisation of the original ON *Áslákr*. Other 'Grimston-hybrids' contain similar anglicisations: *Osmondiston* (*Osmund*, from ON *Ásmundr*?) and Thurgarton (*Þurgar*, from ON *Þorgeirr*) in Norfolk, plus Thuxton in Norfolk and three Thurstons in Suffolk (*Þurstān*, from the ON *Þorsteinn*). Also in Suffolk is Kettlebaston, from the ON *Ketilbjǫrn* with OE *cytel* substituted for ON *ketill* and OE *beorn* for ON *bjǫrn* (Fellows-Jensen 1995b: 15; 2007: 104; *SPNN*: 54).

A third possible indicator of early place-name formation is the use of archaic Scandinavian forms of the personal names containing *-ketill* as their second element; this had become contracted to *-kel(l)* or *-kil(l)* in Denmark by the year 1000 (Fellows-Jensen 1991b: 112-20). The earlier, uncontracted form *Þorketill* (which later became *Þorkell* or *Þorkill*) appears in anglicized form as *Þurcytel* in the lost *Thurkelton* in Suffolk (*Turchetlestuna* in Domesday Book) and the similarly uncontracted **Ylfketill* appears in Ilketshall (*Ilcheteleshala*), although the latter is not a 'Grimston-hybrid' (Fellows-Jensen 1991b: 118-19; 1994: 136-37; 1999: 59; *SPNN*: 414-19). However, both the uncontracted and anglicised forms of these personal names clearly continued to be used by individuals into the eleventh century in East Anglia,[43] and so they cannot be used alone as evidence that the place-names in which they appear are necessarily early.

It is difficult to detect any overall pattern of geographical distribution of the 'Grimston-hybrids' displaying linguistic evidence for possible early formation, but it is possible to discern a cluster of 'Grimston-hybrids' in south-east Suffolk containing personal names which may suggest earlier formation, alongside a smaller number

[43] The commander of the East Anglian forces fighting against the Danes in the early eleventh century was called *Ulfcytel* (see section 2.2.8 above).

which offer no linguistic evidence for dating.[44] Elsewhere, smaller groupings or pairings of 'Grimston-hybrids' containing personal names that suggest earlier origins are apparent in Norfolk (which will be explored below), but otherwise it is difficult to detect any particular concentration or pattern of earlier 'Grimston-hybrid' formation in other parts of East Anglia.

In contrast to these indicators of early formation, there is evidence also suggesting that some 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia may have been formed as late as the second half of the eleventh century. As with a small number of the anthroponymic **thorps**, it has been suggested that some of the ON personal names compounded in 'Grimston-hybrids' that were recorded in Domesday Book were those of contemporaneous individuals whose names are similarly recorded as landholders or tenants of the same vills (von Feilitzen 1937: 32-33). A particular pattern of late name-formation has been hypothesised for a cluster of **tūn**-names in the Colneis hundred of south-east Suffolk recorded in Domesday Book as very small settlements held by freemen but now all lost (Insley 1999: 55-56). Four 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names are interspersed with another five vills with **tūn**-names formed from OE personal names, including *Leston* (from *Lēofstān*) (Briggs, forthcoming). The DB entry for *Leston* also records a freeman called *Leofstanus* (from OE *Lēofstān*) as being a tenant there in 1066 who, it has been proposed, may have given his name to the vill. This could, therefore, indicate a process of very late name-formation for a cluster of peasant settlements in which 'the ones containing ON personal names have nothing to do with the original Viking invasions at the end of the ninth century' (Insley 1999: 55). The geographical context of this cluster of 'Grimston-hybrids' is explored further in section 9.4.5.5.

The diversity of the personal names used to create the 'Grimston-hybrids' of East Anglia can be seen also in their underlying morphological structure. Unlike the ON personal names incorporated into the **thorp** and **-bý** place-names of East Anglia of which only around 7% and 10% respectively are dithematic,[45] a larger proportion

[44] See map in Appendix 9.4.1d.
[45] See sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 above.

(around 30%) of the personal names used to create the 'Grimston-hybrids' are dithematic. This may possibly indicate that a greater number of 'Grimston-hybrids' were formed later in the Anglo-Saxon period when dithematic names were being used more widely, but may be indicative also of the social status and identity of the Scandinavian landholders commemorated in the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names (Sandred 1987: 321; Insley 2003: 381-87).

Unlike the anthroponymic **býr**-names of Flegg and **thorp**-names of East Anglia which seem to mainly represent the names of individuals of low social status, the personal names found in the 'Grimston-hybrids' of East Anglia suggest a process of Scandinavian settlement that has been characterised as 'largely aristocratic and seignorial... [judging] from the place-name evidence' (Insley 1999: 53). This is reflected, for example, in the apparent growing popularity of personal names containing the element *Þor* among the landowning and military classes of Viking Scandinavia from whose ranks the commanders of Viking expeditions were drawn, and suggests that the relative frequency of *Þor*-based names as the first element of 'Grimston-hybrids' may well indicate the renaming of pre-existing English estates seized by the leaders of the late ninth-century Viking armies (Insley 1979: 52-53). Nevertheless, the fact that 70% of the personal names found in the 'Grimston-hybrids' of East Anglia are of monothematic form suggests that a wider social range of individuals were involved in their formation.

(9.4.3) As with the anthroponymic **thorps**, it is possible to detect also some degree of ethnic affiliation in the personal names used to create the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia.[46] A considerable proportion of the personal names contained in the latter were used also in the East Scandinavian linguistic zone (especially the region that became Denmark), with only a few appearing more prominently in sources from West Scandinavian areas. The personal names of 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk such as *Api* (Apton), *Gunni* (Gunton), *Kálfr* (Cawston), *Ketil* (Kettlestone), *Klak* (Claxton), *Krókr* (the two Croxtons), *Styr* (Starston and Sturston), and *Tūmi* (Thompson) are

[46] See tables and map in Appendices 9.4.1e, 9.4.1f and 9.4.3a.

found also in Danish place-names, as are several in Suffolk, such as *Gunni* (Gunton), *Broðir* (Brotherton), *Friði* (Fritton), and possibly *Ali* (Oulton) (*SPNLY*; *SPNN*). Altogether, around 40% of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia contain personal names which are found also in Danish place-names or commonly mentioned in Danish sources, compared with a corresponding figure of around 55% for the **thorps** in East Anglia containing ON personal names.

As with the **býs** and **thorps**, only a very few personal names compounded in East Anglian 'Grimston-hybrids' are more common in West Scandinavian sources (mainly Norway and Iceland), such as *Narfi* (in the lost *Naruestuna*), *Kári* (Corton), *Ingulfr* (Ingleston) and the possible *Leifr* in Leiston (*SPNLY*; *SPNN*). The *Sumarliði* ('summer-traveller') name that gave rise to Somerton in south-west Suffolk and Somerleyton appears to have originated in the Norse settlements of the Western Isles, and the *Fulmôd* of Fulmodeston in Norfolk has been identified as Frankish (*SPNLY*: 270-71; *SPNN*: 351, 124; 1999: 54). If the naming of some 'Grimston-hybrids' can be demonstrated to have occurred as early as the late-ninth century involving veterans of the Viking Great Army, then this variety of ethnic affinities may possibly reflect the multi-cultural nature of the Army's constituents that has been hypothesised (discussed in section 2.2.1b).

In terms of geographical location, it is difficult to detect any regional pattern of distribution for the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia containing personal names identifiable as 'Danish' or 'West Scandinavian' in origin.[47] But it is once again possible to discern a degree of concentration of 'Grimston-hybrids' containing 'Danish' personal names in the same cluster in south-east Suffolk that incorporated personal names indicating possible earlier formation. Both forms of evidence are individually very uncertain and tenuous, but the fact that they coincide for the same cluster of 'Grimston-hybrids' may start to indicate a pattern of possible significance. In Norfolk, isolated pairings of 'Grimston-hybrids' containing 'Danish' personal names similarly tend to coincide with those containing 'early' personal names, which may also be significant.

[47] See map in Appendix 9.4.3a.

Overall, however, the linguistic evidence for gauging the chronological and social context of the formation of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia appears, like that of the **thorps**, to be somewhat ambiguous and inconclusive, although both name-types display a closer ethnic affinity with the name-giving practices of the region that became Denmark than that of other Scandinavian territories. But as with the **thorps**, the 'Grimston-hybrids' seem on balance to display a wider range chronologically and socially than that of the **býr**-names in terms of their possible dates of formation and the social class of individuals whose names are commemorated in them. However, there is no meaningful apparent overall pattern in the distribution of those 'Grimston-hybrids' displaying possible evidence for early – or late – formation, or for possible Danish origins, although it is possible to discern a greater concentration of such 'Grimston-hybrids' in the large cluster of south Suffolk and in some of the smaller ones scattered throughout Norfolk.

(9.4.4) The preceding linguistic analysis has examined the intrinsically Scandinavian characteristics of the personal names compounded in the 'Grimston-hybrids' of East Anglia to determine how they may have influenced the patterns of settlement displayed by this type of place-name. But as they are slightly outnumbered in East Anglia by the equivalent **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names,[48] it is important to differentiate between the formation of the two place-name types. For there is a scattering of 'Grimston-hybrids' in south-west England beyond the traditional boundaries of the Danelaw which clearly cannot be attributed to the usual processes of Scandinavian place-name formation associated with Viking settlement.[49] Some are assumed to contain the personal names of Scandinavian men who had received grants of land from Cnut or his successors in the eleventh century (Fellows-Jensen 2008: 356-57; see section 2.2.7 above). Others are generally of post-Conquest formation, and bear Scandinavian or Anglo-Scandinavian personal names that presumably had entered the stock of Anglo-Saxon personal names in use across

[48] See table in Appendix 9.2b and discussion in section 9.2.1.
[49] See map in Appendix 9.4.1a.

the whole of England by the late eleventh century (Parson 2002: 39-44). It has been suggested that these late examples outside the Danelaw are therefore 'bogus Grimston-hybrids' (Gelling 1997: 231), which should be discounted from any analysis of Viking settlement (Insley 1999: 56).

So if, notwithstanding the evidence for early formation discussed above, a substantial number of 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia were thus similarly named in the eleventh century after English individuals who happened to bear ON names which had entered the general Anglo-Saxon name-stock, then they might be expected to be geographically indistinguishable from, and interspersed randomly with, the other place-names in **tūn** that are compounded with OE personal names. An analysis of the geographical distribution and landscape settings of the settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrids' needs, therefore, to consider the equivalent contexts of the **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names in order to determine whether the two types of settlement were named or renamed together in similar circumstances – or whether the formation of some or all of the 'Grimston-hybrids' may have been due to a different place-naming process.

(9.4.5) The geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in Yorkshire and the East Midlands were partially explored in the 1970s (Cameron 1971; *SSNY*; *SSNEM*), but no corresponding systematic analysis has so far been conducted of the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements in East Anglia. Still generally accepted by scholars today (Townend 2014: 100-05), Cameron's hypothesis of an initial phase of Viking settlement in England in which Viking settlers took over and renamed existing, well-established Anglo-Saxon villages or estates was based on his analysis of the landscape settings of 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements. In the East Midlands, these tended to be located on favourable sites that are 'impossible to distinguish meaningfully' (Cameron 1985: 143) from those of the adjacent English-named villages, containing generics such as **tūn**, **cot**, **hām**, **wīc** and **worð**. The 'Grimston-hybrids' were apparently located more advantageously than the Scandinavian **bý**- and **thorp**-named places, which Cameron consequently regarded as constituting new and secondary settlements in more marginal areas of

land (Cameron 1971; 1976: 19-23; 1985: 143-53). The hypothesis that most 'Grimston-hybrids' were prosperous, pre-existing English settlements on well-established sites and not new developments of the Viking Age is based (as far as the 'Grimston-hybrids' of the East Midlands and Yorkshire are concerned) on the analysis of a number of varied factors, including their locations on fertile soils, the frequency with which they became parishes, their relative wealth in Domesday Book, and their low rate of depopulation and desertion in the later medieval period (Townend 2014: 102; Cameron 1971; *SSNY*: 195-251; *SSNEM*: 268-372).

This methodology provides a starting point for the analysis below which uses GIS technology to examine the geographical context of the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements in East Anglia, and compare them with those of other Scandinavian-influenced place-names as well as the equivalent OE place-names containing the **tūn** generic compounded with OE personal names. It will also consider the possible formation of 'Grimston-hybrids' as a result of the fragmentation of old Anglo-Saxon estates, another hypothesis that has been advanced (Fellows-Jensen 2012: 353-57; 1982: 16-18, 30-31) but for which little local analysis has so far been conducted in East Anglia.

In contrast to the concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in east Norfolk which falls away to the west of the county and to the south into Suffolk, the 'Grimston-hybrids' are distributed more evenly across most of Norfolk and Suffolk, with a combination of several small clusters and a number of isolated individual place-names.[50] The total number of eighty-six 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia is divided fairly equally between Norfolk and Suffolk,[51] but it is significant that there are none in Essex,[52] on the other side of the river Stour which forms the southern boundary of Suffolk – and probably that of the Danelaw in East Anglia also.[53] To some extent, this pattern reflects that of the more abundant place-

[50] See maps in Appendices 4.3c and 9.1a.
[51] See table in Appendix 9.1b.
[52] However, there is an unusual and puzzling use of the OE **tūn** generic in a number of field-names in Essex, including several compounded with personal-name specifics. Some of these are Scandinavian in origin, creating Grimston-hybrid name-types such as *Thorcetelestone* in Salcott Virley near Maldon, first recorded in 1275 (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 423; *PNEss*: 591-92).
[53] Discussed above in Chapter 2.2.3a.

names in **-tūn** compounded with OE specifics,[54] with considerable numbers in Norfolk and Suffolk but far fewer in Essex. However, there are no 'Grimston-hybrids' in Hertfordshire, just one each in Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire, and two in south-west Cambridgeshire (Gover *et al.* 1938: xviii-xx; Mawer and Stenton 1926: xix-xx; Reaney 1943: xix-xxii) – although in these counties the **tūn**-names compounded with OE specifics are relatively abundant.

It may be significant also that very few 'Grimston-hybrids' are located in the immediate localities of some known Anglo-Saxon royal vills or estates, such as Hadleigh, Bures, Rendlesham and Blythburgh. But some are clustered instead around their outer margins in the hundreds of Cosford, Lothingland, Colneis and Blything,[55] perhaps representing some fragmentation of the original large royal estates that had presumably been taken over by the Viking leaders who took control of the East Anglian kingdom, as will be explored below. Other clusters of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names are apparent elsewhere, especially in Norfolk, and are examined in further detail below.

(9.4.5.1) At a more localised level of analysis, the landscape settings of the individual settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia display a greater degree of uniformity than those of other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, such as the **býs** and **thorps**. In terms of local topography and proximity to watercourses, it is surprising that 87% are found on the upper sections of small river valleys that have incised the inland clay plateau of East Anglia.[56] In Norfolk, twenty-five (93%) of the twenty-seven settlements associated with probable 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names that can be accurately located are situated on the valley slopes of small rivers or streams, as are fifteen (79%) out of nineteen in Suffolk. It is also striking how the riverside locations of the 'Grimston-hybrids' are concentrated in the upper reaches of small river valleys, with none in Norfolk located

[54] See maps in Appendices 4.3f, 9.2a and 9.4.1a.
[55] See map in Appendix 9.4.4a. In contrast, the **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names do not display such a pattern of distribution around royal vills, and are scattered more widely.
[56] See map in Appendix 9.4.5a.

further downstream beside a larger (that is, navigable) river or estuary, and only three in Suffolk located beside estuaries or the coast. Conversely, and once again in contrast to other Scandinavian-influenced place-names such as the **thorps** or **thwaites**, there are very few 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements located in landscape settings away from any rivers or significant watercourses, with only two (7%) of the probable 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk, and none in Suffolk.

The frequent siting of the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements in the upper sections of small river valleys suggests that they were formed in the later stages (or 'second phase', as discussed in section 5.3.4) of the colonisation of the claylands, and may therefore represent more marginal locations than those utilised for earlier settlements. This contrasts with the more favourable siting of the majority of 'Grimston-hybrids' elsewhere in the Danelaw, but to some extent it may reflect the greater population density in East Anglia during the late Anglo-Saxon period compared with other regions (Darby 1977: 87-94, 338-45), leading to an increasing scarcity of available land and consequent need to utilise more marginal areas by the time the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' names were being formed.

(9.4.5.2) In terms of underlying geology, the majority of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia are located across the central raised plateau of boulder clay, although two small clusters in Suffolk are situated away from the clay plateau and nearer the coast, in the hundreds of Colneis and Lothingland.[57] The concentration of 'Grimston-hybrids' in the upper sections of river valleys has determined the soil-types with which most of them are associated. In Norfolk, eighteen (67%) of the twenty-seven probable 'Grimston-hybrids' with identifiable locations are located principally on the well-drained sandy or peaty soils of the Isleham, Altcar and Burlingham Associations commonly found in the middle and upper sections of Norfolk river valleys.[58] In Suffolk, eleven (58%) out of nineteen are similarly located mainly on the reasonably well-drained soils of the Hanslope Association found in river valleys both to the north-

[57] See map in Appendix 9.4.5b.
[58] See map in Appendix 9.4.5c.

east of the Lark-Gipping divide (see section 5.2.2) and more widely south-west of this line, as well as the sandier Melford and Ludford Association soils found in the river valleys of south-west Suffolk.

However, although these areas of well-drained, sandy soils associated with river valleys provided favourable sites for settlements and agriculture, they become smaller and narrower towards the valleys' upper reaches. For settlements formed in this section of a river, therefore, the soils they are adjacent to, within their 'catchment-areas' for agricultural exploitation, are just as significant as the soils they are actually situated on – and can alter the agricultural suitability of a settlement's site accordingly. Thus it can be seen on the map in Appendix 9.4.5i that whereas the OE-named village of Swannington is located wholly on the peaty, fertile soils of the Adventurers' 2 Association in the lower valley of the river Wensum, the settlements of Booton, Guton and Cawston (all with 'Grimston-hybrid' names) are located higher up the valleys on the edges of the narrow riverine strips of the Isleham 2 valley soils and close also to other, often less favourable soils such as those of the Newport 3 Association. This factor may well have played a role in the early failure and desertion of some of the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements formed in these locations.

The widespread distribution of 'Grimston-hybrids' across the claylands of East Anglia partially reflects the distributions of the **thorps** and **thwaites**. But the almost ubiquitous siting of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in the upper sections of small river valleys, as opposed to the frequent locating of **thorps** and **thwaites** away from rivers or significant water courses, indicates some significantly different contexts of settlement, or place-naming and renaming processes.

It may be more pertinent that the distribution of the 'Grimston-hybrids' corresponds to some extent with that of the equivalent place-names containing the **tūn** generic compounded with OE specifics, which are also located in considerable numbers across the boulder clay plateau of East Anglia.[59] However, the **tūn**-names compounded with OE non-anthroponymic specifics or OE folk-names are located more widely in lower-lying areas of sands and gravels beyond the clay plateau, with

[59] See maps in Appendices 9.4.5d and 9.4.5e.

a particular cluster in the Fenland area of north-west Norfolk and a broader swathe around the coastal fringes of Norfolk and Suffolk (but less so in Essex). Conversely, both these coastal zones contain fewer **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names, as a higher proportion of these (around 75%) are located instead mainly across the clay plateau, interspersed with the 'Grimston-hybrids'.

However, a distinction can be drawn between the relative siting on the claylands of the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements and those of the **tūns** compounded with OE personal names. If the landscape settings of the latter are analysed using the same methodology as for the 'Grimston-hybrids' in the previous section (9.4.5.1), it becomes apparent that considerably fewer are sited alongside small river valleys.[60] Forty-seven (53%) of the eighty-eight with identifiable locations are indeed located in small river valleys, more than half of the total, but this is a considerably lower proportion than the 87% average for the 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk and Suffolk. A significant proportion (19%) are also found further downstream beside larger river valleys, where no 'Grimston-hybrids' are located. This differentiation is particularly noticeable in south Suffolk, as will be discussed in section 9.4.5.4 below.

The pattern of landscape settings for both 'Grimston-hybrids' and **tūns** compounded with OE personal names may reflect a chronological development in the use of the **tūn** generic, as postulated in sections 5.3.4 and 9.2.2 above. It is suggested that the earliest-formed **tūn**-names began to be applied to settlements located around the coastal fringe of East Anglia in the areas first settled by Anglo-Saxon immigrants, as the use of the initial OE generics such as **hām** started to decline. These early **tūn**-names were formed with geographical, topographical or functional specifics, as was the 'fashion' in the early and middle Anglo-Saxon period. Subsequently, **tūn**-names began to be formed using personal names, at the same time that the East Anglian clay uplands were starting to be colonised. At first, only OE personal names were used for settlements formed in the lower sections of the clayland river valleys. But as settlements were formed or delineated as independent territorial units in the higher sections of these river valleys, some of them were

[60] See map in Appendix 9.4.5i.

named (or renamed) using the ON personal names of the newly arrived Viking settlers in addition to the existing OE name-stock. The question of how individuals with ON personal names acquired ownership or control of such territories in order to commemorate their own names in the naming or renaming of them is an issue that will be explored further below. The very final stage in the colonisation of the East Anglian claylands saw the establishment of more marginal settlements directly on the claylands themselves away from any rivers or watercourses. A few of these bore 'Grimston-hybrid' names, but there were more **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names, suggesting that the principal phase of 'Grimston-hybrid' formation may have ended before the colonisation of the claylands was complete.

(9.4.5.3) As will be explored below, a considerable number of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia subsequently became deserted and lost in the later medieval period, and so it is surprising that 92% of them were of sufficient economic significance in the eleventh century to be recorded as vills in Domesday Book. This percentage matches that of the East Anglian **bý**-names and exceeds those for the other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names – especially the **thorps** (65%) and **thwaites** (50%), two other name-types which were also involved in the colonisation of the East Anglian claylands. The overall mean average value of the seventy-five 'Grimston-hybrid' in East Anglia whose fiscal assessments can be extrapolated from Domesday Book is 3.20 carucates, a slightly higher figure than the average individual values for most other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-name. However, the average fiscal value for 'Grimston-hybrid' vills is derived from a wide range of individual values, from 12.08 carucates for Cawston in Norfolk to 0.03 carucates (that is, just four acres) for the now-lost *Naruestuna* in Norfolk. It is the 'Grimston-hybrids' with low fiscal values recorded in Domesday Book that were particularly prone to desertion and abandonment in the later medieval period. Such a broad range of fiscal values may once again be indicative of the diverse circumstances of formation, and naming or renaming, of the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names.

(9.4.5.4) The relative prosperity of the 'Grimston-hybrids' at the time of Domesday Book is reflected also in their parochial status. Of the eighty-six probable and possible 'Grimston-hybrids' recorded in Norfolk and Suffolk, sixty-one (71%) became settlements that prospered sufficiently to form parishes in their own name that survived into the nineteenth century,[61] considerably more than the 48% of **thorps** but much less than the 92% of **býr**-names.[62] Most of the 'Grimston-hybrids' that did not form parishes subsequently became deserted or lost villages, with five in Norfolk and seven in Suffolk.

Like their fiscal values in Domesday Book, the relative sizes of the parishes formed by 'Grimston-hybrids' vary widely, too. A few, such as Cawston in Norfolk and Westleton in Suffolk (and the adjoining Leiston) are comparatively larger than their neighbours. Several are very small, such as Coston and Holverston in Norfolk, and Flowton in Suffolk. But the majority are in a middling small-to-medium range, being generally smaller than the nearby **hām**-named parishes but otherwise of a comparable size to their neighbours.

The boundary shapes of most 'Grimston-hybrid' parishes similarly display less evidence of secondary formation using land from adjoining parochial units, in contrast to the **thorps** and **thwaites**. Only a few display panhandle protuberances, such as Helhoughton in Norfolk, and Nacton and Westleton in Suffolk, or other signs of interdigitation with neighbouring parishes, such as Somerton and Kettlebaston in Suffolk which both display isolated parochial 'islands' separated from their main parochial territories. It appears instead that the parochial pattern of the 'Grimston-hybrids' is characterised more by the manner in which they are frequently located in clusters, especially in Norfolk and north-east Suffolk. The parishes that have resulted from these patterns of settlements have often formed interlocking and adjoining parochial blocks – some comprising several **tūn**-names compounded solely with ON

[61] However, the relatively high figure of 71% includes around 20% of settlements in which village cores have relocated, leaving what became isolated churches, or have survived only as eponymous Halls, Farms or Streets, which nevertheless retained their parochial status into the nineteenth century.
[62] See maps in Appendices 9.4.5f and 9.4.5g.

personal names, and others containing **tūn**-names compounded with varying combinations of ON and OE personal names.

The clearest example of such a cluster is in Lothingland hundred in north-east Suffolk where the five probable and possible 'Grimston-hybrids' of Corton, Gunton, Flixton, Oulton and Somerleyton are located together, alongside one **tūn**-name incorporating an OE personal name, Blundeston.[63] These six settlements have formed a contiguous block of interlocking parishes (adjoining Lowestoft, another Scandinavian place-name) that constitutes the southern half of the hundred, with an outer boundary delineated by the sea on one side and the river Waveney on the other, that had originally formed the island territory of Lothingland. The boundary shapes of the six parishes within this block tend to suggest that they were formed together contemporaneously, with little interdigitation that might indicate the later formation of some parishes with land taken from their neighbours.[64] Is it possible, therefore, that these settlements, or units of land, were originally part of a larger estate that formed the southern part of the original island of Lothingland? If so, this might reflect a process of estate-fragmentation occurring in the late Anglo-Saxon period, which has been postulated as a possible component in the formation of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names (Fellows-Jensen 2012: 353-57; 1982).[65] But it may be significant that only one of the 'Grimston-hybrids' that constitute this cluster on Lothingland was located in a small river valley, unlike the majority of other 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia that are thus located.

Other clusters of 'Grimston hybrids' can be discerned elsewhere in Norfolk which display possible signs of formation by estate-fragmentation, but the evidence is less clear-cut: Hellington and Claxton in Loddon, together with Holverston and possibly Apton in Henstead;[66] Kettlestone, Clipstone, Croxton and Fulmodeston in Gallow hundred, with the nearby Hindolveston in the neighbouring hundred of

[63] See maps in Appendices 9.4.4c and 9.4.5f.
[64] However, the boundary between Oulton and Lowestoft does display some degree of interdigitation, possibly caused by the incorporation of the settlement of Akethorpe within the township of Lowestoft.
[65] Discussed in section 5.3.7 above.
[66] See maps in Appendices 9.4.4c and 9.4.5f (Apton subsequently formed a joint parish with Bergh).

Eynsford;[67] Cawston, Booton and Oulton, near Reepham in South Erpingham; Garveston(e), Thuxton and a now-lost twinned settlement called Thurstanton (Butler and Wade-Martins 1989: 54-58) in Mitford hundred, plus Coston located slightly further away in Forehoe hundred.[68]

It is significant, however, that most of these clusters straddle the boundaries of hundreds, making it unlikely that the 'Grimston-hybrids' in each cluster could all have resulted from the fragmentation of a single estate. There are also fewer contiguous parishes bearing 'Grimston-hybrid' names in each of these clusters, and it is more difficult in each case to discern from the configuration of their boundaries any likely pattern of fragmentation of a complete estate. Nevertheless, the clustering of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in the more northern areas of East Anglia is in noticeable contrast to the distribution of most of the **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names. In Norfolk, the latter are generally scattered individually across the county, with just occasional pairings, although one or two are also located close to 'Grimston-hybrid' clusters. In Suffolk, there is a noticeable concentration of place-names in **tūn** compounded with personal names in the south of the county, with approximate equal numbers containing OE and ON personal names.[69] The two forms do not appear to be randomly interspersed with each other, but instead the **tūn**-names with OE personal names tend to be located along the banks of the rivers Stour and Gipping, and the lower sections of their tributaries, whereas most of those with ON personal names (the 'Grimston hybrids') are located further north on the upper reaches of the tributaries of these rivers.

This pattern appears to be more typical of the distribution of most other 'Grimston-hybrids' throughout much of Norfolk and Suffolk rather than those which may have been formed by the fragmentation of possible estates. There does indeed appear to be a particular pattern in Norfolk and Suffolk for the formation of settlements in the upper sections of small river valleys on the edges of the East Anglian boulder clay plateau that were named or renamed with 'Grimston-hybrid

[67] See maps in Appendices 9.4.4b and 9.4.5f.
[68] Also on maps in Appendices 9.4.4b and 9.4.5f.
[69] See map in Appendix 9.4.4d.

place-names – a process which requires further analysis. The chronology and circumstances by which these individual settlements were formed have hitherto not been explored, but they may be illuminated by a review of the archaeological evidence at a more local level.

(9.4.5.5) The archaeological evidence for settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia is patchy and incomplete. Despite their apparent prosperity recorded in the documentary evidence of Domesday Book, many 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements declined into insignificance or abandonment during the post-Conquest period (for the reasons outlined in section 5.3.5) – a phenomenon which itself is significant. Ten 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk and Suffolk are now lost, with unlocated settlement-sites. Four more are associated with known sites of deserted medieval villages identified at their presumed locations, but these have tended to generate archaeological evidence of later medieval settlement activity rather than material datable to the Viking period. Another twelve 'Grimston-hybrids' survive today only as eponymous Halls, Farms or Streets. Altogether, therefore, twenty-six (30%) of the eighty-six 'Grimston-hybrids' recorded in East Anglia can thus be categorised as 'lost villages',[70] which is a relatively high proportion compared with equivalent percentages of 13% for the 'Grimston-hybrids' in the counties of the East Midlands and 12% for those in Yorkshire (*SSNY*: 231-36; *SSNEM*: 357-63).

It is not possible to directly compare the number of lost 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements throughout East Anglia with the equivalent lost settlements bearing **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names (or other types of OE-named settlements) as the corresponding data is not readily available. But analysis of the **tūn**-names in Suffolk (as recorded in Briggs, forthcoming) indicates that seventeen (almost 30%) of the fifty-seven containing OE personal names, and twenty-one (36%) of the remaining fifty-eight **tūn**-names compounded with OE non-anthroponymic specifics, can also be regarded as lost villages. It is significant that the proportions of

[70] This figure excludes villages containing an isolated church separated from a relocated settlement-core which has remained in habitational use.

lost villages bearing **tūn**-names with each category of specific – OE and ON, anthroponymic and non-anthroponymic – are all broadly similar, at around one-third of the total. This proportion is much higher than the corresponding 7% of settlements in Suffolk bearing place-names in **-hām** that are lost, reflecting the fundamental difference between **tūn**- and **hām**-named settlements discussed above. Such a high proportion of lost 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements, similar to other **tūn**-named settlements in Suffolk but considerably higher than the lost 'Grimston'hybrids' elsewhere in the Danelaw, surely indicates that a significant number of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia were associated with lower-status settlements – unlike the 'Grimston-hybrids' of the East Midlands which were characterised as 'indistinguishable' from the adjacent prosperous, well-established settlements with English names (Cameron 1985: 143).

As discussed in section 9.4.2, there is a cluster of around ten small settlements in the Colneis hundred of south-east Suffolk bearing **tūn**-names compounded with both ON and OE personal names which do indeed appear to have been formed in different circumstances from the majority of 'Grimston-hybrids' elsewhere. They are nearly all recorded in Domesday Book as very small vills with low fiscal values, and each was usually held by several freemen. Few prospered to form parishes and many were abandoned in the late medieval and early modern periods, to be known today only as lost place-names or eponymous Halls (Scarfe: 1988). It has been suggested, therefore, that these were late formations, perhaps coined in the eleventh century only a few decades prior to being recorded in Domesday Book (Insley 1999: 55-56). If so, it is possible that the ON personal names incorporated into these particular 'Grimston-hybrids' may have been, like their OE counterparts, derived from the name-stock amongst the indigenous local Anglo-Saxon population of which the eponymous landholders were members – like the late formation of the so-called 'bogus Grimston-hybrids' in south-west England discussed above.

Some worthwhile archaeological evidence has been recovered for a number of the East Anglian 'Grimston-hybrids', particularly those still located in predominantly rural settings. For in addition to the unlocatable and lost 'Grimston-hybrids' described above, another seventeen in East Anglia are associated with

readily identifiable churches which have become isolated as their surrounding villages have declined and dwindled, or else relocated to nearby greens and commons or other new sites – leaving open fields in the heart of the original settlement-sites available for fieldwalking and archaeological investigation. Although only stray and isolated finds of Anglo-Saxon material have been recovered in the vicinity of some of these sites, more systematic excavations or surveys have been conducted in twenty-one 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements (just under a quarter of the total) which may provide some evidence for the possible chronology of their formation, especially in Norfolk.

As with the other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, there is little archaeological evidence to suggest that any 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia have evolved directly *in situ* from settlements that originated in the Early Saxon period. Nevertheless, five of the probable 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements in Norfolk appear to display some degree of indirect continuity with Early Saxon communities located nearby. At Claxton, isolated fragments of possible Early Saxon and Middle Saxon pottery have been found by fieldwalking and stray discoveries in an area around the now-deserted St Andrew's church (NHER 32083/31530), together with finds of Late Saxon pottery (NHER 38081). Likewise at Skeyton, scattered finds of Early Saxon artefacts and pottery have been found in a cluster with 300 metres of the now-isolated All Saints' church, together with a sherd of Ipswich ware around 150 metres from the church and several finds of Late Saxon and medieval pottery (NHER 22225/22226, 21788/22451). Early Saxon cemeteries have been discovered around 400-500 metres from the churches and DMV sites at Apton (NHER 1011/11914) and Kilverstone (NHER 34489/37349, 5952/5950/55929).

Similarly, the original site of the possible 'Grimston-hybrid' in Norfolk that is actually named 'Grimston' may also have some degree of indirect continuity with Early Saxon settlements and activity nearby. An Early Saxon inhumation cemetery has been discovered near the centre of the present village, 800 metres from St Botolph's church, and an Early Saxon brooch and sherds of Early or Middle Saxon pottery have been found by metal-detecting and fieldwalking just 150 metres from the church (NHER 3573/19965), together with Middle Saxon and Late Saxon pottery

around 200 metres away (NHER 19110/30967). These finds may help to indicate established pre-Viking origins for the settlement that became known as 'Grimston' – a name given also to the type of pottery that began to be produced in and around the village during the Late Saxon period.

In Suffolk, a recent geophysical survey and trial-trench evaluation in the possible 'Grimston-hybrid' parish of Oulton have revealed an area of long-lasting occupation stretching from the Bronze Age period until after the Norman Conquest, at a site equidistant from the now-deserted St Michael's church and the relocated present-day village which are two kilometres apart (SHER OUL037). As well as substantial prehistoric artefacts, the site has produced sherds of Early to Middle Saxon pottery, plus a number of Late Saxon pottery fragments and artefacts, which may once again (subject to fuller interpretation of this very recent discovery) be indicative of an established pre-Viking settlement that acquired the 'Oulton' name as part of a renaming process.

Overall, the evidence of possible Early Saxon origins for each of the 'Grimston-hybrids' discussed above is uncertain, but the possible pattern of development apparent in most cases seems to reflect the well-researched sequence revealed at Witton (discussed in section 5.3.4), where a more permanent Middle Saxon village (that survived into the later Anglo-Saxon period and beyond) appears to have become established in a new location close to, but not directly on, the site of a preceding Early Saxon settlement that had been abandoned.

There appears to be more tangible archaeological evidence of Middle Saxon origins for four probable 'Grimston-hybrids', and possible evidence for two more. An extensive archaeological investigation conducted in the 1960s at the deserted 'Grimston-hybrid' site of Greynston (also known as Grenstein) in Norfolk indicated probable Late Saxon origins and a post-Conquest process of partial relocation and expansion until the site was deserted in the sixteenth century (NHER 7225; Wade Martins 1980b: 93-161). However, six sherds of Ipswich ware were also found in the excavations, which may suggest the presence of a Middle Saxon site in the vicinity connected in some way with the Late Saxon settlement – but the absence of any

known nearby church that can be associated with the name of Greynston remains puzzling (Wade-Martins 1980b: 141, 160).

At Kettlestone in Norfolk, fieldwalking and metal-detecting have revealed numerous sherds of both Middle Saxon and Late Saxon pottery in a field immediately adjacent to All Saints' church, still located near the centre of the present-day village (NHER 13043/44362). At Corton in Suffolk, a sherd of Ipswich ware has been discovered by metal-detecting in a field next to St Bartholomew's church, and a scatter of pottery (including sherds of Ipswich and Thetford ware) found in another field around 500 metres southwest of the church (SHER COR 044/009). At Fulmodeston in Norfolk, fragments of both Middle Saxon and Late Saxon pottery have been found by fieldwalking surveys at two separate sites within 200 metres of the now-ruined and isolated St Mary's church and the DMV recorded as the site of Old Fulmodeston (NHER 1069/13094/2173). At Helhoughton in Norfolk and Westleton in Suffolk, sherds of possible Middle Saxon pottery have been found by fieldwalking in fields immediately adjacent to the churches in the centre of both villages (NHER 15517; SHER WLN021). It appears, therefore, that the settlements associated with each of these 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names may have originated during the Middle Saxon period before being subsequently renamed following the arrival of Scandinavian-speaking communities. The small areas within which the indicative sherds of Middle Saxon pottery have often been found suggest that some of the Middle Saxon settlements were farmsteads, comprising no more than one or two households, that have been characterised as the 'pre-village nuclei' (Jones and Page 2006: 87-89) which subsequently expanded to form the more substantial villages of the Late Saxon period.

Possible archaeological indications of the formation of some 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements during the Late Saxon or post-Conquest period (that is, after the commencement of Viking settlement) are more uncertain, as they depend largely on negative evidence provided by the absence of Middle Saxon Ipswich ware pottery in contexts where Late Saxon pottery is clearly present (Hoggett 2010: 146-47). There are six possible examples, all in Norfolk. At Hellington, fieldwalking and metal-detecting surveys have recovered fragments of Late Saxon Thetford ware and post-

Conquest pottery and coins around 200 metres from St John the Baptist's church (NHER 23264/10334), plus two Late Saxon brooches (including a Scandinavian Borre-style disc brooch) at other sites within the parish (NHER 23409/34928). Conversely, no material was recovered from the Middle Saxon period which tends to suggest that the settlement was not a pre-Viking formation. At Thurgarton, a scatter of Late Saxon and medieval pottery fragments was found around 200 metres from the now-isolated All Saints' church, but no earlier Middle Saxon pottery was recovered (NHER 29622). This may be indicative of possible Late Saxon origins, but the evidence is uncertain as the sites around the enclosures and the church have not been subject to any archaeological investigation or wider fieldwalking surveys.

Clearer evidence of Late Saxon or post-Conquest settlement-formation is present at two 'Grimston-hybrid' sites in Norfolk where more extensive archaeological investigations have been conducted, but in both cases analyses of their wider contexts raise further difficulties of interpretation. At Thelveton, extensive fieldwalking and trial-trenching ahead of a road-improvement scheme recovered some Roman material and numerous Late Saxon, medieval and post-medieval pottery sherds and artefacts (but no Middle Saxon material) from a field close to the centre of the present-day village (NHER 29520). This suggests the formation of a new Late Saxon settlement beside the Roman Pye Road where there had been previous Roman activity, but the site is around a kilometre away from the Thelveton church of St Andrew's. This may be indicative of an earlier Anglo-Saxon settlement around the church (although no archaeological investigations have been conducted there), which subsequently relocated to the roadside site. It is not clear, therefore, for which settlement the new place-name of Thelveton was coined incorporating the Scandinavian personal name of *Þialfi* – an individual who may have been a Swedish mercenary under Cnut, suggesting a naming or renaming process in the early eleventh century.

A full archaeological investigation was conducted at a DMV-site in Norfolk identified as Thuxton, or possibly its twin settlement, Thurstanton (NHER 8842; Butler and Wade-Martins 1989: 25, 36). This concluded that the main period of occupation lasted from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, with no apparent evidence of

earlier activity (apart from the isolated find of an Early Saxon brooch). But the listing of *Thurstana* and *Turstanestuna* (Thuxton and Thurstanton) in Domesday Book clearly indicates the existence of two earlier settlements somewhere in the vicinity of the excavated DMV. One possible site could be around St Paul's church (which contains Late Saxon elements) at the centre of the present-day village of Thuxton. But no archaeological investigations or fieldwalking have been conducted there, and so the locations, chronology, and subsequent sequences of development and possible relocations of the original settlements of Thuxton and Thurstanton remain unclear.

There is archaeological evidence of Late Saxon origins for two of the possible 'Grimston-hybrids' in Norfolk. At Fritton, a fieldwalking survey in a field around 250 metres from St Catherine's church recovered nine Thetford-type rims of Late Saxon pottery together with fragments of medieval pottery; another survey discovered fragments also of Roman pottery (NHER 16611/20432), reflecting wider evidence of prehistoric and Roman activity elsewhere in the vicinity. But there were no finds of Middle Saxon pottery or artefacts, which may indicate the formation of a *de novo* Late Saxon settlement (in an area of earlier Roman settlement) that was given a name incorporating an ON personal name. At Caston, an archaeological evaluation trench dug within 100 metres of the Holy Cross church recovered some fragments of Late Saxon pottery, but nothing from the preceding Middle Saxon period (NHER 33773). This may perhaps be indicative of Late Saxon origins, although the negative evidence from a single small-scale excavation may not be as conclusive as the more widespread evidence for Fritton. There is currently no archaeological evidence of Late Saxon or post-Conquest formation for any of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in Suffolk, but this may reflect the lack of any Anglo-Saxon archaeological or fieldwalking evidence for many of them.

In summary, the archaeological evidence relating to the settlements in East Anglia associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names is patchy and incomplete, partly because of the varied character of the archaeological interventions but reflecting also the present-day status of around 30% of 'Grimston-hybrids' as lost villages. As discussed previously, this relatively high percentage is indicative of a

lower status for a considerable proportion of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia than elsewhere in the Danelaw. The evidence from those 'Grimston-hybrid' settlement-sites where some Anglo-Saxon archaeological material has been recovered appears to indicate a wide chronological range of possible dates of formation spanning much of the Anglo-Saxon period. Some sites may represent nucleated settlements formed from, and after the abandonment of, nearby Early Saxon sites during the Middle Saxon period. Several other 'Grimston-hybrid' sites have produced pottery-based evidence suggesting Middle Saxon origins, indicating that they were apparently in existence before the arrival of settlers with ON personal names, and therefore the 'Grimston-hybrid' names by which they are known today resulted from a renaming process in the late Anglo-Saxon period. But there is also a smaller proportion of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names associated with settlements which appear to have been formed in the Late Saxon or post-Conquest periods, indicating that ON personal names continued to be used for the naming of newly formed settlements in East Anglia beyond the initial period of Viking activity and control, in quite a different context of Scandinavian linguistic influence.

(9.4.5.6) The village morphology displayed by the settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia (using the methodology outlined in section 5.3.6) has been difficult to characterise, as forty-three (50%)[71] of the total of eighty-six are now lost or represented only by an isolated church, hall or farm, with no visible indication of an earlier village layout – a very high proportion that is itself significant, as discussed elsewhere. Another fourteen 'Grimston-hybrids' have dispersed layouts with no discernible settlement-core. Of the remainder, twenty-two (26%) have apparently formed agglomerate layouts around a central core, usually focussed upon a church, and one (Grimston in Norfolk) has a more complex, polyfocal configuration. But none of the probable 'Grimston-hybrids' and only one of the possible examples in Norfolk (the Croxton in Grimshoe hundred) display a linear village layout aligned

[71] This figure includes the twenty-six categorised as 'lost villages' at the start of the previous section, plus another seventeen represented today by an isolated church and relocated settlement-core.

along a single main street – in noticeable contrast to the majority of **thorps**, for which a linear layout has become identified as a frequent and indeed characterising feature (*TIACL*: 97-107). This fundamental difference suggests that some of the settlements which were given 'Grimston-hybrid' names may have been formed to fulfil different functions from the linear **thorps**, although both name-types were apparently associated with the colonisation of the claylands.

But a few 'Grimston-hybrids' were similar to some **thorps** in being located or relocated around or on the edges of greens and commons. The settlements of Scoulton and Ubbeston completely relocated to new sites beside nearby greens, isolating the churches at their original settlement-cores, and Fritton in Norfolk expanded around a green while retaining the original settlement-core near its church. Thrandeston and Caston formed settlements partly located around small village greens located next to or within 200 metres of their respective churches. But elsewhere the evidence is less clear, and it appears that the formation or relocation of 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia on the edges of greens and commons was an occasional and isolated, perhaps mainly post-Conquest, phenomenon rather than a frequent, characterising feature of the settlements associated with this type of place-name.

(9.4.6) This final section will review the available onomastic evidence for the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia, and correlate this where possible with the geographical and archaeological contexts for the settlement-sites associated with them that can be identified, in order to address questions of chronology and the possible ethnic and linguistic identities of the individuals and communities who named them. It will also reconsider broader questions regarding the origins of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in terms of the historical context outlined in Chapter 2, and their possible role and significance in the process of Viking settlement in East Anglia.

Overall, the evidence provided by the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia for the chronology, nature and extent of Viking settlement is once again diverse and complex for a single category of Scandinavian place-name. It is clear that there can be no simple, single interpretation of the origins and formation of place-

names containing the OE **tūn** generic compounded with ON personal names – or the settlements associated with them – as has been traditionally suggested (Cameron 1971; 1976: 19-23; 1985: 143-53). The difficulty of interpretation is compounded by the relatively large number of 'Grimston-hybrids' that have become lost settlements and so for which no geographical or archaeological contexts can therefore be identified – but that factor is itself of significance, and will be explored below.

The documentary, linguistic and onomastic evidence for the formation of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names suggests that they were coined over a considerable period of time commencing in the late ninth or early tenth centuries and continuing into the post-Conquest period. The evidence of early charters demonstrates that some, such as Drinkstone in Suffolk, were probably in established use by the mid-tenth century, indicating a possible process of naming or renaming of the associated settlement using a Scandinavian personal name earlier in the tenth century or even in the late-ninth. Onomastic analysis of the particular types of ON personal names used to form the 'Grimston-hybrids' suggests possible early dates of formation for perhaps between a third and a half of those in East Anglia. But conversely, there is some evidence also for the creation of some 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names during the later Anglo-Saxon period, possibly named after eleventh-century landholders recorded in Domesday Book. Some of the settlements associated with these later 'Grimston-hybrid' formations, such as those in Colneis hundred mentioned above, were particularly vulnerable to failure or desertion in the late medieval period.

The higher proportion of dithematic ON personal names used to form 'Grimston-hybrids' may also indicate a later date of formation for some of them and a wider social range of individuals whose names are commemorated in the place-names. In terms of possible ethnic affiliation, it appears that many of the personal names used in the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names, including a particular cluster in south Suffolk, display a greater affinity with the region that became Denmark than with other parts of Scandinavia.

The geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names provide a different set of parameters and a wider timeframe for analysis. They are distributed more widely across East Anglia

than most other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. Most are located on the central boulder clay plateau, with a surprisingly high proportion (87%) situated in the upper sections of small river valleys, usually on well-drained, fertile soils – although a number of these were sited in more marginal locations, and thus became more liable to abandonment during the later medieval period. Despite this frequent pattern of post-Conquest decline and desertion, 71% survived and prospered to form parishes that appear to be relatively early primary formations.[72]

A pattern of relatively early, pre-Viking dates of formation is indicated also for a majority of the 'Grimston-hybrid' sites for which archaeological evidence is available, although the overall record is patchy and incomplete. It appears that five settlements with 'Grimston-hybrid' names have some degree of continuity with nearby Early Saxon communities, and there is more tangible evidence of Middle Saxon origins for four 'Grimston-hybrids' and less certain evidence for two more. Nevertheless, six 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia are associated with settlements displaying possible archaeological indications of Late Saxon origins, which seem to confirm a wide chronological range for the formation of the 'Grimston-hybrids'.

As might be expected, there appears to be some degree of correlation between the likely dates of formation of the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrids' place-names (as indicated by archaeological evidence) and the character and agricultural suitability of their local landscape settings. Most of the settlements displaying evidence for possible Early and Middle Saxon formation are located on the most agriculturally favourable soils, usually those found in the upper reaches of small river valleys. Conversely, the possible Late Saxon settlement-formations are found on more variable soils and a smaller proportion are located on small river valleys, including two (Thelveton and Fritton in Norfolk) situated wholly on the Beccles soils of the boulder clay plateau away from any rivers. This pattern might reflect the gradual recolonisation of the claylands hypothesised above, progressing up the river valleys and finally onto the more marginal and heavier clay interfluves during the Late Saxon period – and perhaps also a later process of desertion in which the last

[72] But see note 61 on page 263 above.

segments of land to be settled (in the most marginal areas) were often the first to be abandoned.

The particular contexts and possible chronology of formation for the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names may be further illuminated by comparing them with those of other Scandinavian-influenced name-types found in East Anglia. As has been observed, a majority of both the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements and those associated with **thorp** place-names are located on the boulder clay plateau of East Anglia, suggesting that both were associated in some way with the late Anglo-Saxon colonisation of the claylands. However, most of the **thorps** are non-anthroponymic formations and a large proportion of these are located in interfluvial positions away from rivers and streams, many with linear village layouts that perhaps facilitated the housing of the agricultural labour force (*TIACL*: 97-109, 136-37) – in contrast, most of the 'Grimston-hybrids' are located in the upper sections of small river valleys, with almost none displaying linear village plans. As argued in Chapter 7, however, a minority of **thorps** that are compounded with ON personal names constitute a distinct and separate sub-type of **thorp** within East Anglia with settlement-contexts that differ from the remaining **thorps**, and indeed bear greater similarities with the 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements. For a large proportion of the anthroponymic **thorps** are similarly located in river valleys and have formed non-linear, agglomerate settlements that gave rise to primary parish formations, with some archaeological evidence of pre-Viking Middle Saxon origins. In the Viking settlement of East Anglia, there does seem to be a common pattern in the compounding of Scandinavian personal names with both the ON **thorp** and OE **tūn** generics for the renaming of pre-existing settlements that had been established on or near the claylands during the late Anglo-Saxon period.

Nevertheless, there are some significant locational differences between the two. The 'Grimston-hybrids' are scattered widely across Norfolk and Suffolk, whereas the **thorps** compounded with ON personal names are concentrated in an area of central Norfolk coinciding broadly with the main zone of Scandinavian linguistic

influence.[73] This may indicate a shorter-lived period of place-name formation using ON personal names compounded with the **thorp** element that did not last beyond the initial and most intense phase of Viking activity and influence – unlike the formation of the 'Grimston-hybrids', which spread more widely beyond this zone. Furthermore, the 'Grimston-hybrids' are located almost exclusively in the upper reaches of small river valleys, whereas some of the **thorps** containing ON personal names are found in both the upper and lower sections of rivers. This pattern may suggest that the settlements associated with the **thorps** containing ON personal names were formed at a slightly earlier stage in the colonisation of the claylands.

A similar dichotomy characterises the differences between the locations of the settlements associated with 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names and those bearing place-names in **-tūn** compounded with OE personal names. The former are sited almost exclusively in upper river valleys, whereas the latter are commonly found also in downstream locations, suggesting that the 'Grimston-hybrid'-named settlements were formed at a slightly later stage in the colonisation of the claylands.

The diverse and sometimes contradictory strands of evidence that have been presented above for the formation of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia clearly indicate that it was a complex process with no simple, single explanation. But this broad range of evidence may be interrogated to assess the validity in an East Anglian context of the two traditional explanations – that the 'Grimston-hybrids' represent earlier, established Anglo-Saxon villages taken over and renamed by new Danish landholders (possibly veterans of the Viking Great Army), and that some also resulted from the fragmentation of large estates that occurred in the late Anglo-Saxon period (a process that was itself partly engendered by the Viking predations).

There is certainly evidence to support the first hypothesis as an explanation for the formation of at least some of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia. Documentary, linguistic and onomastic evidence suggests that some of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names may well have been coined during the 'early' phase of Viking activity in East Anglia (during the late ninth and early tenth centuries), using

[73] See maps in Appendices 4.3c, 7.2a and 9.4.1c.

personal names of mainly Danish origin. Likewise, the geographical and archaeological contexts of the associated settlements indicates that some at least were relatively prosperous villages established in agriculturally favourable locations during the Middle Saxon period before the arrival of the Vikings – and that their 'Grimston-hybrid' names therefore clearly constitute a renaming of existing settlements. This evidence may therefore be consistent to a certain extent with the traditional interpretation of 'Grimston-hybrids' as pre-existing villages or estates seized or taken over by Viking settlers, possibly the officers and veterans of the Viking Great Army in the late ninth century and their immediate descendants (Cameron 1971; 1976: 19-23; 1985: 143-53). There is, of course, no historical evidence to categorically confirm or deny the involvement of the personnel of Guthrum's army in such a process as it 'went from Cirencester into East Anglia, and settled there and shared out the land', in the words of the ASC's entry for 880.[74]

However, there are very few, if any, examples of settlements bearing 'Grimston-hybrid' names in East Anglia which 'tick all the boxes' in displaying positive evidence in all the categories explored in this chapter that can provide archetypal exemplars of the classic ninth-century 'Grimston-hybrid' formation as originally envisaged by Cameron. Instead, the evidence can only be taken to suggest that *some* 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia were formed in this way but it is far from certain that many of them actually were. There are just too many East Anglian settlements with 'Grimston-hybrid' names that became lost and deserted, in comparison with settlements bearing other types of OE names such as the **hāms**, to support the notion that 'Grimston-hybrids' were 'in the vast majority of cases' located on sites that are 'impossible to distinguish meaningfully' from 'those of adjacent English-named places' (Cameron 1985: 143).

There is a limited amount of evidence also in East Anglia to support the idea that the formation of some 'Grimston-hybrids' may be associated in some way with the fragmentation of large Anglo-Saxon estates – the second traditional hypothesis

[74] Discussed in section 2.2.2a.

which has been postulated (Fellows-Jensen 2012; Townend 2014: 99-100).[75] The cluster of 'Grimston-hybrids' on the former island of Lothingland appears to provide reasonable evidence for the fragmentation of a former Anglo-Saxon estate. The other clusters of 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia, however, display little indication of the fragmentation of complete estates – but the fact that they are congregated together more than the equivalent **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names and are also frequently located in the upper sections of small river valleys remains puzzling.

It was observed in section 9.4.5 that some 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia are clustered around the outer margins of some known Anglo-Saxon royal vills or estates in Suffolk, such as Hadleigh, Rendlesham and Blythburgh.[76] It may be significant that two of the 'Grimston-hybrids' near Blythburgh are sited on the outer edges of the Blythburgh hundred. Is it possible that these 'Grimston-hybrids' represent some fragmentation of the original large royal estates that had presumably been taken over by the Viking leaders who took control of the East Anglian kingdom, in which outlying portions were granted to loyal Viking retainers whose names then became commemorated in the place-names? Such a process may have occurred during the period of Danish rule over East Anglia in which the existence of Guthrum's royal estate around Hadleigh has been postulated from the available charter evidence, and may also reflect the granting of land to followers that has been recorded historically in Northumbria.[77] It is possible that the particular cluster in south Suffolk of 'Grimston-hybrids' compounded with personal names that appear to be relatively early in formation and Danish in origin (discussed in section 9.4.3) may also be associated in some way with Guthrum's royal estate.

It is thus possible that some 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia were formed as a result of either or both of the two traditional explanations. But the fact that, unlike the 'Grimston-hybrids' elsewhere, so many of those in East Anglia

[75] The background to the process of estate-fragmentation in the late Anglo-Saxon period is discussed in section 5.3.7.
[76] See map in Appendix 9.4.4a.
[77] Discussed in sections 2.2.2a, 2.2.3b and 2.2.4.

were located in the more marginal upper sections of small river valleys on the edge of the boulder clay plateau, and that a high proportion of these subsequently became deserted or lost villages, appears to seriously contradict the traditional interpretations.

The specific siting of so many East Anglian 'Grimston-hybrid' settlements and their subsequent failure may indicate that many of them were involved in some way with the later Anglo-Saxon expansion of agriculture onto the last-remaining and therefore more marginal areas of the claylands. It is possible, therefore, that these 'Grimston-hybrids' may represent some degree of 'infilling' between and around existing English vills, reflecting an idea originally suggested by C.D. Morris (1977: 98; 1984: 8-9) with regard to the 'Grimston-hybrids' of County Durham and recently endorsed in a re-evaluation of those in Yorkshire (Townend 2014: 99-100). In such a scheme, individual Scandinavian peasant farmers (whose names are commemorated in the relevant 'Grimston-hybrids') may have been brought in, or allowed to settle, by major Viking landowners or overlords in order to farm more marginal areas of the claylands that were still under-utilised by the local population. These areas of land may have constituted individual, outlying portions of existing large estates that perhaps bordered the claylands which had been left under-exploited since Roman times. Such units may have been hived off individually rather than in adjacent blocks, and without the rest of the parent estate being broken up, which may explain the apparent lack of evidence for the fragmentation of complete estates in those areas where such clusters of 'Grimston-hybrids' occur. But it is possible that two or more such units on the edges of two different estates (perhaps located in different hundreds) may have abutted each other to form an apparent cluster – but only because they happened to coincide in the same area of previously under-exploited clayland that was being brought into use, not because they had formed part of the same estate.

In creating these smaller land-units, it appears that considerable care was often taken to share out the available land resources equitably to ensure that each had access to a river and agriculturally productive land (as discussed above in section 5.3.7), which may possibly also help explain the almost ubiquitous siting of 'Grimston-

hybrids' in the upper sections of small river valleys. It is possible also that some of these outlying units of estate land already contained incipient farmsteads that may have served as the 'pre-village nuclei' (Jones and Page 2006: 87-89) of the settlements that were subsequently to acquire 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names – and such pre-Viking farmsteads may also have left indicative traces of Middle Saxon pottery for subsequent discovery.

But the pattern of 'Grimston-hybrid' clusters discussed above is only found in certain regions of East Anglia, particularly in Norfolk. Elsewhere, especially in parts of Suffolk away from the southern area (where a number of both OE and ON anthroponymic **tūn**-named settlements are concentrated) and the north-east, the 'Grimston-hybrids' tend to be sited individually, frequently interspersed with equivalent **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names. This pattern may to some extent reflect the practice of a more normalised purchase or acquisition of single units of land or small estates in Suffolk by individuals bearing ON personal names, as has been partially documented with regard to Drinkstone.[78] It may also reflect a commercial market in the buying and selling of land that is implied in the ASC's description of the dispersal of the Viking army of 896, indicating that personnel newly arriving in the Danelaw required some capital in order to obtain land.[79] Such a process would be in contrast to the postulated larger-scale seizure or take-over of entire former Anglo-Saxon estates in Norfolk which may have been partially fragmented to form the clusters of 'Grimston-hybrids' apparent today. Moreover, such a hypothesised disparity in modes of property acquisition between Suffolk and Norfolk may ultimately reflect the differing degrees to which the writ of the newly-established Wessex régime was being established in the northern and southern areas of the recently-conquered Viking-controlled East Anglian kingdom in the early tenth century, as was discussed in Chapter 3 and will be explored further in Chapter 11.

Notwithstanding the various forms of evidence discussed above for the renaming of a number of pre-existing settlements with 'Grimston-hybrid' names in

[78] Discussed in section 9.4.2 above.
[79] Discussed in section 2.2.5.

the earlier stages of the Viking settlement of East Anglia, it is also apparent that some of the remaining 'Grimston-hybrids' are associated with settlements that appear to have been formed in the Late Saxon or post-Conquest period, such as the cluster in Colneis hundred interspersed with **tūn**-names compounded with OE personal names and a number located in the more marginal, upper valleys of the claylands, which were all liable to subsequent desertion. These 'Grimston-hybrids' may represent *de novo* settlements formed and named either by immigrants of Scandinavian descent or members of the indigenous population who had come to bear names of Scandinavian origin.

It is clear from the analysis above that the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia were not created as a result of a uniform process of place-name formation reflecting a single historical development, as perhaps was implied in Cameron's interpretation. It is clear also from their geographical distribution, scattered across most of Norfolk and Suffolk but not extending into Essex, that the 'Grimston-hybrids' derive from a different type of linguistic influence from that which is evident in the concentration of the majority of the remaining Scandinavian-influenced place-name types in central and east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk. These differing patterns of distribution will be explored further in Chapter 11.

9.5) Hybrid place-names containing ON specifics compounded with other OE generics (except *tūn*)

(9.5.1) This section will examine the remaining twenty-nine place-names in East Anglia containing Scandinavian-influenced specifics compounded with OE generics other than **tūn**, which can be divided into two sub-categories: those formed with personal names of Scandinavian origin, and those derived from other, non-anthroponymic elements. The latter can be fully Scandinavian elements used *de novo* to create the place-names in question, or else to replace equivalent OE words in pre-existing place-names. Alternatively, the specifics may be Scandinavianised forms in which the OE pronunciation of a word in an existing place-name has been substituted

by an ON one, such as the replacement of the initial *ċ* [tʃ] in **ċēse-wīċ** (*Chesewic*) by [k] to form Keswick (*SSNEM*: 203-05).[80]

This section will look first at the small number of hybrid place-names containing OE habitative generics (other than **tūn**), and then consider the remainder which contain OE topographical generics.

(9.5.2) Apart from **tūn**, only four or five hybrid place-names (all in Norfolk) contain OE habitative generics, which are all compounded with non-anthroponymic ON specifics, perhaps reflecting the decline of habitative generics other than **tūn** in the later Anglo-Saxon period as **tūn**-names began to be used more widely (as discussed in section 9.1). Three contain elements in which an initial OE [tʃ] sound has been substituted by an ON [k], with the two Keswicks formed as indicated above. Kirstead was formed from the OE **ċiriċ** ('church') and apparently compounded initially with OE **tūn** to form the settlement's original name of *Kerchestuna* recorded in Domesday Book. But it was subsequently recorded as *Kerkestede* in the later eleventh century, with the second *ċ* of **ċiriċ** [tʃ] also replaced by [k] and the **tūn** element replaced by OE **stede** (*CDEPN*: 342, 352; Sandred 1963: 183; Fellows-Jensen 1987b: 297; *VEPN3*: 73). The initial use of **tūn** may have been a scribal error, but it could once again reflect a degree of fluidity in the formation and evolution of place-names at this time.

Whinburgh contains a Middle English word **whin** derived from an ON ***hvin** ('gorse') compounded with the OE generic **burh** ('stronghold'), or OE **bergh** or **beorg** ('hill'). Stoke Ferry and Burnham Westgate were both recorded in Domesday Book with just the first elements of their respective names, but had acquired affixes by the late thirteenth century – derived from ON **ferja** for the former, and OE **west** compounded with ON **gata** for the latter (meaning 'hamlet', to perhaps indicate a western hamlet of the original 'Burnham'-named settlement) (*CDEPN*; *VEPN2*: 82).[81]

[80] See table in Appendix 9.5.1a and map in Appendix 9.5.1b.

[81] It appears that the ON **gata** element, originally meaning 'street', entered the dialect of Middle English as **gate** in Norfolk during the post-Conquest period with a particular localised sense of 'hamlet-settlement', presumably meaning one which been formed along a street or road that had originally given rise to the use of **gata** or **gate**. (*CDEPN*: 204, s.n. Eastgate; *PNNf2*: 178, 180-81, 205-06; Fellows-Jensen 2007; *OED*: s.v. gate).

The apparent late formation of the ON affixes in these two place-names may be indicative of the enduring nature of Scandinavian linguistic influence in the dialect of northern East Anglia during the post-Conquest period.

(9.5.3) Most of the OE generics of hybrid place-names in this category (apart from **tūn**) are topographical, of which about half are compounded with non-anthroponymic, ON specifics. It appears that the specific element of Kettleburgh in Suffolk (compounded with the OE generic **berg**, 'a hill') was originally derived from the OE noun **ċetel** (meaning 'kettle-shaped valley'), but the initial consonant *ċ*[tʃ] was once again subsequently replaced by the ON [k]. The specific element of Kirkley in Suffolk (compounded with the OE generic **lēah**, 'clearing in wood') was apparently formed originally from the OE noun **ċiriċe** ('church'), which was then completely replaced by its ON cognate **kirkja** or ODan **kirk**. Both place-names are recorded in Domesday Book with spellings derived from their amended pronunciations, which suggests a pre-Conquest process of Scandinavianisation (*DSPN*: 83; *CDEPN*: 342, 352; *DEPN*: 274; *EPNE*: 2.3-4).

Other East Anglian place-names with OE topographical generics are apparently compounded with fully Scandinavian non-anthroponymic specifics rather than ON replacements for pre-existing OE words. Minsmere, a now-lost village in Suffolk, contains OE **mere** ('lake') probably compounded with the ON **mynni** ('river-mouth'). Bixley in Norfolk and Bixley in Suffolk both contain the OE generic **lēah** ('clearing in wood') compounded with the Old Danish ***byski** ('bush'), or possibly an OE term ***bysce** that was influenced by the Old Danish word. Similarly, Blofield, Lingwood and Cringleford in Norfolk contain specifics derived respectively from the ON terms **blár** ('dark, blue, cold'), **lyng** ('heather') and **kringla** ('circle') (*DSPN*: 97-98; Price and Robb 2015; *CDEPN*; Briggs 2011; *EPNE*: 1.38, 74, 2.7, 30, 38, 46; *VEPN2*: 116). All the hybrid place-names mentioned in this paragraph were initially recorded in Domesday Book (apart from Lingwood, first mentioned in the twelfth century), indicating a pattern that had become established by the mid-eleventh century of using some ON words, which had apparently entered the local dialect of English, in the formation of otherwise English place-names.

(9.5.4) The remaining East Anglian hybrid place-names all contain OE topographical generics compounded with specifics derived from personal names which are or may be of Scandinavian origin. There are just three possible examples within the main area of Scandinavian settlement in eastern Norfolk:[82] Catfield contains the OE generic **feld** ('field') compounded with the ON personal name *Káti*; Costessey and Panxworth may similarly both contain ON personal names as specifics, but their etymologies are very uncertain, as indicated in the corpus in Appendix 1 (*PNNf2*: 86-87; *CDEPN*; *DEPN*: 123; *SPNLY*: 163, 180; *EPNE*: 1.147-48, 166-68, 180-83).

There are isolated examples elsewhere in East Anglia that were recorded early enough to have been named or renamed in the pre-Conquest period. Ilketshall in north Suffolk contains the OE generic **halh** ('nook, corner of land') compounded with the ODan personal name **Ylfketil* or ON **Ylfketill* (*DSPN*: 77; *CDEPN*: 330; *SPNN*: 433-37; *SPNLY*: 325-27; *EPNE*: 1.223-24). Four other place-names in Suffolk containing OE generics (first recorded by the late eleventh century or earlier) are compounded with specifics that may be derived from personal names of Scandinavian origin: Gusford (ON **Guthulf*), Handford (ON *Hagni* or OE *Hagena*), Sicklesmere (ON *Sighulf* or OE **Siduwulf*) and Sotterley (ODan *Sūtari*) (*DSPN*: 64, 122, 125; Briggs, forthcoming).

Arkesden in north-west Essex contains the OE generic **denu** ('a valley') compounded with the genitive singular form *Arceles* of *Arcel*, an anglicised version of the ON personal name *Arnkell* or the Anglo-Scandinavian *Arnketill* (*PNEss*: 516; *CDEPN*). Three other place-names in Essex contain OE topographical generics compounded with Scandinavian-influenced personal names, but none was recorded before the thirteenth century: the lost *Oskethey* near Halstead (*Oscytel*, derived from the ON *Ásketill*) and *Othulvesho* in the parish of Gestingthorpe (*Othulf*, derived from the ON *Auðúlfr*), and Skighaugh near Great Oakley (ON *Skeggi*), as detailed in the corpus in Appendix 3 (*PNEss*; *SPNN*; *SPNLY*; *EPNE*).

[82] See map in Appendix 9.5.1b.

(9.5.5) The geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements in East Anglia associated with the place-names in this category are as varied as the wide diversity of their name-forms. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern a distinction between the differing geographical distributions of the two main types of specific. Those containing non-anthroponymic, Scandinavian-influenced elements tend to be located within the main concentrated cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in central and east Norfolk, and along the coastal fringe of Suffolk, but are not found in Essex. Conversely, those compounded with personal names of Scandinavian origin are more widely scattered across the region, including some in Essex that were not recorded before the thirteenth century.[83]

At a more localised level, the landscape contexts of these place-names also vary widely but a majority appear to be sited in agriculturally favourable settings.[84] Fourteen [48%] of the twenty-nine are associated with settlements located on river valleys, mainly in the upper reaches of smaller rivers of streams, and more so in Suffolk than Norfolk. Nine (31%) are located away from any rivers or watercourses – and, conversely, more so in Norfolk than Suffolk. One is on the coast, another was apparently located on a former island (as its name, Costessey, indicates), and two are uncertain. There appears to be no discernible distinction between the local landscape settings of the hybrid place-names in this category compounded with ON personal names and those containing non-anthroponymic elements.

Fifteen (52%) of the twenty-nine place-names are located on soil-types that can be regarded as suitable for arable agriculture in the late Anglo-Saxon period, eight (28%) are on less favourable soils, and the remainder are in areas of mixed soils or are uncertain.[85] The comparatively few place-names in this category found on the central clayland plateau of East Anglia tend to be located more in Suffolk and Essex than in Norfolk,[86] often on the edges of river valleys that have incised the clay plateau rather than in higher interfluvial positions wholly on the claylands away from any

[83] See map in Appendix 9.5.1 b.
[84] See map in Appendix 9.5.5a.
[85] See map in Appendix 9.5.5c.
[86] See map in Appendix 9.5.5b.

rivers. This pattern suggests that the settlements associated with these hybrid place-names were generally not involved in the later Anglo-Saxon colonisation of the claylands, unlike some other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names such as the non-anthroponymic **thorps** and **thwaites**.

Although the sample size is small, it may be significant that just nineteen (65%) of the twenty-nine place-names in this category are recorded as vills in Domesday Book (reflecting the absence of four out of five in Essex), which may suggest a possible pattern of later formation. But those which are recorded in Domesday Book indicate a relatively high degree of prosperity, with a mean average fiscal value of 4.35 carucates or hides recorded for their vills that is considerably higher than the averages of other categories of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. However, the individual fiscal values of these hybrid place-names vary widely, from the very high figure of twenty-five carucates for Methwold in Norfolk to 0.48 for Bixley in Suffolk.

The pattern of parish-formation exhibited by these hybrid place-names is varied too, with nineteen out of twenty-nine (65%) becoming sufficiently significant settlements to form parishes in their own name that survived into the nineteenth century.[87] In Norfolk, 86% formed parishes, compared with 50% in Suffolk and 40% in Essex, a pattern which may once again indicate differing circumstances and chronologies for the formation or renaming of place-names in this particular category. Most parochial territories formed by these place-names are of a comparable size to their neighbours, although there are some marked discrepancies of absolute size in Norfolk between the relatively small parishes of Bixley, Keswick and Kirkley, and the very large Methwold. In Suffolk, Ilketshall may similarly have originally constituted a large single territory or estate that was subsequently divided into four separate parishes with names bearing affixes derived from the saints' dedications of their respective churches. Most parishes of place-names in this category display little sign of interdigitation or subsequent formation with land from adjoining parochial units, possibly suggesting that they were primary parish

[87] See map in Appendix 9.5.5d.

formations created contemporaneously with their neighbours. But some notable exceptions, such as Kelsale, Arkesden and Stoke Ferry, possess parish boundaries displaying considerable interdigitation with their neighbours and formation of separate parochial 'islands'; Catfield has an exceptionally long panhandle protuberance. These anomalies may be indicative of more complex or later processes of parish formation, or subsequent alteration in some circumstances.

The archaeological evidence for the hybrid place-names in this category is sparse, as twenty-two (76%) of the twenty-nine settlement-sites associated with them have so far produced little or no Anglo-Saxon archaeological material that can indicate likely dates of formation. But evidence from the seven remaining more archaeologically productive settlements tends to suggest that, like the place-names containing ON topographical generics (excluding the **thwaites**),[88] these place-names represent a renaming of pre-existing Anglo-Saxon settlements rather than the formation and naming of new ones. The original settlement-site of Handford in Ipswich is adjacent both to the well-known Early Saxon cemetery at Hadleigh Road excavated by Nina Layard in 1906-07 and a recently-excavated Early Saxon settlement on Handford Road (SHER IPS016/280, IAS 9612). The latter site has produced finds also of Ipswich and Thetford ware, which probably indicates a continuity of settlement lasting into the late Anglo-Saxon period of Viking activity – when the settlement may have been renamed using a personal name of possible Scandinavian origin.

A clearer indication of settlement-continuity since the Middle Saxon period is evident at Catfield, where systematic fieldwalking over four fields adjacent to All Saints' church has recovered sherds of Middle Saxon, Late Saxon, medieval and post-medieval pottery (NHER 32151/8338). Similarly at Costessey, fieldwalking and metal-detecting on a site around 350 metres north-east of St Edmund's church have recovered fragments of Middle Saxon and Late Saxon pottery, including 'many Ipswich ware sherds' (NHER 25624).

[88] Discussed in section 8.4.5.

Conversely, it is significant that none of the twenty-nine hybrid place-names in this category can be clearly associated with a settlement displaying possible Late Saxon origins. The one possible exception is Blofield, but the archaeological evidence is uncertain (NHER 18097/25248).

Overall, therefore, the archaeological material available for hybrid place-names is limited but provides little evidence that any of the associated settlements were formed in the Late Saxon period after the arrival of Viking settlers. Instead, it appears that these settlements were formed during the pre-Viking Middle Saxon period or earlier, and were then renamed using Scandinavian-influenced elements.

(9.5.6) It is difficult to draw overall conclusions regarding the hybrid place-names discussed in this section, or differentiate meaningfully between the various types of Scandinavian or Scandinavianised specific elements that have been categorised linguistically above,[89] because many of the place-names are characterised by uncertain etymologies, like those containing ON topographical generics discussed in Chapter 8. But unlike the latter which display a tendency towards names associated in some way with woodland and its clearance, the OE topographical generics compounded with ON specifics are diverse and do not display lexical affinity with any particular type of topography or landscape. The specifics in this category are equally wide-ranging, with a broad mix of fully Scandinavian personal names, nouns and adjectives as well as Scandinavianised elements in which OE pronunciations have been replaced by Scandinavian ones. The diversity of both ON specifics and OE generics in these place-names may once again reflect a Scandinavian linguistic influence that exerted its effect in a haphazard manner, like the place-names containing ON topographical generics.

Nevertheless, it appears that two broad categories of settlements can be identified, associated with place-names containing the two main types of ON specific compounded with OE generics: those formed with personal names of Scandinavian origin, and those derived from other, non-anthroponymic Scandinavian-influenced

[89] In sections 9.5.1 – 9.5.4, and Appendices 9.5.1a and 9.5.1b.

elements such as nouns or adjectives. This difference applies also to the other place-names discussed throughout Chapter 9, and will be discussed in the next section.

9.6) Conclusion

The place-names examined in Chapter 9 encompass a wide range of hybrid name-formations that incorporate a limited number of OE generics, of which **tūn** is by far the commonest, compounded with a wide variety of Scandinavian or Scandinavianised specifics. The fundamental distinction between those formed from ON personal names and those derived from non-anthroponymic elements seems to be reflected also in the nature of the settlements associated with them.

Many of the place-names containing non-anthroponymic specifics appear to constitute the partial renaming of already-existing, well-established Anglo-Saxon settlements that were generally situated in agriculturally favourable locations. OE specifics (of what may originally have been wholly OE place-names) have frequently been replaced by equivalent ON cognate words, in what amounted to minor linguistic modifications of existing OE place-names. The distribution of these non-anthroponymic hybrid place-names is similar to that for the place-names containing ON topographic generics discussed in Chapter 8.[90] This suggests that both can be interpreted as resulting from a prevailing Scandinavian linguistic influence postulated in section 8.4.6, with a particular concentration coinciding with the main East Anglian cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in central and east Norfolk, and along the coastal fringe of Suffolk – a pattern that will be explored further in Chapter 11.

Conversely, the hybrid place-names formed with ON personal names, including both the numerous 'Grimston-hybrids' as well as the few isolated examples formed with other OE generics, display a different pattern of distribution in East Anglia, being scattered more widely across the region – including a few in Essex that were not recorded before the thirteenth century. This may indicate a longer-lasting

[90] See maps in Appendices 9.5.1b, 8.4.1b and 8.4.1c.

Scandinavian influence upon the personal name-giving practices of the local population that continued into the post-Conquest period and extended geographically beyond the main area of concentration of Scandinavian place-names in east Norfolk, in contrast to the more limited Scandinavian linguistic influence on the non-anthroponymic vocabulary of East Anglian place-names. It appears that personal names of Scandinavian origin that had entered the personal name-stock of the local Anglo-Scandinavian population continued to be used after the Conquest, but usually only in conjunction with OE place-name generics. For by this time, the use of ON generics in East Anglian place-names (apart from those such as **thorp** that had entered the English language) had virtually ceased, as the Scandinavian linguistic influence dwindled during the new Anglo-Norman era.

This longer period of place-name formation using ON personal names may also help explain the greater diversity of settlement-types associated with these names. Some appear, like the non-anthroponymic name-formations, to constitute the renaming of existing and well-established Anglo-Saxon settlements in favourable locations – and may thus conform to some extent with the traditional interpretation of 'Grimston-hybrids'. But ON personal names were also used in the naming of settlements that were established relatively late, often in more marginal locations that frequently led to early abandonment and desertion.

It is clear, therefore, that the use of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in East Anglia has been affected by the fundamental underlying processes occurring in the rural economy of the region, involving the expansion of agricultural land-use and the continuing formation of new settlements. These processes coalesced in the progressive colonisation of the boulder clay plateau, which was still continuing as Viking leaders temporarily took political control of the old East Anglian kingdom and settlers of Scandinavian origin started to name or rename some of the new settlements on the upper claylands using their own personal names. The Vikings' involvement in the ongoing and dynamic development of the East Anglian rural landscape during the late Anglo-Saxon period thus appears at odds with what has previously been characterised as the Viking takeover of an apparently more static rural framework of established settlements bearing OE place-names in other parts of

the Danelaw. It may therefore help explain the significant differences between the geographical contexts of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in this region and those elsewhere, as will be explored further in Chapter 11.

Chapter 10:

SURVEY OF OTHER FORMS OF ONOMASTIC EVIDENCE

10.1) Introduction

This chapter will briefly review other forms of onomastic evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia which can also be analysed in terms of geographical context and distribution, and compare them with the analyses of major Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names presented in Chapters 6 to 9. It is based on the rather limited analyses and interpretations that have so far been published and presented by other scholars in areas of study that still require much further work. It should be emphasised, therefore, that the sections below presenting each category of onomastic evidence are only brief surveys of the relevant material for which geographical information is available, subject to the limitations of current scholarship.

10.2) Language and dialects

(10.2.1) The use of Scandinavian-influenced elements in the place-names examined in this thesis are just one facet of a broader Scandinavian influence upon the English language, which manifested itself in a large number of ON loanwords as well as some influences on syntax, grammar and pronunciation (Townend 2002: 196-210; Pons-Sanz 2013). This became apparent especially in the post-Conquest period, as speakers of ON gave up their own language and switched to speaking English (at different times in different places), at which point ON words, constructions and pronunciations were increasingly imported into what had become Middle English (Townend 2014: 221). Some of these ON loans spread geographically beyond the

areas of Scandinavian settlement as other English speakers adopted them, and became accepted in time as basic elements of standard written English (such as the use of the pronouns 'they', 'them' and 'their').

But many other ON loanwords and elements of linguistic influence were not adopted into standard English and remained geographically restricted to the original areas of Scandinavian settlement and influence (Townend 2014: 221). In time, they constituted integral elements of regional dialects and were recorded and catalogued in surveys (Wright 1898-1905; Orton *et al.* 1962-71), from which it has been possible to chart their distributions on isoglossal maps. The geographical patterns of use for a number of Scandinavian-influenced dialectal words have been mapped across the whole of England in this way (Orton and Wright 1974), and it is possible to see varying distribution-patterns for different words in East Anglia. Some words, such as 'clipping' (from ON **klippa**, used rather than 'shearing'), 'clatch' (from ON **klekja**, rather than 'broad' or 'hatch'), 'gilt' (from ON **gyltr**, rather than 'yeld'), and 'beck' (from ON **bekkr**, rather than 'brook'), are recorded as being used in most regions of the former Danelaw, including much of Norfolk and parts of north-east Suffolk (*ibid.*, 87, 92, 105, 259). Others, such as 'maggots' (from ON **maðkr**, rather than 'ticks') and 'whin' (probably from ON ***hvin**, rather than 'furze' or 'gorse')[1] were used in more restricted areas of the Danelaw, and smaller parts of Norfolk and Suffolk (*ibid.*, 80, 245). Some Scandinavian-influenced dialectal words, such as 'sails' (from ON **seil**, rather than 'hames' or 'seals' for a section of a horse's collar (*ibid.*, 171)) are recorded as having been used solely in East Anglia and nowhere else in England, but once again only in central and eastern Norfolk, and the northern half of Suffolk.

This evidence demonstrates the frequent use in East Anglia of Scandinavian-influenced dialectal words usually found elsewhere in the Danelaw, but shows that only parts of north and central Norfolk were consistently within the relevant isoglosses. Some words, however, attained a wider zone of usage extending into

[1] ON ***hvin** probably forms the specific element of Whinburgh (discussed in section 9.5.2) and other minor names (*PNNf2*: 94, 102), discussed in the next section.

parts of the remaining areas of East Anglia, a pattern that mirrors the distribution of different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names.

(10.2.2) The occasional sole use in East Anglia of some dialectal words such as 'sail' may reflect the existence of an identifiable dialectal and linguistic region with its own distinctive patterns of speech and shared linguistic characteristics that are not found elsewhere in England. A core area of linguistic East Anglia has been identified, based on an analysis of major, shared characteristics of English usage (Trudgill 2001a).[2] It encompasses nearly all of Norfolk and Suffolk – but, intriguing, excludes the Fens (an area that also lacks Scandinavian-influenced place-names) and includes north-east Essex (the one area of Essex that includes them) in a coincidence that is surely significant.

Two of the most characteristic and defining features of East Anglian dialect are the anaphoric use of 'that' in place of 'it' as the third-person singular non-human pronoun for the subject of a sentence (but not its object), and the third-person singular present-tense zero (the lack of 's') (Trudgill 2001a: 1-2). They both appear at the end of a playground chant with which the present writer was confronted when starting primary school at Hadleigh in south Suffolk in 1961:

> See my finger, see my thumb,
> See my fist, and here *that come*!

The traditional East Anglian use of anaphoric 'that' has been characterised as a relic of a Scandinavian substratum in the dialects of the Danelaw area that can be dated back to the period of Viking settlement, and reflects a Scandinavian third-person pronoun singular paradigm still evident in modern Swedish. It has been suggested that whereas standard English (which developed from a central East Midland dialect) adopted only the third-person personal pronoun plurals ('they', 'them' and 'their')

[2] See map in Appendix 10.2.2a.

from the Scandinavian-influenced dialects, the East Anglian dialect also adopted and retained the singular 'that' for third-person neuters (Poussa 2001: 245-246).

The use of the third-person present-tense singular zero in East Anglia probably originated with immigrants during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Trudgill 2001b), demonstrating that the Viking settlement of East Anglia was only one of several formative immigration processes resulting from the region's proximity to the North Sea that uniquely affected its historical, cultural and linguistic development (Bates and Liddiard 2013).

(10.2.3) It has been possible also to detect and chart the geographical distribution-patterns of Scandinavian influence upon the pronunciation of OE phonemes in different regions of England (Kristensson 1995). Analysis of the written forms of place- and personal names in fourteenth-century lay subsidy rolls from the East Midlands and East Anglia has indicated that the voicing of initial fricatives (so 'f' becomes pronounced as 'v') took place in late Old English during the ninth century as a result of an immanent tendency in the West Germanic languages, but only in the areas of southern England unaffected by Scandinavian settlement. In areas of the former Danelaw, the tendency towards voicing was forestalled by the strong influence of the Scandinavian language(s), in which the initial fricatives remained unvoiced.

The isophone delineating the northern limit of voicing runs through the southern half of Suffolk, thus placing south Suffolk and the whole of Essex within the 'English' zone of voiced fricatives beyond the area of Scandinavian linguistic influence (Kristensson 1995: 159-61, Map 16; 1997).[3] Once again, this linguistic border supports the differentiation between a northern zone of East Anglia subject to greater Scandinavian influence during the late Anglo-Saxon period and a southern zone that remained more English in character, as will be explored further in Chapter 11.

[3] See map in Appendix 10.2.3a.

10.3) Microtoponyms

(10.3.1) Many of the local dialectal words of Scandianvian origin discussed in the previous section were used also in the formation of minor and field-names, which can be located more precisely geographically. In contradistinction to major place-names (as defined in section 4.1), microtoponyms can broadly be regarded as minor names of less important settlements or less prominent features (Rumble 2011: 35-40), of which the most widely recorded and studied are field-names. Some have been documented for over eight hundred years, others appear only in a single document, and many more have been passed down only orally without ever having been recorded in writing. Field-names have therefore often been able to preserve the words and phrases of local dialects which would not otherwise have been recorded – unlike place-names which were often 'corrected' in official documents to regional or national norms and preserved in an unchanging, fossilised form, as discussed in section 4.2.3 (Field 1993: 1-9; Cavill 2018; Gregory 2018: v-vi; 2016: 51-52).

The study of minor and field-names in East Anglia has been hindered by the lack of available source material, as microtoponyms are listed only briefly in the EPNS volume for Essex, and more detailed EPNS records are so far only available for seven of the thirty-three hundreds in Norfolk (*PNEss*; *PNNf2*; *PNNf3*). Consequently, only two localised studies have been conducted on identifying and analysing the field-names in East Anglia containing elements that are possibly of Scandinavian origin.

One of these, conducted by David Parsons (2006), compared the field-names in the Norfolk hundreds of East and West Flegg (containing a noticeable concentration of place-names in **-býr**) with those of Holt and North Erpingham (two hundreds containing fewer Scandinavian-influenced place-names, located around forty kilometres north-west of Flegg). Using EPNS data to examine 956 minor and field-names first recorded between *c.* 1100 and 1400, the survey showed that 18% of the 146 generics found in the field-names of East and West Flegg are identifiably ON in origin, and 47% are OE (the remainder being of other or uncertain origin),

compared with equivalent figures of 17% (ON) and 53% (OE) for the 122 field-names of Holt and North Erpingham. The direct ratios between the ON and OE generics are 28:72 (ON:OE) for Flegg, and 24:76 for Holt and North Erpingham, suggesting that the degree of Scandinavian influence on the medieval vocabulary of Holt and North Erpingham is similar to that of East and West Flegg –much greater than might be deduced from the evidence of major place-names alone.

Karl Sandred's (1979) analysis examined the widespread use of ON word-elements in the field-names of Flitcham in north-west Norfolk, an area where major Scandinavian place-names are almost entirely absent. Although Sandred's study did not compare statistically the relative proportions of ON and OE elements in field-names, it revealed 'a great many field-names with ON elements in Flitcham' that provided 'telling evidence of Scandinavian influence on the vocabulary of […] an area where there are no traces of Scandinavian influence in the major names' (Sandred 1979: 115).

The relationship between Scandinavian settlement and Scandinavian influence on the vocabulary of field-names has always been more difficult to define than for Scandinavian-derived major place-names, which were nearly all recorded by the eleventh century and presumably formed by Scandinavian speakers, whereas the documents in which microtoponyms are recorded usually date from the twelfth century onwards. It has generally been assumed that field-names have preserved the language or vocabulary of the farming classes in a particular locality – and if that language should be heavily Scandinavian-influenced, that might suggest the common use of Old Norse among the farmers and workers in that area (Townend 2014: 110-11; Abrams and Parsons 2004: 402-03).

However, a recent analysis of Scandinavian-influenced field-names in two different areas of north-west England (Rye 2016) has shown that the circumstances of pre-Conquest Scandinavian settlement often had little bearing on the subsequent character of minor names that were recorded in those areas at least two centuries later. Although the circumstances and linguistic consequences of pre-Conquest Scandinavian settlement in different areas of England might initially have been quite similar, developments in the following centuries apparently led to different levels of

Scandinavian influence upon place-name vocabulary by the Middle English period. Some individual ON word-elements entered the Middle English language during the post-Conquest period and their use may have then spread by what have been termed 'horizontal patterns of element diffusion', a process which may have obscured or disrupted the original links between Scandinavian settlement and Scandinavian influence on the microtoponymy at a local level.

Ultimately, therefore, the use of ON place-name elements (and, indeed, personal names) in minor names may reflect regional trends of usage rather than a more specific and localised direct Scandinavian influence on naming vocabulary (Rye 2016: 350-51). This model may reflect the limited field-name evidence so far presented from East Anglia that indicates a diffusion of Scandinavian linguistic influence, as ON words were adopted in Middle English, that in time extended beyond the early areas of Scandinavian settlement.

(10.3.2) It is possible also to discern patterns of Scandinavian linguistic influence across East Anglia by using GIS datasets to display the geographical distribution of present-day minor names incorporating specific Scandinavian-influenced elements, and compare them with equivalent OE terms. It is difficult to extract the relevant geographical data for most minor-name types (including some Scandinavian-influenced elements, such as 'carr' and 'holm', from ON **kjarr** and **holmr**, respectively).[4] However, one word-element which can be charted in this way is 'beck', the modern English spelling of the ME form **bek** or **bec(c)** which in turn was derived from the ON **bekkr** or ODan **bæk**, meaning a 'stream' or a watercourse smaller than a river (*OED*: s.v. beck, *n.1*; *VEPN1*: 75-77; *EPNE*: 1.26). It is found in the names of many small rivers and streams throughout the territory of the former Danelaw, taking the place of 'brook' (from OE **brōc**) used throughout the rest of southern England. As can be seen from the map in Appendix 10.3.2a, there is a clear linguistic boundary dividing the use of the 'beck' and 'brook' elements that runs from north Lancashire in a south-easterly direction across central England to Norfolk, a

[4] The use of **holmr** in major place-names is discussed in section 8.4.4.3.

boundary which generally coincides with the linguistic isogloss separating the use of 'beck' and 'brook' in modern local English dialects (Orton and Wright 1974: 87).

However, the number of 'beck'-named watercourses in East Anglia is sparse and the boundary more diffuse, and so the cluster of 'becks' in Norfolk appears to constitute a more isolated dialectal phenomenon that is not part of a linguistic continuum of 'beck'-usage stretching across to the other areas of the Danelaw in northern England. In East Anglia, the element is only found in the names of smaller watercourses that flow east into the Yare/Wensum, Bure and Waveney rivers,[5] which significantly are all part of the river-system serving the area of Norfolk in which the principal concentration of major Scandinavian-influenced place-names is found. So, unlike Scandinavian elements in field-names which have been used more widely in East Anglia (such as those of Flitcham in west Norfolk discussed in the previous section), the use of 'beck' appears to be associated more closely with the geographical distribution of the major Scandinavian-influenced place-names, which may suggest a similarly earlier period of formation.

However, as few names of rivers and streams are recorded in early written sources, it is difficult to find clear documentary evidence of early origins. Thirteen of the 'beck'-named watercourses in Norfolk are listed in the relevant EPNS volumes (*PNNf3*; *PNNf2*), but only two are recorded in medieval (thirteenth and fourteenth century) documents, and only one, Scarrow Beck, has a specific containing a Scandinavian element (ON **sker**, 'rock, or scar', compounded with OE **rāw**, 'row').

It is difficult, therefore, to gauge the dates of formation for these 'beck'-names. Nevertheless, their limited distribution in East Anglia and congruence with that of the major Scandinavian place-names suggests that the term may have been introduced contemporaneously – presumably before the other types of Scandinavian-influenced field-names, which have been shown by the limited analyses conducted so far (as discussed previously) to be the result of a different and wider type of Scandinavian linguistic influence.

[5] See map in Appendix 10.3.2b.

10.4) Hundred-names

(10.4.1) The relatively high proportion of hundred-names in Norfolk displaying possible Scandinavian origins or influence (nine or ten out of a total of thirty-three recorded in Domesday Book for Norfolk, plus three out of twenty-five in Suffolk)[6] has traditionally been interpreted as evidence for some degree of Viking involvement in the development of the hundredal system in East Anglia (Sandred 1994; Anderson 1934: xxxi-xxxii, xxxviii-xxxix, 63-98). However, detailed analysis of the nature and degree of Scandinavianisation of the hundred-names involved suggests that they may represent only a relatively minor degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence, akin to the place-names containing ON topographical generics discussed in Chapter 8.

The origins of the hundredal system in East Anglia remain uncertain, but it appears to have derived originally from early Anglo-Saxon tribal groupings, as indicated by the four surviving hundred-names of the **-ingas** type, such as Happing (from **Hæppingas*) in Norfolk and Blything (**Blīþingas*) in Suffolk (Hadley 2006: 89-92; Sandred 1994; Anderson 1934: 63-98; Warner 1996: 144-65). However, the hundredal system appears to have undergone a major re-organisation during the late Anglo-Saxon period, presumably after the conquest of Viking-controlled East Anglia by Wessex. But it has usually been assumed that the preceding period of Viking political control and settlement left its mark as well and may have 'obliterated' earlier systems of territorial organisation (Williamson 1993: 128), leaving several hundred-names of probable Scandinavian origin as 'a clear indication of Scandinavian ascendancy' (Anderson 1934: xxxii). The nine or ten such hundred-names in Norfolk and the three in Suffolk are all interpreted as containing ON generics which are topographical in nature – a point of some significance, as will be explained below.

By contrast, the non-Scandinavian hundred-names of Norfolk and Suffolk are more varied in form. As mentioned above, four contain ancient folk-names. Another eleven in Norfolk and four in Suffolk are derived from the place-names of established

[6] See map in Appendix 10.4.1a. There are no Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names in Essex.

settlements listed in Domesday Book that have largely survived to the present day as significant villages or towns. Some of these names incorporate early OE habitative generics, including six in **-hām**, which may indicate the early origins of the associated settlements that presumably preceded the use of the same name for the hundred itself (Anderson 1934: xxvi-xxxi). Significantly, there are no hundred-names in **-tūn**, which came into use in the later Anglo-Saxon period, and also denoted more enclosed settlements, in contrast to the more open-spaced milieu of hundredal meeting places.

Most of the remaining non-Scandinavian hundred-names appear to have been named after topographical features that in some way identified their meeting places. Six contain the OE **ford** generic and two OE **brycg**, combined with an identifying specific, denoting meeting places at easily located crossing-points of rivers. Others identified prominent landmarks, such as the 'high place' (Henstead), 'smooth down' (Smithdon), 'small lake' (Bosmere), and 'black stream' (Blackbourn).

Similarly, the twelve possibly Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names in Norfolk and Suffolk all contain generics referring to topographical features that may identify the meeting places of their respective territories – except Flegg, as will be discussed below. Five or six (North and South Greenhoe, Grimshoe, Forehoe and possibly Gallow in Norfolk, plus Thingoe in Suffolk) appear to contain the ON generic **haugr**, 'mound or tumulus', that may refer in each case to one or more tumuli in the landscape adjacent to, or actually constituting, the hundred's probable meeting place. The tumuli were prominent and often ancient landscape features which presumably bore earlier OE names, perhaps containing OE **hlāw** or **hlǣw**, also meaning a 'burial mound' or 'tumulus', or **hōh**, meaning a 'spur' or 'hill' – two cognates or near-cognates of ON **haugr** which are difficult to distinguish linguistically (Meaney 1997; *EPNE*: 1.248-49, 256-57).

Two of the hundred-names in **-haugr** are compounded with specifics of clearly ON origin: Grimshoe, from the ON personal name *Grim* or *Grímr*, and Thingoe, containing the ON noun **þing**, 'assembly'. The third, Forehoe, contains either ON **fiuræ** or **fiurir**, or possibly OE **fēower**, meaning 'four'. As these three hundred-names are probably fully Scandinavian and refer to meeting places near identifiable tumuli,

it has been assumed that they contain ON **haugr** (Sandred 1994: 271-72; Anderson 1934: 75, 78-79, 95-96).

More ambiguously, the specific of Gallow may be OE **galga** rather than its ON cognate **galgi** ('gallows'), and North and South Greenhoe could each contain either ON **grønn** or OE **grēne** ('green'). It has been suggested also that that the generic of these names is derived from OE **hōh** rather than ON **haugr**, and so their names may actually be OE rather than ON in form (Sandred 1994: 271-75; Anderson 1934: 66-67, 74; *LPN*: 174). It is also possible that the hundreds containing the ON **haugr** element may in fact constitute a Scandinavianised modification of earlier names which perhaps had contained the cognate OE **hlāw** or **hlǣw** element. For the use of prominent mounds as sites for meeting places was common elsewhere in southern England outside the Danelaw, where the **hlǣw** element is found frequently as a generic of hundred-names, such as Thunderlow in Essex ('Thunor's mound') and Wenslow in Bedfordshire ('Woden's mound') (Meaney 1997; Turner 2005).

Two more hundred-names in Norfolk, Brothercross and Guiltcross, contain the ON generic **kross**, 'cross', for which there was not an equivalent OE cognate current at the time of their likely formation.[7] They are compounded with the ODan personal name *Brothir* (or OS *Brodhir*) and ODan *Gildi* (or OS *Gilde*), respectively (Sandred 1994: 272, 274; Anderson 1934: 66-67, 75-76). Both names are assumed to refer to crosses in the landscape that served as markers for each hundred's meeting place. It is intriguing that such recent and religiously significant landmarks should be recognised in the wholly Scandinavian names of two hundreds, possibly providing evidence of conversion to Christianity and some degree of cultural assimilation, as discussed in Chapter 2 and 3. A corresponding recognition of a site's pagan religious significance may be seen in the renaming of Wayland Wood (containing the ON generic **lundr**, meaning 'a small wood' that possibly conveys also a sense of a 'sacred grove', probably compounded with the ODan personal name *Waghn*) as the name of the eponymous hundred, as discussed in section 8.4.2.

[7] The cognate OE word **cros**, derived from the Old Irish **cros**, only came into use later, as it replaced **rōd** (or 'rood'), the usual OE word for 'cross', and the late OE **crūc** (ME **crouche**), at a later date (Smith 1956: 1.114-15).

The two hundreds of East and West Flegg were probably initially constituted as one, encompassing what was originally an island (as discussed in sections 6.3 and 6.4). The name of Flegg itself is derived from a Danish word **flæg**, meaning 'marsh plants', that presumably but unusually referred to the late Anglo-Saxon landscape of the whole former island rather than the location of its meeting place. This has been separately identified as an area of heathland at the junction of six **bý**-named parish boundaries, referred to in medieval court and account rolls as *Stefne*, from ON **stefna** or ODan **stæfnæ**, used in the sense of 'meeting place' (Sandred 1986-87: 310-11; 1994: 270-71; *PNNf2*: 1-2, 45-46; *EPNE*: 2.149-50).

There are only two hundred-names in Suffolk containing possible Scandinavianised elements, in addition to Thingoe discussed above. Colneis probably contains the ON generic **nes**, 'a headland or promontory', (as opposed to its OE cognate **næss**), compounded with the ON personal name *Koli*, and perhaps refers to a now-lost coastal headland which might have provided the hundred's original meeting place. The name of Carlford apparently refers to a ford across a small stream near Hasketon, compounded with the ON element **karl**, 'ceorl' (as discussed in section 9.3.2 regarding 'Carltons' and 'Charltons') or the ON personal name *Karli*, or ODan *Karl* (*DSPN*: 30, 35; Anderson 1934: 91-93; Arnott 1946: 6, 11, 26-27, 1950: 41)

Geographically, the three Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names in Suffolk appear to represent isolated outliers of possible Scandinavian influence, whereas the majority of those in Norfolk are aligned in two contiguous clusters outside the main concentration of Scandinavian place-names: one in the south-west of the county around Thetford, and the other in north Norfolk. [8] East and West Flegg, probably derived from a single name for the former island, remain the only Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names in the principal concentration-area of Scandinavian place-names.

The lack of congruence between the distributions of Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names and place-names suggests that the two were formed in differing circumstances. The Scandinavianisation of some hundred-names may possibly

[8] See map in Appendix 10.4.1a.

reflect a more 'top-down' process of administrative relabelling by the ruling élite, perhaps seeking to render the hundredal meeting-place sites more identifiable by replacing the OE terminology in the old Anglo-Saxon hundred-names with ON cognates. Perhaps ON **haugr** was thus substituted for OE **hlāw** or **hōh** in one hundred-name, and the practice spread by analogy to the others. However, the formation of the Brothercross and Guiltcross hundred-names indicates quite a different process of name-formation, involving in each case an ON word (for which there was no contemporaneous OE cognate) compounded with an ON personal name, perhaps suggesting a more fundamental Viking re-organisation of the hundred-area concerned, together with a possible relocation of its meeting place.

More broadly, the relatively large number of Scandinavian-influenced hundred-names in Norfolk compared with just three in Suffolk and none in Essex once again reflects a pattern of greater Scandinavian linguistic influence, and perhaps longer-lasting Viking political autonomy, in northern East Anglia compared with the southern half of the region that was closer to the burgeoning authority of Wessex, a theme that will be discussed further in Chapter 11.

Overall, the Scandinavianisation of some hundred-names in Norfolk and Suffolk but not others appears to have been a fairly haphazard and piecemeal phenomenon, rather than part of the complete administrative re-organisation of a new régime. Although some of the hundredal territories appear to have been restructured in the late Anglo-Saxon period (Williamson 1993: 126-30), many of the presumably long-established hundred-names derived from ancient Anglo-Saxon folk-names and early OE village-names were apparently left unchanged. Furthermore, it appears that many (but not all) of the Scandinavianised hundred-names only served to replace existing OE terminology, and may thus represent minor linguistic modifications of pre-existing OE names that referred to long-established landscape features marking the sites of the hundreds' meeting places – just as a number of place-names containing ON topographical generics constituted a renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements (as described in sections 8.4.2 and 8.4.6).

Apart from Brothercross and Guiltcross discussed above, the only exceptions to the suggested predominant pattern of renaming are East and West Flegg, which

may have arisen as a newly coined Scandinavian name for a recently colonised and previously marginal area (as discussed in section 6.4), that then became its 'official' hundredal name as the territory subsequently prospered and was incorporated into the local administrative system. Ultimately, the partial Scandinavianisation of several hundred-names in Norfolk and Suffolk may reflect the hybrid nature of the Viking administration of East Anglia, which utilised the Anglo-Saxon hundredal system rather than the wapentakes seen elsewhere in the Danelaw but measured the units of land that comprised each hundred using Scandinavian carucates rather than the Anglo-Saxon hides used throughout most of southern England, including Essex (Hart 1992: 289-335).

10.5) Personal names

(10.5.1) The significance of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian personal names in late Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest England as evidence for Viking settlement has long been debated, and it is now acknowledged that personal names reflect cultural influences and social attitudes rather than indicate national or 'racial' origins (Clark 1982: 52). It certainly cannot be assumed that ON personal names invariably indicate individuals of Scandinavian descent, as some families of both settler and indigenous communities in late Anglo-Saxon England contained members of the same generation bearing both OE and ON names. This might reflect a new naming fashion initiated by the Scandinavian settlers or a desire by the indigenous population to align themselves – and their children – with their new political overlords, and the adoption of English names by settlers may have been attributable to similar factors (Hadley 2000b: 123-24; 2001: 24; Lewis-Simpson 2011: 22).

In terms of geographical distribution, it has been assumed that the proportion of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian personal names found in particular regions of England dating from the late Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest period may bear some relationship to the original strength of Viking influence in the districts

represented, although it may be more accurate to speak only in terms of 'influence' rather than 'density of settlement' (Clark 1979: 17).

But a study by David Parsons (2002) has analysed the relative proportions of Scandinavian and English personal names borne by landholding individuals in different areas of England in the 1060s, using von Feilitzen's (1937) detailed list of landholders' names recorded in Domesday Book. The resultant map[9] shows that the proportion of ON personal names is highest in Yorkshire (70%) and Lincolnshire (62%), and lowest in Cornwall (13%) and other southern coastal counties, demonstrating some degree of correlation between the areas containing the greatest concentration of Scandinavian-influenced place-names and those with the highest proportions of ON names recorded in Domesday Book. However, it is significant that the counties in southern and western England, outside the principal known areas of Viking settlement, display considerably higher proportions of ON personal names than might be predicted from the almost complete absence there of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. In East Anglia, the proportions of ON personal names are halfway between the wider variations seen elsewhere in the Danelaw. The percentages of 45% for Norfolk and 33% for Suffolk correspond broadly with the relative number of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in each county, but the figure of 33% for Essex which has far fewer Scandinavian-influenced place-names than Suffolk is more anomalous.

A similar analysis has also been conducted of the relative proportions of men's ON personal names in the post-Conquest name-stocks of some Danelaw counties and towns, as recorded in a range of twelfth- and thirteenth century documents (Clark 1982: 53-55). Once again, these give relatively high figures of 60-65% for Lincolnshire and 60% for Newark in Nottinghamshire, compared with lower figures of 30% for Huntingdonshire, 25% for Cambridgeshire and 20% for Bedfordshire, and more intermediate figures in East Anglia of 40-50% for Norfolk and 30-35% for Suffolk. These results are strikingly similar to those of Parsons' survey of eleventh-century

[9] See Appendix 10.5.1a.

names, and suggest a surprising continuity in the personal-naming patterns of eastern England from the eleventh to the thirteenth century (Parsons 2002: 51).

Various factors have been identified to account for the considerable numbers of Scandinavian-named landholders recorded in the regions of England outside the known areas of Viking settlement (Lewis 2016). It seems evident that a large proportion were first- or second-generation Danish migrants who had acquired their land following Cnut's conquest of England, as discussed in section 2.2.7. It is probable also that others were descendants of the original Viking settlers in the later ninth century who may have been granted, or were able to purchase, land in other areas of England. Other individuals bearing ON names may have been from English families who acquired elements of Danish identity during the régime of Cnut and his sons (Williams 1986; Lewis 2016; Insley 1982: 77-78). As mentioned above, there was a considerable two-way exchange of names between indigenous and settler communities (Hadley 2000b: 123-24; 2002: 59-60).

(10.5.2) It is possible also to use the detailed information from Domesday Book to plot the pattern of distribution for landholders' personal names within the individual hundreds of a county. Parsons' (2002) survey undertook this exercise for Suffolk, which had by far the largest name-stock of any county recorded in Domesday Book, with 351 different names listed. The highest proportion of ON personal names compared with those of OE origin is found in the four most north-easterly hundreds of Suffolk (including Lothingland and Blything, with 52% and 46% respectively), and the lowest in the two south-west hundreds of Babergh (16%) and Risbridge (19%).[10] This pattern reflects the distribution of Scandinavian-influenced place-names (except the 'Grimston-hybrids) throughout Suffolk,[11] which displays a similar concentration in the north-east. The high proportion of ON personal names in the hundreds of north-east Suffolk may correspond with the overall figure of 45% for Norfolk, but it is

[10] See Appendix 10.5.2a.
[11] See map in Appendix.

likely that the figures for individual hundreds in eastern Norfolk may be considerably higher still.

As with the counties of southern and western England, however, the proportion of landholders with ON names elsewhere in Suffolk does not fall away as markedly as the corresponding numbers of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. It is also intriguing that there appear to be localised 'hotspots' of ON personal names in the hundreds of Cosford, Wilford, Blything and Blackbourn hundreds, which contain (or are adjacent to) the royal vills and estates of Hadleigh, Rendlesham, Blythburgh and Coney Weston, respectively (as discussed in sections 9.3.4, 9.4.5 and 9.4.6). The localised higher proportion of ON names in Wilford (42%) is particularly marked, being surrounded by hundreds with much lower proportions of 21%, 20% and 27%. It has been suggested that the apparent localised 'hotspot' of ON names in Cosford hundred, containing the royal vill of Hadleigh where Guthrum is reported to have died, may represent the lingering Scandinavian influence of Guthrum's court (Martin and Satchell 2008: 221) – which perhaps manifested itself also in the naming of the cluster of 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in south Suffolk that are compounded with Danish personal names (as discussed in sections 9.4.3 and 9.4.6).

The personal-name evidence from Domesday Book provides further evidence that Scandinavian influence on the name-stock of eleventh-century Suffolk landholders was stronger in the higher ranks of society than amongst the free peasantry, as the proportion of ON names for individuals classified as 'freemen' (or 'sokemen') throughout the hundreds of the county is consistently lower than for landholders in general (Parsons 2002: 50-51). This pattern may once again reflect the recent acquisition of land by high-ranking Danish individuals under the régime of Cnut and his successors.

(10.5.3) So overall, the evidence of Domesday Book indicates that the distribution-pattern of landholders' ON personal names across the counties of England corresponds to some extent with that of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, with a relative concentration of both ON personal names and place-names in the northern Danelaw and, to a lesser extent, in Norfolk, that could well suggest some common

elements of origin in terms of Scandinavian settlement. However, the patterns do not correlate so well at a more localised level, indicating other factors at play which resulted in the diffusion of ON personal names beyond the original areas of Scandinavian settlement, as has been discussed above. Within East Anglia, the proportion of ON personal names across the hundreds in Suffolk appears to constitute a microcosm of the national pattern, with a similar concentration in the north-east coinciding with that of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names, but substantial proportions of ON names in other areas that contain virtually no Scandinavian-influenced place-names – mirroring the pattern in southern and western England.

Further work is needed on the distribution of ON personal names in East Anglia (especially in Norfolk) and elsewhere in the Danelaw, but a picture is already beginning to emerge that provides an illuminating counterpoint to the distribution-patterns of Scandinavian-influenced place-names. Although they provides no direct evidence of ethnic 'Vikings', the selection of etymologically ON names by both indigenous and immigrant communities provides a measure of Scandinavian linguistic and cultural influence that lasted from the beginnings of Viking conquest and settlement into England in the post-Conquest period (Parsons 2002: 42). This evidence may partly reflect a renewed Scandinavian cultural influence in the eleventh century as a result of Cnut's regime, but it may represent also a longer-lasting Scandinavian linguistic influence which endured beyond the shorter, earlier phase of Scandinavian place-name formation – a phenomenon that will be explored further in Chapter 11.

10.6) Street-names

(10.6.1) In contrast to the wider distribution of ON personal names beyond the areas of known Viking settlement, it appears that Scandinavian-influenced street-names are largely restricted to urban areas within the confines of the former Danelaw –

where the arrival of Scandinavian settlers was clearly a significant factor in the increasing urbanisation of the late Anglo-Saxon period, as discussed in section 3.5. However, unlike place-names which remained largely unchanged following their first written forms (usually in Domesday Book), street-names in English towns have changed constantly as urban landscapes have been extended and rebuilt. Even where original street lines have remained largely unaltered since being laid out initially in the Anglo-Saxon period or earlier, their original street-names have often long been lost and replaced as the circumstances and functions of the streets have changed (Room 1992: xiii; Clegg 1984: 9-18). The study and analysis of street-names is further hindered by the fact that most are recorded only in sources dating from well after the Viking period (Fellows-Jensen 2010: 89). In East Anglia, comprehensive EPNS surveys of street-names have only been conducted in Norwich and Great Yarmouth (*PNNf1*; *PNNf2*). Information is available for the street-names of some other East Anglian towns, including Ipswich and Bury St Edmunds (Clegg 1984; Briggs, forthcoming), but is less detailed and more sporadic.

Toponymic analysis of the early forms of street-names in several English cities has revealed a discernible pattern, with a noticeable absence of Scandinavian influence in London and Winchester outside the Danelaw but more tangible evidence of Scandinavian urban settlement and presence within it. This is indicated especially by the presence of street-names containing the ON generic **gata**, or its later ME forms **gate** and **gatte** ('a way, path, road or street'; *EPNE*: 1.196; *OED*: s.v. gate, *n.2*), which can provide a measure of the degree of Scandinavian influence (Fellows-Jensen 2010;). Norwich contains twenty-eight examples, of which ten are compounded with specifics certainly or possibly of Scandinavian origin. This compares with York (thirty-six street-names in **-gata**, with twenty compounded with possible ON specifics), Lincoln (with corresponding figures of thirty-six, and twelve), Nottingham (twenty-five, and five), Leicester (twenty-three, and five), Derby (four, and none) (Fellows-Jensen 2010: 91-92). The levels of Scandinavian linguistic influence indicated by the relative numbers of street-names in **-gata** suggest that Norwich occupies an intermediate position between the higher figures for York and Lincoln, and the lower figures seen in the cities of the East Midlands.

Street-names containing 'gate' are found widely in other urban settlements in East Anglia and elsewhere in England, but mainly compounded with specifics derived from English words not in use before the later medieval period, and so it is assumed that the 'gate' element does not represent ON **gata**, but rather OE **geat** ('a hole, opening, or gap') that gave rise to various ME forms such as **gate** or **gatte**, **y(h)att** and **ȝett** (Smith 1956: 1.198; *OED*: s.v. gate, *n.1*). This element became used frequently in English street-names referring to openings or gates in urban walls or ramparts through which the eponymous street or road often passed.

The similarity of the ME forms of ON **gata** and OE **geat** may have facilitated the wider use of the 'gate' element during the post-Conquest period, resulting in many surviving street-names containing 'gate' in the towns of East Anglia beyond Norwich, including Thetford, Great Yarmouth, Beccles, Bury St Edmunds and Ipswich. A small number of these have been identified as probably containing the ON **gata** element, such as Northgate in Great Yarmouth, Raingate Street and Risbygate in Bury St Edmunds, Ingate in Beccles (*PNNf2*: 32; Briggs, forthcoming; Boulton and Briggs 2017: 39-40). Some occurrences of 'gate' are impossible to identify definitively as either ON **gata** or OE **geat**, such as Burgate in Felixstowe (Briggs, forthcoming), but most are assumed to represent ME 'gate' derived from OE **geat**. Some have been correspondingly associated with known town-wall gates, such as Northgate Street and Westgate Street in Ipswich (Clegg 1984: 7-8).

A few other elements in the (often now-lost) street-names of Norwich have also been identified as Scandinavian in origin, such as Tombland (containing ME **tōm**, 'empty', probably from ON **tómr**), and the use of 'staithe' (from ON **stǫð**, 'landing stage, harbour') to name wharfs and landings-stages along the river (Sandred 1991: 330-31; 2001: 52-54). In other East Anglian towns, there are only isolated examples of Scandinavian-influenced street-names. In Lowestoft, it appears that the ON term **skora** ('a cut, or notch') was used to describe surface-water channels grooved into the soft glacial deposits of the town's seaward-facing cliff-face that were later engineered into managed footways and cart-tracks known as 'scores' (Butcher 2016: 5, n. 10; *EPNE*: 2.126).

Overall, it appears that the distribution of street-names in East Anglian towns displaying Scandinavian linguistic influence resembles more closely the geographical pattern of Scandinavian-influenced place-names than any of the other forms of onomastic evidence discussed in this chapter. The occurrence of some purely Scandinavian street-names in Norwich (especially those containing ON **gata** compounded with specifics of probable Scandinavian origin) provides a clear indication of relatively early Scandinavian linguistic influence resulting from probable Danish settlement that corresponds with the urban archaeological evidence discussed in section 3.5.3 – and with the concentration of purely Scandinavian place-names in the cluster of eastern Norfolk surrounding Norwich, as will be explored in Chapter 11.

But the use of 'gate' in the street-names of other towns in East Anglia may constitute a wider use of ON **gata** (alongside OE **geat**) in their later ME forms, reflecting a more general diffusion of Scandinavian linguistic influence which has been seen also with the distribution of some hybrid place-names as well as the personal names, microtoponyms and hundred-names discussed above.

10.7) Conclusion

The various other types of onomastic evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia briefly reviewed in this chapter provide a diverse range of similarities and contrasts to the analyses of major Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names presented in Chapters 6 to 9, in terms of their geographical contexts and distribution.

Some forms of evidence, such as the use of Scandinavian-influenced elements in street-names, minor names, hundred-names, and some dialectal words, display a similar pattern of distribution to the concentration of Scandinavian place-names in central and eastern Norfolk, with only a few isolated outliers located further south in Suffolk and none in Essex. This congruence may indicate a relatively early pre-Conquest period of formation that is contemporaneous with that of the major place-

names. The specific circumstances of each type of Scandinavian element as discussed above (the street-names in Norwich, the minor names such as 'beck' in central Norfolk, the hundred-names in Norfolk, and the restricted isoglosses of some dialectal words within parts of Norfolk) would seem to render such a contemporaneity feasible.

Conversely, the geographical distribution of other ON element-types, such as field-names, personal names, and other dialectal words, is more widely spread across East Anglia with examples located in areas where there are very few Scandinavian-influenced place-names (although much further field-work is required for each of these onomastic categories). Nevertheless, even these more widely distributed elements display a greater degree of concentration in central and eastern Norfolk which corresponds with that of the place-names. In broader terms, the different types of onomastic evidence reviewed in this chapter clearly support a fundamental differentiation between a northern zone of East Anglia displaying some degree of Scandinavian linguistic and cultural influence and a southern zone that remained more English in character. This theme will be explored further in the next chapter.

PART THREE:
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Chapter 11: DISCUSSION

11.1) Introduction

The different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names examined in Chapters 6 to 9 have presented a complex and diverse body of evidence for the possible patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia. Detailed analysis of the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with each name-type has revealed further layers of complexity that tend to contradict the interpretations of previous studies of Scandinavian-influenced place-names elsewhere in the Danelaw. It is clearly no longer possible to apply a simple, single-cause explanation for the formation of each main type of Scandinavian-influenced place-name in East Anglia. In some respects, the diversity of the toponymic evidence matches the ambiguous and often contradictory nature of the differing strands of archaeological evidence for Viking settlement in this region presented in Chapter 3. The lack of a simple explanation is compounded further by the dearth of historical evidence which, as outlined in Chapter 2, can only hint at the possible processes of Viking settlement.

Nevertheless, it is possible to discern some common themes and patterns amidst the diverse types and contexts of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia as presented in Chapters 6 to 9, together with the other forms of onomastic evidence outlined in Chapter 10. These can be compared and correlated with the equally diverse strands of historical, documentary and archaeological evidence discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 in order to illuminate the possible processes and pathways of Viking settlement.

This chapter will provide a brief comparative overview of the individual types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names presented in Chapters 6 to 9, looking for broader paradigms that may transcend the individual name-type categories. It will

then identify different zones of linguistic influence in East Anglia, as indicated by the geographical locations of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and examine the varying concentrations – and absences – of different name-types in certain areas. The geographical patterns of place-name distribution from this analysis will be related to the historical, documentary and archaeological evidence discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 to identify possible wider discernible patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia. Finally, this chapter will consider possible evidence for the long-postulated 'secondary migration' of settlers from Scandinavia in terms of recent migration theory as this might be reflected in Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and will tentatively propose a possible historical and migrationary model of Scandinavian settlement in East Anglia.

11.2) Review of individual types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names

The examination of the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in the previous chapters has been arranged according to traditional onomastic analysis, looking in turn at each type of generic, in order to facilitate comparison with existing surveys of Scandinavian-influenced place-names elsewhere in the Danelaw. But the geographical and archaeological dimension of this study has revealed a significant degree of variation and contradiction within each category of generic, and so perhaps a more useful and fundamental distinction in terms of Viking settlement may be drawn between those Scandinavian-influenced place-names associated with pre-Viking settlements in existence before being renamed by newly arrived Scandinavian-speaking settlers, and those associated with new settlements formed after their arrival.

The Scandinavian-influenced place-names associated with settlements apparently dating from the pre-Viking period include most of those that incorporate ON personal names, including around a third of both the **thorps** and the **bý**-names.

These are nearly all located in central and eastern Norfolk, and many appear to have been coined relatively early in the process of Viking settlement to name existing, outlying portions of Anglo-Saxon estates as these were fragmented into smaller units. They were presumably named after their new owners or occupiers, perhaps to indicate a transfer of ownership but reflecting also the fundamental changes in late Anglo-Saxon place-naming practices that coincided with the period of Viking settlement. Some at least of the 'Grimston-hybrids' may similarly represent the early Viking takeover of existing, established Anglo-Saxon settlements and the fragmentation of existing Anglo-Saxon estates, as postulated in previous scholarship, but it is unclear how many 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia may be placed in this category.

The remaining Scandinavian-influenced place-names associated with pre-existing Anglo-Saxon settlements are those containing ON generics that were rarely used in East Anglia (that is, excluding **býr**, **thorp**, **thwaite** and **toft**), as well as the hybrid place-names combining non-anthroponymic, Scandinavian-influenced specifics with OE generics. These presumably constitute a renaming of earlier Anglo-Saxon names, often only a minor Scandinavianisation of equivalent, cognate OE elements. These place-names contained non-anthroponymic elements that often referred to landscape features which identified the associated settlement – descriptive terms which may have been Scandinavianised on an *ad hoc* basis, perhaps to convey a better meaning of the relevant term in a predominantly Scandinavian-speaking community. The places renamed in this way tended to be smaller and less significant settlements rather than more-established Anglo-Saxon villages with names containing earlier OE generics such as **hām**.

Conversely, most of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia associated with settlements that were apparently formed after the arrival of Scandinavian settlers are compounded with the ON generics **býr**, **thorp, thwaite** and **toft** that were all used quite widely in East Anglia. The frequent use of these terms for new settlements may suggest a more systematic and deliberate use of particular generics to denote particular types of new settlements formed within the areas occupied by Scandinavian-speaking communities. Subsequently, the indigenous

population also made wider use of some of these ON elements, such as **thorp** and **toft**, for certain types of new settlement after the words had entered the English language. But this category of 'new settlements' also includes a considerable proportion of the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia, which (in contrast to their traditional interpretation elsewhere in the Danelaw) appear to represent a later process of settlement-formation throughout Norfolk and Suffolk on previously unused or under-exploited land.

For one of the fundamental socio-economic developments of late Anglo-Saxon rural England – which coincided with the process of Viking settlement – was the exploitation of newly available agricultural land. In East Anglia, this included areas of recently-drained marshland which (as argued in Chapter 6) appear to have resulted in the non-anthroponymic **býr**-names of Flegg, and the more widespread colonisation of the claylands that led to the formation of some of the non-anthroponymic and simplex **thorps** and **thwaites**, as well as some of the 'Grimston-hybrids'. By the later stages of this process, however, only marginal and unviably small units of land were available, which subsequently resulted in the early demise of many of these later **thorps** and 'Grimston-hybrids'. The use of the **býr** and **thwaite** elements in East Anglian place-names appears to have been relatively shortlived, whereas both the **thorp** and **toft** terms both entered Middle English and continued to be used into the post-Conquest period, often for minor names as well as place-names.

11.3) Geographical review of different zones of Scandinavian-influenced place-names

The differing patterns of settlement-formation and occupation are more evident at a micro level, and so this section will review the geographical context of the various types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names discussed above, looking at the local distribution-patterns and areas of particular concentration or clusters in

East Anglia. It will bring together and cross-refer the analyses of individual name-types that have so far only been examined in separate chapters.

Two of the most prominent clusters are of place-names containing the same generic, including the **býr**-names of Flegg and the 'Grimston-hybrids' of Lothingland, whose possible origins have been discussed in sections 6.4.6 and 9.4.5.3. But it may be significant also that these clusters were formed in two former and adjoining island-territories which were still effectively isolated from the mainland in the late Anglo-Saxon period and thus perhaps able to develop differently from the remainder of the East Anglian Scandinavian-influenced place-names, and from each other. For, notwithstanding the 'Grimston-hybrid' cluster on Lothingland, it is striking that there is otherwise a noticeable absence of 'Grimston-hybrids' in north-east Norfolk immediately around the cluster of **býr**-names on Flegg. Such a pattern may hold some significance regarding the localised choice of generic for place-names in areas of particular Scandinavian linguistic influence, and raises the question of whether such choices were made according to the usual precise selection of terminology that is characteristic of Anglo-Saxon place-name formation (*LPN*: xiv) or determined more by local fashion and analogical factors, as discussed in previous chapters (*SSNEM*: 256, 370-71).

The significance of clusters and concentrations of individual types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names has been discussed above, but it is important also to adopt a wider perspective and consider the possible connections between the individual settlements bearing different Scandinavian name-types that are located in close proximity to each other. For most of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia are congregated either in the main concentration of central and eastern Norfolk and north-east Suffolk, or a smaller one along the coastal fringe of south-east Suffolk and north-east Essex.[1] These comprise two heterogenous groupings of many different place-name types, and the question arises of how far the settlements bearing these diverse Scandinavian-influenced names were interconnected with each other in any meaningful way at a local level.

[1] See map in Appendix 4.3c.

For example, two 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names in North and South Erpingham, Thurgarton and Gunton, are situated in close proximity to the two **býr**-names of Alby and Colby (both also compounded with ON personal names), Calthorpe (probably derived from an ON personal name) and Thorpe Market (recorded in Domesday Book as a simplex **thorp**), as well as a simplex Thwaite.[2] This cluster is embedded within an area of early Anglo-Saxon settlements, including several bearing **-ingahām** names such as Bessingham, Erpingham and Antingham. As Gunton and Thurgarton are both assessed highly in Domesday Book and possessed manorial structures, it has been suggested that they were old-established English estates taken over by Danish lords named *Gunni* and *Þurgar*, with some Danish followers who were responsible for a process of internal colonisation that resulted in the formation of the nearby names in **-býr**, **þorp** and **þveit** (Insley 1999: 55).

However, such an interpretation is somewhat at variance with the recent consensus in Viking scholarship that Scandinavian-influenced place-names do not directly indicate individual centres of Viking settlement (as discussed in section 4.2.2), and it does not correlate very well with the geographical contexts of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names involved (presented in sections 6.5.1, 7.6.7.5, 8.4.3 and 9.4.5.5). It is certainly quite probable that the parish of Thwaite was formed as a later, secondary formation from the parochial territory of Alby, and that the parish of Colby may be associated similarly with the presumably earlier Anglo-Saxon settlement of Erpingham. But it is difficult to establish any meaningful relationship in terms of settlement- and parish-formation between Alby, Colby, Thwaite and Calthorpe (all in the hundred of South Erpingham) on the one hand, and Thurgarton, Gunton and Thorpe Market (all in North Erpingham) on the other. Moreover, although the archaeological context of most of these settlements has not been explored or is inconclusive, it is at least apparent that Calthorpe dates from the pre-Viking, Middle Saxon period – and did not, therefore, arise from a process of internal colonisation by followers of the eponymous *Þurgar* and *Gunni*, as has been suggested (Insley 1999: 55).

[2] See map in Appendix 11.3a.

Extrapolating from the interpretations advanced in this thesis, it could therefore be argued instead that this cluster of disparate Scandinavian-influenced place-names was formed by a series of separate and discrete developments that reflected several different manifestations of Scandinavian linguistic influence, resulting presumably from the presence of considerable numbers of Scandinavian-speaking settlers in the wider and surrounding region of central and eastern Norfolk. The five anthroponymic Scandinavian-influenced place-names (Thurgarton, Gunton, Alby, Colby and Calthorpe) contain the ON personal names of individuals who presumably, at different times from the late-ninth to the mid-eleventh centuries, became owners or occupiers of the relevant settlements or units of land, perhaps in some cases as a result of the fragmentation of former Anglo-Saxon estates. Using the Scandinavian-influenced terminology that had become accepted in the local community, the name of 'Thwaite' may have been given to a wooded and previously unused portion of the settlement-area of Alby that was cleared and then established as a separate settlement and parish in its own right. Similarly, the 'Thorp' name may have been given in simplex form (although it later became Thorpe Market) to a new settlement formed to facilitate the agricultural exploitation of nearby previously under-exploited, higher interfluvial land. The cluster of Scandinavian-influenced place-names could thus have been formed over time by a series of separate developments in the rural economy and changes of land ownership in a region that had received a sufficient number of Scandinavian-speaking settlers to influence the process of place-name formation.

The suggested pattern of formation for this small group of Scandinavian-influenced place-names may perhaps thus serve as a microcosm for the wider concentration-zone of different types of Scandinavian place-names in central and eastern Norfolk. The clusters of 'Grimston-hybrids' in this area have been considered in section 9.4.5.3, but it has been difficult to connect the individual 'Grimston-hybrid' names of any of these clusters as being derived from a single estate. This may suggest that any wider network of local connections between the 'Grimston-hybrids' and other nearby types of ON place-names is unlikely, although it is possible that some isolated Scandinavian-influenced place-names (such as **thorps** or **thwaites**) may have

been given to new settlements formed on the territory of existing ones (such as individual 'Grimston-hybrid' or **bý**-named settlements). It appears instead that the wide variety of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in this zone reflects very differing types and degrees of Scandinavian linguistic influence, with a fundamental dichotomy between the use of ON personal names on one hand and non-anthroponymic ON elements on the other, for reasons that will be explored below.

Elsewhere in East Anglia, however, a different pattern of place-name formation and possible local interconnection is discernible in the second main concentration-area of Scandinavian-influenced place-names, located along the coastal zone of south-east Suffolk extending into the north-east corner of Essex. Here, it appears that some different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-name located in close proximity were formed in similar circumstances to each other that differed from those of their neighbouring OE place-names. This pattern reflects the changeable agricultural quality of its land (as discussed in section 5.2), with soil-types varying widely from the fertile *loess*-soils of the Wick Associations to the infertile soils of the Newport Associations and the impervious Windsor clays.

The Shotley peninsula in south-east Suffolk (constituting the eastern half of Samford hundred) contains an area of quick-draining and fertile cover-loam soils, surrounded by the poorer sandy soils of the slopes skirting the edge of the peninsula and stretching down to the Stour and Orwell estuaries (*SIEE*: 322-28, 237-41).[3] The OE place-names of the peninsula are scattered fairly evenly across the fertile and relatively flat plateau or on the edges of it. By contrast, the place-names containing Scandinavian-influenced elements are clustered together on the less fertile slopes at the end of the peninsula. *Thurkelton* is a lost 'Grimston-hybrid' settlement or estate located on the northern slopes overlooking the Orwell estuary which, as the uncontracted, anglicized name-form in Domesday suggests (OE *Þurcytel*, from ON *Þorketill*), was probably established before *c.* 1000, and has been interpreted as representing an estate established by a grant made in the 880s during Guthrum's reign (Laverton 2001: 84). Geographically, however, Thurkelton's rather small size

[3] See maps in Appendices 11.3b and 11.3c.

and setting on the isolated and infertile slopes at the end of the peninsula suggests that it was a more marginal settlement than the neighbouring OE-named villages. A lost *Thorp* was correspondingly situated on the southern slopes overlooking the Stour. But the third Scandinavian-influenced place-name on the peninsula is *Kirkton*, which is situated within an area of fertile Tendring Association soils, according well with the usual interpretation of the Kir(k)ton name as indicating an earlier, favourably-sited Anglo-Saxon village with a church that was renamed by Scandinavian-speaking settlers – as discussed in section 9.3.3, which outlined also the recent archaeological finds in this area that provide further evidence of Viking influence if not settlement at the end of the Shotley peninsula.

A similar pattern of marginal Viking settlement adjacent to more established OE-named villages is discernible just across the Stour estuary in the Tendring hundred of Essex, in the hinterland of another possible Viking camp or port at Harwich, a name derived from OE **here** and **wīc**, meaning 'army-dwelling' or army-camp', and usually interpreted as an English description of a Viking fortification (*PNEss*: 339; Hart 1992: 37). The earlier settlements with OE place-names are located primarily on, or adjacent to, the more fertile and workable Tendring and Wix soils, whereas the more scattered settlements with names of possible Scandinavian origin (such as Moze, Frowick, Ciche and Thorpe-le-Soken) [4] tend to be found instead on the lower-lying coastal fringe, with several located on the difficult Windsor soils formed from the London Clay (*PNEss*: 325-58; Hunter 1999: 1-42). In contrast to the zone of extensive Viking influence and settlement indicated by the concentration of place-names in Norfolk, could these Scandinavian-influenced place-names in Tendring hundred and those at the end of the Shotley peninsula be evidence of a more tentative settlement around the margins and edges of English-owned land by communities which lacked the Great Army's power to seize existing Anglo-Saxon estates, perhaps indicating instead the immigration of poorer Scandinavian settlers?

By contrast, the grouping of 'Grimston-hybrids' located on and around the fertile Wick soils of the Colneis peninsula and interspersed with several **tūn**-names

[4] The place-names are discussed individually in Chapters 7 and 8.

containing OE personal names represent quite a different pattern of settlement. As discussed previously (in sections 9.4.2 and 9.4.5.5), this cluster of ten settlements, with low fiscal values in Domesday Book and mainly subsequently abandoned, appear to be late formations, with names perhaps coined in the eleventh century. It has been suggested that the high number of very small estates in this area were the result of repeated subdivision of older, larger estates, perhaps reflecting the early economic and political significance of the district around Sutton Hoo and Rendlesham (Williamson 2005a: 76-77).

To the north-west of this cluster is a more scattered distribution of place-names with ON elements in Carlford and Wilford, the two hundreds adjoining Colneis on either side of the upper Deben estuary. Most are now lost, including four Grimston-hybrids (*Barkestone*, *Ingleton* and *Isleton* in Carlford, and a *Thurston* in Wilford), as well as *Stockerland* and *Hundstoft* in Wilford, and an unidentified *Carlton* in Carlford. The precise locations of most of these settlements are uncertain and so it is difficult to analyse their geographical settings, but as far as can be judged from their probable locations (and the fact that they are now lost), they seem to have been generally sited less favourably than the adjacent settlements with OE names. So these settlements, along with those placed less favourably on the coastal and estuarine fringes of Colneis hundred, might also reflect a process of more marginal settlement in this area similar to that evident in the Shotley peninsula and Tendring hundred.

Overall, the analysis above has demonstrated widely varying circumstances in which the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia were formed. In some localities, such as the coastal fringe of Suffolk and north-east Essex, the Scandinavian-influenced place-names apparently share a pattern of quite marginal siting and formation in comparison with the equivalent OE-named settlements. But elsewhere in East Anglia, they appear to constitute a more diverse group of place-names formed at different times from the late ninth century into the post-Conquest period by communities of both Scandinavian-speaking settlers as well as indigenous communities whose language had been subject to some degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence. At a local level, therefore, it is possible that some

different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names located in close proximity to each other may have been somehow linked in terms of their formation, but it appears more probable that most were not.

11.4) A broader pattern of Viking settlement in East Anglia

Notwithstanding the diversity of Viking settlement and place-names at a local level outlined in the previous section, the distribution patterns of Scandinavian place-names and the archaeological evidence discussed in Chapter 3 indicate in broader terms a more fundamental differentiation between a zone of significant Scandinavian linguistic and cultural influence in northern East Anglia and one of less intense and more diffuse Scandinavian influence in the south of the region that remained more English in character.

The northern, more Scandinavianised zone (comprising central and eastern Norfolk, and north-east Suffolk) can be characterised linguistically by: the clusters of **býr**-names and **thorps** compounded with ON personal names; a concentrated area of non-anthroponymic **býr**-names and other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names; a high proportion of ON personal names recorded in Domesday Book; a comparatively widespread use of Scandinavian-influenced dialectal words and forms of pronunciation; several Scandinavianised hundred-names; and a significant cluster of Scandinavianised street-names in Norwich. Although much of the possible archaeological evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia presented in Chapter 3 remains inconclusive (such as that for burials and buildings), the geographical distribution of other types of archaeological evidence points also to a particular concentration of Scandinavian influence and settlement in central and eastern Norfolk. This includes a tangible Viking influence upon the development of the urban area of Norwich from the late ninth century until the eleventh, and a concentration of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian female jewellery and dress-fittings in areas of known Viking settlement that coincides with the cluster of Scandinavian-

influenced place-names around Norwich. The numismatic evidence from this period (outlined in section 3.7.4) similarly suggests some degree of autonomous Viking coin production in northern East Anglia, and perhaps also the continuing use of a bullion economy, that continued after the region had been brought under the political and administrative control of Wessex.

By contrast, the southern half of East Anglia (comprising most of Suffolk and Essex) is part of a wider area of less intense and more diffuse Scandinavian linguistic and cultural influence. This can be characterised linguistically by: an absence of **býr**-names and only very few **thorps** compounded with ON personal names; a less dense scattering of other types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names; less widespread use of Scandinavianised dialect words and pronunciation; a wider and less intense distribution of ON personal names recorded in Domesday Book; few Scandinavianised hundred-names; and very few Scandinavian-influenced street-names. Archaeologically, there is correspondingly less tangible evidence of Viking influence in the urban areas of southern East Anglia (such as Ipswich and Colchester), and only isolated stray finds of Viking artefacts in rural areas which include fewer and more scattered finds of Viking brooches and other types of metalwork. Numismatic evidence indicates that by the mid-920s the southern half of East Anglia had become integrated more effectively into the monetary system of Wessex and Mercia than northern East Anglia.

The differentiation between the north and south of East Anglia in terms of Viking influence is clear, but it has proved more difficult to chart a definitive boundary between the two zones. As discussed in sections 3.8.6 and 5.2.7, several scholars have proposed aligning the southern edge of the area of stronger Scandinavian influence with the so-called 'Gipping (or 'Lark-Gipping') divide' (Martin and Satchell 2008: 198-206, 217-221; Kershaw 2013: 192). However, the apparent southern demarcation lines deduced for the different types of Viking influence (such as the find-spot distributions for Viking metalwork, and isoglosses of Scandinavian linguistic influence) do not align very closely with each other or with the Gipping and Lark river valleys, and nor does the distribution of the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia.

Other boundaries between putative northern and southern cultural zones of East Anglia have also been proposed, such as the river Stour separating Suffolk and Essex (Phythian-Adams 2000; Williamson 2010a: 153-55), and the river Waveney between Suffolk and Norfolk (Kristensson 1995: xi; 2001: 68). It appears, therefore, that the cultural boundary between the northern and southern areas of greater and lesser Viking influence in East Anglia should not be regarded as a single line along the 'Lark-Gipping divide'. It can perhaps be better understood as a broader zone of transition across central Suffolk (Williamson 2013b: 58-59), resulting from a more diffuse gradation of Viking influence concentrated in central and eastern Norfolk that gradually diminishes in a piecemeal and uneven manner moving west into the remainder of Norfolk and south into Suffolk and Essex. Such an interpretation seems to reflect the varying geographical extent of differing types of Viking linguistic and cultural influence more appropriately, but it raises the fundamental question of how and why such a pattern arose.

11.5) A possible geographical and historical context for Viking settlement in East Anglia

As discussed in section 5.2.7, the particular geographical milieu of northern East Anglia (as opposed to the southern parts of the region) rendered it simultaneously more remote from the mainstream currents of late Anglo-Saxon ideas and culture developing in the burgeoning 'English' state of Wessex, and more open to contact with, and influence from, northern Europe and Scandinavia. After East Anglia had been controlled by a military force of Scandinavian origin for several decades following the Viking take-over of the kingdom in 880, it would be surprising if such contact between Scandinavia and some areas of East Anglia was not enhanced and developed more substantially in terms of both trade and, indeed, migration – a hypothesis that will be explored in the next section.

At a more local geographical level (discussed in section 5.2.3), northern East Anglia's continuing contact with the maritime-orientated communities of Scandinavia was further facilitated in the late Anglo-Saxon period by the Broadland complex of estuaries and rivers, which enjoyed easy approaches from the sea and enabled maritime access to inland destinations such as the growing and increasingly Scandinavian-influenced urban centre of Norwich. Similarly, the closely located estuaries of the Deben, Gipping/Orwell and Stour rivers facilitated maritime access to south-east Suffolk and north-east Essex, in contrast to other sections of the East Anglian coastline which were less accessible. It is particularly striking that the two main clusters of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia are located adjacent to and around these two river systems, whereas the remaining Scandinavian-influenced place-names are scattered more sparsely throughout the rest of the region.

Furthermore, it appears that the particular concentration of Viking influence in Norfolk may represent a longer period of migration and settlement from Scandinavia that continued even after Edward the Elder's conquest of East Anglia in the early tenth century. This may have been made possible by the apparent lack of effective political control, which appears to have diminished towards the north of the region furthest from the administrative rule of the Wessex régime (as postulated in section 3.7.4) – so where Edward's political control may have been weaker, the Viking presence and influence appears greater.

Such a pattern may have resulted from Edward the Elder's incomplete overlordship of the Anglo-Scandinavian leaders in East Anglia established in 917, which the ASC suggests was not as effective as the more complete submission to him by Viking leaders in neighbouring areas of the Danelaw (as discussed in section 2.2.6). It could therefore have enabled some continuing degree of Viking autonomy in East Anglia after its integration with Wessex. This interpretation seems to be supported by the numismatic evidence (discussed in 3.7.4), which suggests an uneven process of administrative and political absorption by Wessex of different parts of East Anglia during the period after 917. Thus it appears that the southern area was integrated more quickly and fully into the auspices of the Wessex régime, and some of the

previously Viking-owned property was sequestrated (as discussed in section 2.2.4). This pattern appears to reflect also Essex's status as an outlying province of Wessex during the period of Viking control in East Anglia (as suggested by Dumville 1992 and discussed in section 2.2.3a), with little evidence of Viking settlement apart from the pocket of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in the north-east. By contrast, the Anglo-Scandinavian leaders and their followers in the northern parts of East Anglia apparently continued to retain for a while at least some degree of autonomy – and perhaps also a greater number were able to retain their lands, ensuring the formation and survival of a greater number of place-names incorporating ON personal names.

Ultimately, such a combination of political and geographical circumstances may well have created a milieu in which for some time after 917 widespread Scandinavian migration and settlement were able to continue, principally into what is now central and east Norfolk and north-east Suffolk rather than south Suffolk or Essex, in a pattern that is still discernible today in the distribution of Scandinavian artefacts and place-names.

11.6) A possible migrationary model of Viking settlement in East Anglia

A possible secondary migration of Scandinavian settlers in addition to the Great Army's colonisation of East Anglia in the late ninth century has been alluded to in previous sections. First postulated by Kenneth Cameron in the 1960s and initially rejected for lack of evidence, it has subsequently become accepted as a plausible component of Scandinavian settlement in England by scholars of the Viking period, reflecting the rehabilitation of migration in theoretical archaeology and the recent discovery of more tangible archaeological evidence of immigration from Scandinavia.

Previous studies have demonstrated that human migrations usually have similar characteristics, and tend to develop in a predictable manner once they begin (McLeod 2014: 43; Anthony 1990: 895-96; Castles and Miller 2014: 25-41). A number of broad principles of population movement have therefore been formulated by

several scholars to create a corpus of migration theory, which can be useful in suggesting how immigrants into any new territory may have acted at various stages of the migration process (McLeod 2014: 43, 50; Lee 1966). Several principles of migration theory have been adapted to deal with undocumented pre- and proto-historic migrations (Anthony 1990; 1997), including the particular circumstances of Scandinavian migration in the late Anglo-Saxon period (McLeod 2014: 43-107; Redmond 2007: 54-68). As proposed in section 2.2.1d, the Scandinavian settlement of England can thus be interpreted in terms of migration theory, identifying its characteristic phases and participants, such as 'pioneers, and 'primary and secondary migrants'.

So in the context of Viking settlement in East Anglia, the 'pioneers' were the Great Army veterans, quite probably accompanied by a significant number of women and children (McLeod 2014: 89, 100-01; Jesch 1991: 96-106), who began the process of settlement and acculturation in the camps and towns where the Vikings over-wintered during the military campaigns of the late 860s and early 870s (Redmond 2007: 61-64). As discussed in sections 2.2.1b to 2.2.1d, however, it is increasingly acknowledged that the Great Army veterans, who were probably multi-ethnic in origin rather than purely 'Danish', had become fairly well assimilated into Anglo-Saxon society by the time they began to settle in East Anglia, fifteen years after first arriving in England. This process of assimilation may help explain why their historically attested presence is surprisingly hard to detect in the archaeological and onomastic record, and why there is little evidence of Scandinavian linguistic influence that can be categorically attributed to this early phase of Viking activity and settlement – apart from the probable use of their own personal names with the OE **tūn** generic to form new place-names. The formation of at least some of the 'Grimston-hybrids' (and perhaps some of the **thorps** and **bý**-names that contain ON personal names as well) may thus be associated with the Great Army's initial seizure and 'sharing out of the land' in East Anglia during the years immediately following the arrival of Guthrum and his followers from Cirencester in 880, as traditionally postulated by Cameron.

Migration theory would suggest that contact was soon established and maintained between these pioneers and their kin or associates (the potential 'primary migrants') in the Scandinavian homelands, and perhaps also in more immediate points of origin in Francia and the Irish Sea region (Redmond 2007: 64; McLeod 2014: 103-07). Information would have been sent regarding the pioneers' routes and their places of residence in the destination territory, which would presumably have been the early urban centres of eastern England already under Viking control, quite possibly several years before the 'formal' commencement of Viking settlement in East Anglia in 879/880 recorded in the ASC. So it is assumed that the primary migrants from the Scandinavian homelands and Scandinavian-controlled territories continued to follow the established migration routes and settle in these growing urban centres, in close proximity to the pioneer groups (Redmond 2007: 64-65).

This hypothesis is supported by the archaeological evidence of urban expansion in towns such as York, Lincoln, Thetford and Norwich during the late ninth and early tenth centuries (discussed in section 3.5). The arrival of primary migrants in these towns, and the associated increase in urban population, no doubt boosted economic development and trade which in turn widened the contact base with the Scandinavian homelands and territories, allowing a process of 'chain-migration' to continue (Anthony 1990: 899-905; 1997: 26-27; Redmond 2007: 55-56, 64-65). It is possible that some of the original pioneer settlers in these towns became established as the new Viking leaders and aristocracy who retained a presence in such fortified centres to maintain their control (McLeod 2014: 74). In due course, some of these towns – but not others – provided foci for the subsequent formation of clusters of Scandinavian-influenced place-names around them, as will be explored below.

The Great Army's initial seizure of land was presumably a relatively short-lived process, and it appears that by the early tenth century land was being acquired once again by purchase (as discussed in sections 2.2.2a – 2.2.5). So the descendants of the Great Army veterans and perhaps also the privileged second- or third-generation offspring of the nascent, town-based Scandinavian or Anglo-Scandinavian aristocratic leaders may have continued to participate in an expansion of Viking influence and

landownership throughout the East Anglian countryside during the early tenth century. This process coincided with, and perhaps was partly facilitated by, a restructuring of the rural landscape also occurring at this time that involved some break-up of older larger estates and a colonisation of the previously under-utilised claylands. It may therefore be the ON personal names of both the pioneer settlers (including some Great Army veterans) and primary migrants, and those of their descendants, which are commemorated in the naming or renaming of smaller settlements or units of land in the tenth and eleventh centuries. These perhaps included some 'Grimston-hybrids' that continued to be formed as well as some of the place-names in -**thorp** and -**bý** containing ON personal-name specifics, especially in central and eastern Norfolk.

The next stage in a migration process is for new, or 'secondary', migrants travelling from the homeland to head for the primary centres previously settled by pioneers and primary migrants but actually to begin establishing homes in the surrounding neighbourhood, creating satellite communities (Redmond 2007: 56-59, 65). In the context of late Anglo-Saxon East Anglia, this could well have been on whatever land was available in the rural hinterlands of the original urban centres of settlement, especially around Norwich. It is quite possible that such groups of secondary migrants can be associated with the recently-discovered low-quality jewellery and metalwork (discussed in section 3.8), suggesting that they were of lower status than the original pioneers and primary migrants, and lacked the power and authority to take control of existing settlements or create new ones – unlike the higher-status individuals commemorated in the anthroponymic place-names. These newly-arrived settlers would not have had the extended contact with the indigenous Anglo-Saxon population experienced by the Great Army veterans prior to their settlement, and would probably have been more culturally homogenous and drawn from a wider pool of Scandinavian society, and therefore more likely to introduce and extend further knowledge of Scandinavian cultural practices (Redmond 2007: 61-68).

Recent developments in migration theory have added a further dimension to the relationship between pioneers and primary migrants on one hand and later migrants on the other, which may hold some significance for the particular

circumstances of Viking settlement in East Anglia. It is usual for the first settlers in any migration process to initially assist the subsequent settlement of later migrants from the same homelands and gain some status for doing so (McLeod 2014: 53), but it appears that once immigrant communities reach a certain size and maturity, the positive benefits of continuing migration decrease and diseconomies of scale start to occur through increasing competition for jobs and other resources – to such an extent that the earlier and established migrants become less willing to assist or associate with new migrants from the homeland who continue travelling to join them. So the original higher-status settled migrants tend to evolve from being facilitative 'bridgeheads' to becoming more restrictive 'gatekeepers', leading to their increasing social and spatial distancing from the newly arrived migrants ([de Haas 2010: 1610-13; Epstein 2008: 570-73, 579-80), and ultimately exacerbating the division between the two types of immigrant communities. Such a process may help explain the apparent creation of a lower-status group or even underclass of later Scandinavian immigrants who were less able to quickly assimilate into Anglo-Saxon society than the earlier higher-status Great Army pioneers and perhaps therefore obliged to live more on the margins of existing Anglo-Saxon communities, retaining their Scandinavian identities for much longer as they did so.

Such immigrants 'straight off the boat' from Scandinavia may well have therefore retained a more pronounced Scandinavian identity in language, naming practices, dress and belongings than that of the earlier and more assimilated Great Army veterans, providing longer-lasting evidence of Scandinavian influence that is still discernible today in terms of place-names, personal names and archaeological artefacts. If these Scandinavian immigrants then occupied areas of settlement in sufficient numbers, they may well have continued to use their own language (or greatly influence the indigenous language) in the use of ON terminology for the formation of new place-names and the Scandinavianisation of existing ones. These place-names reflected a wider and more diffuse Scandinavian linguistic influence in their formation, utilising ON vocabulary for basic generic terms and specific topographic or habitative features – unlike the place-names derived from ON

personal names, which suggest a direct association of some kind between a specific settlement or estate and a specific individual bearing an ON personal name.

As discussed previously, the non-anthroponymic ON place-names of East Anglia tended to be concentrated in clusters, and it is possible to interpret the distribution of these also within the context of the hypothesised migrationary process outlined above – identifying and comparing the locations of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names that can be broadly associated with the pioneers and primary migrants, and those that can likewise be linked more with the secondary migrants. The main grouping of non-anthroponymic ON place-names in the rural hinterland to the south of the growing urban centre of Norwich[5] (together with the recent abundant finds of Viking metalwork) may well represent the impact of a large number of Scandinavian-speaking secondary migrants, who were able to exert sufficient linguistic influence to Scandinavianise the OE place-names of many existing settlements.

But it may seem surprising that similar clusters did not develop around the other urban centres of 'Viking' East Anglia such as Thetford and Ipswich. A similar pattern is apparent in the northern Danelaw, where a distinct cluster of Scandinavian place-names and hinterland of Viking political, economic, cultural and social influence developed around York, which has been characterised as 'a sort of Ellis Island' through which migrants passed on their way to settling in the surrounding countryside (Townend 2014: 160-73). Conversely, however, there is no corresponding grouping around Lincoln nor around the other four Viking-controlled Boroughs of the East Midlands (Derby, Nottingham, Stamford and Leicester). This is possibly because the Viking leaders who based themselves in these towns took over the immediate surrounding estates for their own use, which survived intact and were not therefore fragmented and renamed (Leahy and Paterson 2001: 183-85; Cameron 1965).

So it appears that Norwich, like York, may have served as a migrants' gateway to its own hinterland of rural Scandinavian settlement. But it is possible that

[5] See maps in Appendices 4.3c and 11.6a.

Thetford, perhaps evolving from an early Viking fortified camp, followed instead the pattern of the Five Boroughs with its surrounding estates being taken over in their entirety by early Viking leaders and not renamed with Scandinavian-influenced place-names;[6] and perhaps its poor riverine access also impeded access for lower-status migrants.

Ipswich similarly failed to acquire an immediate surrounding hinterland of rural Scandinavian-influenced place-names, but possibly more because of its position in southern East Anglia and greater proximity to the burgeoning control of Wessex following Edward's takeover, which could well have restricted or curtailed a continuing process of secondary migration from Scandinavia. However, some degree of Scandinavian settlement and Scandinavianisation of place-names clearly did occur along the coastal zone of south-east Suffolk and north-east Essex, and around the estuaries of the Deben, Gipping/Orwell and Stour rivers, but it is uncertain whether the Scandinavian settlers in these areas had any social or economic connection with, or had passed in transit through, the neighbouring urban centres of Ipswich and Colchester.

But Norwich continued to thrive as a significant centre of Viking trade and culture even after Wessex's takeover of East Anglia, reflecting its particular geographical location with more direct maritime access to Scandinavia. This enabled the urban centre and its hinterland to become a primary target destination for Scandinavian immigrants to 'Viking' East Anglia, thus conforming more closely to the characteristic secondary phase of the migration process. The motivating factors most often associated with long-distance migration are primarily economic (Anthony 1990: 900), and so it is possible that lower-status Scandinavian immigrants were able to utilise existing skills in fishing and other maritime activities in the areas they settled around the riverine systems of eastern Norfolk.

Thus it is within this area that the most intensive manifestation of Scandinavian linguistic influence can be seen in the formation of a number of fully

[6] As observed in section 9.4.5, a similar lack of Scandinavian place-names is also discernible in the immediate vicinity of some of the known royal estates of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of East Anglia.

Scandinavian, non-anthroponymic place-names, which perhaps date from the earliest phase of settlement by migrants from Scandinavia. In particular, the use of the **bý** generic (often compounded with non-anthroponymic ON specifics such as **kirk**) is concentrated around the Broadland rivers and estuaries, in the renaming of existing OE settlements and the naming of some new ones. Similarly, although the place-names containing the **thwaite** generic are associated primarily with the clearance of previously unoccupied and wooded claylands (as discussed in section 8.4.3), their sites also all fall within the catchment area of the Broadlands riverine system, as does the use of ON elements in minor names such as 'beck' (discussed in section 10.3.2). This early phase of Scandinavian settlement may perhaps have also seen a widening use of the ON **thorp** generic from its original Danish sense of an outlying, secondary settlement to become an equivalent of its OE cognate **throp** in denoting the new settlements formed to facilitate an extension of arable farming in the ninth century (as discussed in section 7.6.1).

Subsequently, perhaps as second- and third-generation individuals from the original Scandinavian-speaking areas began to settle more widely beyond the original confines of the Broadland riverine system in the surrounding indigenous communities and intermingled more with English speakers, the Scandinavian linguistic influence apparently became diluted and more diffuse. But at the same time, it began to spread more widely in East Anglia, although remaining concentrated more in the northern half of the region, as reflected in the isoglosses for some dialectal words (discussed in section 10.2.3). It was perhaps in such a developing Anglo-Scandinavian milieu that the place-names coined by Scandinavian-influenced communities began to change from being wholly Scandinavian formations incorporating both ON generics and ON specifics to becoming more hybrid in nature. So existing OE place-names (and some hundred-names) were frequently Scandinavianised to partially adapt them to the speech habits of the Scandinavian settlers, without losing their meaning (Jesch 2015: 46), often by replacing OE specifics with similar-sounding ON cognates.

At this time also, it appears that the use of ON generics such as **bý** and **thwaite** declined and then ceased as Scandinavian linguistic influence dwindled. However,

some ON generics such as **thorp** and **toft** were taken up by what had become an Anglo-Scandinavian indigenous population, entering the Middle English lexicon and continuing to be used into the post-Conquest period, as were other ON terms which had found their way into the later medieval vocabulary of field-names (discussed in section 10.3.1). These elements of Scandinavian origin thus ultimately spread geographically even more widely into areas of East Anglia, such as central and south Essex, where previously no Scandinavian-influenced place-name had been formed and no communities of Scandinavian immigrants are presumed to have settled, but where some linguistic traces of Scandinavian influence are nevertheless now apparent.

As discussed above, the geographical distribution of the place-names in East Anglia incorporating ON personal names differs from that of the non-anthroponymic ON place-names, and cannot be linked so closely with a process of secondary migration. The more haphazard distribution of these place-names may tend to reflect instead the vagaries of the Great Army's initial 'sharing out of the land', the subsequent commercial fluctuations of a growing land market, and the personal volitions and circumstances of the eponymous landholders. In migrationary terms, therefore, the place-names incorporating ON personal names can be associated primarily with the activities and settlement-patterns of the pioneers (probably including some of the Great Army veterans) and primary migrants, who were able to seize, purchase or be granted land – for which new place-names were often coined incorporating their own personal names, reflecting a growing practice already occurring in late Anglo-Saxon England.

The use of the **býr** and **thorp** generics combined with ON personal names appears to have been comparatively shortlived (as summarised in sections 6.6.3, 6.7 and 7.8), which may explain why the combination is found mainly in those areas of East Anglia (primarily in Norfolk) where some degree of Viking autonomy and land ownership presumably continued at least for a while after Wessex's takeover of Viking East Anglia in 917. This perhaps enabled more settlements and units of territory that had been taken over or acquired by Scandinavian-named individuals to be retained – and their new, anthroponymic names preserved.

But as the compounding of **býr** and **thorp** with ON personal names declined in East Anglia, the use of **tūn** continued as it increasingly became the default generic for use in conjunction with personal names (of both OE and ON origin) in the formation of new place-names for both existing and new settlements throughout Norfolk and Suffolk. As acknowledged above, some of the resultant 'Grimston-hybrids' may have been formed by Great Army veterans as they took over or were granted land in the initial 'sharing out of the land', but many were clearly formed later in the tenth and eleventh centuries, sometimes perhaps commemorating the names of individuals who bore ON names but were not ethnically of Scandinavian origin. This continuing use of the **tūn** generic in conjunction with both OE and ON personal names can help explain why the resultant 'Grimston-hybrids' are spread more widely throughout Norfolk and Suffolk.

However, they are not found in Essex, perhaps because of its position outside the Viking-controlled kingdom of East Anglia (as argued in section 2.2.3a), rendering it more difficult for Scandinavian-named individuals to acquire land during the years of Viking settlement. But it may also reflect the less frequent use of the **tūn** generic in Essex for forming place-names (with OE as well as ON specifics), compared with Suffolk and Norfolk. The conjunction of these two quite disparate factors in determining the distribution pattern for the 'Grimston-hybrids' serves once again to highlight the diversity of the factors that resulted in the formation of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia.

Chapter 12: CONCLUSION

(12.1) This thesis has explored the different phases and patterns of Viking settlement and assimilation in East Anglia from the ninth to the eleventh centuries, by means of a linguistic analysis of the Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian place-names of the region, integrated with an examination of the geographical and archaeological contexts of the settlements associated with them. The information derived from this survey, in conjunction with the other forms of onomastic evidence that are so far available, has been used to gauge the nature and extent of Scandinavian linguistic influence across the differing geographical zones of East Anglia, from which in turn underlying patterns of Viking settlement have been hypothesised.

In particular, the thesis sought to test three working hypotheses. The first was that in the late ninth century the leaders and veterans of the Great Army took control of and occupied large areas of land located in favourable settings throughout inland East Anglia, a process which has left little evidence of Scandinavian linguistic influence apart from the numerous Anglo-Scandinavian 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names. By contrast, a more numerous and lower-status Scandinavian-speaking population formed zones of linguistic influence and settlement in central and eastern Norfolk, and along the coastal fringes of Suffolk and north-east Essex, indicated by the presence there of a greater number of purer Scandinavian place-names – which may thus provide possible evidence of a later secondary migration of individuals from Scandinavia.

The second hypothesis was that the Great Army veterans (who were probably more multi-ethnic in origin, rather than purely 'Danish') had become fairly well assimilated into Anglo-Saxon society by the time they began to form settlements in East Anglia, which may be why their historically attested presence is surprisingly hard to detect in the archaeological and onomastic record. By contrast once again, later migrants from Scandinavia would have been less well assimilated and more

identifiably 'Scandinavian' in language, dress and place-naming practices – and therefore their presence, although historically unattested, may in fact be more recognizable in terms of archaeological artefacts and place-names.

Thirdly, it was hypothesised that the Great Army veterans and the subsequent immigrants from Scandinavia can be categorized in classic migration theory as 'pioneers' and 'primary and secondary migrants' respectively, and the characteristics of both groups hypothesised and reconstructed accordingly.

(12.2) This thesis has used an interdisciplinary approach to explore the objectives and hypotheses outlined above, with the methodologies of each academic discipline introduced and assessed in **Part 1** (Chapters 2 to 5, as outlined in Chapter 1). As the different types of evidence were collated and organised to create the databases (presented in Appendices 1, 2 and 3) upon which the interpretative text was based, some limitations became apparent. Some of the place-name etymologies used (derived from the work of other scholars) are uncertain and often still the subject of unresolved academic debate, which renders the presence or the degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence in some individual place-names correspondingly uncertain.

In archaeological terms, this thesis has focussed upon the Scandinavian-influenced place-names of largely rural settlements in East Anglia, where there has usually been little rebuilding or development work, creating few opportunities for detailed archaeological investigation and leaving many place-names with little or no archaeological evidence for the presence or absence of Viking activity or settlement. Conversely, however, the fact that many of the settlements associated with Scandinavian-influenced place-names are even today small rural communities has in fact facilitated their suitability for fieldwalking, which has in many cases revealed the presence or absence of Ipswich ware pottery, enabling the identification of pre-Viking origins.

(12.3) Overall, the findings of this thesis are complex, demonstrating that the formation of the various types of Scandinavian and Scandinavianised place-names in

East Anglia resulted from a combination of diverse circumstances associated with the different phases of Viking settlement. It is clearly evident that the findings do not all conform to previously accepted, and largely monocausal, interpretations for the origins of the different types of Scandinavian place-names in England, which have been based mainly on analyses conducted in other regions of the Danelaw. But it was these interpretations that provided the theoretical starting point for the working hypotheses of this thesis – and so these have been partially supported by its findings in Chapters 6 to 9, but not fully, as will be outlined below.

The analysis in Chapter 6 of the East Anglian place-names in **bý** has broadly confirmed the interpretations of previous scholars. The particular concentration of **bý**-names in the estuarine and coastal areas of north-east Norfolk and north Suffolk may suggest a relatively early period of formation (as postulated in other areas of the Danelaw), when a continuing maritime connection with the Scandinavian homeland was still an important factor in the siting of settlements. The analysis also revealed a clear distinction between the place-names in **-bý** that are compounded with ON personal names and the remaining, non-anthroponymic **bý**-names. This dichotomy may have determined a particular pattern of development for the **bý**-names of Flegg (as hypothesised in section 6.4) and affected also the formation and distribution of those located elsewhere in East Anglia.

Chapter 7's analysis of the **thorp**-named place-names in East Anglia has confirmed to some extent the conclusions of *TIACL* that the generic was used mainly for naming new settlements formed in the late Anglo-Saxon period to facilitate the expansion of arable farming, which in East Anglia involved the recolonization of the claylands left under-utilised since Roman times. But the geographical and archaeological evidence has demonstrated also that a particular concentration in Norfolk of **thorps** compounded with ON personal names were apparently not new settlements formed as part of this process. Instead, they appear to represent pre-Viking settlements that perhaps had originally constituted outlying, subsidiary portions of earlier, larger Anglo-Saxon estates, which were then granted to individuals of Scandinavian origin who used their own personal names to rename them – reflecting a similar use of the **thorp** generic in Denmark.

In Chapter 8, the geographical and archaeological contexts of the place-names in East Anglia formed from ON topographic generics have revealed a fundamental distinction between a minority containing elements that related to the clearance of trees (mainly the **thwaites**) which apparently represent new settlement-formations, and the remainder containing a diversity of ON generics (associated in other ways with woods and trees, and other landscape features) which generally appear to constitute the renaming of existing Anglo-Saxon settlements. Many of the etymologies for these place-names are uncertain and the presumed 'Scandinavian' elements often appear only to constitute minor linguistic modifications of equivalent or cognate OE words that formed part of the original, pre-Viking place-names. Consequently, the intrinsic lexical meaning of these Scandinavianised topographic place-names cannot be taken as indicative in some way of the particular types of landscape selected by, or available to, Scandinavian settlers. Instead, they provide an index of the degree and extent of Scandinavian linguistic influence in the areas involved.

The analysis in Chapter 9 of hybrid place-names has demonstrated that the 'Grimston-hybrids' in East Anglia certainly do not all represent well-established Anglo-Saxon villages taken over and renamed by Great Army veterans or other new Danish landholders, or result from the fragmentation of large estates, as has previously been hypothesised. Instead, the geographical and archaeological evidence indicates that a considerable proportion of the 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names were apparently coined to name new settlements established in the upper river valleys of the East Anglian clay plateau as this was being brought back into agricultural use, alongside the formation of the **thorp**-named settlements. Many of these 'Grimston-hybrids' were thus apparently established in the last available and therefore fairly marginal portions of territory, and so a relatively high proportion of these settlements subsequently failed and became deserted or lost villages – thus seriously contradicting the traditional interpretation of 'Grimston-hybrids' elsewhere in the Danelaw. Conversely, other hybrid place-names containing OE generics combined with non-anthroponymic ON specifics (such as the Carl[e]tons) appear to mainly represent the partial renaming of already-existing, well-established Anglo-

Saxon settlements, once again somewhat at variance with the received interpretations of previous scholarship.

(12.4) The analyses of different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names within Chapters 6 to 9, as outlined above, have been based on their linguistic categorisation by generic and specific according to traditional onomastic scholarship. But the recent availability of more sophisticated mapping and GIS technology that were used in this thesis has revealed a significant and problematic degree of variation and contradiction within each category of generic. This may suggest that a new paradigm of interpretation is required that transcends the individual Scandinavian name-type categories and identifies broader discernible patterns of Viking settlement in East Anglia – and perhaps elsewhere. For other patterns of distribution have emerged in this study (outlined in Chapter 11), especially the fundamental difference in origins between those place-names containing ON personal names and those containing non-anthroponymic, Scandinavian-influenced elements. There is also an archaeological distinction between the Scandinavian-influenced place-names associated with pre-Viking settlements in existence before being renamed by newly arrived Scandinavian-speaking settlers, and those associated with new settlements formed after their probable arrival.

Overall, the analysis of this thesis has demonstrated widely varying circumstances in which the different types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia were formed. Some, located along the coastal fringe of Suffolk and north-east Essex, apparently shared a pattern of quite marginal siting and formation in comparison with equivalent OE-named settlements. Others located elsewhere in East Anglia appear to constitute a more diverse group of place-names formed at different times from the late ninth century into the post-Conquest period by communities of both Scandinavian-speaking settlers as well as indigenous communities whose language had been subject to some degree of Scandinavian linguistic influence.

Nevertheless, the distribution patterns of Scandinavian-influenced place-names indicate a clear geographical differentiation between a zone of significant

Scandinavian linguistic and cultural influence in northern East Anglia and one of less intense and more diffuse Scandinavian influence in the south of the region. This coincides with the distribution of the other forms of onomastic evidence that are so far available (as outlined in Chapter 10), and also with several types of archaeological evidence, including a tangible Viking influence upon the development of Norwich and a concentration of Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian female jewellery and dress-fittings in the area around it (discussed in Chapter 3 and section 11.4).

The particularly intense concentration of Viking linguistic and cultural influence in Norfolk can be partly attributed to the geographical milieu of northern East Anglia, more remote from the political control of Wessex and adjacent to the North Sea, enabling continuing contact with the maritime-orientated communities of Scandinavia that was facilitated by the network of estuaries and rivers in eastern Norfolk. But it may be a function also of a longer period of migration and settlement from Scandinavia, which continued even after Edward the Elder's conquest of East Anglia in the early tenth century that apparently resulted in an incomplete overlordship over the region. Numismatic evidence suggests that Wessex's effective administrative control of East Anglia diminished towards the north of the region, where the Anglo-Scandinavian leaders and their followers apparently continued to retain for a while at least some degree of autonomy – and perhaps also some of their lands, ensuring the formation and survival of a greater number of place-names incorporating ON personal names.

(12.5) After being rejected for many years, the possibility of a secondary migration of Scandinavian settlers (as originally postulated by Cameron) has recently been seen as a more viable proposition, reflecting the growing archaeological evidence (especially from metalwork finds) for substantial Scandinavian immigration into East Anglia. Drawing on principles of migration theory formulated to deal with undocumented pre- and proto-historic migrations, this thesis has therefore proposed an interpretation of the formation of the Scandinavian-influenced place-names in East Anglia in terms of a possible migrationary process.

So in the context of Viking settlement in East Anglia, the Great Army veterans and their families may be characterised as migrationary 'pioneers'. They were probably multi-ethnic in origin and had become fairly well assimilated into Anglo-Saxon society by the time they began to settle in East Anglia, which perhaps explains why their historically attested presence is surprisingly hard to detect archaeologically and onomastically. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that the formation of at least some (but certainly not all) of the 'Grimston-hybrids' may be associated with the Great Army's initial seizure and 'sharing out of the land' in East Anglia during the late ninth century, as traditionally postulated.

It appears that these pioneers were followed by primary and secondary migrants from the Scandinavian homelands and other Scandinavian-controlled territories, who would not have had the extended contact with the indigenous Anglo-Saxon population experienced by the Great Army veterans, and may well have therefore retained a more pronounced Scandinavian identity in language, naming practices, dress and belongings. Archaeological evidence has indicated an increasing Scandinavian presence in the growing urban centres of eastern England under Viking control such as York and Norwich, and in satellite communities around them, forming core-settlement areas of Scandinavian immigrants.

It is quite possible that such groups of migrants can be associated with the recent finds of low-quality Viking jewellery and metalwork in the area around Norwich, suggesting that they were of lower status than the original pioneers, and lacked the power and authority to take control of existing settlements or create new ones – unlike the higher-status individuals whose names are commemorated in the place-names containing ON personal names. But a large number of Scandinavian-speaking migrants may well have exerted sufficient linguistic influence to replace the OE place-names of many existing settlements, with fully Scandinavian names containing both ON generics and specifics. This development may thus have helped create the main cluster of non-anthroponymic Scandinavian place-names around Norwich and more widely in eastern Norfolk (as discussed in Chapters 6 to 9).

Subsequently, perhaps as second- and third-generation individuals from the original Scandinavian-speaking core-settlement areas began to settle further afield

and intermingled more with English speakers, the Scandinavian linguistic influence was apparently diluted. It was perhaps in such a developing Anglo-Scandinavian milieu that the place-names coined by Scandinavian-influenced communities began to change from being wholly Scandinavian formations to becoming more hybrid in nature. So existing OE place-names were frequently Scandinavianised, often by replacing OE specifics with similar-sounding ON cognates. Some ON generics such as **thorp** and **toft** eventually entered the Middle English lexicon during the post-Conquest period, and spread even further geographically into areas of East Anglia where previously no Scandinavian-influenced place-names had been formed.

Similarly, as the use of the **býr** and **thorp** generics in conjunction with ON personal names declined, the use of **tūn** for anthroponymic place-names (of both OE and ON origin) increased and spread geographically. Many 'Grimston-hybrid' place-names were thus formed in the late-tenth and eleventh centuries for both existing and new settlements throughout Norfolk and Suffolk (but not Essex), sometimes commemorating the names of individuals who bore Scandinavian names but were not ethnically of Scandinavian origin.

Overall, it is clear from the evidence of this thesis that the place-names in East Anglia containing ON personal names were formed in a variety of differing circumstances over a period of at least 200 years – but collectively, they differ even more markedly from the formation of the remaining Scandinavian-influenced place-names containing non-anthroponymic elements.

(12.6) The starting point of this thesis was provided by the continuing academic debate regarding the formation of Scandinavian-named settlements in England initiated by Cameron's pioneering work on their geographical contexts. Although many of Cameron's conclusions regarding the specific origins of the **býs**, **thorps** and 'Grimston-hybrids' are not borne out by the evidence from East Anglia, his broader hypothesis of a 'secondary migration' appears increasingly to have been corroborated by recent archaeological evidence – and is now supported also by the new interpretation of the place-name evidence presented herein.

However, the detailed analyses of the individual Scandinavian place-name types in this thesis have demonstrated patterns of place-name formation different from those which have been charted and hypothesised elsewhere in the Danelaw by other scholars. Gillian Fellows-Jensen (1999: 45) similarly noted 'marked differences […] between the number and nature of the Scandinavian settlement names in East Anglia and those in the other zones of Scandinavian settlement in England'. This thesis has suggested that these differences, especially regarding the formation of the 'Grimston-hybrids', have to some extent resulted from the particular circumstances of East Anglia's geographical location, as discussed above. But they may also reflect the fact that Viking settlement in the region coincided with the late Anglo-Saxon expansion of arable farming and the associated conversion of the previously under-utilised East Anglian claylands into ploughlands. So the ASC's references to the Great Army veterans 'sharing out the land, and proceeding to plough and support themselves' (quoted in section 2.2.1d) may hold a particular resonance in an East Anglian context. Ultimately, the Vikings' involvement in the ongoing and dynamic development of the East Anglian rural landscape during the late Anglo-Saxon period appears somewhat at odds with what has been characterised as a Viking takeover of an apparently more static rural framework of established settlements bearing OE place-names in other parts of the Danelaw.

This apparent discrepancy may highlight the need for further comparative surveys of the differing types of Scandinavian-influenced place-names (such as the **býs** and the 'Grimston-hybrids') across the different regions of the Danelaw, looking at their geographical and archaeological contexts as well as their linguistic characteristics, following the pioneering analysis of **thorps** in *TIACL*. In East Anglia, further research is also needed into the other forms of onomastic evidence for Viking settlement, including broader surveys of the geographical distribution of Scandinavian-influenced minor and field-names, and of personal names recorded in Domesday Book and other medieval documents, that can provide further data for comparison with the place-name evidence. For there is still much to be learnt about the process of Viking settlement in this region, including the question of why it apparently differs so markedly from other regions of the Danelaw – somehow

reflecting an enduring propensity for East Anglia to ‘do different’, in the motto of its eponymous university.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations used in bibliography

ASSAH	*Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*
BAR	British Archaeological Reports
BNJ	*British Numismatic Journal*
CBA	Council for British Archaeology
CUP	Cambridge University Press
EAA	East Anglian Archaeology
EAH	*Essex Archaeology and History*
EME	*Early Medieval Europe*
EPNS	English Place-Name Society
JEPNS	*Journal of the English Place-Name Society*
LUP	Leicester University Press
MUP	Manchester University Press
NAU	Norfolk Archaeological Unit
NMAS	Norfolk Museum and Archaeology Service
NMS	Norfolk Museum Service
OUP	Oxford University Press
PSIAH	*Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History*
SCCAS	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

Sources

Abels, R. (1998) *Alfred the Great: War, Kingship and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England* (Harlow: Longman).

Abrams, L. (2000) 'Conversion and Assimilation', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 135-53.

Abrams, L. (2001) 'The conversion of the Danelaw', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 31-44.

Abrams, L. (2005) 'Scandinavian Place-names and Settlement-History: Flegg, Norfolk, and East Anglia in the Viking Age', in Mortensen and Arge (eds, 2005), 307-22.

Abrams, L. and Parsons, D.N. (2004) 'Place-names and the History of Scandinavian Settlement in England', in Hines, Lane and Redknap (eds, 2004), 379-431.

Adams, J. and Holman, K. (eds, 2004) *Scandinavia and Europe 800-1350* (Turnhout: Brepols).

Admiralty (2011) *Leisure Chart Folio*, SC 5607 Thames Estuary: Essex and Suffolk Coast, 9th edn (Taunton: United Kingdom Hydrographic Office).

Admiralty (2014) *Leisure Chart Folio*, SC 5614 East Coast: Orford Ness to Whitby, 8th edn (Taunton: United Kingdom Hydrographic Office).

Anderson, O.S. (1934) *The English Hundred-Names* (Lund).

Andersson, T. and Sandred, K.I. (eds, 1978) *The Vikings: Proceedings of the Symposium of the Faculty of Arts of Uppsala University, June 6-9 1977* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell).

Andrews, P. and Penn, K. (1999) *Excavations in Thetford, North of the River, 1989-90*, EAA Report No. 87 (Dereham: NMS).

Anthony, D.W. (1990) 'Migration in Archaeology: The Baby and the Bathwater', *American Anthropologist*, 92: 895-914.

Anthony, D.W. (1997) 'Prehistoric Migrations as Social Process', in J. Chapman and H. Hamerow, *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (Oxford: BAR), 21-32.

Archibald, M. (2007) 'Half-eyrir lead weight', in P.A. Emery (ed.) *Norwich Greyfriars: The pre-Conquest town and medieval priory*, EAA No. 120 (Dereham: EAA), 148-49.

Arngart, O. (1980) 'The hundred-name Wayland', *JEPNS*, 12: 54-58.

Arnott, W.G. (1946) *The Place-Names of the Deben Valley Parishes* (Ipswich: Adlard).

Arnott, W.G. (1950) *Suffolk Estuary: The Story of the River Deben* (Ipswich: Adlard).

Arnott, W.G. (1954) *Orwell Estuary: The Story of Ipswich River* (Ipswich: Boydell).

Ashwin, T. and Davison, A. (eds, 2005) *An Historical Atlas of Norfolk* (Chichester: Phillimore).

Atkin, M. (1985) 'The Anglo-Saxon urban landscape in East Anglia', *Landscape History*, 7: 27-40.

Atkin, M., Carter, A. and Evans, D.H. (1985) *Excavations in Norwich 1971-1978 (Part II),* EAA No. 26 (Norwich: Centre of East Anglian Studies).

Atkin, M., and Evans, D.H. (2002) *Excavations in Norwich 1971-1978 (Part III),* EAA No. 100 (Norwich: NMAS).

Attenborough, F.L. (ed. and trans., 1922) *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings* (reprint 2000, Felinfach: Llanerch).

Audouy, M. and Chapman, A. (eds, 2009) *Raunds: The origin and growth of a midland village AD 450-1500* (Oxford: Oxbow).

Avery, B.W. (1980) *Soil Classification for England and Wales [Higher Categories]* (Harpenden: Soil Survey of England and Wales).

Ayers, B. (1985) *Excavations within the North-East Bailey of Norwich Castle, 1979,* EAA No. 28 (Norwich: NAU).

Ayers, B. (1987) *Digging Deeper: Recent Archaeology in Norwich* (Norwich: NMS).

Ayers, B. (2004) 'The Urban Landscape', in C. Rawcliffe and R. Wilson (eds), *Medieval Norwich* (London: Hambledon), 1-28.

Ayers, B. (2009) *Norwich: Archaeology of a Fine City* (Stroud: Amberley).

Ayers, B. (2011) 'The growth of an urban landscape: recent research in early medieval Norwich', *EME*, 19: 62-90.

Ayers, B.S., Bown, J.E. and Reeve, J. (1991) *Digging Ditches* (Norwich: NMS).

Baker, J. (2004) 'The distribution of *tūn* place-names in Hertfordshire, Essex and neighbouring areas', *JEPNS*, 36: 5-22.

Baker, J. (2006a) 'Topographical Place-Names and the Distribution of *Tūn* and *Hām* in the Chilterns and Essex Region', in *ASSAH*, 13: 50-62.

Baker, J. (2006b) *Cultural Transition in the Chilterns and Essex Region, 350 AD to 650 AD* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press).

Bale, A. (ed., 2009a) *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (York: University of York).

Bale, A. (2009b) 'Introduction: St Edmund's Medieval Lives', in Bale (ed., 2009a).

Banham D. and Faith, R. (2014) *Anglo-Saxon Farms and Farming* (Oxford: OUP).

Barlow, G. (2011) 'The Landscape of Domesday Suffolk', *Landscape History*, 32: 19-36.

Barlow, G. (2013) 'The Interrelationship Between Freeman and Manors in Late Anglo-Saxon Suffolk, *PSIAH*, 43 (1): 52-67.

Baron, M.C. (1952) 'A Study of the Place-Names of East Suffolk', unpublished MA thesis (University of Sheffield).

Barrow, J. (2000) 'Survival and Mutation: Ecclesiastical Institutions in the Danelaw in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 155-76.

Bassett, S.R. (1982) *Saffron Walden: excavations and research 1972-80,* CBA Research Report No. 45 (London: CBA).

Batcock, N. (1991) *The Ruined and Disused Churches of Norfolk*, EAA Report No. 51 (Dereham: NAU).

Bately, J.M. (ed., 1986) *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, Vol. 3: MS A (Cambridge: Brewer).

Bates, D. and Liddiard, R. (eds, 2013) *East Anglia and Its North Sea World in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Bekker-Nielsen, H., Foote, P. and Olsen, O. (eds, 1981) *Proceedings of the Eighth Viking Congress* (Odense: Odense University Press).

Benskin, M., Laing, M., Karaiskos, V. and Williamson, K. (2013) *An Electronic Version of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/elalme/elalme_frames.html (accessed 27.12.2016).

Biddle, M. and Kjølbye-Biddle, B. (2001) 'Repton and the great heathen army, 873-4', in Graham-Campbell *et al*. (eds, 2001), 45-96.

Blackburn, M. (1989) 'The Ashdon (Essex) Hoard and the Currency of the Southern Danelaw in the Late Ninth Century', *BNJ*, 59: 13-38 + plates; reprinted in Blackburn 2011a: 177-205.

Blackburn, M. (2001) 'Expansion and control: aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian minting south of the Humber', in Graham-Campbell *et al*. (eds, 2001), 125-42.

Blackburn, M. (2005) 'Currency Under the Vikings. Part 1: Guthrum and the Earliest Danelaw Coinages', *BNJ*, 75: 18-43; reprinted with supplement in Blackburn 2011a: 2-31, 371-76.

Blackburn, M. (2006) 'Currency Under the Vikings. Part 2: The Two Scandinavian Kingdoms of the Danelaw', *c.* 895-954', *BNJ*, 76: 204-26; reprinted with supplement in Blackburn 2011a: 32-57, 376-82.

Blackburn, M. (2009) 'Currency Under the Vikings. Part 5: The Scandinavian Achievement and Legacy', *BNJ*, 79: 43-71; reprinted with supplement in Blackburn 2011a: 119-47, 383-84.

Blackburn, M. (2011a) *Viking Coinage and Currency in the British Isles* (London: Spink).

Blackburn, M. (2011b) 'Coinage in its Archaeological Context', in Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds, 2011), 580-99.

Blackburn, M. and Dumville, D.N. (eds, 1998) *Kings, Currency and Alliances: History and Coinage of Southern England in the Ninth Century* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Blackburn, M. and Pagan, H. (2002) 'The St Edmund coinage in the light of a parcel from a hoard of St Edmund pennies', *BNJ*, 72: 1-14; reprinted in Blackburn 2011a: 265-80.

Blair, J. (ed., 1988) *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition 950-1200* (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology).

Blake, E.O. (ed., 1962) *Liber Eliensis* (London: Royal Historical Society).

Blinkhorn, P. (2012) *The Ipswich ware project: Ceramics, trade and society in Middle Saxon England* (Medieval Pottery Research Group).

Blinkhorn, P. (2013) 'No pots please, we're Vikings: pottery in the southern Danelaw, 850-1000', in Hadley and ten Harkel (eds, 2013a), 157-71.

Blunt, C.E. and Dolley, R.H.M. (1958-59) 'The Hoard Evidence for the Coins of Alfred' *BNJ*, 29: 220-47.

Bosworth, J. and Toller, T.N. (1898) *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford: OUP).

Boulton, D. and Briggs, K. (2017) 'Scandinavian elements in Suffolk place-names', in G. Akselberg and I. Særheim (eds), *Scandinavian Names and Naming in the medieval North-Atlantic Area*, vol. 95, NORNA-rapporter, Proceedings of the 44th Symposium of NORNA in Caen 23-25 April 2014 (Uppsala: NORNA-förlaget), 29-45.

Briggs, K. (2006) 'Martlesham and Newbourne: a note on two obscure Suffolk names', *JEPNS*, 38: 31-36.

Briggs, K. (2010) 'The place-names of Foxhall in Suffolk', *JEPNS*, 42: 31-42.

Briggs, K. (2011) 'Bixley', *JEPNS*, 43: 3-25

Briggs, K. (forthcoming) 'Suffolk Place-names'.

Briggs, K. and Kilpatrick, K. (2016) *A Dictionary of Suffolk Place-Names* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Brink, S. and Price, N. (eds, 2008) *The Viking World* (London: Routledge).

Brooks, N.P. (1979) 'England in the Ninth Century: The Crucible of Defeat', *TRHS*, Series V, 29: 1-20.

Brown, P. (ed. and trans., 1984) *Domesday Book, Vol 33: Norfolk,* 2 vols (Chichester: Phillimore).

Butcher, D. (2016) *Medieval Lowestoft: The Origins and Growth of a Suffolk Coastal Community* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Butler, L. & Wade-Martins, P. (1989) *The Deserted Medieval Village of Thuxton, Norfolk*, EAA Report No. 46 (Dereham: NAU).

Cabot, S., Davies, G., and Hoggett, R. (2004) 'Sedgeford: Excavations of a Rural Settlement in Norfolk', in Hines, Lane and Redknap (eds, 2004), 313-23.

Cameron, K. (1965) 'Scandinavian Settlement in the Territory of the Five Boroughs: The Place-Name Evidence', first published as Inaugural Lecture, University of Nottingham (reprinted in Cameron 1975: 115-38).

Cameron, K. (1970) 'Scandinavian Settlement in the Territory of the Five Boroughs: The Place-Name Evidence – Part II, Place-Names in Thorp', *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 3: 35-49 (reprinted in Cameron 1975: 139-56).

Cameron, K. (1971) 'Scandinavian Settlement in the Territory of the Five Boroughs: The Place-Name Evidence – Part III: The Grimston Hybrids', in Clemoes and Hughes (eds, 1971), 147-63 (reprinted with postscript in Cameron 1975: 157-71).

Cameron, K. (ed., 1975) *Place-Name Evidence for the Anglo-Saxon Invasion and Scandinavian Settlements* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Cameron, K. (1976) *The Significance of English Place-Names*, Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy 1976 (Oxford: British Academy).

Cameron, K. (1985) 'Viking Settlement in the East Midlands: The Place-Name Evidence', in R. Schützeichel (ed.), *Gießener Flurnamen-Kolloquium* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter), 129-153.

Cameron, K. (1996b) *English Place-Names* (London: Batsford).

Campbell, A. (ed. and trans., 1962) *Chronicon Æthelweardi: The Chronicle of Æthelweard* (London: Nelson).

Campbell, A. (1971) *Skaldic Verse and Anglo-Saxon History*, The Dorothea Coke Memorial Lecture in Northern Studies, 1970 (London: University College).

Campbell, A. (ed. and trans., 1998) *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, 2nd edn with introduction by S. Keynes (Cambridge: CUP).

Campbell, B.M.S. (1981) 'The Extent and Layout of Common Fields in Eastern Norfolk', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 28: 5-32.

Campbell, J. (2001) 'What Is Not Known About the Reign of Edward the Elder', in Higham and Hill (eds, 2001), 12-24.

Campbell, J. (2002) 'Domesday Herrings', in C. Harper-Bill *et al.* (eds, 2002), *East Anglia's History: Studies in honour of Norman Scarfe* (Woodbridge: Boydell), 5-17.

Capelli, C., N. Redhead, J.K.Abernethy, F. Gratrix, J.F. Wilson, T. Moen, T. Hervig, M. Richards, M.P.H. Stumpf, P.A. Underhill, P. Bradshaw, A. Shaha, M.G. Thomas, N. Bradman, D.B. Goldstein, (2003) 'A Y Chromosome Census of the British Isles', *Current Biology*, 13: 979-984.

Carroll, J. (2013) 'Perceiving place through time: English place-name studies,1924-2013', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), xiii-xxxvii.

Carroll, J. and Parsons, D.N. (eds, 2013) *Perceptions of Place: Twenty-First Century Interpretations of English Place-name Studies* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Castles, S., de Haas, H. and Miller, M.J. (2014) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 5th edn (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Cavill, P. (2018) *A New Dictionary of English Field-Names* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Chapman, H. (2006) *Landscape Archaeology and GIS* (Stroud: Tempus).

Chapman, J. and Hamerow, H. (eds, 1997a) *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (Oxford: BAR).

Chapman, J. and Hamerow, H. (1997b) 'On the Move Again: Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation', in Chapman and Hamerow (eds, 1997a), 1-10.

Charles, B.G. (1934) *Old Norse Relations with Wales* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press).

Christie, N. and Stamper, P. (eds, 2012) *Medieval Rural Settlement: Britain and Ireland, AD 800-1600* (Oxford: Windgather).

Clark C. (1979) 'Clark's First Three Laws of Applied Anthroponymics', *Nomina*, 3: 13-19.

Clark, C. (1982) 'The Early Personal Names of King's Lynn: An Essay in Socio-Cultural History', *Nomina*, 6: 51-71.

Clark, C. (1983) 'On Dating *The Battle of Maldon*: Certain Evidence Reviewed', in Jackson 1995: 20-36.

Clark, C. (1992) 'Onomastics', in R.M. Hogg(ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (Cambridge: CUP), 452-89.

Clegg, M. (1984) *Streets and street names in Ipswich: their origin and development* (Ipswich: Salient Press).

Clemoes, P. and Hughes, K. (eds, 1971) *England Before the Conquest*, (Cambridge: CUP).

Coates, R. (2005) 'A Tendring hundred miscellany', *JEPNS*, 37: 37-47.

Coates, R. (2012) ' "Agricultural" compound terms and names in *tūn* like *Acton* and *Barton*', in Jones and Semple (eds, 2012a), 211-237.

Coates, R. (2013) 'Place-names and linguistics', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), 129-58.

Colman, F. (2014) *The Grammar of Names in Anglo-Saxon England: The Linguistics and Culture of the Old English Onomasticon* (Oxford: OUP).

Conolly, J. and Lake, M. (2006) *Geographical Information Systems in Archaeology* (Cambridge: CUP).

Cornford, B. (1998) 'The Lost Domesday Vill of Ness', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 43: 168-72.

Cornford, B. (2002) *Medieval Flegg: Two Norfolk Hundreds in the Middle Ages, East and West Flegg, 1086-1500* (Dereham: Larks Press).

Countryside Agency, The (1999) *Countryside Character, Vol. 6: East of England* (Cheltenham: Countryside Agency).

Cox, A., Fox, J. and Thomas, G. (1998) 'Sedgeford Historical and Archaeological Research Project, 1997 Interim Report', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 43: 172-79.

Cox, B. (1972-73) 'The Significance of the Distribution of English Place-Names in *hām* in the Midlands and East Anglia', *JEPNS*, 5: 15-73.

Cox, B. (1975-76) 'The Place-Names of the Earliest English Records', *JEPNS*, 8: 12-66.

Cracknell, B.E. (2005) *'Outrageous Waves': Global Warming and Coastal Change in Britain through Two Thousand Years* (Chichester: Phillimore).

Crawford, B.E. (2008) *The Churches Dedicated to St. Clement in Medieval England*, Scripta Ecclesiastica Vol. 1 (St Petersburg: Axioma).

Crick, J. and van Houts, E. (eds, 2011) *A Social History of England, 900-1200* (Cambridge: CUP).

Crosby, A. (1986) *A History of Thetford* (Chichester: Phillimore).

Crummy, P. (1981) *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon and Norman Colchester,* CBA Research Report No. 39 (London: CBA).

Crummy, P. (1997) *City of Victory: the story of Colchester – Britain's first Roman town* (Colchester: Colchester Archaeological Trust).

Cubbin, G.P. (ed., 1996) *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, Vol. 6, MS D (Cambridge: Brewer).

Cullen, P., Jones, R. and Parsons, D.N. (2011) *Thorps in a Changing Landscape* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press).

Cushion, B. and Davison, A. (1997) 'A Group of Earthworks in the Tat Valley', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 42-4: 492-505.

Cutler, H. (2018) 'Why make an urban archaeology database? Revealing Ipswich's heritage', *British Archaeology*, 161 (Jul-Aug): 38-43.

Dallas, C. (1993) *Excavations in Thetford by B.K. Davison between 1964 and 1970*, EAA Report No.62 (Dereham: NMS).

Darby, H.C. (1971) *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England* (Cambridge: CUP).

Darby, H.C. (1977) *Domesday England* (Cambridge: CUP).

Darby, H.C., and Versey, G.R. (1975) *Domesday Gazetteer* (Cambridge: CUP).

Darling, M.J. and Gurney, D. (1993) *Caister-on-Sea Excavations by Charles Green 1951-55*, EAA No. 60 (Dereham: NMS).

Davies, G. (2010b) 'Early Medieval 'Rural Centres' and West Norfolk: A Growing Picture of Diversity, Complexity and Changing Lifestyles', *Medieval Archaeology*, 54: 89-122.

Davis, R.H.C. (1954) *The Kalendar of Abbot Samson of Bury St Edmunds and Related Documents* (London: Royal Historical Society).

Davison, A. (1995) 'The Field Archaeology of the Mannington and Wolterton Estates', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 42: 160-84.

Davison, A. (1996) *Deserted Villages in Norfolk* (North Walsham: Poppyland).

Davison, A., Green, B. and Milligan, B. (1993) *Illington: A Study of a Breckland Parish and its Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, EAA Report No. 63 (Dereham: NMS).

Davison, A. (1999) 'The Archaeology of the Hargham Estate', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 43: 257-74.

Davison, B.K. (1967) 'The Late Saxon Town of Thetford: An Interim Report on the 1964-6 Excavations', *Medieval Archaeology*, 11 (1967), 189-208.

Downham, C. (2009) '"Hiberno-Norwegians" and "Anglo-Danes": Anachronistic Ethnicities and Viking-Age England', *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 19: 139-69.

Downham, C. (2012) 'Viking Ethnicities: A Historiographic Overview', *History Compass*, 10 (1): 1-12.

Dumville, D. (1992) *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Dumville, D. (2002) 'Vikings in the British Isles: A Question of Sources', in J. Jesch, *The Scandinavians from the Vendel Period to the Tenth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective* (Woodbridge: Boydell), 209-50.

Dumville, D. (2008) 'Vikings in Insular chronicling', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 350-67.

Dumville, D. and Lapidge, M. (1984) *The Annals of St Neots, with Vita Prima Sancti Neoti,* The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; A Collaborative Edition, Vol. 17 (Cambridge: Brewer).

Dunmore, S., Loader, T., and Wade, K. (1976) 'Ipswich Archaeological Survey: Second Interim Report', in S.E. West (ed.), *EAA Report No. 3* (Suffolk (Ipswich: Suffolk County Planning Dept.), 135-40.

Dyer, C. and Jones, R. (2010) *Deserted Villages Revisited* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press).

Dymond, D. and E. Martin (1988) *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, (Ipswich: Suffolk C.C. Planning Dept.).

Dymond, D. and E. Martin (1999) *An Historical Atlas of Suffolk*, 3rd edn (Ipswich: SCCAS).

Ekwall, E. (1960) *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names,* 4th edn (Oxford: OUP).

Epstein, G.S. (2008) 'Herd and Network Effects in Migration Decision-Making', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34 (4): 567-583.

Evison, M. P. (2000) 'All in the Genes?: Evaluating the Biological Evidence of Contact and Migration', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 277-294.

Evison, V.I. (1969) 'A Viking Grave at Sonning, Berks.', *Antiquaries Journal*, 99: 330-45.

Faden, W. (1989) *Faden's Map of Norfolk*, first printed 1797; reprinted with introduction by J.C. Barringer (Dereham: Larks Press).

Fairclough, J. (2010) *Boudica to Raedwald: East Anglia's relations with Rome* (Holbrook: Malthouse Press).

Fairweather, J. (trans., 2005) *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Faith, R. (1997) *The English Peasantry and the Growth of Lordship* (Leicester: LUP).

Faith, R. (1996) 'The Topography and Social Structure of a Small Soke in the Middle Ages: The Sokens, Essex' *EAH*, 27: 202-13.

Fellows Jensen, G. (1968) *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

Fellows Jensen, G. (1972) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in Yorkshire* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

Fellows Jensen, G. (1974) 'English Field-Names and the Danish Settlement', *Festskrift til Kristian Hald* (Copenhagen), 45-55.

Fellows Jensen, G. (1978) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag).

Fellows Jensen, G. (1981) 'Scandinavian settlement in the Danelaw in the light of the place-names of Denmark', in Bekker-Nielsen, Foote and Olsen (eds, 1981), 133-45.

Fellows Jensen, G. (1982) 'Scandinavian Settlement in England: The Place-Name Evidence', in H. Bekker-Nielsen and H.F. Nielsen (eds), *Første Tvæfaglige Vikingesymposium, Odense Universitet 1982* (Højbjerg: Hikuin), 9-32.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1983) 'Anthroponymical specifics in place-names in *–býʼ* in the British Isles', *Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica,* 1: 45-60.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1984) 'Place-names and settlements: some problems of dating as exemplified by place-names in *býʼ*, *Nomina*, 8: 29-39.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1985a) *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the North-West* (Copenhagen: Institut for Navneforskning).

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1985b) 'On *dalr* and *holmr* in the place-names of Britain', in T. Vilmundarson (ed.), *Merking Staðfræðilegra Samnafn i Ornefum*, Norna-Rapporter 28 (Uppsala: Norna-Forlaget), 9-24.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1987a) 'To Divide the Danes from the Norwegians: On Scandinavian Settlement in the British Isles', *Nomina*, 11: 35-60.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1987b) 'The Vikings' Relationship with Christianity in the British Isles: the evidence of place-names containing the element *kirkja*', in J.E. Knirk (ed.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress* (Oslo), 295-307.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1990) 'Scandinavian Personal Names in Foreign Fields', in *Cahiers des Annales de Normandie No. 23, Recueil d'études en homage à Lucien Musset* (Caen: Université de Caen), 149-59.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1991a) 'Scandinavian influence on the place-names of England', in Ureland and Broderick (eds. 1991), 337-54.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1991b) 'Of Danes – and Thanes – and Domesday Book', in I. Wood and N. Lund (eds), *People and Places in Northern Europe 500-1600: Essays in Honour of Peter Hayes Sawyer* (Woodbridge: Boydell), 107-21.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1991-92) 'Place-Names in *þorp*: In Retrospect and in Turmoil', *Nomina*, 15: 35-51.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1994) 'Danish place-names and personal names in England: The influence of Cnut?', in Rumble (ed., 1994), 125-140.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1995b) *The Vikings and Their Victims: The Verdict of the Names* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research).

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1998) 'Little thwaite, who made thee?', in W.F.H. Nicholaisen (ed.), *Proceedings of the XIXth International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, Aberdeen, August 4-11, 1996*, Vol. 2 (Aberdeen: Dept. of English), 101-06.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (1999) 'Scandinavian Settlement Names in East Anglia: Some Problems', *Nomina*, 22: 45-60.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2005) 'On the dating of place-names in *-býr* in England and Scotland and of the settlements bearing these names', in E. Brylla and M. Wahlberg (eds), *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences: Uppsala 19-24 August 2002* (Uppsala: Institut for Språk och Folkminnen), 96-104.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2006) 'On the dating of place-names in *-býr* in England and Scotland and of the settlements bearing these names', in E. Brylla and M. Wahlberg (eds), *ICOS 2002* (Uppsala: Institut for Språk- och Folkminnen), 96-104.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2007) 'Nordic and English in East Anglia in the Viking Period', *Nowele*, 50-51: 93-108.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2008) 'Grimston revisited', in Padel and Parsons (eds, 2008), 125-35.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2009) 'A few more words on place-names in *thorp* in England', in P. Dam *et al.* (eds), *Torp som ortnamn och bebyggelse*, Tvärvetenskaplig torp-konferens Malmö, 25-27 April 2007 (Lund: Dialekt- och ortnamnsarkivet i Lund), 43-53.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2010) 'Place-names as evidence for urban settlements in Britain in the Viking period', in J. Sheehan and D. Ó Corráin (eds), *The Viking Age: Ireland and the West* (Dublin: Four Courts), 89-96.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2012) 'Grimston and Grimsby: the Danes as re-namers', in Jones and Semple (eds, 2012a), 352-61.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2013) 'The Scandinavian background to English place-names', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), 75-101.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2014a [2016]) 'Looking even more closely at the Nordic element in East Anglian place-names', *Nomina*, 37: 143-58.

Fellows-Jensen, G. (2014b) 'On the track of some lost place-names and early substitutions in England', in B. Eggert, P. Gammeltoft and R.S. Olesen (eds), *På sporet: Festskrift til Bent Jørgensen på 70-årsdagen den 12. marts 2014* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums), 127-42.

Field, J. (1972) *English Field-Names: A Dictionary* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles).

Field, J. (1993) *A History of English Field-Names* (Harlow: Longman).

Finberg, H.P.R. (1964) 'Charltons and Carltons', in *idem, Lucerna: Studies of Some Problems in the Early History of England* (London: Macmillan), 144-60.

Finlay, A. (2009) 'Chronology, Genealogy and Conversion: The Afterlife of St Edmund in the North', in A. Bale (ed.), *St Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint* (York: University of York), 45-62.

Fisiak, J. (2001) 'Old East Anglian: A Problem in Old English Dialectology, in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 13- 38.

Fisiak,J. and Trudgill, T. (eds, 2001) *East Anglian English* (Cambridge: Brewer).

Fleming, R. (1985) 'Monastic lands and England's defence in the Viking Age', *English Historical Review*, 100 (395): 247-265.

Fleming, R. (2003) 'Lords and Labour', in W. Davies (ed.), *From the Vikings to the Normans* (Oxford: OUP), 107-37.

Fleming, R. (2010) *Britain after Rome: The Fall and Rise, 400-1070* (London: Allen Lane).

Fleming, R. (2011) 'Land use and people', in Crick and van Houts (eds, 2011), 15-37.

Forster, P., *et al.* (2004) 'mtDNA Markers for Celtic and Germanic Language Areas in the British Isles' in M. Jones (ed.), *Traces of Ancestry: Studies in Honour of Colin Renfrew* (Cambridge McDonald Institute), pp. 99-111.

Fox , H.S.A. (1989) 'The People of the Wolds in English Settlement History', in M. Aston and, D. Austin and C. Dyer (eds), *The Rural Settlement of Medieval England: Studies Presented to Maurice Beresford and John Hurst* (Oxford: Blackwell), 77-101.

Gammeltoft, P. (2001) ' "I sauh a tour on a toft, tryelyche i-maket": On place-names in *-toft*, *-tote* and *-tobhta* from Shetland to the Isle of Man', *Nomina*, 24: 17-32.

Gammeltoft, P. (2003) ' "I sauh a tour on a toft, tryelyche i-maket", Part 2: On place-names in *-toft* in England', *Nomina*, 26: 43-63.

Gardiner, M. (2012) 'Oral tradition, landscape and the social life of place-names', in Jones and Semple (eds, 2012a), 16-30.

Gelling, M. (1984) *Place-Names in the Landscape* (London: Dent).

Gelling, M. (1992a) 'A Chronology for Suffolk Place-Names', in M. Carver (ed.), *The Age of Sutton Hoo* (Woodbridge: Boydell), 53-64.

Gelling, M. (1992b) *The West Midlands in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester: LUP).

Gelling, M. (1997) *Signposts to the Past: Place-names and the History of England*, 3rd edn (Chichester: Phillimore).

Gelling, M. (2009) 'The word *church* in English place-names', in Quinton (ed.) 2009: 7-14.

Gelling, M. and Cole, A. (2003) *The Landscape of Place-Names*, repr. edn with corrections (Donington: Shaun Tyas).

Gover, J.E.B., Mawer, A and Stenton, F.M. (1938) *The Place-Names of Hertfordshire* (Cambridge: CUP).

Graham-Campbell, J. (1977) 'British Antiquity 1976-77: Western British, Irish and later Anglo-Saxon', *Archaeological Journal*, 134: 418-35.

Graham-Campbell, J. (1992b) 'Anglo-Scandinavian Equestrian Equipment in Eleventh-Century England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 14: 77-89.

Graham-Campbell, J. (2001a) 'Pagan Scandinavian burial in the central and southern Danelaw', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 105-23.

Graham-Campbell, J. (2004) 'The Archaeology of the "Great Army" (865-79', in E. Roesdahl and J.P. Schjødt (eds), *Beretning fra Treogtyvende Tværfaglige Vikingesymposium* (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitet), 30-46.

Graham-Campbell, J. (2013) *Viking Art* (London: Thames & Hudson).

Graham-Campbell, J., Hall, R., Jesch, J. and Parsons, D.N. (eds, 2001) *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress* (Oxford: Oxbow).

Gransden, A. (1974) *Historical Writing in England c. 550-1307* (reprint 1996, London: Routledge).

Gregory, R. (2016) 'Minor and field-names of Thurgarton Wapentake, Nottinghamshire', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Gregory, R. (2018) 'Introduction', in Cavill (2018), v-xxxviii.

Griffiths, D. (2013) 'Living in Viking-Age towns', in Hadley and ten Harkel (eds, 2013a), 1-13.

Groves, N. (2010) *The Medieval Churches of the City of Norwich* (Norwich: Norwich Heritage Economic and Regeneration Trust).

Gurney, D. (2005) 'Roman Norfolk', in Ashwin and Davison (eds, 2005), 28-29.

Haas, H. de (2010) 'The Internal Dynamics of Migration Processes: A Theoretical Inquiry', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36 (10): 1587-1617.

Hadley, D.M. (1996b) '"And they proceeded to plough and to support themselves": the Scandinavian settlement of England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 19: 69-96.

Hadley, D.M. (2000a) *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c. 800-1100* (Leicester: LUP).

Hadley, D.M. (2000b) ' "Hamlet and the Princes of Denmark": Lordship of the Danelaw, *c.* 860-954', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 107-32.

Hadley, D.M. (2000c) ' " Cockle among the Wheat?": The Scandinavian Settlement of England', in W.O. Frazer and A. Tyrrell (eds), *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain* (Leicester: LUP), 111-35.

Hadley, D.M. (2001) 'In Search of the Vikings: The Problems and the Possibilities of Interdisciplinary Approaches', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 13-30.

Hadley, D.M. (2002) 'Viking and native: re-thinking identity in the Danelaw', *EME*, 11: 45-70.

Hadley, D.M. (2006) *The Vikings in England: Settlement, Society and Culture* (Manchester: MUP).

Hadley, D.M. and Richards, J.D. (eds, 2000a) *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries* (Turnhout: Brepols).

Hadley, D.M. and Richards, J.D. (2000b) 'Introduction: Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Scandinavian Settlement', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 3-13.

Hadley, D.M. and Richards, J.D. (2016) 'The Winter Camp of the Viking Great Army, AD 872-3, Torksey, Lincolnshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 96: 23-67.

Hadley, D.M and Richards, J.D. (2018) 'In Search of the Viking Great Army: Beyond the Winter Camps', *Medieval Settlement Research*, 33: 1-17.

Hadley, D.M. and ten Harkel, L. (eds, 2013a) *Everyday Life in Viking-Age Towns: Social Approaches to Towns in England and Ireland, c. 800-1100* (Oxford: Oxbow).

Hadley, D.M. and ten Harkel, L. (2013b) 'Preface', in Hadley and ten Harkel (eds, 2013a), vii-xii.

Hall, A. (2012) 'The instability of place-names in Anglo-Saxon England and early medieval Wales, and the loss of Roman toponymy' in Jones and Semple (eds, 2012a), 101-29.

Halsall, G. (2000) 'The Viking Presence in England? The Burial Evidence Reconsidered', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 259-276.

Halsall, G. (2005) 'The sources and their interpretation', in P. Fouracre (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Vol. I: c.500 – c.700* (Cambridge: CUP), 56-90.

Hamerow, H. (1991) 'Settlement mobility and the 'Middle Saxon Shift': rural settlements and settlement patterns in Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 20 (1991), 1-17.

Hamerow, H. (1994) 'Migration Theory and the Migration Period', in B. Vyner, *Building on the Past: Papers Celebrating 150 Years of the Royal Archaeological Institute* (London: Royal Archaeological Institute), 164-77.

Hamerow, H. (1997) 'Migration Theory and the Anglo-Saxon "Identity Crisis"', in J. Chapman and H. Hamerow (eds), *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanation* (Oxford: BAR), 33-44.

Hamerow, H. (2011a) 'Overview: Rural Settlement', in Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds, 2011), 119-27.

Hamerow, H. (2011b) 'Anglo-Saxon Timber Buildings and Their Social Context', in Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds, 2011), 128-55.

Hamerow, H. (2012) *Rural Settlements and Society in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: OUP).

Hamerow, H, Hinton, D.H. and Crawford, S. (eds, 2011) *The Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*, (Oxford: OUP).

Hamilton, N.E.S.A. (ed., 1876) *Inquisitio Eliensis [Inqusitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis...]* (London: John Murray; reprint, London: British Library, no date).

Härke, H. (2002) 'Kings and Warriors: Population and Landscape from Post-Roman to Norman Britain' in P. Slack and R, Ward, *The Peopling of Britain: The Shaping of a Human Landscape*, (Oxford: OUP), 145-75.

Harkel, L. ten (2013b) 'Of towns and trinkets: metalworking and metal dress-accessories in Viking-Age Lincoln', in Hadley and ten Harkel (eds, 2013a), 172-92.

Harmer, F.E. (ed. and trans., 1952) *Anglo-Saxon Writs* (reprint 1989, Stamford: Paul Watkins).

Hart, C.R. (ed., 1966) *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Leicester: LUP).

Hart, C.R. (ed., 1971) *The Early Charters of Essex* (Leicester: LUP).

Hart, C.R. (1981) 'The East Anglian Chronicle', *Journal of Medieval History*, 7: 249-82.

Hart, C.R. (1992) *The Danelaw* (London: Hambledon).

Hart, C.R. (ed. and trans., 2006) *Byrhtferth's East Anglian Chronicle* (Lampeter: Mellen).

Heather, P. (2009) *Empires and Barbarians* (London: Macmillan).

Hedemand, L., Dam, P. and Gøgsig Jakobsen, J. (2003) 'De danske *torp*-landsbyers jordbundsforhold', in P. Gammeltoft and B. Jørgensen (eds), *Nordiske* torp-*navne* (Uppsala 2003: 95-108). [English summary: http://jggj.dk/thorpes.htm (accessed 27.2.2018)]

Hedges, R. (2011) 'Anglo-Saxon Migration and the Molecular Evidence', in Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds, 2011), 79-90.

Hesse, M. (2003) 'Domesday Settlement in Suffolk', *Landscape History*, 25: 45-57.

Higham, N.J. and Hill, D.H. (eds, 2001), *Edward the Elder, 899-924* (London: Routledge).

Higham, N.J. and Ryan, M.J. (eds, 2010) *The Landscape Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Higham, N.J. and Ryan, M.J. (eds, 2011) *Place-Names, Language and the Anglo-Saxon Landscape* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Higham, N.J. and Ryan, M.J. (2013) *The Anglo-Saxon World* (London: Yale University Press).

Hilberg, V. (2008) 'Hedeby: an outline of its research history', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 101-11.

Hill, D. (1981) *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Hills, C. (2003) *The Origins of the English* (London: Duckworth).

Hines, J., Lane A. and Redknap, M. (eds, 2004) *Land, Sea and Home: Settlement in the Viking Period* (Leeds: Maney).

Hinton, D.A. (2005) *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford: OUP).

Hodge, C.A.H., Burton, R.G.O., Corbett, W.M., Evans, R. and Seale, R.S. (1984) *Soils and Their Uses in Eastern England* (Harpenden: Soil Survey of England and Wales).

Hodges, R. (2006) *Goodbye to the Vikings? Re-reading Early Medieval Archaeology* (London: Duckworth).

Hodskinson, J. (2003) *Hodskinson's Map of Suffolk in 1783*, reprinted with introduction by D.P. Dymond (Dereham: Larks Press).

Hoggett, R.S. (2007 'Changing Beliefs: The Archaeology of the East Anglian Conversion', unpublished PhD thesis, University of East Anglia (Norwich).

Hoggett, R. (2010) *The Archaeology of the East Anglian Conversion* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Holman, K. (2001) 'Defining the Danelaw', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 1-11.

Holman, K. (2007) *The Northern Conquest: Vikings in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Signal).

Hooke, D., (2010) *Trees in Anglo-Saxon England: Literature, Lore and Landscape* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Howard, I. (2003) *Swein Forkbeard's Invasions and the Danish Conquest of England 991-1017* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Huggins, P.J. (1976) 'The excavation of an 11th-century Viking hall and 14th-century rooms at Waltham Abbey, Essex, 1969-71', *Medieval Archaeology*, 20: 75-133.

Hunter, J. (1999) *The Essex Landscape* (Chelmsford: Essex Record Office).

Hutcheson, A. (2006) 'The Origins of King's Lynn? Control of Wealth on the Wash Prior to the Norman Conquest', *Medieval Archaeology*, 50: 71-104.

Hutcheson, A.R. (2009) 'The Origins of East Anglian Towns: Coin Loss in the Landscape, AD 470-939', unpublished PhD thesis, University of East Anglia (Norwich).

Innes, M. (2000) 'Danelaw Identities: Ethnicity, Regionalism, and Political Allegiance', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 65-88.

Insley, J. (1979) 'Regional Variation in Scandinavian Personal Nomenclature in England', *Nomina*, 3: 52-60.

Insley, J. (1982) 'Some Scandinavian personal names from south-west England', *Namn och Bygd*, 70: 77-93.

Insley, J. (1994) *Scandinavian Personal Names in Norfolk: A Survey Based on Medieval Records and Place-Names* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell).

Insley, J. (1998) 'The place-names of Norfolk: A Danelaw project in progress", *Namn och Bygd*, 86: 105-117.

Insley, J. (1999) 'Grimston-Hybrids', *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, 13: 49-56.

Insley, J. (2002) 'Drinkstone', *Ortnamnssällskapets i Uppsala årsskrift (2002)*: 64-68.

Insley, J. (2003) 'Pre-Conquest personal names', *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, 23: 367-96.

Insley, J. (2013) 'Personal names in place-names', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), 209-49.

Irvine, S. (ed., 2004) *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, Vol. 7, MS E (Cambridge: Brewer).

Jackson, P. (ed., 1995) *Words, Names and History: Selected Writings of Cecily Clark* (Cambridge: Brewer).

Jesch, J. (1991) *Women in the Viking Age* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Jesch, J. (2008) 'Poetry in the Viking Age', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 291-98.

Jesch, J. (2015) *The Viking Diaspora* (Abingdon: Routledge).

Johansson, C. (1975) *Old English Place-Names and Field-Names Containing 'Lēah'* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell).

Johnson, M. (2010) *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell).

Johnson South, T. (ed. and trans., 2002) *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of His Patrimony* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Jones, C. (1972) *An Introduction to Middle English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

Jones, G. (1984) *A History of the Vikings*, 2nd edn (Oxford: OUP).

Jones, G.R.J. (1965) 'Early Territorial Organization in Northern England and Its Bearing on the Scandinavian Settlement', in A. Small (ed.), *The Fourth Viking Congress* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd), 67-84.

Jones, R. (2013) 'Settlement archaeology and place-names', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), 181-207.

Jones, R. and Page, M. (2006) *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape: Beginnings and Ends* (Macclesfield: Windgather).

Jones, R. and Semple, S. (eds, 2012a) *Sense of Place in Anglo-Saxon England* (Donington: Shaun Tyas).

Jones, R and Semple, S. (2012b) 'Making sense of place in Anglo-Saxon England', in Jones and Semple (eds, 2012a), 1-15.

Jones, S. (1997) *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London: Routledge).

Jorgensen, A. (ed., 2010a) *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History* (Turnhout, Brepols).

Jorgensen, A. (2010b) 'Introduction: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', in Jorgensen (ed., 2010a), 1-28.

Jørgensen, B. (2008) *Danske stednavne* (Copenhagen: Gyldenhal).

Kemble, J. (2007) *Essex Place-Names: Places, Streets and People* (London: Historical Publications).

Kershaw, J. (2009) 'Culture and Gender in the Danelaw: Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian Brooches', *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia*, 5: 295-325.

Kershaw, J.F. (2013) *Viking Identities: Scandinavian Jewellery in England* (Oxford: OUP).

Kershaw, P. (2000) 'The Alfred-Guthrum Treaty', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 43-64.

Keynes, S. (1978) 'The declining reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', in D. Hill (ed.), *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference* (Oxford: BAR), 227-53).

Keynes, S. (1994) 'Cnut's earls', in Rumble (ed., 1994), 43-88.

Keynes, S. (1997) 'The Vikings in England, *c.* 790-1016', in P. Sawyer (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings* (Oxford: OUP), 48-82.

Keynes, S. (1998) 'King Alfred and the Mercians', in Blackburn and Dumville (eds, 1998), 1-45.

Keynes, S. (1999) 'Charters and Writs', in Lapidge *et al.* (eds,1999), 99-100.

Keynes, S. and Lapidge, M. (eds and trans, 1983) *Alfred the Great: Asser's 'Life of King Alfred' and Other Contemporary Sources* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Klaeber, F. (ed., 1950) *Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*, 3rd edn (Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath).

Kristensson, G. (1995) *A Survey of Middle English Dialects 1290-1350: The East Midland Counties* (Lund: Lund University Press).

Kristensson, G. (1997) 'The Voicing of Initial Fricatives Revisited', in Rumble and Mills (eds, 1997), 186-94.

Kristensson, G. (2001) 'Language in Contact: Old East Saxon and East Anglian', in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 63-70.

Lapidge, M. (ed. & trans., 2009) *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St. Oswald and St Ecgwine* (Oxford: OUP).

Lapidge, M., Blair, J., Keynes, S., and Scragg, D. (eds, 1999) *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Lavelle, R. (2002) *Aethelred II: King of the English 978-1016* (Stroud: Tempus).

Laverton, S. (2001) *Shotley Peninsula: The Making of a Unique Suffolk Landscape* (Stroud: Tempus).

Lawson, A.J., *et al.* (1983) *The Archaeology of Witton, near North Walsham, Norfolk*, EAA Report No. 18 (Dereham: NMS).

Lawson, M.K. (2004) *Cnut: England's Viking King*, 2nd edn (Stroud: Tempus).

Leahy, K. and Paterson, C. (2001) 'New Light on the Viking Presence in Lincolnshire: The Artefactual Evidence', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 181-202.

Lee, E.S. (1966) 'A Theory of Migration', *Demography*, 3(1): 47-57.

Lewis, C. (2010) 'Exploring Black Holes: Recent Investigations in Currently Occupied Rural Settlements in Eastern England', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2010), 83-105.

Lewis, C. (2011) 'Test-pit excavation within currently occupied rural settlements: results of the HEFA CORS project in 2010', *Medieval Settlement Research*, 26: 48-59.

Lewis, C.P. (2012) 'The Invention of the Manor in Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 34: 123-50.

Lewis, C.P. (2016) 'Danish Landowners in Wessex in 1066', in R. Lavelle and S. Roffey (eds), *Danes in Wessex: the Scandinavian Impact on Southern England, c.800-c.1100*, (Oxford: Oxbow), 172-211.

Lewis-Simpson, S. (2011) 'Assimilation or Hybridization? A Study of Personal Names from the Danelaw', in W.M. Hoofnagle and W.R. Keller (eds), *Other Nations: The Hybridization of Insular Mythology and Identity* (Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag Winter), 13-43.

Lindkvist, H. (1912) *Middle-English Place-Names of Scandinavian Origin*, Part 1 (Uppsala: Uppsala University Press).

Ljungkvist, J. (2008), 'Handicrafts', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 186-92.

Logan, F.D. (2005) *The Vikings in History*, 3rd edn (Abingdon: Routledge).

London Canal Museum (undated) website: 'Waterways of England and Wales: Up to 1750' http://www.canalmuseum.org.uk/history/1750/index1750.htm (accessed 14.12.2017).

Lönnroth, L. (2008) 'The Icelandic Sagas', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 304-10.

Lowe, K.A. (1999) 'Wills', in Lapidge *et al.* (eds,1999), 478-80.

Loyn, H.R. (1962) *Anglo-Saxon England and the Norman Conquest* (London: Longman).

Loyn, H (1994) *The Vikings in Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Lucy, S. (2000) *The Anglo-Saxon Way of Death: Burial Rites in Early England* (Stroud: Sutton).

Lucy, S., Tipper, J. and Dickens, A, *et al.* (2009) *The Anglo-Saxon Settlement and Cemetery at Bloodmoor Hill, Carlton Colville, Suffolk*, EAA No. 131 (Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit).

Lund, N. (1976) ‘*Thorp*-Names’, in Sawyer (ed., 1976), 223-25.

Lund, N. (1981) ‘The settlers: where do we get them from – and do we need them?’, in Bekker-Nielsen, Foote and Olsen (eds, 1981), 147-171.

Macrae-Gibson, O.D. (1970) ‘How Historical is *The Battle of Maldon*?’, *Medium Ævum*, 39, 2: 89-107.

Manco, J. (2013) *Ancestral Journeys: The Peopling of Europe from the First Venturers to the Vikings* (London: Thames & Hudson).

Margeson, S. (1996) ‘Viking Settlement in Norfolk; A Study of New Evidence’, in Margeson, Ayers and Heywood (eds, 1996), 47-57.

Margeson, S. (1997) *The Vikings In Norfolk* (Norwich: NMS).

Margeson, S., Ayers, B. and Heywood, S. (eds, 1996) *A Festival of Norfolk Archaeology* (Norwich: Norfolk & Norwich Archaeological Society).

Markey, T.L. (1978) ‘Nordic *tveit-/tved*-Names and settlement History’, *Onoma*, 22: 47-83.

Marten, L. (2006) ‘The shiring of East Anglia: an alternative hypothesis’, *Historical Research*, 81: 1-27.

Martin, E. (1999) ‘Place-Name Patterns’, in Dymond and Martin (eds, 1999), 50-51.

Martin, E. (2003) ‘Guthrum, the Vikings and the Earldordom Estate’, (unpublished paper).

Martin, E. (2007) ‘Wheare Most Inclosures Be’: The Making of the East Anglian Landscape’, in M. Gardiner and S. Rippon (eds), *Medieval Landscapes: Landscape History After Hoskins, Vol. 2* (Macclesfield: Windgather), 122-36.

Martin, E. (2012) ‘Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex: Medieval Rural Settlement in “Greater East Anglia”’, in Christie and Stamper (eds, 2012), 224-48.

Martin E. and Satchell, M. (2008) ‘*Wheare Most Inclosures Be’ – East Anglian Fields: History, Morphology and Management*, EAA Report No. 124 (Ipswich: SCCAS).

Mawer, A. and Stenton, F.M. (1926) *The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire* (Cambridge: CUP).

Macnair, A. and Williamson, T. (2010) *William Faden and Norfolk’s 18th-Century Landscape* (Oxford: Windgather).

McEvoy, B., Richards, M., Forster, P. and Bradley, D.G. (2004) 'The *Longue Durée* of Genetic Ancestry: Multiple Genetic Marker Systems and Celtic Origins on the Atlantic Façade of Europe', *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 75: 693-702.

McKitterick, R. (1983) *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751-987* (Harlow: Longman).

McLeod, S. (2006) 'Feeding the *micel here* in England *c*. 865-878', *Journal of the Australian Early Medieval Association*, 2: 141-56.

McLeod, S. (2011) 'Warriors and women: the sex ratio of Norse migrants to eastern England up to 900 AD', *EME*, 19 (3): 332-53.

McLeod, S. (2014) *The Beginning of Scandinavian Settlement in England: The Viking 'Great Army' and Early Settlers, c. 865-900* (Turnhout: Brepols).

Meaney, A. (1997) 'Hundred Meeting-Places in the Cambridge Region', in Rumble and Mills (eds, 1997), 195-240.

Medieval Settlement Research Group (1993) *Annual Report*, 8.

Mills, A.D. (2011) *A Dictionary of British Place-Names*, first edn revised (Oxford: OUP).

Mills, A.D. (2014) *Suffolk Place-Names: Their Origins and Meanings* (Monks Eleigh, Suffolk: the author).

Mirrington, A. (2013) 'Transformations of identity and society in Essex, *c.* 400-1066', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Moesgaard, J.C. (2011) 'The Grisebjerggård Hoard and the Beginning of Pecking in Scandinavia', in J. Graham-Campbell, S.M. Sindbæk and G. Williams (eds), *Silver Economies, Monetisation and Society in Scandinavia, AD 800-1100* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press), 297-308.

Morris, C.D. (1977) 'Northumbria and the Viking Settlement : the evidence for land-holding', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 5th series, 5: 81-103.

Morris, C.D. (1981) 'Viking and native in northern England: A case study', in Bekker-Nielsen, Foote and Olsen (eds, 1981), 223-44.

Morris, C.D. (1984) 'Aspects of Scandinavian settlement in northern England: a review', *Northern History*, 20: 1-22.

Mortensen, A. and Arge, S.V. (eds, 2005), *Viking and Norse in the North Atlantic: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Fourteenth Viking Congress, Tórshavn, 19-30 July 2001* (Tórshavn: Føroya Fróðskaparfelag).

Nelson, J.L., (trans., 1991) *The Annals of St-Bertin* (Manchester: MUP).

Newman, J. (1992) 'The Late Roman and Anglo-Saxon Settlement Pattern in the Sandlings of Suffolk, in M. Carver (ed.), *The Age of Sutton Hoo* (Woodbridge: Boydell); 25-38.

Newman, J. (2005) 'Survey in the Deben valley', in M. Carver (ed.), *Sutton Hoo: A seventh-century princely burial ground and its context* (London: British Museum), 477-87.

Newton, S. (2011) 'The Battle of Newmouth and the Lost Viking History of Sudbourne, With A Postscript on the Place-Name Orford', *PSIAH*, 42 (3): 292-99.

O'Donoghue, H. (2004) Old *Norse-Icelandic Literature: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Oosthuizen, S. (2010) 'Medieval Field Systems and Settlement Nucleation: Common or Separate Origins?', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2010), 108-131.

Oppenheimer, S. (2007) *The Origins of the British* (London: Constable & Robinson).

Orton, H. *et al.* (1962-71) *Survey of English Dialects*, 4 vols (Leeds: Arnold).

Orton, H. and Wright, N. (1974) *A Word Geography of England* (London: Seminar Press).

Pääbo, S., Poinar, H., Serre, D., Jaenicke-Després, V., Hebler, J., Rohland, N., Kuch, M., Krause, J., Vigilant, L. and Hofreiter, M., (2004) 'Genetic Analyses from Ancient DNA', *Annual Review of Genetics*, 38: 645-679.

Padel, O.J. and Parsons, D.N. (eds, 2008) *A Commodity of Good Names: Essay in Honour of Margaret Gelling* (Donongton: Shaun Tyas).

Page, R.I. (1999a) *An Introduction to English Runes*, 2nd edn (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Page, R.I. (1999b) 'Personal Names, Old English', in Lapidge *et al.* (eds,1999), 363-64.

Pálsson, H. and Edwards, P. (trans., 1972) *The Book of Settlements: Landnámabók* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press).

Parker, M. S. (1985) 'Some notes on Barnby and related place-names in England', *JEPNS*, 17: 5–13.

Parkes, M.B. (1976) 'The palaeography of the Parker manuscript of the *Chronicle*, laws and Sedulius, and historiography at Winchester in the late ninth and tenth centuries', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5: 149-71.

Parsons, D.N. (2001) 'How Long Did the Scandinavian Language Survive in England? Again', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 299-312.

Parsons, D.N. (2002) '*Anna, Dot, Thorir*... Counting Domesday Personal Names', *Nomina*, 25: 29-52.

Parsons, D.N. (2003-04) 'A Note on Herrings in Place-Names', *JEPNS*, 36: 83-86.

Parsons, D.N. (2004) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 3: Ceafor-Cockpit (Nottingham: EPNS).

Parsons, D. (2006) 'Field-name statistics, Norfolk and the Danelaw', in P. Gammeltoft and B. Jørgensen, *Names through the Looking Glass: Festschrift in Honour of Gillian Fellows-Jensen*, (Copenhagen: Reitzels Forlag), 165-188.

Parsons, D.N. & T. Styles (1997) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 1: Á-Box (Nottingham: Centre for English Name Studies).

Parsons, D.N. & T. Styles (2000) *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, Part 2: Brace-Cæster (Nottingham: Centre for English Name Studies).

Pearson, A. (2002) *The Roman Shore Forts: Coastal Defences of Southern Britain* (Stroud: Tempus).

Pedersen, A. (2005) 'The Metal Detector and the Viking Age in Denmark', in Mortensen and Arge (eds, 2005), 402-411.

Penn, K. (2000) 'Anglo-Scandinavian Norwich: An Archaeological Desktop Survey' (Norwich: NAU; unpublished).

Pestell, T. (2004) *Landscapes of Monastic Foundation: The Establishment of Religious Houses in East Anglia c. 650-1200* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Pestell, T. (2013) 'Imports or Immigrants? Reassessing Scandinavian Metalwork in Late Anglo-Saxon East Anglia', in Bates and Liddiard (2013), 230-55.

Pestell, T. (2019) *Viking East Anglia* (Norwich: Norfolk Museum Service).

Pett, D.E.J. (2010) 'The Portable Antiquities Scheme's Database: Its Development for Research since 1998', in S. Worrell, G. Egan, J. Naylor, K. Leahy and M. Lewis (eds), *A Decade of Discovery: Proceedings of the Portable Antiquities Scheme Conference, 2007* (Oxford: BAR), 1-18.

Pewsey, S. and Brooks, A. (1993) *East Saxon Heritage: An Essex Gazetteer* (Stroud: Sutton).

Phythian-Adams, C. (2000) 'Frontier Valleys', in J. Thirsk (ed.), *The English Rural Landscape* (Oxford: OUP), 236-62.

Plunkett, S. (2005) *Suffolk in Anglo-Saxon Times* (Stroud: Tempus).

Pons-Sanz, S. (2013) *The Lexical Effects of Anglo-Scandinavian Linguistic Contact on Old English* (Turnhout: Brepols).

Poole, R. (1987) 'Skaldic Verse and Anglo-Saxon History: Some Aspects of the Period 1009-1016', *Speculum*, 62: 265-298.

Popescu, E.P. (ed., 2009) *Norwich Castle: Excavations and Historical Survey, 1987-98,* EAA No. 132, 2 vols (Dereham: NMAS).

Poussa, P. (2001) 'Syntactic change in north-west Norfolk', in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 243-59.

Price, N. (2014) 'Belief and Ritual', in Williams, Pentz, and Wemhoff (eds, 2014), 164-95.

Price, J.R. and Robb, D. (2015) *The Draining of the Minsmere Levels: The saga of a project and a community* (Leiston: Leiston Press).

Priestley, J. (1831) *Historical Account of the Navigable Rivers, Canals and Railways of Great Britain* (reprint 1969, Newton Abbot : David & Charles).

Quinton, E. (ed., 2009) *The Church in English Place-Names* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Rahtz, P. (1976) 'Buildings and rural settlement', in Wilson (ed.,1976a), 49-98.

Randsborg, K. (1980) *The Viking Age in Denmark: The Formation of a State* (London: Duckworth).

Reaney, P.H. (1935) *The Place-Names of Essex* (Cambridge: CUP).

Reaney, P.H. (1943) *The Place-Names of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely* (Cambridge: CUP).

Redknap, M. (2008) 'The Vikings in Wales', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 401-10.

Redmond, A.Z. (2007) *Viking Burial in the North of England: A Study of Contact, Interaction and Reaction between Scandinavian Migrants with Resident Groups, and the Effect of Immigration on Aspects of Cultural Continuity,* BAR British Series No. 429 (Oxford: BAR).

Reuter, T. (ed., 1992) *The Annals of Fulda*, Ninth-Century Histories, Vol. 2 (Manchester: MUP).

Richards , J. D. (2000a) *Viking Age England* (Stroud: Tempus).

Richards, J.D. (2000b) 'Identifying Anglo-Scandinavian Settlements', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 295-309.

Richards, J.D. (2001) 'Finding the Vikings: the search for Anglo-Scandinavian rural settlement in the northern Danelaw', in Graham-Campbell *et al.* (eds, 2001), 269-77.

Richards, J.D. (2002) 'The Case of the Missing Vikings: Scandinavian Burial in the Danelaw', in S. Lucy and A. Reynolds, *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales* (London: Society for Medieval Archaeology), 156-170.

Richards, J.D. (2008) 'Viking settlement in England', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 368-74.

Richards, J.D. (2011) 'Anglo-Scandinavian Identity', in Hamerow, Hinton and Crawford (eds, 2011), 46-61.

Richards, J.D. *et al.* (2004) 'Excavations at the Viking barrow cemetery at Heath Wood, Ingleby, Derbyshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 84: 23-116.

Richards, J.D., Naylor, J. and Holas-Clark, C. (2008) *The Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy (VASLE) Project*, http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/vasle_ahrc_2008 (accessed 13 October 2013).

Richards, J.D., Naylor, J. and Holas-Clark, C. (eds, 2009) 'Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy: using portable antiquities to study Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age England', *Internet Archaeology*, 25 http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue25/richards_toc.html (accessed 12 December 2014)

Richards, J.D. and Naylor, J. (2010) 'The metal detector and the Viking Age in England', in J. Sheehan and D. Ó Corráin (eds), *The Viking Age: Ireland and the West* (Dublin: Four Courts Press), 338-52.

Richards, J.D and Haldenby, D. (2018) 'The Scale and Impact of Viking Settlement in Northumbria', *Medieval Archaeology*, 62/2: 322-350.

Richards, M., Capelli, C. and Wilson, J.F. (2008) 'Genetics and the Origins of the British Population', in D.N. Cooper and H. Kehrer-Sawatzki (eds), *Handbook of Human Molecular Evolution* (Chichester: Wiley), 463-69.

Ridyard, S. (1988) *The Royal Saints of Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: CUP).

Rippon, S. (1996) 'Essex *c.* 700-1066', in O. Bedwin (ed.), *The Archaeology of Essex: Proceedings of the Writtle Conference* (Chelmsford: Essex County Council), 117-28.

Rippon, S. (2007) 'Focus or Frontier? The Significance of Estuaries in the Landscape of Southern Britain', *Landscapes*, 1: 23-38.

Rippon, S. (2008) *Beyond the Medieval Village: The Diversification of Landscape Character in Southern Britain* (Oxford: OUP).

Rippon, S. (2010) 'Landscape Change during the "Long Eighth Century" in Southern England', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2010), 39-64.

Roberts, B.K. (1977) *Rural Settlement in Britain* (London: Hutchinson).

Roberts, B.K. (1987) *The Making of the English Village* (London: Longman).

Roberts, B.K. and Wrathmell, S. (2002) *Region and Place: A study of English rural settlement* (London: English Heritage).

Robertson, A.J. (ed. and trans., 1925) *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I* (reprint 2000, 2 vols, Felinfach: Llanerch).

Rodwell, W. (2005) *The Archaeology of Churches* (Stroud: Tempus).

Roesdahl, E. (1982) *Viking Age Denmark* (London: British Museum).

Roffe, D. (2007) *Decoding Domesday* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Rogerson, A. (1995a) 'Fransham: An Archaeological and Historical Study of a Parish on the Norfolk Boulder Clay', unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of East Anglia (Norwich).

Rogerson, A. (1995b) *A Late Neolithic, Saxon and Medieval Site at Middle Harling, Norfolk*, EAA 74 (London: EAA).

Rogerson, A. and Dallas, C. (1984) *Excavations in Thetford, 1948-59 and 1973-80*, EAA Report No. 22 (Dereham: NAU).

Room, A. (1992) *The Street Names of England* (Stamford: Paul Watkins).

Round, J.H. (1921-23) 'Norse Place-Names in Essex', *Transactions of the Essex Archaeological Society*, 15: 169-77.

Rumble, A. (ed. and trans., 1983) *Domesday Book, Vol 32: Essex* (Chichester: Phillimore).

Rumble, A. (ed. and trans., 1986) *Domesday Book, Vol 34: Suffolk,* 2 vols (Chichester: Phillimore).

Rumble, A.R. (ed., 1994) *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway* (Leicester, LUP).

Rumble, A.R. (2011) 'The Landscape of Place-Name Studies', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2011), 23-49.

Rumble, A.R. and Mills, A.D. (eds, 1997) *Names, Places and People: An Onomastic Miscellany in Memory of John McNeal Dodgson* (Stamford: Watkins).

Rutledge, P. (1999) 'The Origins and Early Development of Great Yarmouth: Further Evidence' *Yarmouth Archaeology*, Vol. 1999: 27-33.

Rutledge, P. (2010) 'Great Yarmouth's Settlement Pattern' *Norfolk Archaeology*, 96-1: 63-70.

Ryan, M.J. (2011) 'Place-names, Language and the Anglo-Saxon Landscape: An Introduction', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2011), 1-21.

Rye, E. (2016) 'Dialect in the Viking-Age Scandinavian Diaspora: the Evidence of Medieval Minor Names', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Rye, J. (1991) *A Popular Guide to Norfolk Place-Names* (Dereham: Larks).

Rye, J. (1997) *A Popular Guide to Suffolk Place-Names* (Dereham: Larks).

Rye, W. (ed., 1881) *Pedes Finium: or Fines Relating to the County of Norfolk* (Norwich: Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society).

Sandred, K.I., (1963) *English Place-Names in '-Stead'*, Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 2 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells).

Sandred, K.I. (1979) 'Scandinavian Place-Names and Appelatives in Norfolk: A Study of the Medieval Field-Names of Flitcham', *Namn och Bygd*, 67: 98-122.

Sandred, K.I. (1986) 'From the King's Retainers to Unfree Peasants: Some Reflexes of Anglian Social-Class Groups in Norfolk Place-Names', *Nomina*, 9: 21-30.

Sandred, K.I. (1986-87) 'The Scandinavians in Norfolk: Some Observations on the Place-Names in *-býʼ*, *JEPNS*, 19: 5-28.

Sandred, K.I. (1987) 'The Vikings in Norfolk: Some Observations on the Place-Names in *-býʼ*, in J.E. Knirk (ed.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress* (Oslo), 309-24.

Sandred, K.I. (1990) 'Language Contact in East Anglia: Some Observations on the Scandinavian Place-Names in *–thwaite* in Norfolk', in E.M. Närhi (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th Congress of Onomastic Sciences* (Helsinki), 1-8.

Sandred, K.I. (1991) 'The study of Scandinavian in England: A survey of Swedish contributions including ongoing research in East Anglia', in Ureland and Broderick (eds., 1991), 317-36.

Sandred, K.I. (1994) 'Viking Administration in the Danelaw: A Look at Scandinavian and English Hundred-Names in Norfolk', in B. Ambrosiani and H. Clarke, *Developments Around the Baltic and the North Sea in the Viking Age: The 12th Viking Congress* (Stockholm), 269-76.

Sandred, K.I. (2001) 'East Anglian Place-Names: Sources of Lost Dialect', in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 39-61.

Sandred, K.I. (2002) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part Three, The Hundreds of North and South Erpingham and Holt* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Sandred, K.I. and Lindström, B. (1989) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part One, The Place-Names of the City of Norwich* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Sandred, K.I., Cornford, B., Lindström, B. and Rutledge, P. (1996) *The Place-Names of Norfolk: Part Two, The Hundreds of East and West Flegg, Happing and Tunstead* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Sawyer, P.H. (ed., 1968) *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (London, 1968); online version ('The Electronic Sawyer') available at www.trin.cam.ac.uk/chartwww/charthome.html (last accessed March 2016)

Sawyer, P.H. (1969) 'The Two Viking Ages of Britain: A Discussion', *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 2: 163-76.

Sawyer, P.H. (1971) *The Age of the Vikings,* 2nd edn (London: Arnold).

Sawyer, P.H. (ed., 1976) *Medieval Settlement: Continuity and Change* (London: Arnold).

Sawyer, P.H. (1982) *Kings and Vikings: Scandinavia and Europe, AD 700-1100* (London: Methuen).

Sawyer, P.H. (1998) *From Roman Britain to Norman England*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge).

Scarfe, N. (1986) *Suffolk in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Scarfe, N. (1987) *The Suffolk Landscape* (Bury St Edmunds: Alastair).

Scarfe, N. (1988) 'Domesday Settlements and Churches: The Example of Colneis Hundred', in Dymond and Martin (eds, 1988), 42-43.

Schram, O.K. (1961) 'Place-names', in F. Briers (ed.), *Norwich and its Region* (Norwich: Norwich Local Executive Committee of the British Association), 141-49.

Scragg, D. (ed., 1981) *The Battle of Maldon* (Manchester: MUP).

Selten, B. (1972) *The Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Middle English Personal Names* (Lund: Gleerup).

Sheeran, H. (2009) 'Artefact distribution case study: equestrian equipment', in Richards, Naylor and Holas-Clark (eds, 2009), section3.4.2 https://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue25/2/3.4.2.html (accessed 24.01.2020).

Skeat, W. (1913) *The Place-Names of Suffolk* (Cambridge: Cambridge Antiquarian Society).

Skre, D. (2008) 'The development of urbanism in Scandinavia', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 83-93.

Smart, V. (1985) 'The Moneyers of St Edmund', *Hikuin*, 11: 83-90.

Smart, V. (1986) 'Scandinavians, Celts, and Germans in Anglo-Saxon England: the evidence of moneyers' names', in M. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History: Essays in Memory of Michael Dolley* (Leicester: LUP), 171- 84.

Smith, A.H. (1956) *English Place-Name Elements*, 2 vols (Cambridge: CUP).

Smyth, A.P. (1977) *Scandinavian Kings in the British Isles, 850-880* (Oxford: OUP).

Smyth, A.P. (1998) 'The Emergence of English Identity, 700-1000', in A.P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave), 24-52.

Soil Survey of England and Wales (1983) *Soils of England and Wales: Sheet 4, Eastern England* [map] (Southampton: Ordnance Survey for Soil Survey of England and Wales).

Staecker, J. (2003) 'The Cross Goes North: Christian Symbols and Scandinavian Women', in M. Carver (ed.), *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press), 463-82.

Stafford, P. (1989) *Unification and Conquest: A Political and Social History of England in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries* (London: Arnold).

Stenton, F.M. (1971) *Anglo-Saxon England,* 3rd edn (Oxford: OUP).

Stevenson, W.H. (1904) *Asser's 'Life of King Alfred'*, *together with the 'Annals of Saint Neots' erroneously ascribed to Asser* (Oxford: OUP; rev. impression 1959).

Sturdy, R.G. & Allen, R.H. (1981) *Soils in Essex IV: Sheet TM12 (Weeley)*, Soil Survey Record No. 67 (Harpenden: Rothamsted Experimental Station).

Suffolk Local History Council (1984) *Deben Valley Place-Names*, 21 vols (Ipswich, 1984).

Taylor, C.C. (1977) 'Polyfocal Settlement and the English Village', *Medieval Archaeology*, 21: 189-203.

Thomas, G. (2000) 'Anglo-Scandinavian Metalwork from the Danelaw: Exploring Social and Cultural Interaction', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 237-255.

Thomas, G. (2012) 'The Prehistory of Medieval Farms and Villages: From Saxons to Scandinavians', in Christie and Stamper (eds, 2012), 43-62.

Töpf, A., *et al.* (2006) 'Tracing the Phylogeography of Human Populations in Britain Based on 4th-11th Century', *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 23: 152-61.

Töpf, A. (2009) 'DNA Analysis', in E.P. Popescu (ed.), *Norwich Castle: Excavations and Historical Survey, 1987-98,* EAA Report No. 132, 2 vols (Dereham: NMAS), Part 1, pp. 248-54.

Townend, M. (1998) *English Place-Names in Skaldic Verse* (Nottingham: EPNS).

Townend, M. (2002) *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (Turnhout: Brepols).

Townend, M. (2013) 'Scandinavian place-names in England', in Carroll and Parsons (eds, 2013), 103-26.

Townend, M. (2014) *Viking Age Yorkshire* (Pickering: Blackthorn Press).

Trafford, S. (2000) 'Ethnicity, Migration Theory and the Historiography of the Scandinavian Settlement of England', in Hadley and Richards (eds, 2000a), 17-39.

Trudgill, P. (2001a) 'Modern East Anglia as a dialect area', in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 1-12.

Trudgill,, P. (2001b) 'Third-person singular zero: African-American English, East Anglian dialects and Spanish persecution in the Low Countries', in Fisiak and Trudgill (eds, 2001), 179-86.

Turner, S. (2000) 'Aspects of the Developments of Public Assembly in the Danelaw', *Assemblage*, 5 https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/assemblage/html/5/turner.html

Turville-Petre, J. (1995) 'The Tofts of Aylsham Manors', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 42: 148-59.

Ureland, P.S. and Broderick, G. (eds, 1991) *Language Contact in the British Isles: Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1988* (Tübingen: Niemeyer).

von Feilitzen, O. (1937) *The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells).

Wade, K. (1993) 'The urbanisation of East Anglia: an Ipswich perspective', in J. Gardiner (ed.), *Flatlands and Wetlands: Current Themes in EAA*, EAA No. 50 (Norwich: EAA), 144-51.

Wade, K. (1999) 'Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Ipswich', in Dymond and Martin (eds, 1999), 158-59.

Wade, K. (2014) 'A History of Archaeology in Ipswich and of Its Anglo Saxon Origins', Ipswich Archaeological Trust website, http://ipswichat.org.uk/AboutUs/History.aspx (accessed 13.6.2017)

Wade-Martins, P. (1980a) *Excavations in North Elmham Park*, 2 vols, EAA Report No. 9 (Dereham: NAU).

Wade-Martins, P. (1980b) *Village Sites in Launditch Hundred,* EAA Report No. 10 (Dereham: NAU).

Wain, P. (2016) 'The Medieval Port of Goseford', *PSIAH*, 582-601.

Wallis, H. (2004) *Excavations at Mill Lane, Thetford, 1995*, EAA Report No. 108 (Dereham: Norfolk Museums & Archaeology Service).

Wallis, H. with Anderson, S. (2009) *A Medieval Cemetery at Mill Lane, Ormesby St Margaret, Norfolk,* EAA Report No. 130 (Dereham: Norfolk Museums & Archaeology Service).

Wareham, A. (1996) 'Saint Oswald's family and kin', in N. Brooks and C. Cubitt (eds), *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence* (Leicester: LUP), 46-63.

Warner, P. (1986) 'Shared churchyards, freemen church builders and the development of parishes in eleventh-century East Anglia', *Landscape History*, 8: 39-52.

Warner, P. (1987) *Greens, Commons and Clayland Colonization: The Origins and Development of Green-side Settlement in East Suffolk* (Leicester: LUP).

Warner, P. (1996) *The Origins of Suffolk* (Manchester: MUP).

Watts, M. (2006) *Watermills* (Princes Risborough: Shire).

Watts, V. (2004) *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Cambridge: CUP).

Waughman, M. (1998) 'Chapter 3: Excavations at Chigborough Farm', in S. Wallis & M. Waughman, *Archaeology and the Landscape in the Lower Blackwater Valley*, EAA Report No. 82 (Chelmsford: EAA), 59-108.

Wegman, I. (2016) 'The Causes of Common-Edge Drift: A Norfolk Study', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 47-3: 356-73.

Whitelock, D. (ed., 1930) *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge: CUP).

Whitelock, D. (1969) 'Fact and Fiction in the Legend of St. Edmund', *PSIA*, 31 (3), 217-33.

Whitelock, D. (1972) 'The pre-Viking age church in East Anglia', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 1: 1-22.

Whitelock, D. (ed. and trans., 1979) *English Historical Documents c. 500-1042*, 2nd edn (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode).

Williams, A. (1986) ' "Cockles Amongst the Wheat": Danes and English in the Western Midlands in the First Half of the Eleventh Century', *Midland History*, 11: 1-22.

Williams, A. (1992a) 'A Bell-House and a Burh-Geat: Lordly Residences in England Before the Conquest', in Liddiard (ed., 2003), 23-40.

Williams, A. (1992b) 'The battle of Maldon and *The Battle of Maldon*: history, poetry and propaganda', *Medieval History*, 2: 35-44.

Williams, A. (1996) 'The Vikings in Essex, 871-917', *EAH*, 27: 92-101.

Williams, A. (2003) *Æthelred the Unready: The Ill-Counselled King* (London: Hambledon).

Williams, D. (1997) *Late Saxon stirrup-strap mounts: A classification and catalogue* (York: CBA).

Williams, G. (2013) 'Towns and identities in Viking England', in Hadley and ten Harkel (eds, 2013a), 14-34.

Williams, G. (2014) 'Introduction', in Williams, Pentz, and Wemhoff (eds, 2014), 16-27.

Williams, H. (2008) 'Runes', in Brink and Price (eds, 2008), 281-90.

Williams, G., Pentz, P. and Wemhoff, M. (eds, 2014) *Vikings: life and legend* (London: British Museum).

Williamson, T. (1993) *The Origins of Norfolk* (Manchester: MUP).

Williamson, T. (1997) *The Norfolk Broads: A Landscape History* (Manchester: MUP).

Williamson, T. (2003) *Shaping Medieval Landscapes: Settlement, Society, Environment* (Oxford, Windgather).

Williamson, T. (2005a) *Sandlands: The Suffolk Coast and Heaths* (Macclesfield: Windgather).

Williamson, T. (2005b) 'Place-Name Patterns', in Ashwin and Davison (eds, 2005), 34-35.

Williamson, T. (2006) *England's Landscape: East Anglia* (London: Collins).

Williamson, T. (2008) *Sutton Hoo and Its Landscape: The Context of Monuments* (Oxford: Windgather).

Williamson, T. (2010a) 'The Environmental Contexts of Anglo-Saxon Settlement', in Higham and Ryan (eds, 2010), 133-55.

Williamson, T. (2010b) *The Origins of Hertfordshire* (Hatfield: Hertfordshire Publications).

Williamson, T. (2013a) *Environment, Society, and Landscape in Early Medieval England: Time and Topography* (Woodbridge: Boydell).

Williamson, T. (2013b) 'East Anglia's Character and the "North Sea World"', in Bates and Liddiard (2013), 44-62.

Wilson, D.M. (ed., 1976a) *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: CUP).

Wilson, D.M. (1976b) 'The Scandinavians in England', in Wilson (ed., 1976a), 393-403.

Wilson, D.M. (1976c) 'Scandinavian Settlement in the North and West of the British Isles – an Archaeological Point of View', *TRHS*, 26: 95-113.

Winchester, A. (2000) *Discovering Parish Boundaries*, 2nd edn (Princes Risborough: Shire).

Winterbottom, M. (1972) *Three Lives of English Saints* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies).

Wrathmell, S. (2017) 'Open fields and village planning during the late Saxon period: a Carleton and a Carlton in West Yorkshire', *Medieval Settlement Research*, 32: 7-12.

Wright, J. (1898 – 1905) *The English Dialect Dictionary*, 6 vols (Oxford: OUP).

Youngs, S.M., Clark, J. and Barry, T. (1984) 'Medieval Britain and Ireland in 1983', *Medieval Archaeology*, 28: 241.

Youngs, S.M., Clark, J. and Barry, T. (1986) 'Medieval Britain and Ireland in 1985', *Medieval Archaeology*, 30: 162-63.

Yorke, B. (1990) *Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England* (London: Seaby).

End of **Volume One**

(**Volume Two** contained in separate PDF)