

usual derivation from **fāgan treowe* be accepted. *Facit* in Lancs. ('variegated hill-side') shows this development of *fāg*; it is recorded as *Fagheside* in the thirteenth century, which leaves no doubt about the etymology.

The development of *sceaga* to *shay* poses a difficult problem, not adequately dealt with as yet in place-name literature. But there can be no serious doubt that *shay* is from *sceaga*. It appears in minor names in areas where *sceaga* is particularly common, and interchange between the two forms is very well-evidenced. The specialized use of the *shay* form which is established in Mrs Higham's paper perhaps derives from awareness that *shaw* sometimes occurred in regions where there had been no trace of woodland for a very long time. Since the word *shaw* retained its connotation of woodland, the alternative form *shay* might have been adopted for use in the situations described in the paper.

There may be other instances in minor place-names of the use of an alternative modern form to mark the distinction between areas where the known ME or modern meaning of the term was appropriate, and those where the conditions which gave rise to the name have vanished utterly from the landscape. The occurrence of a term originally denoting woodland in areas which have long been treeless may be paralleled by the use in place-names of OE *wald*, modern *wold*.

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

A. E. B. Owen

A castle mound, a couple of farms and an overgrown churchyard are almost all that is visible today of Castle Carlton, a mere speck on the map of north-east Lincolnshire five miles south-east of Louth. Even two centuries ago the antiquary Richard Gough found there 'only nine wretched cottages of mud and straw', but declared that 'this poor village was once a populous market town'.¹ My own researches over a number of years have confirmed that Castle Carlton was more than just another of Lincolnshire's deserted medieval villages. It seems to have arisen near the end of the twelfth century, under the ægis of Hugh Bardolf the judge, as a 'new town' foundation beside an existing castle mound on the borders of Great Carlton and South Reston. The present article has its origins in an attempt to discover when, and by whom, the actual castle might have been built before Castle Carlton parish, a mere 471 acres, was (as seems probable) formed from the extremities of these two neighbours. What follows is therefore concerned with them rather than with Castle Carlton itself.²

At the time of the Lindsey survey (LS) of 1115 x 1118, Asgautr (Ansgot) of Burwell held, *inter alia*, four carucates in *Carletune* as tenant-in-chief, besides six bovates in *Carletuna* and *Sumercotis* as under-tenant of Robert de Haia.³ In their edition of the Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey, Foster and Longley identify the former holding as 'Castle Carlton and Great Carlton', the *Carletuna* of the latter merely as 'Great Carlton'. They identify the LS holding of Alan of Percy, two carucates in *Ristuna* and *Carletuna*, as 'Reston and Little Carlton' in the body of their text, calling the former place more precisely 'Reston, North' in the index. The corresponding, somewhat larger, DB holding of William of Percy, three carucates in *Ristone et Carletone* (GDB, fo. 354r; Lincs. 22/29), they identify similarly as 'North Reston and Little Carlton'.⁴ What is apparently lacking from the two surveys is, in LS, any mention of South Reston, and, most notably, any mention in DB of either South Reston or Great Carlton.

Initially I accepted the latter as just another unexplained Domesday lapse which might, or might not, have implications for the status of the two places in 1086. As my research progressed, however, and in the face of Fellows-Jensen's positive statement 'not named in DB' in respect of Great Carlton,⁵ it seemed essential to check whether its 'missing' four carucates might be subsumed under the entry for some other holding. A tedious comparison of the DB and the LS entries for every place in Loutheske wapentake left me none the wiser, merely

servicing to emphasize this as the one LS holding in the wapentake with no discoverable counterpart in DB. Mindful of the ease with which Lincolnshire place-names are confused, I then examined every DB entry concerning each of the eight medieval Carltons in the county, in search of a clue. This seemed the faintest of hopes, but it did produce the clue.

In the record of the numerous Domesday holdings of Kolsveinn (Colsuan, Colswain) in Lincolnshire, Foster and Longley identify half a carucate in *Risun et Carlentun* (357r; 26/20) as 'Riseholme and South Carlton', the following entry (357r; 26/21) being for a bovate in *Cocrinton*, i.e. Cockerington in Loutheske wapentake.⁶ I was struck by the fact that, though Riseholme and South Carlton, which adjoin each other in Lawress wapentake just north of Lincoln, are on the opposite side of Lindsey to Cockerington, Matthew 'Kolsveinn's man' is shown as sub-tenant in both holdings but nowhere else save at Horbling in Kesteven (357v; 26/46). Furthermore, contrary to the usual DB practice of placing in sequence all holdings of a tenant-in-chief in any one vill, here sixteen entries separate Kolsveinn's holding of a carucate in *Risun* (356v; 26/2), identified as Riseholme, from that in *Risun et Carlentun*. My suspicions, now aroused, were intensified on discovering that Alsige (Ailsi, Alsi), the tenant T.R.E. of Kolsveinn's half carucate in the latter, was also tenant T.R.E. of William of Percy's three carucates in *Ristone et Carletone* already mentioned. If the latter is correctly identified as North Reston and Little Carlton, the other must surely be South Reston and Great Carlton. In that event, it could reasonably be assumed that, before being separated at the Conquest, Alsige's two Restons, North and South, and two Carltons, Little and Great, constituted a single holding, in which the church recorded under the DB Percy holding may well have served all four settlements (the existing churches of three, the two Restons and Little Carlton, are all dedicated to St Edith).

There is no difficulty in accommodating this identification to the tenurial geography of the eleventh century. On the one hand, Kolsveinn's bovate at Cockerington, an outlier from the main body of his estates in west Lindsey and central Kesteven (see the map of them in Hill's *Medieval Lincoln*),⁷ is revealed as a little less isolated when seen as a partner to his half carucate at Reston and Carlton in the same wapentake. On the other hand, we now get a truer picture of Alsige's pre-Conquest estates. This last holding, which hitherto seemed an outlier in west Lindsey, can now be seen to reinforce the compact block of his previously known holdings in and adjoining the central Wolds at Ludford, Kirmond, Covenham, Elkington and Legsby (354r; 22/21, 24, 26, 28, 35) and the accepted

(later Percy) Reston and Carlton holding, to which we must add Louth if Hill is right in locating there the lands which Alsige and Wulfgrim (Olgrim) 'placed in the church of Saint Mary of Lincoln and at the discretion of bishop Wulfwig' (375r; CS/5).⁸ Nor is there difficulty with Darby's Domesday mapping of Lincolnshire. In particular, the 160 acres of woodland in Kolsveinn's holding at Reston and Carlton plainly complement the 100 acres of woodland in the Percy holding there, while being consistent with what was already known of the distribution of woodland in the county.⁹ At the same time, the deduction of these 160 wooded acres from Riseholme and South Carlton on the opposite side of Lindsey is wholly credible, being inconsistent with a part of the county where natural woodland was in the eleventh century, and for the most part still is, conspicuously absent.

We may, then, confidently equate *Risun et Carlentun* with South Reston and Great Carlton. My satisfaction at establishing this was, I must confess, somewhat dented when at this stage in my enquiry I realized that a local historian had quietly published the identification sixty years ago. In an article I had consulted many times already during my research on Castle Carlton, Dudding says simply: 'At the date of the Domesday Survey Colswain had a manor in Reston and Carlton [*Risun et Carlentun*]', quoting as his source in a footnote, from Foster and Longley's edition, the very DB entry which had first aroused my suspicion.¹⁰ What is odd is that he shows no awareness of anything controversial about this statement, since he goes straight on without comment to the later history of the manor, yet he can scarcely have failed to notice that his identification differed radically from that supplied by the editors of his source. At this distance of time the mystery is impossible to explain. I can only account for my own failure to notice the implications of Dudding's statement by the completely matter-of-fact manner of its expression, and admit that I, in the good company of Fellows-Jensen, Darby and those responsible for the Phillimore edition, erred alike in overlooking the work of a pioneer enquirer and in accepting Foster and Longley without question.

Riseholme must nevertheless be represented by others of the *Risun* DB entries, but which? It became necessary now to look critically at each one. Suspicion attached to the penultimate entry among the holdings of Svartbrandr (Sortebrand) and other thanes, where in *Risun* Agmundr (Agemund) the priest held half a carucate (371v; 68/47). After the information that he had a plough(-team) there, we are further told: 'This belongs to the church of Saint Michael'. What does this mean? In the context of Domesday such a statement can scarcely refer

to the parish church of Riseholme which in any case is, and presumably was, dedicated to St Mary. Foster and Longley in the subject index to their edition hesitate between 'Lincoln [query St. Michael]' and Riseholme [query], St. Michael', but in their index of persons and places come down in favour of 'Lincoln, St. Michael' (i.e. St Michael on the Mount) with no query,¹¹ presumably on the basis of this church's proximity to Riseholme. Hill, discussing the DB evidence for Lincoln churches, makes the same assumption: 'St. Michael (presumably of Lincoln) is recorded because it had land at Riseholme'.¹² If this were so, however, one might have expected to find in the entry 'Saint Michael of Lincoln', in those words.

The actual form of words seems to me to have a different implication, and to point not to a parish church but to a religious house identified by its patron saint. St Guthlac of Crowland, St Peter of *Burg*, St Benedict of Ramsey, all figure thus in DB entries, as also St Karilef at Covenham and St Sever at Haugham. These last two (340v; 3/16-17. 349v; 13/44) have a particular interest, for at both Covenham and Haugham there were alien priories, or more precisely cells, dependent on the respective monasteries in France bearing those saints' names.¹³ If *Risun* in 68/47 is Riseholme, then Michael remains unexplained, but if it is Reston an explanation is to hand. The DB holdings of Asgautr of Burwell comprised land in Burwell itself, Authorpe, Muckton and Welton-le-Wold (366v; 55/1-4), augmented by the time of LS by further lands in Ludford, Walmsgate, West Wykeham, Somercotes, and the crucial four carucates in Carlton which we may now regard as including South Reston. In all this group, only one church today is dedicated to St Michael, that of Burwell – a dedication borne also by the alien priory or cell formerly at Burwell and dependent on the monastery of La Sauve Majeure near Bordeaux.¹⁴ La Sauve's cartulary includes the text of what corresponds to a foundation charter for this priory. Addressed to Robert, bishop of Lincoln (1094-1123), and the chapter of Lincoln, it informs them that 'Ansgot of Burewelle' on his way back from Compostella has given to La Sauve the church of Burwell, its chapel of Authorpe, the churches of Carlton, Muckton and Walmsgate, a bovate and a toft in Carlton, and other endowments. Round dated this document 'c.1110?',¹⁵ and the priory's foundation has in consequence been assigned to the early twelfth century.¹⁶

Round's dating, however, self-evidently an approximation, was supported only by a footnote reference to identifications by Sitwell of two of the witnesses to the Burwell document.¹⁷ Even if these are correct, their value as evidence to support a date has now been undermined. The work of Tait and Barraclough has shown

that the early grants in favour of St Werburgh's abbey, Chester, on which Sitwell largely relied, 'cannot easily be accepted as authentic', having been probably 'put together by the monks of Chester from genuine material during the reign of Stephen'.¹⁸ If therefore St Michael of Burwell already had interests in Reston in 1086, the way is open for a reconsideration of the priory's foundation date.

We know of three other 'alien' dependencies of French monasteries in north-east Lindsey in 1086. At Covenham the Conqueror himself had granted the manor to St Karilef in 1082; the date of Haugham's foundation by Earl Hugh of Chester is not known, but DB shows the monks of St Sever already in possession; it also records the existence of 'the church of *Wingeham*' (352r; 16/8), i.e. Winghale priory in South Kelsey which belonged to the monastery of Séz.¹⁹ I suggest that Burwell was a fourth such dependency. Though the founder's charter cannot itself be earlier than 1094, the year of Bishop Robert's election, it may well have been designed to record, for the information of the bishop and posterity, an event which actually took place some years previously. There would be nothing remarkable about this. Very similar motives, after all, prompted the monks of Chester and other religious houses to reduce to writing, though with less conscience about the details, what they knew or chose to believe about their own early history in times when the testimony of witnesses to seisin probably sufficed as 'the best of all evidence of the execution of a gift'.²⁰ Thus we may reasonably argue for the founder's pilgrimage to Compostella and its outcome as having taken place before 1086 and not, as hitherto supposed, at least two decades later. If so, we may add Burwell to the little group of pre-Conquest alien priories in this part of Lincolnshire, and in so doing add a little also to our knowledge of Carlton and Reston.²¹

It must be admitted, in conclusion, that of the four carucates which Asgautr/Ansgot²² held in chief in *Carletune* at the Lindsey Survey, this enquiry has managed to identify only one in Domesday, distributed under two heads. But 'every little helps', and perhaps it may stimulate someone else to identify, or account for, the remainder.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

The following abbreviation has been used:

LDLS = C. W. Foster and T. Longley, eds, *The Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey*, Lincoln Record Society XIX (1924).

In conformity with *Nomina* policy I have (with some misgivings) cited personal names occurring in DB in the forms employed in the Phillimore translation (Chichester, 1986). However, since these may be unrecognizable to readers accustomed to the forms employed in LDLS, the latter are added in brackets.

¹ W. Camden, *Britannia*, ed. R. Gough, II (London, 1789), 274.

² For the Bardolf connection with Lincolnshire, see C. Clay, 'Hugh Bardolf the justice and his family', *Lincs. History and Archaeology* I (1966), 4-28. It is not possible here to say more about Castle Carlton's early history. I intend to publish an account of it elsewhere in due course.

³ LDLS, 258-9.

⁴ *Ibidem*, 103.

⁵ G. Fellows-Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands*, Institut for Navneforskning, Navnestudier XVI (Copenhagen, 1978), 182.

⁶ LDLS, 120, where these entries are numbered respectively 26/19 and 26/20 in accordance with the actual DB sequence. The Phillimore edition adjusts the numbering to fit the transpositions desired by the DB scribe.

⁷ J. W. F. Hill, *Medieval Lincoln* (Cambridge, 1948), 48-50.

⁸ *Ibidem*, 67.

⁹ H. C. Darby, *The Domesday Geography of Eastern England* (3rd edn, Cambridge, 1971), 56-61.

¹⁰ R. C. Dudding, 'The East Lindsey Carltons', *Assoc. Archit. Societies' Reports and Papers*, XXXIX pt.2 (1929), 264-72.

¹¹ LDLS, 284, 310-11.

¹² Hill, *Medieval Lincoln*, 130.

¹³ D. M. Owen, *Church and Society in Medieval Lincolnshire*, History of Lincolnshire V (Lincoln, 1971), appendix 3.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵ J. H. Round, ed., *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France* (London, 1899), 448.

¹⁶ Owen, *Church and Society*, 49; D. Knowles and R. N. Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (London, 1971), 83, 87.

¹⁷ G. R. Sitwell, *The Barons of Pulford* (Scarborough, 1889), esp. 54-5, 58.

¹⁸ J. Tait, ed., *The Chartulary or Register of the Abbey of St. Werburgh, Chester*, I, Chetham Society n.s. LXXIX (1920), 13 *et seq.*; G. Barraclough, ed., *The Charters of the Anglo-Norman Earls of Chester, c.1071-1237*, Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, CXXVI (1988), esp. 8-11, 15-16, 25.

¹⁹ Owen, *Church and Society*, appendix 3, as 'Wengale'.

²⁰ F. M. Stenton, *Documents Illustrative of the...History of the Danelaw* (London, 1920), xlix.

²¹ Reston, like Carlton, seems fated to suffer confusion with similar names. In successive volumes of R. Hill, ed., *The Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton, 1280-99*, 8 vols., Lincoln Record Society (1948-86), North and South Reston (Lincs.), Ruston (Norfolk), and the (former) two churches of Rushton (Northants.) are thoroughly confused in the indexes, owing to the form *Riston* having been employed for them all. Only by careful examination of the context in each case can they be disentangled.

²² *Pace* the Phillimore editors, can we really accept that the 'approximate late 11th century form' of the name of Ansgot of Burwell was Asgautr? With such a name he could only have been a native of the Danelaw, but tenants-in-chief of

native origin are decidedly rare birds in Lincolnshire. Without disputing the name's Scandinavian origin, it seems much more likely that Ansgot himself came from Normandy, where names ultimately Scandinavian still survived though rapidly diminishing in number, and that he would never have answered to Asgautr. Cf. F. M. Stenton, 'The Scandinavian Colonies in England and Normandy', in D. M. Stenton, ed., *Preparatory to Anglo-Saxon England: The Collected Papers of F. M. Stenton* (Oxford, 1970), 340.